

February 27, 2025

To: Honorable Members of the Indiantown Village Council
Honorable Members of the Village of Indiantown Planning, Zoning, Appeals Board
Indiantown Village Administrator Taryn Kryzda
Community Development Director Deanna Freeman

RE: Objections to Projects Numbers: ANX 24-072 and CPA 24-073

No one likes to object just for the sake of objecting, and we have no ill will towards the applicant, however, we find the application premature as outlined below.

As the landowners, stakeholders and representatives of more than 2,300 acres of industrial land located within Indiantown's incorporated boundaries, we object to the proposed annexation of additional industrial acreage. Our technical objections are based on a number of factors supported by Martin County's recent statistical analysis of industrial and commercial lands in the county, including those in Indiantown.

In addition, as historic stewards of many of Indiantown's lands, we also appeal to your current role as stewards of Indiantown's future. Please consider carefully our objections and our appeal that follows:

TECHNICAL OBJECTIONS TO ANNEXATION APPLICATION AND COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND FUTURE LAND USE MAP AMENDMENTS (Projects Numbers: ANX 24-072 and CPA 24-073) – Beskar Investments, LLC, of Baldwin, Wisconsin

1. The recent report by Metro Forecasting for Martin County showed no demonstrable need exists for additional industrial acreage in Indiantown. Their statistical analysis shows sufficient land already zoned and available for industrial development within Village boundaries, and additional industrial acreage will not be needed for many years to come!
2. Without a need, there is no real benefit to annexation. An existing perception by some officials that the benefit in expanding Indiantown's tax base outweighs all other considerations is quickly offset by the unintended consequences of annexing 650 acres of UNNEEDED land. (The land in question is the former Indiantown Farms on Warfield Boulevard between Fox Brown and Allapattah roads). Many of the undersigned landowners are poised to bring new projects forward soon that will significantly expand Indiantown's tax base, and they are located in an area long planned for industrial development in Indiantown.
3. Granting a developer's request to annex land immediately increases its value significantly by freeing that land from Martin County's rigid agricultural land uses and limited development. An outside developer benefits from annexation, yet that increase in industrial acreage within the Village boundaries dilutes the value of industrial land already here, thus hurting Indiantown's current industrial landowners.
4. Although the Village of Indiantown's designated water and sewer service area extends five miles beyond its boundaries, the infrastructure does not yet exist to support newly annexed land. In fact, the demands of providing services to a new industrial project previously outside of Indiantown's boundaries could put undue pressure on the PZAB and

the Village Council to prioritize the new project's needs due to the size of the landowner's investment, thus taking resources from existing Village properties, certainly an unintended and harmful consequence.

5. Approving this major annexation application — although the landowner may pledge to “wait in line” for needed infrastructure — opens the door to countless others wanting to do the same. The Council and PZAB should consider that more than 27,000 acres of agricultural land lie contiguous to the Village's boundaries, thus qualify for annexation. As acres are annexed, then additional lands become contiguous and eligible for annexation. It invites speculators in a “me, too, land grab” with absolutely no benefit to the Village, only to the developers.
6. Developing Industrial parcels differs dramatically from developing residential and commercial properties. The timelines are longer, and market cycles are more unpredictable, well illustrated by the shift to e-commerce during the Covid shutdown and the widespread construction of large distribution centers that followed. Until a site plan is approved, the Village will not know how the annexed land will be developed, regardless of what the developer says. The final result could well be another unintended consequence of too-eager annexation.

A DIRECT APPEAL TO VILLAGE COUNCIL AND PZAB MEMBERS

Although not statistically supported by Martin County's land analysis, as are the previous six points, we believe the following factors — based on Indiantown's history and a little common sense — should also be considered:

1. It is too early in Indiantown's timeline to take a “sky-is-falling” approach to expanding Indiantown's industrial base in an effort to reduce Indiantown's dependence on FPL's tax revenues. Venture Park, a small 150-acre industrial park on Silver Fox Run road within Village boundaries, was platted in 2004, yet no lots were purchased until after Indiantown's incorporation. All lots have now been sold to manufacturers, but construction is only 30 percent complete; therefore, we will not know the full impact on Indiantown's tax revenues, (combined with that of the GrandHard facility on Farm Road, the bio-medical facility on Market Street, and all the new housing projects), for at least two more years. Increasing the amount of Indiantown's land area just increases the demands on infrastructure at this point.
2. If the Village Council approves the annexation and the proposed amendments to the Village's Comp Plan, they still will not know with any certainty what project will be developed, even if the landowner describes their intentions. At the point of annexation, the landowner's property rights kick in. As long as they meet the bare minimum of the Village's Comp Plan and LDR requirements, the Village cannot interfere in the project the developer chooses to bring forward. That is state law.
3. The average number of years that the undersigned have owned property in Indiantown approaches 25 years, with some nearing 40 years of ownership! Our properties always have been within Indiantown's urban services area and now are within the Village of Indiantown's boundaries. The agricultural parcels currently being considered for annexation by the Village were purchased just six weeks after Indiantown's incorporation. We respect the investment made by any landowner; however, we feel that

we have a considerable edge in understanding Indiantown's needs and culture better than an out-of-state speculator.

4. We are aware that Indiantown is undertaking a written review of its LDRs, updating its master plan for water and sewer, and will conduct a public workshop to develop an updated strategic plan. We applaud these efforts. We look to you to thoughtfully guide Indiantown's growth to maximize the benefits to citizens without jeopardizing the goal of providing an enhanced quality of life for Indiantown residents. Planning Indiantown's growth could well be undermined by a premature annexation of land.

We have been planning projects for development of our industrial lands that will help fulfill the promises of incorporation, but we did not rush into these decisions. In fact, all of us have rejected proposals we felt were inappropriate for Indiantown.

We take stewardship seriously, as we know you do, too. We soon will be ready to present the first of some exciting projects to the Village for consideration. Until then, we look forward to continuing the conversation.

Sincerely,

Industrial landowners of Indiantown – (owned since)

Indiantown Airport/Dawson – 1986

Floridian / Targa– 2016

Florida Commerce Park / Graifman 2005

Tampa Farm Service/Bynum – 1986

Itown Rail & Commerce / Hendry – 2017

Wall/Edwards - 1986