

**From:** [Aly Serrano](#) on behalf of [Town Council](#)  
**To:** [Town Council & Mayor](#)  
**Cc:** [Wayne Bergman](#); [Kelly Churney](#)  
**Subject:** FW: 110 Seagate Road  
**Date:** Monday, October 12, 2020 1:38:00 PM

---

---

**From:** Katy's AOL <dewkaty@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, October 12, 2020 10:51 AM  
**To:** Town Council <TCouncil@TownofPalmBeach.com>  
**Cc:** Joanne Paladino <powellpaladino@gmail.com>; Jeff Amling <Jeffrey.Amling@fticonsulting.com>  
**Subject:** 110 Seagate Road

\*\*\*\*\*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.\*\*\*\*\*

Dear Town Council,

I've reached out to Lew (through his secretary), Dani, Maggie, Bobbie and Julie. At this point, I've heard back from Bobbie and Julie but not the others so I thought I'd better write to you all to express my dissatisfaction with how ARCOM has handled the proposed plan for 110 Seagate Road. Also, I'm not sure how much time we'll have at the appeal and I wanted to make sure my concerns were heard. There were a number of issues procedurally with the process. One, our letter of objection, as well as Joanne Paladino's letter, was not presented in a timely manner. If our letters had been distributed in a timely manner, we would not be appealing on a procedural basis. Two, If ARCOM had acted responsibly, to enforce Town Code, we would not be filing this time consuming, expensive appeal. My letter of July 27 mentioned "there have been many lovely additions to our street". All were code compliant, neither too similar or dissimilar and they have only added to the harmonious nature of Seagate Road. We are happy to have these new neighbors and look forward to others. ARCOM members talked at length (July 29) about how dissimilar the proposed house was, from its roof line to its starkness. Almost all members, thought it was "not a good fit" as presented. Discussions/ suggestions followed regarding what changes might make it more appropriate for Seagate Road. At the August 26 meeting, with no substantive architectural changes, the plan was unanimously approved. How did a discussion where most members of ARCOM thought the design was too dissimilar and "not a good fit" then get approved without design changes to the architectural plan? A few pale pink Pandora vines, which will most likely not thrive in our environment, were added to soften the roof line?!? Again, I addressed this "planting" issue in my letter of August 31st. "ARCOM should be solely fixated on architecture, not ever changing landscaping." The commission has failed us miserably in this instance. I believe the only remedy is to send this back to ARCOM and let them enforce code with a house that's neither too similar nor too dissimilar.

We have a Town Code which ARCOM clearly ignored when approving 110 Seagate Road.

With four resident letters in opposition to this project at the gateway to a small street and all of the procedural mishaps that have occurred, I hope you all will vote to send this back to ARCOM.

Sincerely,  
Katy Dew Amling

Sent from my iPad