

From: Bob Koske <bob@koskeywest.com>
Sent: Monday, August 21, 2017 1:13 PM
To: Enid Torregrosa; bryankw@me.com
Cc: HARC
Subject: 1212 Georgia Street

Dear HARC Members,

I am writing in protest of an illegal roof deck being constructed at 1212 Georgia Street. This will certainly create a privacy issue for us as the deck is being constructed to the edge of the building and will overlook our bedroom, bathroom and kitchen windows and doors. It is not code compliant as there is not a 5 foot setback from the side yard property line. We just completed a major renovation of 1214 Georgia Street / 1215 Duncan Street and had we been aware of the plans for a deck at 1212 Georgia Street overlooking our property we certainly would not have even considered the property. Please feel free to observe their deck from inside our property.

Thanking you in advance for your consideration with this matter.

Sincerely,

Yvonne Gibb
Robert Koske

Bob Koske
bob@koskeywest.com
305-295-8855

From: Bert Bender <bbender@benderarchitects.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 22, 2017 9:02 AM
To: Enid Torregrosa
Cc: Ronald Ramsingh; Bert Bender
Subject: FW: August HARC

Please add this email to the public comments for all applications.

Bert L. Bender, Architect

Address: 410 Angela Street, Key West FL 33040

Phone: 305-296-1347

Email: bbender@benderarchitects.com

Website: www.benderarchitects.com



From: Dana Day [mailto:danalday@earthlink.net]
Sent: Monday, August 21, 2017 9:28 PM
To: Bryan Green; Bert Bender; Richard McChesney
Subject: August HARC

Greetings Gentlemen:

I've done my HARC homework and added a disclaimer. You will need to manage without me this month because I am in Chicago. Try to be brave and forge ahead. See you next month.

-D

#2. 724 Caroline. 2nd reading. Concur with staff

#3 & #4. 415 Frances Street. I thought the addition of the dormer at the rear of this eyebrow house was fine as originally designed. Staff acknowledges the dormer is not visible to the public and further recognizes the back of the house has already been subject to extensive changes. It seems this owner is being held to a standard not generally applied to others if he is not allowed to construct an addition that is a) invisible from the public ROW and 2) does not intrude on neighbors' privacy. I would approve.

#5. 1212 Georgia. Concur with staff – this application defies multiple guidelines. Moreover, the adjacent neighbor objects. Note the application claims construction costs of \$1,000 for a 288 square foot deck with approximately 48 linear feet of railing. At a conservative \$15 per square foot for the deck and \$10 per lineal foot for the railing the cost would be \$4,800.

#6 & #7. 922 Thomas Court. Concur with staff. Ample room to re-orient this addition lengthwise on

the parcel. The adjacent houses at 910 and 916 Thomas also have rear additions visible from the street; however, those additions are minimized by fences and plantings. Here, the front door is moving to the addition thus making the addition more prominent than others on the street. Window air conditioners should come out as well.

#8 & #9. 803 Emma. Concur with staff.

#10. 315 Catherine. I don't mind the idea of a common wall but think the design could be modified to escape the mirror image, townhouse appearance. For example, a shared front door with interior vestibule could allow for the appearance of a single-family home. The front parking pad is problematic. Guideline p38-g ". . . not appropriate to create new parking areas on front or side street yards." Mass and scale exceed the neighboring residences with the exception of 313 Catherine. Concur with staff that 313 should be referenced only as an example of what should be disallowed in the historic districts.

#11. 901 White Street. Concur with staff – nice to see the historic windows restored.

#12. 306 Peacon Lane. Concur with staff – Guideline p38-g ". . . not appropriate to create new parking areas on front or side street yards."

Disclaimer: The views and opinions herein expressed are mine alone. I am not acting on behalf or at the request of any applicant or otherwise interested party nor am I receiving compensation from any applicant or other interested party. I have no financial interest in any agenda item upon which I have made comment and will not incur any private gain or loss due to any determination made by the Historic Architectural Review Commission with respect to said agenda items. I offer my views and opinions on the HARC agenda solely as a member of the community interested in preserving the character and appearance of Key West's historic districts.