



To: **Scott Reale, AICP**
Senior Planner- City of Pompano Beach
100 West Atlantic Boulevard
Pompano Beach, Florida, 33060

Re: **Variance Request for the Crowell Residence**
2749 Southeast 11th Street
Pompano Beach, FL 33062

Dear Mr. Reale,

Our office is making this variance request to section *155.4303.A.3.e* on behalf of our clients, the homeowners, at the above noted address with the following responses to the required standards met:

- a. Generally speaking, our client has the hardship that they cannot do the desired improvements to their home because the existing house is 6" below Pompano's requirement that the finish floor be 18" above the crown of the road. We explored the feasibility of adding on to this home and found any addition to this home would have to stay under the threshold of "substantial improvement" (50% of the value of the existing building component) in order to comply with flood requirements. The Broward County Property Appraiser's office has the building component valued at \$368,800, which would limit the new addition cost to \$184,400. In this case, we would be limited to an addition of approximately 368 sf. This amount may also be reduced because there have been previous improvements to the home that may have to be deducted from the maximum allowable construction cost. Our client can, however, develop the new lifestyle space desired as an independent structure which will comply with Fema, FBC, and Pompano's slab elevation requirements. We would need a variance because the size of this addition (new structure) exceeds the maximum allowed under the Accessory Dwellings Unit section *155.4303.A.3.e*.
- b. The owner did not create this issue, they were not aware of the issue, nor was it disclosed that the house was not meeting the required flood elevations at the time of our client's purchase.
- c. The conditions of this property under existing zoning conditions restrict the utilization of the land and prevent the engagement of outdoor recreational space. More than 50% of the property is open and on the west side of the existing house with a pool that is not relating to or engaging with the lifestyle spaces of the main house. The owner's intention was to build life spaces around the pool yard area.
- d. The variance would not create any special privileges. The setbacks, height restrictions, and lot coverage limits are respected. The setbacks exceed the minimum required, and the coverage is much lower than the maximum allowable. (see item "e" below). Also, it's worth noting that the combined square footage is in keeping with the size of new homes on similarly sized lots, and is consistent with the neighborhood and zoning.



- e. The extent of the variance request is the minimum necessary to allow a reasonable use of the land or structure. The lot coverage would be 27% less than the maximum, allowed, and the new building meets or exceeds setback requirements.
- f. The variance is in harmony with the general purpose and intent of this code and preserves its spirit. The primary use of this structure is for the owner and is not for non-family use.
- g. The variance would not adversely affect the health or safety of persons residing or working in the neighborhood, be injurious to property or improvements in the neighborhood, or otherwise be detrimental to the public welfare.
- h. The variance is consistent with the comprehensive plan.

Thank you in advance for your time and consideration of our request.

Sincerely,

Robert Tuthill, Architect
Tuthill Architecture