

# SMITH AND MOORE ARCHITECTS, INC.

Harold Smith • Jonathan Moore • Peter Papadopoulos • Daniel Kahan



Re: 176 Seminole Avenue  
Palm Beach, FL 33480

January 4, 2023

**UPDATED: January 18, 2023**

## **LETTER OF INTENT (LOI)**

**ARC-23-032**

**ZON-23-041**

### **PROPOSED RENOVATION TO A TWO-STORY HOUSE IN THE R-B DISTRICT**

Please find for review the attached drawings for our project at 176 Seminole Avenue in the R-B Zoning District of Palm Beach. The existing house on the property was built in 2005. The proposal is for a second-story addition above an existing garage. As part of the project, the existing garage will be converted into storage and vertical circulation to the new space above. The area of driveway that is being removed will be converted into a garden. No changes are being proposed to the existing footprint or existing volume of the residence. 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.

## **Sec. 134-201. - Criteria for Variances.**

VARIANCE 1: Section 134-893(b)(9): A variance to allow the proposed addition with a rear yard setback of 14 feet in lieu of the 15 foot minimum required.

VARIANCE 2: Section 134-2179(b): A variance to forgo 2 required off-street parking spaces in an enclosed garage to convert it to storage space and vertical circulation.

VARIANCE 3: Section 134-893(13): A variance for Cubic Content Ratio (CCR) of 4.41 in lieu of the 4.0 maximum allowed and the 4.05 existing.

VARIANCE 4: 134-893(b)(12)(a): A variance for a Landscape Open Space (LOS) of 37.8% in lieu of the 45% minimum required.

1 ) The property is located in the R-B Zoning District and the residence was constructed in 2005 and non-conforming to today' s code in area as well as situated on an irregular shaped corner lot.

1500 South Olive Avenue · West Palm Beach, Florida 33401

Telephone (561) 835-1888 · Fax (561) 832-7015

www.smithmoorearchitects.com • Florida AAC No. 001285

# SMITH AND MOORE ARCHITECTS, INC.

- 2) The applicant was not the cause of the special conditions of the property or residence. The non-conformities and irregularities of the lot were existing prior to the applicant owning the property.
- 3) The granting of the variances will not confer on the applicant a special privilege that is denied to the neighboring properties.
- 4) The hardship, which runs with the land, is that the property is nonconforming, irregular in shape and is situated on a corner. The existing garage, although conforming to code, is not functional because of the narrow driveway.
- 5) The variances requested are the minimum necessary to make reasonable use of the land considering the non-functioning garage and opportunity to bring the home up to today's living standards and add greenspace.
- 6) The granting of the variances will not be injurious to the neighborhood. A renovated single family residence will be beneficial to the neighborhood.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to be 'Daniel Kahan', with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Daniel Kahan  
Principal Architect