SMITH AND MOORE ARCHITECTS, INC.

Harold Smith • Jonathan Moore • Peter Papadopoulos • Daniel Kahan



Re: 1247 South Ocean Blvd (Formerly 60 Blossom Way)

Palm Beach, FL 33480

October 21, 2024

LETTER OF INTENT (LOI) ARC-24-0103 ZON-24-0061

REQUESTED MODIFICATIONS TO A PREVIOUS ARCOM APPROVAL FOR – THE CONSTRUCTION OF NEW RESIDENCE, GUEST HOUSE, AND ASSOCIATED HARDSCAPE, LANDSCAPE, AND SITE IMPROVEMENTS

Please find for review the attached drawings for our project at 1247 South Ocean Blvd in the R-AA Zoning District of Palm Beach. The current application is requesting a slight increase to the height of the previously approved privacy/site walls fronting on South Ocean Boulevard. Due to the low street elevation, and the natural reduction in height of the road from north to south along the property frontage, these walls are in excess of the height allowed by code.

The originally approved proposal was for the unification of 10 Blossom Way, 70 Blossom Way, 60 Blossom Way, and a portion of 1265 South Ocean Boulevard. The proposal on the newly formed property is to construct a new one-story main house and new one-story guest house at the eastern end of the property. Associated gardens, pools, and site improvements are also being proposed. We believe the proposal is in accordance with the following guidelines:

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 18-205 AND 18-206:

Sec. 18-205. - Criteria for building permit.

- 1. The plan for this proposed residence is in conformity with good taste and design and in general contributes to the image of the town and neighborhood as a place of beauty, spaciousness, balance, charm and high quality.
- 2. The plan for the proposed building or structure is reasonably protected against external and internal noise and other factors that would tend to make the environment less desirable.
 - a. The plans show that major entertaining spaces are centrally located on the site placing these spaces far as possible from neighboring properties.
 - b. The pool area is located at the rear of the residence.
 - c. The proposed generator and pool equipment are located in a walled enclosure on the North side of the house.
- 3. The proposed building exterior design and appearance is not of inferior quality such as to cause the nature of the local environment to materially depreciate in appearance value.
- 4. The proposed residence is in harmony with the proposed developments on land in the general area and with the compressive plan for the town.

SMITH AND MOORE ARCHITECTS, INC.

- 5. The proposed residence is not excessively similar to any other structure existing or within 200 feet of the proposed site in respect to one or more of the following features of the exterior design and appearance:
 - a. This proposal does not have apparently visible identical front or side elevations.
 - b. This proposal does not have substantially identical size and arrangement of either doors, windows, porticos or other opening or breaks in the elevation facing the street, including reverse arrangement.
 - c. We do not have other significant identical features of design such as, but not limited to, material roof line and height of other design elements.
- 6. The proposed residence is not excessively dissimilar in relation to any other structures existing or 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. Arrangements of 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 the 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 a neighboring property.
- 7. The proposed addition or accessory structure is subservient in style and massing to the principal or main structure. This is not applicable; however, the design keeps the garage wing subservient to the principal mass.
- 8. The proposed residence 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. The proposed design meets the zoning code without requiring variances.
- 10. The projects' location and design adequately protect unique site characteristics such as those related to scenic views, rock outcroppings, natural vistas, waterways and similar features. The proposed residence does not negatively impact any existing natural features.

Special Exception

Section 134-1759(e) & (d): A request for a special exception for the construction of a Pickleball court.

Variances 134-201

Section 134-1475(c)(1): Request to allow a wall height ranging from 6.9' to 8'0 ½" in lieu of the six foot (6') maximum allowed above the crown of road along South Ocean Boulevard.

- 1. The property is located in the R-A-A Zoning District and due to the low street elevation and the natural reduction in height of the road from North to South along the property frontage, these walls are in excess of the height allowed by code.
- 2. The applicant was not the cause of the special conditions of the property, as the characteristics of the land have been in existence before they acquired the land.

SMITH AND MOORE ARCHITECTS, INC.

- 3. The granting of the variance will not confer on the applicant a special privilege. There are other properties in the neighborhood with higher walls constructed prior to today's zoning code requirements.
- 4. The proposed increase in height is minor and necessary to protect the privacy of the residents.
- 5. The variance requested in the minimum necessary to make reasonable use of the land in order to create a modest addition.
- 6. Granting the variance will not be injurious to the neighborhood as the request is minor and is necessary to properly screen the property.

Sincerely,

Daniel Kahan

Principal Architect