

September 16, 2020

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

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

Re: Tifford Residence – 125 N. Dixie Blvd.; Existing, Contributing Historic Residence & Proposed Addition

Mrs. Hoyland:

I hope all is well. As the Architect Of Record (& Agent) for Gail & Craig Tifford please accept this letter and associated package to seek City approval for the complete and total renovation of the existing historic, contributing structure located at 125 North Dixie Blvd., located within the Del Ida Historic District. I am hereby respectfully submitting a “Class 1 Site Plan Modification” and a “Variance” application associated with the Project, the “Variance” is respectfully seeking a reduction in the “Side (Interior) Yard Building Setback Line” for our proposed positioning of a new “addition” within the Site. We seek a modest 2.5’ reduction, from the code required 10’ to a proposed 7.5’. This appendage, or “addition” is cleverly integrated into the existing historic structure yet, slightly exceeds the buildable width afforded that side of the lot. I feel the proposed width is the minimum required to make reasonable use of it’s interior spaces.

Pursuant to **LDR Section 2.4.7 “Procedures for Obtaining Relief from Compliance with Portions of the Land Development Regulations”**, please accept the attached fully executed application and sets of Architectural Documents, appropriate mailing envelopes, mailing lists, a 500’ radius map, \$1,500 check, etc.

We recognize that **LDR Section 4.3.4, (H), (1): Setbacks** address building setback guidelines. The “Side Yard Building Setback Line” requirement for our site is 10’, as we are within an R-1-AA zoning district. The rationale behind our request is that of keeping our proposed “addition” harmonious context with the existing structure: from a massing perspective, from trying to be “subordinate” to the existing structure, etc. But most importantly – the “addition” has been tastefully designed so that it has negligible to no negative impact on our immediate next-door neighbor.

Staff has always encouraged growth in a horizontal fashion, as opposed to going vertical (new 2nd floor) – so while we could have been more compact with our new floor layout, we would have had to go to a 2-story scenario to accommodate the few basic spaces contained in our program. As a team, we thought seeking a single story solution, even though it required a relief in the western side yard, was far more supportable than a 2-story solution requiring no relief.

I have designed many tasteful Projects, one (65 Palm Square) receiving as many as seven (7) variances. Variances are a design instrument granted to well designed historic Projects to gain Owner’s an opportunity to stay true to their individual and site specific conditions. Our existing historic structure is non-conforming relative to it’s side yard setback as well as it’s rear yard setback – coming as close as 4.56’ to the North/rear property line. We have a quirky positioning of an existing structure to deal with.

We feel the intent of the code, in all matters, will not be compromised in any fashion whatsoever.

In conclusion, if granted, the “Variance” would in no way “be contrary to the public interest and where owing to the conditions peculiar to the property and not the result of the actions of the landowner, a literal enforcement of the regulations would result in unnecessary and undue hardship”. Furthermore, we feel “that the reasons set forth in the “Variance” petition justify the granting of the “Variance”, and feel that the “Variance” is the minimum “Variance” that will make possible the reasonable use of the land, building, or structure” and finally “that the granting of the “Variance” will be in (complete) harmony with the general purpose and intent of exiting regulations, will not be injurious to the neighborhood, or otherwise detrimental to the public welfare”.

Please do not hesitate to call should you require anything else. I look forward to the support, the approval process and the Historic Preservation Board hearing in the very near future.

Sincerely:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Roger Cope', with a large, stylized 'R' and a series of loops and strokes that form the rest of the name. The signature is written over a faint, illegible background.

Roger Cope
Principal
RWC/jad

Cc Gail & Craig Tifford, Owners

July 14, 2020

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

Attn.: Michelle Hoyland – Senior Historic Preservation Planner, Planning & Zoning

Re: Letter of Justification: COA 2020-180

Project: The Tifford Residence, 125 N. Dixie Blvd. – Del Ida Historic District

Mrs. Hoyland:

I hope all is well.

As the Architect-Of-Record for the above referenced Project, please accept this letter of justification associated with the COA processing of our Project.

I am focusing on LDR Section 4.5.1(7) Visual Compatibility Standards & the Secretary of the Interiors Standards for Rehabilitation.

JUSTIFICATION

“Pursuant to LDR Section 4.5.1(7)(a) – Height”

Response: Our proposal limits our highest new roof element to be well below the highest existing roof parapet! Therefore, we are compatible.

“Pursuant to LDR Section 4.5.1(7)(b) – Front Façade Proportion”

Response: We are NOT altering the front façade in a manner that negatively affects the existing proportions (of it's massing). We are, carefully and tastefully introducing a new Balcony at the existing 2nd floor – but in such a way as to not negatively affect the massing of the overall façade. Therefore, we are compatible.

“Pursuant to LDR Section 4.5.1(7)(c) – Proportion of Openings (Windows & Doors)”

Response: All of our proposed new windows & exterior doors are designed in harmony with existing conditions. We acknowledge the presence of “arched” windows found throughout the existing structure but contend that they were originally rectangular and were illegally converted to arched openings at some point. We have no archival photos to show the original configuration. But please see the attached photo of the existing interior wood framing which lends credence to this theory. Therefore, we are compatible.

“Pursuant to LDR Section 4.5.1(7)(d) – Rhythm of Solids to Voids”

Response: I contend our rhythm of solids to voids, for the proposed improvements is tasteful. Therefore, we are compatible.

“Pursuant to LDR Section 4.5.1 (7)(e) – Rhythm of Building on Streets”

Response: Our proposed improvements are consistent with other adjacent structures, and so we do NOT disrupt the rhythm of anything on this block or street. Therefore, we are compatible.

“Pursuant to LDR Section 4.5.1(7)(f) – Rhythm of Entrance and/or Porch Projection(s)”

Response: We are proposing a tastefully designed, proportionally integrated new Front Entry (Tower) as well as a new open-air covered outdoor space preceding the Entry experience. Therefore, we are compatible.

“Pursuant to LDR Section 4.5.1(7)(g) – Relationship of Materials, Texture & Color”

Response: All completely harmonious with existing conditions. Therefore, we are compatible.

“Pursuant to LDR Section 4.5.1(7)(h) – Roof Shapes”

Response: Our existing structure has both flat and sloped (tiled) roof shapes. Our proposed improvements do as well. Therefore, we are compatible.

“Pursuant to LDR Section 4.5.1(7)(i) – Walls of Continuity”

Response: We are proposing nothing to change this visual compatibility, therefore it is not applicable.

“Pursuant to LDR Section 4.5.1(7)(j) – Scale of a Building”

Response: Both, our existing building and proposed addition is very much in keeping with the scale of the existing street and community. Therefore, we are compatible.

“Pursuant to LDR Section 4.5.1(7)(k) – Directional Expression of Front Elevation”

Response: Being classified as “horizontal”, we have proposed nothing to alter the existing directional expression of the front elevation. Therefore, we are compatible.

“Pursuant to LDR Section 4.5.1(7)(l) – Architectural Style”

Response: Our renovation and proposed expansion is NOT altering the existing Architectural Style – “Mission Revival” (Stick Frame). I classify our addition as a modern twist to “Mission Revival”. Therefore, we are compatible.

“Pursuant to LDR Section 4.5.1(7)(m) – Additions to Individually Designated Properties & Contributing Structures in all Historic Districts”

Response: We are compatible because,

- 1. Our addition is to the side of the existing structure and is, therefore, as subordinate as possible.*
- 2. We ARE proposing a modest “addition”, the minimum necessary to provide a comfortable and contemporary way of life for the new inhabitants.*
- 3. We are not destroying or obscuring characteristic features of the original building.*
- 4. The basic form and character of the historic building will remain intact should our proposed addition ever be removed.*
- 5. Our proposal does not introduce a new Architectural style nor does it mimic too closely the style of the original building. It closely resembles and compliments it.*
- 6. Our proposal is subordinate to the original building and does not overwhelm it in any way.*

Finally, in my humble opinion, our proposal is an excellent example of renovating and rehabilitating an existing historic residence as outlined in the Secretary of the Interiors Standards for Rehabilitation, an electronic copy of which is hereby included in our Flashdrive associated with this COA application.

This concludes our justification letter. Please do not hesitate to call should you require anything further. We look forward to being scheduled before the next appropriate HPB Board hearing. Thank you in advance.

Sincerely:

Roger Cope
Principal
RWC/jad

Cc Gail & Craig Tifford, Clients
Marc Julien, Marc Julien Homes