

From: [Levi Meyer](#)
To: [Garrido, Lorena](#)
Cc: [Acebo, Jessie](#)
Subject: Re: 240 Edgewater Dr_Dock Variance Waterway Advisory Board
Date: Friday, May 15, 2026 6:00:23 PM
Attachments: [Outlook-njely0iv.png](#)
[Outlook-cbre3x11.png](#)
[Outlook-avqijakd.png](#)
[240 Edgewater Waterway Board Comments.pdf](#)

CAUTION: External Sender. Please do not click on links or open attachments from senders you do not trust.

My full l analysis and comments are attached by PDF.

In summary, I am not formally opposing the requested dock variance and I generally believe all waterfront homeowners should have reasonable access to the water and dockage, so long as overall navigability of the waterway is preserved and access for other vessels is not materially impeded.

That said, I do believe there is reasonable cause for concern regarding the actual remaining safely navigable deep-water channel width at this location, particularly given the shallow and rocky conditions along portions of the opposing shoreline, bridge proximity, tidal current flow, and existing navigational challenges in this section of the canal.

Before final approval of the variance, I believe it would be prudent to request a navigability study, hydrographic/depth survey, or similar professional analysis to better evaluate the real-world remaining navigable channel width and vessel maneuverability under actual operating conditions.

SEE **ATTACHED** PDF FOR MY IN DEPTH RESPONSE. .

--

Levi Meyer
Chairman,
City of Coral Gables waterway advisory board

On Fri, May 15, 2026 at 4:04 PM Garrido, Lorena <lgarrido@coralgables.com> wrote:

Good afternoon, Board members - just a reminder to share your comments regarding the referenced variance. I would like to forward everyone's comments by Friday, May 22nd.

Best regards,

Lorena Garrido

RE: 240 Edgewater Drive Dock Variance Request

After reviewing the submitted plans for the proposed dock variance request at 240 Edgewater Drive, I would like to raise several navigational concerns that I believe warrant further study and review prior to final approval of the requested variance.

To be clear, I am not formally opposing the applicant's request. I generally believe waterfront property owners should have reasonable access to the waterway, **so long as the remaining navigable channel continues to safely and reasonably accommodate vessel traffic and does not materially impede navigability.**

Key Concerns

- **The plans reference approximately 91.5 feet of total waterway width**, however portions of the opposing shoreline appear shallow and rocky and may not constitute practically navigable water, particularly during low tide conditions.
- **The proposed dock and moored vessel configuration appear capable of occupying a meaningful portion of the usable navigable channel width.**
- This section of the waterway already presents operational navigational challenges due to:
 - Bridge proximity
 - Tidal current flow
 - Restricted turning movements
 - Shallow shoreline conditions
 - Fishing activity near the bridge approaches
- **While the plans depict a 40-foot vessel with an approximate 12-foot beam, there does not appear to be any clear restriction preventing a larger vessel with greater beam width, overhang, or draft from utilizing the dock in the future.**

Further Explanation

While the plans reference approximately 91.5 feet of total waterway width, my concern is that the plans appear to measure shoreline-to-shoreline width rather than the actual remaining safely navigable deep-water channel width under real-world operating conditions.

From personal navigational experience in this section of the canal, portions of the opposing shoreline contain shallow and rocky conditions that materially reduce the practically navigable portion of the waterway, particularly during low tide conditions.

In addition, vessels navigating this area are often simultaneously managing tidal current flow through the nearby bridge opening, immediate turning requirements, and fishing activity near the bridge approaches, all

of which can further complicate safe vessel maneuverability.

The submitted plans depict a dock and vessel configuration that appears capable of reducing the usable navigable width by approximately 20 to 25 feet once accounting for the dock projection, vessel beam, fenders, and real-world mooring conditions.

While the vessel shown on the plans is approximately 40 feet in length with an approximate 12-foot beam, there does not appear to be any restriction preventing future use by a larger vessel with greater beam width, overhang, or draft, which could further reduce maneuverability and navigational clearance within this section of the canal.

Recommendation

Again, **I am not formally opposing the requested dock variance**, and I support reasonable water access for waterfront property owners. However, before final approval is granted, I believe it would be prudent for the applicant to provide:

- A navigability study
- A hydrographic/depth survey
- Or similar professional analysis

...demonstrating the actual remaining safely navigable deep-water channel width between the proposed moored vessel and the opposing shallow shoreline conditions.

These comments are intended solely to ensure that **long-term navigability, safe vessel passage, and reasonable shared use of the waterway** are fully evaluated prior to approval.