

DEPARTMENT FOR COMMUNITY SUSTAINABILITY Planning Zoning Historic Preservation Division

1900 2ND Avenue North Lake Worth Beach, FL 33461 561-586-1687

HISTORIC RESOURCES PRESERVATION BOARD REPORT

HRPB Project Number 23-00100034: Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the partial demolition and renovation of the existing structure at 325 North Ocean Breeze, removing a 1994 addition. The subject property is located in the Single-Family Residential (SFR) zoning district and has a future land use designation of Single-Family Residential (SFR). The property is a non-contributing resource in the Old Lucerne National and Local Historic District.

Meeting Date: April 12, 2023

Property Owner: Tine Shipman

Address: 325 North Ocean Breeze

PCN: 38-43-44-21-15-096-0100

Size: ±0.31 acres / 13,500 sf

General Location: West side of North Ocean Breeze between 3rd Avenue North and 4th Avenue

North

Existing Land Use: Single-Family Residential

Current Future Land Use Designation: Single-

Family Residential (SFR)

Zoning District: Single-Family Residential (SFR)

Location Map- 325 North Ocean Breeze Department for Community Sustainability 4th Ave N Appendix Resource Property of the state of th

RECOMMENDATION

The documentation and materials provided with the application request were reviewed for compliance with the applicable guidelines and standards found in the City of Lake Worth Beach Land Development Regulations (LDRs), the Historic Preservation Design Guidelines, and for consistency with the Comprehensive Plan. The proposed removal of the 1994 addition does not conflict with the City's Land Development Regulations and is consistent with the requirements established in the Historic Preservation Design Guidelines, and it brings the structure closer to its original historic appearance. Therefore, staff recommends approval of the partial demolition and renovation. The conditions are located on page 6 of this report.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The property owner, Tine Shipman, is requesting approval for the partial demolition and renovation of the existing residence at 325 North Ocean Breeze. The project proposes to remove an addition that was constructed in 1994, replace vinyl siding, and replace three windows. A survey of the property and current photos of the site are included in **Attachments A and B**.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Staff has not received any letters of support or opposition for this application.

PROPERTY DEVELOPMENT HISTORY

Based on documentation in the property file, the residence at 325 North Ocean Breeze was built c. 1935 in the Wood Frame Minimal Traditional architectural style, with wood siding, wood shingle roofing, and an attached garage. An enclosed porch was added onto the rear of the building c. 1940, and a storage shed was built on the property in 1993. The attached garage was converted to additional living space prior to 1994. In 1994, an addition was built on the southeast corner of the building to create a new master bedroom and bathroom and the original wood siding was replaced with vinyl siding. A permit was submitted in 2001 for another addition, a front porch, and kitchen remodeling, but the work was never carried out.

In January 2023, the property owner submitted a permit to replace the existing vinyl siding with wood siding, repair any original wood siding that remained on the house, remove the 1994 addition, and replace three windows affected by the addition's removal. During staff's review, it was noted that, per the Historic Preservation Ordinance, a partial demolition requires HRPB approval. The property owner was notified and the project was placed on the April 12th HRPB agenda.

ANALYSIS

Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan

The subject site has a Future Land Use (FLU) designation of Single-Family Residential (SFR). Per policy 1.1.1.2, the Single-Family Residential category is "intended primarily to permit development of single-family structures at a maximum of 7 dwelling units per acre. Single-family structures are designed for occupancy by one family or household. Single-family homes do not include accessory apartments or other facilities that permit occupancy by more than one family or household. Residential units may be site-built (conventional) dwellings, mobile homes or modular units."

Analysis: The proposed partial demolition and exterior alterations will not change the structure's use. As the structure is a single-family residence and has a proposed density of fewer than 7 units per acre, and is consistent with the intent of the Single-Family Residential designation. The proposed alterations to the single-family structure are consistent with Goal 3.1, which seeks to achieve a supply of housing that offers a variety of residential unit types and prices for current and anticipated homeowners and renters in all household income levels by the creation and/or preservation of a full range of quality housing units. The project's architectural design complements the City's appearance as consistent with Objective 3.2.4.

Based on the analysis above, the COA request is consistent with the goals, objectives, and polices of the City of Lake Worth Beach's Comprehensive Plan.

<u>Consistency with the Land Development Regulations - Zoning</u>

Single-Family Residential (SFR): Per LDR Section 23.3-7(a), the "SF-R single-family residential district" is intended primarily to permit development of one (1) single-family structure per lot. Provision is made for a limited number of nonresidential uses for the convenience of residents. These nonresidential uses are compatible by reason of their nature and limited frequency of occurrence with an overall single-family residential character. The "SF-R single-family residential district" implements the "single-family residential" land use category of the Lake Worth Comprehensive Plan.

The proposed partial demolition and renovation is consistent with the site data requirements in the City's Land Development Regulations. The project, as proposed, will not increase lot coverage, building coverage, FAR, or density, and will not create or expand any nonconformities with the zoning code.

Formal and complete review for compliance with the City's Land Development Regulations, including landscaping, will be conducted at building permit review. The proposed site plan and architectural drawings are included in this report in **Attachment A.**

Consistency with the Land Development Regulations – Historic Preservation

All exterior alterations to structures within a designated historic district are subject to visual compatibility criteria. Staff has reviewed the documentation and materials provided in this application and outlined the applicable guidelines and standards found in the City's Historic Preservation Ordinance, detailed in the section below. The applicant has also submitted a Justification Statement provided in this report in **Attachment D**.

Section 23.5-4(k)1 – General guidelines for granting certificates of appropriateness.

A. What is the effect of the proposed work on the landmark or the property upon which such work is to be done?

Analysis: The proposed work consists of demolition of the 1994 addition, replacement of the vinyl siding with wood siding (and repair wherever original wood siding remains), and replacement of three windows. The removal of the 1994 addition will bring the front façade closer to its original c. 1935 appearance.

B. What is the relationship between such work and other structures on the landmark site or other property in the historic district?

Analysis: The proposed work will have no direct physical effect on any surrounding properties within the Old Lucerne Historic District.

C. To what extent will the historic, architectural, or archaeological significance, architectural style, design, arrangement, texture, materials and color of the landmark or the property be affected?

Analysis: While the building's east and south elevations will be significantly altered from their existing appearance, the proposed alterations seek to bring the structure back to its original appearance and are appropriate for the Minimal Traditional architectural style.

D. Would denial of a certificate of appropriateness deprive the property owner of reasonable beneficial use of his property?

Analysis: No, denial of the COA would not deprive the applicant of reasonable use of the property.

E. Are the applicant's plans technically feasible and capable of being carried out within a reasonable time?

Analysis: Yes, the applicant's plans can be completed in a reasonable timeframe.

F. Are the plans (i) consistent with the city's design guidelines, once adopted, or (ii) in the event the design guidelines are not adopted or do not address the relevant issue, consistent as reasonably possible with the applicable portions of the United States Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation then in effect?

Analysis: The proposed partial demolition and exterior alterations for the residence are in compliance with the Design Guidelines. The proposed replacement windows and siding are appropriate for the structure's architectural style, and the 1994 addition is not yet old enough to obtain historic significance.

G. What are the effects of the requested change on those elements or features of the structure which served as the basis for its designation and will the requested changes cause the least possible adverse effect on those elements or features?

Analysis: The proposed work will retain the original historic layout of the home, and will not adversely affect the historic features of the structure. Staff has worked closely with the contractor to arrive at a window designs that are complimentary to the existing structure and compatible with the Minimal Traditional architectural style.

Section 23.5-4(k)2 – Additional guidelines for alterations and additions, noncontributing structures.

A. Is this a change to the primary façade?

Analysis: Yes, this is a change to the primary façade. The removal of the 1994 addition will result in changes to the structure that are visible from the public right-of-way.

B. Is the change visually compatible and in harmony with its neighboring properties as viewed from a public street?

Analysis: Yes, the removal of the addition, replacement of the windows, and repair/replacement of the siding is visually compatible with the architectural style of the structure as well as with neighboring properties. The proposed alterations will bring the structure closer to its historic appearance as viewed from a public street.

Section 23.5-4(k)4.A – Additional Requirements for Demolitions: All requests for demolition shall require a certificate of appropriateness. No certificate of appropriateness for demolition of a landmark or contributing property shall be issued by the HRPB unless the applicant has demonstrated that no other feasible alternative to demolition can be found. In making its decision to issue or deny a certificate of appropriateness to demolish, in whole or in part, a landmark building or structure, the HRPB shall, at a minimum, consider the following additional decision-making criteria and quidelines:

(1) Is the structure of such interest or quality that it would reasonably fulfill criteria for designation as a landmark on the National Register of Historic Places?

Analysis: The existing structure is a non-contributing resource in the Old Lucerne National and Local Historic District. Based on the information currently available about the structure, staff analysis is that the structure is unlikely to qualify as an individual landmark on the National Register of Historic Places.

(2) Is the structure of such design, texture, craftsmanship, size, scale, detail, unique location or material that it could be reproduced only with great difficulty or economically unreasonable expense?

Analysis: It is the analysis of Staff that a historically accurate version of the building, including the 1994 addition, could be reconstructed using materials available today.

(3) Is the structure one of the few remaining examples of its kind in the city?

Analysis: No, there are other remaining examples of Minimal Traditional architecture in the city.

(4) Would retaining the structure promote the general welfare of the city by providing an opportunity to study local history, architecture and design or by developing an understanding of the importance and value of a particular culture or heritage?

Analysis: No, retaining the 1994 addition would not provide an exemplary opportunity to study local history or design.

(5) Does the permit application propose simultaneous demolition and new construction? If new construction is proposed, will it be compatible with its surroundings (as defined above) and, if so, what effect will those plans have on the character of the surrounding sites or district?

Analysis: No, the application proposes to demolish the 1994 addition without constructing a new addition in its place.

(6) Would granting the certificate of appropriateness for demolition result in an irreparable loss to the city of a significant historic resource?

Analysis: No, the loss of the 1994 addition would not result in an irreparable loss of significant historic resources. The addition is not yet old enough to gain historic significance in its own right.

(7) Are there definite plans for the immediate reuse of the property if the proposed demolition is carried out, and what effect will those plans have on the architectural, historic, archeological or environmental character of the surrounding area or district?

Analysis: Yes. Should the demolition of the 1994 addition be approved by the HRPB, it is the property owner's intention to simultaneously renovate the structure and continue its use as a single-family residence.

(8) Is the building or structure capable of earning reasonable economic return on its value?

Analysis: Staff defers to the Applicant. No documentation regarding economic return has been submitted.

(9) Would denial of demolition result in an unreasonable economic hardship for the property owner?

Analysis: Staff defers to the Applicant. No documentation regarding economic hardship has been submitted.

(10) Does the building or structure contribute significantly to the historic character of a designated historic district and to the overall ensemble of buildings within the designated historic district?

Analysis: The existing structure is a non-contributing resource in the Old Lucerne Historic District. Although it is designated as non-contributing, the structure's appearance from the public right-of-way does impact the overall ensemble of buildings within the district. The proposed partial demolition would support the historic character of the structure by removing a non-historic addition that is visible from the street.

(11) Has demolition of the designated building or structure been ordered by an appropriate public agency because of unsafe conditions?

Analysis: No, the addition has not been deemed unsafe by the Building Official.

(12) Have reasonable measures been taken to save the building from further deterioration, collapse, arson, vandalism or neglect?

Analysis: It appears that reasonable measures have been taken to secure the property.

Consistency with the Historic Preservation Design Guidelines

The proposed partial demolition and exterior alterations, as shown in the plans submitted, are designed to restore the original appearance of the home's façade and comply with the Design Guidelines for Minimal Traditional architecture. The Minimal Traditional architectural style is covered as a primary style in the Lake Worth Beach Historic Preservation Design Guidelines, and that chapter is included in this report as **Attachment C**.

Analysis: The proposed partial demolition would bring back the historic appearance of the southeast portion of the home, and would re-establish the home's footprint from c. 1940 (when the rear porch was added). The architectural plans from the 1994 addition show that the original front window was centered under the gable; the plans submitted by the applicant restore that original layout. The proposed single-hung windows and wood siding are appropriate for the architectural style and are compatible with the existing windows.

CONCLUSION AND CONDITIONS

The proposed application for new construction does not conflict with the City's Land Development Regulations and is consistent with the Historic Preservation Design Guidelines, as the project brings the structure closer to its original appearance. Therefore, staff recommends that the HRPB approve the COA with conditions; staff has drafted conditions of approval below.

Conditions of Approval:

- 1) Only the 1994 addition at the southeast corner of the residence shall be demolished, as shown in the submitted plans.
- 2) Vinyl siding shall be removed. Existing wood siding shall be repaired where possible, or replaced with wood siding to match the existing siding.
- 3) The replacement window on the front elevation shall be centered under the gable roof and shall be a casement window with muntins to imitate a 6-over-6 single hung window.
- 4) The replacement windows on the south elevation (labeled "left elevation" on the submitted plans) shall be a 6-over-6 single hung window and a casement window with muntins to imitate a 6-over-6 single hung window.
- 5) All divided light patterns shall be created utilizing exterior raised applied triangular muntins. Exterior flat muntins or "grids between the glass" shall not be used.
- 6) All glazing shall be clear, non-reflective and without tint. Low-E (low emissivity) is allowed but the glass shall have a minimum 60% visible light transmittance (VLT) measured from the center of glazing. Glass tints or any other glass treatments shall not be combined with the Low-E coating to further diminish the VLT of the glass.
- 7) All windows shall be installed recessed in the jambs and shall not be installed flush with the exterior wall.
- 8) Landscaping shall be reviewed for compliance with the City's landscape requirements at building permit.

BOARD POTENTIAL MOTION:

I MOVE TO **APPROVE** HRPB Project Number 23-00100034 with staff recommended conditions for the partial demolition and renovation of the existing structure at **325 North Ocean Breeze**, based upon the competent substantial evidence in the staff report and pursuant to the City of Lake Worth Beach Land Development Regulations and Historic Preservation requirements.

I MOVE TO **DISAPPROVE** HRPB Project Number 23-00100034 for a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the partial demolition and renovation of the existing structure at **325 North Ocean Breeze**, because the Applicant has not established by competent substantial evidence that the application complies with the City of Lake Worth Beach Land Development Regulation and Historic Preservation requirements.

Consequent Action: The Historic Resources Preservation Board's decision will be final decision for the demolition and exterior alterations. The Applicant may appeal the Board's decision to the City Commission.

ATTACHMENTS

- A. Plan Set and Survey
- B. Photos
- C. Historic Preservation Design Guidelines Minimal Traditional
- D. Application and Justification Statement