



KIRCHHOFF & ASSOCIATES
ARCHITECTS

LETTER OF INTENT
RENOVATION TO EXISTING FRONT ENTRY
AT 207 PENDLETON ROAD
ARC-24-038
ZON-24-045

Please find for review the attached drawings for our project at 207 Pendleton Road in the R-B Zoning District. The existing two-story residence was designed by Architect John Volk and was issued a Permit in 1940. Other than permits for normal maintenance and repairs, the property was altered in 1995, including a new pool with Variances for setbacks and substantially remodeled in 2019. As part of that remodel, the covered front entry was modified. The metal columns supporting the roof were replaced with the current pattern and the front door along with transom and sidelights were replaced with an impact rated unit which we feel is not properly scaled. The current Owners purchased the home following the completion of that work.

The work requested here is the replacement of the front door (transom and sidelights) with a similar Mahogany impact rated unit in the same masonry opening but more properly detailed. We are also requesting replacement of the covered entry. The proposed entry is wider and deeper to provide protection from the weather at the only access (besides the overhead garage door) to the home.

The proposed design requires two Variances for the minor increase in lot coverage and cubic content. The Site is non-conforming, being undersized in width at 80 feet in lieu of the 100 feet required. The proposed entry complies with the Front yard setback.

A) LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION 54-122 & 54-161
Not Applicable

B) ARCOM 18-205

We are submitting a proposal that we consider tastefully designed, with harmonious and balanced elevations, providing texture and shadow, and designed for our tropical climate with appropriate materials and details consistent with the existing.

1. The plan for the proposed building or structure is in conformity with good taste and design and in general contributes to the image of the town as a place of beauty, spaciousness, balance, taste, fitness, charm and high quality.

2. The plan for the proposed building or structure indicates the manner in which the structures are reasonably protected against external and internal noise, vibrations, and other factors that may tend to make the environment less desirable.
3. The proposed building or structure is not, in its exterior design and appearance, of inferior quality such as to cause the nature of the local environment to materially depreciate in appearance and value.
4. The proposed building or structure is in harmony with the proposed developments on land in the general area, with the comprehensive plan for the town, and with any precise plans adopted pursuant to the comprehensive plan.
5. The proposed building or structure is not excessively similar to any other structure existing or for which a permit has been issued or to any other structure included in the same permit application within 200 feet of the proposed site in respect to one or more of the following features of exterior design and appearance:
 - a. Apparently visibly identical front or side elevations;
 - b. Substantially identical size and arrangement of either doors, windows, porticos or other openings or breaks in the elevation facing the street, including reverse arrangement; or
 - c. Other significant identical features of design such as, but not limited to, material, roof line and height of other design elements.
6. The proposed building or structure is not excessively dissimilar in relation to any other structure existing or for which a permit has been issued or to any other structure included in the same permit application within 200 feet of the proposed site in respect to one or more of the following features:
 - a. Height of building or height of roof.
 - b. Other significant design features including, but not limited to, materials or quality of architectural design.
 - c. Architectural compatibility.
 - d. Arrangement of the components of the structure.
 - e. Appearance of mass from the street or from any perspective visible to the public or adjoining property owners.
 - f. Diversity of design that is complimentary with size and massing of adjacent properties.
 - g. Design features that will avoid the appearance of mass through improper proportions.
 - h. Design elements that protect the privacy of neighboring property.
7. The proposed addition or accessory structure is subservient in style and massing to the principal or main structure.
8. The proposed building or structure is appropriate in relation to the established character of other structures in the immediate area or neighboring areas in respect to significant design features such as material or quality or architectural design as viewed from any public or private way (except alleys).
9. The proposed development is in conformity with the standards of this Code and other applicable ordinances insofar as the location and appearance of the buildings and structures are involved.

10. The project's location and design adequately protects unique site characteristics such as those related to scenic views rock outcroppings, natural vistas, waterways, and similar features.

C) ARCOM 18-206 – CRITERIA FOR DEMOLITION PERMIT

1. Not Applicable

D) SITE PLAN REVIEW 134-329

Not Applicable

E) VARIANCES

- 1) Section 134-893 (11) A request for a Variance to allow the front entry addition to have a 37.4% lot coverage in lieu of the 37.1% existing and the 30.0% maximum allowable.
- 2) Section 134-893(13) A request for a variance to allow the front entry addition to have a Cubic Content Ratio of 4.52 in lieu of the 4.51 existing and the 4.31 maximum allowable.

The criteria for granting the variances are as follows:

1. List the special conditions and circumstances peculiar to the land, structure or building which are not applicable to other lands, structures or buildings in the same zoning district.

The property is located in the R-B Zoning District and is non-conforming in width and area than what is required in the R-B Zoning District. Further, when the house was constructed there was no CCR requirement in the code thus the existing house is currently non-conforming to that calculation as well as the lot coverage.

2. Indicate how the special conditions and circumstances do not result from the actions of the applicant.

The Applicant was not the cause of the special conditions of the property or residence, as the characteristics of the residence and land have been in existence since the house was designed and built in 1940.

3. Demonstrate that the granting of the variance will not confer on the applicant any special privilege that is denied by this ordinance to other lands, buildings or structures in the same zoning district.

The granting of the variances will not confer on the Applicant a special privilege. There are other properties in the neighborhood with non-conforming CCR and lot coverage as many of the residences were constructed prior to today's zoning code requirements.

4. Demonstrate how literal interpretation of this ordinance would deprive the applicant of rights commonly enjoyed by other properties in the same zoning district under the terms of this ordinance and would work unnecessary and undue hardship on the applicant.

The hardship for the cubic content ratio variance, which runs with the land, is that the residence was built in 1940 and is non-conforming to today's code as the width of the lot is 80 feet in lieu of the 100 foot

minimum required and 8,887 square feet in area in lieu of the 10,000 square foot minimum required. The proposed increase in lot coverage and CCR is minor in order to add a covered entry to the front door.

5. Demonstrate that the variance granted is the minimum variance that will make possible the reasonable use of the land, building or structure.

The variances requested are the minimum necessary to make reasonable use of the land in order to protect the front door.

6. Show how the granting of the variance will be in harmony with the general intent and purpose of this chapter, and such variance will not be injurious to the area involved or otherwise detrimental to the public welfare.

Granting the variances will not be injurious to the neighborhood as the requests are minor.

F) OTHER

Not applicable.

Sincerely,



Thomas M Kirchhoff
Principal Architect