

August 09, 2019

City of Delray Beach  
100 NW 1st Avenue  
Delray Beach, Florida 33444

Attn.: Michelle Hoyland – Senior Historic Preservation Planner, Design Development Services

Re: COA 2019-229 - "The Kowalski Residence"

Project: "The Kowalski Residence", 707 SE 1<sup>st</sup> Street, National Marina Historic District

Mrs. Hoyland:

I hope all is well.

As the Architect-Of-Record for the above referenced Project, please accept this letter addressing how the very modest proposed improvements to 707 SE 1<sup>st</sup> Street address the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation and the Land Development Regulations as they relate to the "Visual Compatibility" standards.

### **VISUAL COMPATIBILITY**

#### **"Pursuant to LDR Section 4.5.1(E)(8) –Visual Compatibility Standards"**

*Response: Our proposed improvements fall into the broad Architectural "style" of "Spanish Mediterranean" – as it was designed and constructed circa 1926, but the proposed improvements also incorporate many subtle hints of unique custom design features that tie into those simple details of the existing structure. We also feel.....*

- a. Height – The height of the new Porch is visually compatible w/ the exist'g structure
- b. Front Façade Proportion – We feel our proposal is visually compatible as the new Porch has better proportion than the current Porch
- c. Proportion of Openings – Not applicable as we have no new doors nor windows
- d. Rhythm of Solids to Voids – Because we have made the new Porch much more transparent than the existing (we eliminate all screening) we have improved upon the rhythm of solids to voids
- e. Rhythm of Buildings on Streets – Not applicable
- f. Rhythm of Entrance &/or Porch Projections – Stylistically, our new Porch is much more compatible than the existing Porch
- g. Relationship of Materials, Texture and Color – We feel our proposal is more than visually compatible as we are replicating all existing materials and finishes
- h. Roof Shapes – We feel, strongly, that our proposal is visually compatible as we "highlight" and celebrate our unique barrel tile roof feature (Garage to Living Room)
- i. Walls of Continuity – We feel our "enclosure components" masses and facades) are visually compatible
- j. Scale of a Building – We feel our proposal is visually compatible as we contend we are NOT negatively altering the building's scale
- k. Directional Expression of Front Elevation – We feel our proposal is visually compatible – we are cleaning up the Front Elevation
- l. Architectural Style – see statement above
- m. Additions to Individually Designated Properties & Contributing Structures In All Districts:

- 1. additions.....not applicable

2. additions not applicable
3. characteristic features of the original building shall not be destroyed or obscured – we are not doing either
4. additions.....not applicable
5. additions..... not applicable
6. additions.....not applicable

### **SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR STANDARDS**

**“Pursuant to LDR Section 4.5.1 (E) – Development Standards”.....**

**Standard 1 A property shall.....**

*Response: We are not changing its use*

**Standard 2 The historic character.....**

*Response: We are not removing any original components of the original structure.*

**Standard 3 Each property shall be.....**

*Response: No false sense of historical development here!*

**Standard 4 Most properties change over time.....**

*Response: All historic significance is being retained.*

**Standard 5 Distinctive features.....**

*Response: All distinctive features remain unaltered.*

**Standard 6 Deteriorated historic features.....**

*Response: There are no deteriorated historic features involved.*

**Standard 7 Chemical or physical treatments.....**

*Response: None planned.*

**Standard 8 Significant archeological.....**

*Response: We are not an archeological site.*

**Standard 9 New additions.....**

*Response: Not applicable.*

**Standard 10 New Additions.....**

*Response: Not applicable.*

Finally, our Ownership and Design Team recognizes the continued review process and ANY impending Final TAC comments – they will ALL be duly addressed during the PERMIT review process.

This concludes our response letter. Please do not hesitate to call should you require anything further.

Sincerely:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Roger Cope', with a large, stylized 'R' and 'C'.

Roger Cope  
Principal  
RWC/jad

Cc     Dan Kowalski, Client  
         Aleaxandra Meighan, Client