

From: [work](#)
To: [Kelly Churney](#)
Cc: [Smith, Jeffery](#); [Smith, Nancy](#)
Subject: 110 Seagate Road, Palm Beach
Date: Monday, July 27, 2020 3:36:09 PM

*****Note: This email was sent from a source external to the Town of Palm Beach. Links or attachments should not be accessed unless expected from a trusted source. Additionally, all requests for information or changes to Town records should be verified for authenticity.*****

Kelly,

Attached is a letter addressed to the Chairman of ARCOM and all ARCOM members. Will you please see that everyone gets a copy of my letter.
Thank you in advance.
Best regards,

Jeffery W. Smith, AIA
jeff@smitharchitecturalgroup.com

JEFFERY W. SMITH, AIA
119 SEAGATE ROAD
PALM BEACH, FLORIDA

July 21, 2020

Town of Palm Beach
Architectural Review Commission
360 South County Road
Palm Beach, Florida 33480

Re: ARCOM #B037-2020/110 Seagate Road, Palm Beach

Dear Mr. Chairman and ARCOM Members,

My family and I have owned the property at 119 Seagate Road for 50 years. I have been notified by the Town of Palm Beach of the redevelopment of the property at 110 Seagate Road. We have watched the gradual redevelopment of houses on the street without incident. However, the proposed new residence at 110 Seagate Road is out of context with the immediate neighborhood, which our code defines as an area within 200 feet of the proposed development. My property is less than 25 feet from said project.

I am a past member of the Architectural Review Commission for 15 years, 7 of which I was the Chairman. I know you have a difficult job in front of you every month but you cannot lose sight of our ordinances or your charge to enforce them.

I submit to you that this project does not meet the letter of our Code in the following respects, taken directly from the language in our Code of Ordinances:

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

(a) The architectural commission may approve, approve with conditions, or disapprove the issuance of a building permit in any matter subject to its jurisdiction only after consideration of whether the following criteria are complied with:

(1) The plan for the proposed building or structure is **(NOT)** 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.

(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 **(NOT)** 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.

(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:

- 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 any perspective visible to the public or adjoining properties.

(8) The proposed building or structure is **(NOT)** 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).

Our code is quite clear in that no new residence may be too similar or too dissimilar to any residence within 200 feet of the proposed structure.

The only way to approve this project is to change the wording in our Town Code.

Respectfully submitted,



Jeffery W. Smith, AIA