



MEMORANDUM DATE: October 6, 2021

AGENDA DATE: October 13, 2021

TO: Chair and Members of the Historic Resources Preservation Board

RE: **320 North Lakeside Drive | Continuance**

FROM: Erin Sita, Assistant Director
Department for Community Sustainability

TITLE: HRPB Project Number 21-00100222: Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the construction of a new +/- 1,790 square foot addition for the single-family residence at 320 North Lakeside Drive; PCN #38-43-44-21-15-430-0050. The subject property is located within the Single-Family Residential (SF-R) zoning district and is a contributing resource to the Old Lucerne Local Historic District.

OWNER: Per and Rachel Lorentzen
320 N Lakeside Drive
Lake Worth Beach, FL 33460

PROPERTY DEVELOPMENT HISTORY:

Per documentation within the City's property files, the building at 320 North Lakeside Drive was constructed circa 1925 in a Mediterranean Revival architectural style. Although no original architectural drawings of the buildings are available in the City's property file, a property card from 1943, included as **Attachment A**, describes the structure as being of block construction with gable roofs, having a stucco exterior, and plaster and wood interior walls. Recent photos of the building illustrate a linear building with an irregular plan with varying roof heights over individual massing elements, partially enclosed colonnades, wood casement windows with decorative grills, and simple exterior detailing typical for its period of construction. By 1943, a garage was erected at the front of the building which has since been converted to habitable living space and serves as the front entry point facing North Lakeside Drive. Alterations over time include the installation of an asphalt shingle roof, window replacement, and various site alterations. Photos of the property are included in this report as **Attachment B**. The building maintains a moderate to high degree of the seven aspects of historic integrity; location, setting, design, workmanship, materials, feeling, and association.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The property owners, Per and Rachel Lorentzen, are requesting approval for the construction of a +/- 1,790 square foot addition. The subject property is a 125' x 135' (16,875 square foot) parcel consisting of 2.5 platted lots of record (Block 430, Lots 5, 6, and the southern half of lot 7) located on the east side of North Lakeside Drive between 3rd Avenue North and 4th Avenue North. The property is bordered on the east by the Lake Worth Beach Municipal Golf Course. The parcel is located in the Single-Family Residential (SF-R) zoning district and retains a Future Land Use (FLU) designation of Single Family Residential (SFR). The application will require the following approval:

1. **COA** for the construction of a +/- 1,790 square foot addition

BACKGROUND:

- At the May 12, 2021 HRPB meeting, the Board reviewed conceptual plans (included as **Attachment C**) for the proposed addition at the property. The property owners presented schematic drawings of the addition and expressed their intent to utilize shipping containers for the addition’s construction. The Board requested that the property owners carefully consider the decision to utilize the manufactured containers, as Board members familiar with this type of construction did not believe it would be advantageous. In addition, the Board requested that vertically oriented windows be utilized as they are the most appropriate for the architectural style of the existing historic resource.
- At the September 8, 2021 HRPB meeting, the Board reviewed the formal request for an addition (included as **Attachment C**). The request was continued and the Board recommended that the overall height of the addition be reduced and that the orientation of the gable roof be changed to reduce the addition’s massing as visible from the street.
- At the September 15, 2021 HRPB meeting, the Board reviewed conceptual plans (included as **Attachment C**) prior to the formal presentation at the October meeting. The Board recommended reducing the height of the addition connector, increasing the size of the faux shuttered openings, and adding windows to the west elevation to avoid a blank façade.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The applicants have incorporated the Board’s recommendations provided at the May 12, September 8, and September 15, meetings. Therefore, staff recommends approval with conditions provided on page 10 of this report.

PROPERTY DESCRIPTION:

Owner	Per and Rachel Lorentzen
General Location	East side of North Lakeside Drive between 3 rd Avenue North and 4 th Avenue North
PCN	38-43-44-21-15-430-0050
Zoning	Single-Family Residential (SF-R)
Existing Land Use	Single Family Residence
Future Land Use Designation	Single Family Residential (SFR)



SITE ANALYSIS:

Surrounding Properties

The site is surrounded by similar structures with similar Zoning and FLU designations, and thus, are found to be compatible with the existing and proposed residential use on the subject site. The following summarizes the nature of the surrounding properties adjacent to the subject site:

NORTH: Immediately north of the subject site is a single-family structure. This parcel contains a FLU designation of SFR and a zoning designation of SF-R.

SOUTH: Immediately south of the subject site is a single-family structure. This parcel contains a FLU designation of SFR and a zoning designation of SF-R.

EAST: East of the subject site is the Lake Worth Beach Municipal Golf Course. This parcel contains a FLU designation of PROS and a zoning designation of PROS.

WEST: West of the subject site across North Lakeside Drive is a single-family structure. This parcel contains a FLU designation of SFR and a zoning designation of SF-R.



LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE REQUIREMENTS:

Land Development Code Requirements		
Code References	23.3-7 (SF-R); 23.4-10 (Off-street parking)	
	Required	Existing/Proposed
Lot Area	5,000 sf.	16,875 sf.
Lot Width	50'-0"	125'-0"
Building Height	30'-0" (2 stories)	Existing Front portion: Approx.: 9'-6" Proposed: 20'-3"
Setback - Front	20'-0"	Existing: 21.9' Proposed: 31.8'
Setback - Side	10'-0" (10% of lot width up to a maximum of 10 feet for lots over 100 feet in width)	Existing North: 31.1' Proposed North: 31.1' Existing South: 50.4' Proposed South: 14.8'
Setback - Rear	13'-6" (10% of lot depth)	Existing: 8.1' (existing non-conformity) Proposed: 75.6' (addition)
Impermeable Surface Total ⁽¹⁾	60.0% total (10,125 sf.)	50.1% (8,455 sf.)
Front Yard Impermeable	Lesser of 900 square feet or 75% pervious and landscaped	1,255 sf. Pervious and landscaped
Maximum Building Coverage ⁽¹⁾	30.0% maximum (5,035 sf.)	22.3% (3,751 sf.)
Density/Number of Units	1 dwelling unit	1 dwelling unit
Floor Area Ratio ⁽¹⁾	0.45 (7,593.75) maximum	0.21 (3,611 sf.)
Living Area	800 sf. minimum	Existing: 2,856 sf. Proposed: Approx. 3,986 sf.
Parking	2 spaces	Existing: 4 spaces Proposed: 8 spaces
Parking Dimensions	9'x18' perpendicular or angled off street 9'x28' perpendicular or angled off alley 9'x22' parallel	9'x18' perpendicular in driveways and garage
Base Flood Elevation (NAVD)	Pending Flood Zone AE BFE: 8' NAVD + 12" Freeboard 9'-0" NAVD	4.48 NAVD

(1)- Large lot (lots over 7,500 square feet)

The proposed addition is consistent with all site data requirements in the City’s zoning code. The application, as proposed, exceeds the minimum off-street parking requirements and complies with all impermeable surface requirements, building coverage allotments, floor area ratio, and required building setbacks. A survey of the existing parcel is included as **Attachment D**. The proposed site plan and architectural drawings are included as **Attachment E**.

Existing Non-Conformities – Buildings and Structures




The existing historic structure has a legal non-conforming rear setback that does not comply with minimum setback requirements provided within Section 23.3-7 of the Lake Worth Beach Land Development Regulations. Pursuant to LDR Section 23.5-3(d), Non-conforming buildings and structures:

- 1. Nonconforming buildings and structures may be enlarged, expanded or extended subject to these LDRs, including minimum site area and dimensions of the district in which the building or structure is located. No such building or structure, however, shall be enlarged or altered in any way so as to increase its nonconformity. Such building or structure, or portion thereof, may be altered to decrease its nonconformity, except as hereafter provided.*

The proposed addition complies with current zoning requirements and do not increase the existing non-conforming setbacks of the existing structure.

Base Flood Elevation

The existing structure does not comply with the current base flood elevation (BFE) requirements. Pursuant to FEMA’s Home Builder’s Guide to Coastal Construction (P-499);

Coastal Construction Requirements and Recommendations				
	V Zone 	Coastal A Zone 	A Zone 	Additional Resources
Repairs, Remodeling, and Additions [See Fact Sheet No. 9.1]				
Lateral Additions That Do Not Constitute Substantial Improvement NFIP 60.3(e)(5) and 60.3(c)(5)	<p>Recommendation: Make addition compliant with current NFIP requirements for V Zone construction.</p> <p>Requirements: Post-FIRM existing building – the addition must meet NFIP requirements in effect at time the building was originally constructed. Pre-FIRM existing building – NFIP requirements concerning new construction are not triggered (see Fact Sheet Nos. 1d, 1e, 2b, 3a, 3e, 8a, 8c)</p>	<p>Recommendation: Follow V Zone requirement for building elevation and open foundations for the addition and the existing building.</p> <p>Requirements: Post-FIRM existing building – the addition must meet NFIP requirements in effect at the time the building was originally constructed (see Fact Sheet Nos. 1d, 1e, 2b, 3a, 3e, 8a, 8c). Pre-FIRM existing building -- NFIP requirements concerning new construction are not triggered.</p>	<p>Recommendation: Elevate bottom of lowest horizontal structural member to or above BFE (same for existing building if it is elevated) (see Fact Sheet No. 1d)</p> <p>Requirements: Post-FIRM existing building – the addition must meet NFIP requirements in effect at the time the building was originally constructed (see Fact Sheet Nos. 1d, 1e, 2b, 3a, 3e, 8a, 8c). Pre-FIRM existing building -- NFIP requirements concerning new construction are not triggered.</p>	<p>BC: 3403.2, 3412.2.3, 3405.3 IRC: R322.3.1 ASCE: ASCE 7 Sec. 1.6 Other: FEMA TB #1, FEMA TB #5, FEMA TB #9, FEMA 550</p>

As indicated in the table above, lateral additions that do not constitute a substantial improvement in Pre-Firm existing buildings (in the A Zone) and are not required to meet current BFE requirements. FIRM stands for Flood Insurance Rate Map, the first FIRM became effective December 31, 1974. The subject property is Pre-Firm as it was constructed circa 1925. The City's Building Official and Floodplain Administrator, Peter Ringle, utilized an independent appraisal provided by the applicants to determine the substantial improvement threshold. The independent appraisal assessed the depreciated value of the structure at \$527,542.00. The applicants estimate that their construction costs will be below the \$263,771.00 substantial improvement threshold (50% of assessed value). Therefore, the addition is allowed to be constructed at a BFE of 4.48 NAVD to match the existing structure.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION ANALYSIS:

All additions to contributing resources within a designated historic district shall be visually compatible. Additions should take their design cues from the surrounding existing structures, using traditional or contemporary design standards and elements that relate to existing structures that surround them and within the historic district as a whole.

The scope of this COA application includes the construction of a new two-story addition consisting of a garage, stair corridor, and second-story master suite. 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 property owners have submitted a Justification Statement for the request, included as **Attachment F**.

Section 23.5-4(K)(1) *General guidelines for granting certificates of appropriateness*

1. *In general.* In approving or denying applications for certificates of appropriateness, the city shall, at a minimum, consider the following general guidelines:

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

Staff Analysis: The proposal includes a two-story addition to the south of the existing structure. The addition will consist of a two-story stair corridor, a two-vehicle garage bay, and a second-story master suite.

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

Staff Analysis: The proposed addition will have a direct visual impact on the massing relationship of the existing structure and neighboring properties. The existing contributing resource is characterized by the insertion of individual massing forms that were added to or connected to the property overtime, giving the property a staggered and atypical appearance in terms of massing and scale. However, the revised design helps mitigate the height and massing of the addition.

- 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?

Staff Analysis: The proposed addition will alter the historic design and arrangement of the building's visual massing. The resource was constructed in the 1920s and added to over the years, creating the appearance of a group of independent structures that have been connected over time. The proposed addition continues this theme, with a large two-story massing attached to the existing resource via a connector hallway.

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

Staff 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?

Staff Analysis: The plans are feasible and could be carried out 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?

Staff Analysis: As discussed in the Design Guidelines Analysis, page 9 of this report, the proposed addition generally respects the historic fabric and integrity of the existing resource by connecting to an inconspicuous location set back on the south façade.

- 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?

Staff Analysis: The building is a contributing resource that was designed in a Mediterranean Revival architectural style. The proposed addition does not require substantial alterations to the existing building, but the two-story addition is substantial and will have a visual impact on the resource when viewed from North Lakeside Drive.

Section 23.5-4(K)(2) *Additional guidelines for alterations and additions.*

2. In approving or denying applications for certificates of appropriateness for alterations and additions, the city shall also consider the following additional guidelines: *Landmark and contributing structures:*

- A. Is every reasonable effort being made to provide a compatible use for a property that requires minimal alteration of the building, structure or site and its environment, or to use the property for its originally intended purpose?

Staff Analysis: Not applicable, no change is proposed for the use of property.

- B. Are the distinguishing original qualities or character of a building, structure, or site and its environment being destroyed? The removal or alteration of any historic material or distinctive architectural features shall be avoided whenever possible.

Staff Analysis: A portion of the wall on the south façade will be removed where the addition attaches to the structure. The applicants are not proposing to remove or alter any distinguishing qualities of the historic structure. Overall, the arrangement of massing elements will be altered due to the size and placement of the addition.

- C. Is the change visually compatible with the neighboring properties as viewed from a primary or secondary public street?

Staff Analysis: The addition's two-story garage element is similar to the garage addition at the neighboring property to the south, 314 N Lakeside Drive, as evident on the streetscape alteration.

- D. When a certificate of appropriateness is requested to replace windows or doors the HRPB or development review officer, as appropriate, may permit the property owner's original design when the city's alternative design would result in an increase in cost of twenty-five (25) percent above the owner's original cost. The owner shall be required to demonstrate to the city that:

- (1) The work to be performed will conform to the original door and window openings of the structure; and

Staff Analysis: The applicants are not proposing to replace existing windows or doors.

- (2) That the replacement windows or doors with less expensive materials will achieve a savings in excess of twenty-five (25) percent over historically compatible materials otherwise required by these LDRs. This factor may be demonstrated by submission of a written cost estimate by the proposed provider of materials which must be verified by city staff; and

Staff Analysis: Not applicable, the applicants are not replacing windows and doors.

- (3) That the replacement windows and doors match the old in design, color, texture and, where possible, materials where the property is significant for its architectural design or construction.

Staff Analysis: Not applicable, the applicant is not replacing windows and doors.

Historic Preservation Design Guidelines Analysis (Mediterranean Revival Architectural Style)

Per the Historic Preservation Design Guidelines, the Mediterranean Revival architectural style became popular in the United States during the early part of the twentieth century in areas that had strong ties to Spanish Colonial heritage, such as California, Texas, and Florida. The buildings were designed with influences from Moorish, Persian, Spanish, and Italian architecture found throughout the Mediterranean. The massing of the buildings is often asymmetrical and utilize thick walls covered with stucco, which can have a smooth or rough finish. One of the most recognizable features of this style is the use of clay barrel tile on gable or cross gable roofs. Rooflines are also designed as staggered or multi-level. Windows were typically casements, sash windows, or a combination of the two. The Mediterranean Revival chapter from the LWBHPDG is included as **Attachment G**.

Staff Analysis: The architectural design of the addition was altered significantly between each HRPB review in May and September. The new design features a broad asymmetrical gable roof and utilizes a single-story and a two-story massing element that connects the primary bulk of the addition to the existing structure. The connecting element is set back roughly 47 feet from the front property line, with the front façade of the two-story garage portion set back roughly 32 feet. Both massing elements are setback from the front façade of the existing structure, which is sited at a 22-foot setback. The front façade of the addition utilizes three vertically oriented windows in the connecting element staggered on the staircase, and three false recesses on the second floor of the primary mass. Vertical slat shutters with shutter hardware are placed in the recesses to create the appearance of window openings. The remaining north, south, and east facades utilize vertically oriented single-hung and casement windows at regular intervals to avoid long expanses of blank façade.

The addition will utilize stucco with a texture to match the existing stucco application and an asphalt shingle roof to match the existing roof type. Although barrel tiles are a more appropriate roofing material for Mediterranean Revival buildings, a property card from 1943, included as **Attachment A**, indicates that the building has utilized a slate or composite shingle for the majority of its existence.

Staff does have some remaining concerns regarding the long expanse of blank facade in the addition connector. A condition of approval has been included to ensure larger staggered windows are utilized. Based on the design of the other windows, a four-light decorative pattern is recommended. Additionally, staff has recommended several standard conditions of approval to further ensure visual compatibility.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

At the time of publication of the agenda, staff has received no public comment.

CONCLUSION:

It is the analysis of staff that the proposed addition is generally consistent with the City's Historic Preservation Ordinance and the Lake Worth Beach Historic Preservation Design Guidelines. Therefore, staff recommends approval of the project, subject to the conditions provided below:

Conditions of Approval

1. All proposed exterior entry doors shall be compatible with the Mediterranean Revival architectural style, and shall be subject to staff review at permitting.
2. The windows shall be recessed a minimum of two inches (2") in the wall, and shall not be installed flush with the exterior wall.
3. The divided-light patterns on windows shall be created utilizing exterior raised applied triangular muntins. Exterior flat muntins or "grills between the glass" shall not be permitted.
4. The windows shall utilize glazing that is 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.
5. The doors may utilize clear glass, frosted, obscure glass, or glass with a Low-E coating (70% minimum VLT). Tinted, highly reflective, grey, colored, etched, or leaded glass shall not be used.
6. The garage door shall utilize a recessed panel design or vertical plank design (as proposed), subject to staff review at permitting.
7. The new stucco shall match the existing stucco on the residence in application, coarseness, and texture.
8. The new roof shingles shall match the shingles on the existing residence, subject to staff review at permitting.
9. The faux openings on the west façade shall utilize shutters recessed in the wall. The shutters shall be dimensioned to match the existing shutter sizes on the west façade.
10. The staggered windows on the west façade shall be increased in size while maintaining vertical proportions. A four-light decorative pattern is recommended.

I MOVE TO **APPROVE** HRPB Project Number 21-00100222, with staff recommended conditions of approval for a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for a +/- 1,790 square foot addition to the single-family residence located at **320 North Lakeside Drive**, 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 **DENY** HRPB Project Number 21-00100222, a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for a +/- 1,790 square foot addition to the single-family residence located at **320 North Lakeside Drive**, because the applicant has not established by competent substantial evidence that the application is in compliance with the City of Lake Worth Beach Land Development Regulation and Historic Preservation requirements.

ATTACHMENTS:

- A. Property File Documentation
- B. Current Photos
- C. Superseded Drawings
- D. Property Survey
- E. Proposed Architectural Plans
- F. Applicant Justification Statement
- G. LWBHPDG Mediterranean Revival