



## HISTORIC RESOURCES PRESERVATION BOARD REPORT

**HRPB Project Number 24-00100083:** Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for demolition of an existing carport and construction of a new attached garage at 534 South Palmway. The subject property is a contributing resource to the South Palm Park District and is located in the Single Family Residential (SFR) Zoning District. The future land use designation is Single Family Residential (SFR).

**Meeting Date:** May 10, 2024

**Property Owner:** Inke Sunila

**Applicant:** Jyrki Koivuharju, Birch Construction, Inc.

**Address:** 534 South Palmway

**PCN:** 38-43-44-27-02-000-0010

**Lot Size:** 0.17 acre / 7,500 sf

**General Location:** Northeast corner of South Palmway and 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue South

**Existing Land Use:** Single Family Residential

**Current Future Land Use Designation:** Single Family Residential (SFR)

**Zoning District:** Single Family Residential (SFR)



## RECOMMENDATION

The documentation and materials provided in 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 garage addition is consistent with the City's Land Development Regulations. The proposed addition is consistent with the requirements in the Historic Preservation Design Guidelines for additions, and staff contends that the proposed demolition of the existing carport meets the required criteria in the Historic Preservation Ordinance. **Therefore, staff recommends approval of the application with conditions.**

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant, Jyrki Koivuharju of Birch Construction, Inc., on behalf of the property owner, Inke Sunila, is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition of an existing carport and storage area and construction of a new attached garage at 534 South Palmway.

## PUBLIC COMMENT

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

## PROPERTY DEVELOPMENT HISTORY

The existing single-family house at 534 South Palmway was constructed c. 1925. Although the original architectural plans are not available in the City's records, historic property records and photographs show the structure was designed in the Mission Revival style, with a textured stucco exterior wall finish, flat roof with decorative parapets, wood windows and doors, and a sleeping porch on the south elevation.

Based on records in the City's property file, the property has gone through numerous alterations since the house was constructed. The property was re-platted and subdivided in 1959, separating the existing parcel from 531 South Lakeside Drive. The 1944 property card shows that the house at 534 South Palmway had an attached garage, with an accessory apartment above the garage accessed by an exterior staircase. A series of alterations throughout the 1980s enclosed the existing garage and exterior staircase, renovated the former garage and apartment areas to function as part of the single-family house, installed new carports and sheds, replaced windows, installed a pool, and built a new balcony on the east elevation. A panel roof was constructed over the second-story balcony on the east elevation in 2005. A new pool was installed in 2017, and windows and doors were replaced throughout the home in 2020.

The property owner and applicant met with staff regarding the proposed project in February 2024, and provided a complete COA submittal for demolition of the existing carport and construction of a new attached garage in April 2024.

The proposed architectural plans and survey are included as **Attachment A**, and photographs of the site are included as **Attachment B**.

## 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 carport demolition and garage addition will not change the structure's use. As the structure is a single-family residence, it is consistent with the intent of the Single-Family Residential designation. 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 policies of the City of Lake Worth Beach's Comprehensive Plan.

#### **Consistency with the Land Development Regulations – Zoning**

**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.

534 South Palmway has existing non-conformities, which include impermeable surface coverage, front yard landscape area, and wall height at side setback. The non-conforming front yard landscape area and wall height at side setback will not be affected or increased by the proposed project.

The proposed demolition of the existing carport and storage area and construction of a new one-car garage will decrease the non-conforming impermeable surface coverage; per the applicant's justification statement, the demolition of the carport will facilitate the creation of a native garden between the new garage and rear property line. Per LDR Section 23.5-3(d)(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.*** Staff contends that, as the proposed project would alter the existing structure to decrease its nonconformity, the project aligns with the intent of the LDRs.

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**.

Development Standard		Single Family Residential (SFR)	Provided
Lot Size (min)		5,000 sf	7,500 sf
Lot Width (min)		50'	75'
Density		7 du/acre x 0.172 ac = 1 du	1 du
Principal Structure Setbacks	Front	20'	28'
	Rear	10'	14'
	Side	7.5'	13'
Impermeable Surface Coverage (max)		50%	65% existing* 59.45% proposed
Structure Coverage (max)		30%	25% (1,879 sf)
Building Height (max)		30' (2 stories)	30' (2 stories)
Front Yard		75% permeable & landscaped	66% (510 sf) (existing)*
Maximum Wall Height at Side Setback (Primary structure addition)		18' @ 5' setback Up to 23' at 10' setback	About 28' @ 13' setback (existing)*
Floor Area Ratio (FAR) (max)		0.45	0.366 (2,742.76 sf)
Parking		2 spaces	Estimated 4-5 spaces: 1 garage, 3-4 driveway

\*Existing non-conformity: will either be unaffected by the proposed work or will be decreased through the proposed work

#### **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)(4)(A) – Additional requirements for demolition:** 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 guidelines:

- 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 carport is unlikely to fulfill the criteria for designation as an individual landmark on the National Register of Historic Places, nor is it likely to contribute to the overall property's ability to qualify as a landmark on the National Register.

- 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:** The existing carport could be reproduced using modern building materials.

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

**Analysis:** No, there are other remaining examples of 1980s carports and accessory structures throughout the City's historic districts.

- 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 1984 carport 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:** Yes, the application proposes simultaneous demolition of the carport and new construction of an attached garage. The proposed new addition is compatible with its surroundings, as established in this report.

- 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 1984 carport 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, the applicants are proposing to build a new attached garage. The proposed plan will not have a detrimental impact on the historical, archaeological or environmental character of the surrounding area or district.

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

**Analysis:** This criterion is not applicable to the subject carport.

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

**Analysis:** No, the denial of the demolition will not result in an unreasonable economic hardship.

- 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:** No, the existing carport does not contribute significantly to the historic character of the subject property or the surrounding historic district.

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

**Analysis:** No, the carport has not been condemned or ordered for demolition by any agency.

- 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.

**Section 23.5-4(k)2 – Additional guidelines for alterations and additions, 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?

**Analysis:** Not applicable; no change to the use of the property is proposed.

- 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.

**Analysis:** The proposed addition will not destroy any distinguishing original qualities or characteristics of the building. The addition will differentiate from, yet be compatible with, the structure's original characteristics.

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

**Analysis:** Yes, the garage addition is visually compatible with the existing structure and with neighboring properties as viewed from the public right-of-way.

- 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
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
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.
4. If the applicant avails himself of this paragraph the materials used must appear to be as historically accurate as possible and in keeping with the architectural style of the structure.

**Analysis:** Not applicable.

**Section 23.5-4(k)(3)(A) – Additional guidelines for new construction and for additions; visual compatibility:** *In approving or denying applications for certificates of appropriateness for new construction and additions, the City shall also, at a minimum, consider the following additional guidelines which help to define visual compatibility in the applicable property's historic district:*

- 1) The height of proposed buildings shall be visually compatible and in harmony with the height of existing buildings located within the historic district.

**Analysis:** The proposed one-story addition is smaller in scale and size than the existing principal structure, which appropriately gives visual emphasis to the historic portions of the building. The proposed garage will be visually compatible with the height of existing buildings within South Palm Park.

- 2) The relationship of the width of the building to the height of the front elevation shall be visually compatible and in harmony with the width and height of the front elevation of existing buildings located within the district.

**Analysis:** While this criterion is not applicable, as the addition is on the rear elevation of the structure, the proposed garage is in harmony with the width and height of the existing building and other buildings along South Palmway.

- 3) For landmarks and contributing buildings and structures, the openings of any building within a historic district should be visually compatible and in harmony with the openings in buildings of a similar architectural style located within the historic district. The relationship of the width of the windows and doors to the height of the windows and doors in a building shall be visually compatible with buildings within the district.

**Analysis:** The openings for the proposed addition are generally in harmony with the existing structure and the Mission Revival architectural style. Staff has added a condition of approval that the exact window and door designs shall be reviewed for architectural compatibility at permit.

- 4) The relationship of solids to voids in the front facade of a building or structure shall be visually compatible and in harmony with the front facades of historic buildings or structures located within the historic district. A long, unbroken facade in a setting of existing narrow structures can be divided into smaller bays which will complement the visual setting and the streetscape.

**Analysis:** Although the proposed addition is not on the front façade of the principal structure, the addition will be visible from a public right-of-way (South Palmway). The portion of the addition that faces the right-of-way

avoids expanses of blank façade, and the shape of the garage door opening visually mimics the arched openings on the existing open front porch.

- 5) The relationship of a building to open space between it and adjoining buildings shall be visually compatible and in harmony with the relationship between buildings elsewhere within the district.

**Analysis:** The proposed garage addition adheres to setback requirements within the current zoning code and is spaced appropriately in relation to neighboring buildings.

- 6) The relationship of entrance and porch projections to sidewalks of a building shall be visually compatible and in harmony with the prevalent architectural styles of entrances and porch projections on buildings and structures within the district.

**Analysis:** This requirement is not applicable since the entrance to the structure is not changing and the addition is on the rear elevation.

- 7) The relationship of the materials, texture and color of the façade of a building shall be visually compatible and in harmony with the predominant materials used in the buildings and structures of a similar style located within the historic district.

**Analysis:** The proposed addition will match the existing primary structure in materials, texture, and color.

- 8) The roof shape of a building or structure shall be visually compatible and in harmony with the roof shape of buildings or structures of a similar architectural style located within the historic district.

**Analysis:** The proposed addition has a flat roof with a shaped parapet to match the existing roof style. Flat roofs with decorative parapets are a visually compatible roof shape and material for Mission Revival and Mediterranean Revival structures within the South Palm Park historic district.

- 9) Appurtenances of a building, such as walls, wrought iron, fences, evergreen, landscape masses and building facades, shall, if necessary, form cohesive walls of enclosures along a street to ensure visual compatibility of the building to the buildings and places to which it is visually related.

**Analysis:** Most of the site features (fences, building facades, etc.) will be unaffected by the proposed new garage addition. Per the applicant's justification statement, because the new addition will have a smaller footprint than the existing carport and storage structure, approval of the proposed work will facilitate the creation of a native garden between the garage and the rear property line.

- 10) The size and mass of a building in relation to open spaces, the windows, door openings, porches and balconies shall be visually compatible and in harmony with the buildings and places to which it is visually related.

**Analysis:** The proposed addition is compatible in size and massing both with the existing house and the surrounding neighborhood.

- 11) A building shall be visually compatible and in harmony with the buildings and places to which it is visually related in its directional character: vertical, horizontal or non-directional.

**Analysis:** Based on the elevation drawings and rendering provided, the proposed one-story garage addition is visually compatible in height and massing to neighboring structures.



- 12) The architectural style of a building shall be visually compatible with other buildings to which it is related in the historic district, but does not necessarily have to be in the same style of buildings in the district. New construction or additions to a building are encouraged to be appropriate to the style of the period in which it is created and not attempt to create a false sense of history.

**Analysis:** The addition design successfully incorporates elements of the Mission Revival architectural style present in the existing structure and is visually compatible with the existing structure and surrounding district.

- 13) In considering applications for certificates of appropriateness to install mechanical systems which affect the exterior of a building or structure visible from a public right-of-way, the following criteria shall be considered:
- (a) Retain and repair, where possible, historic mechanical systems in their original location, where possible.

**Analysis:** The applicant has not provided mechanical plans for staff review. Staff will review mechanical system locations at building permit.

- (b) New mechanical systems shall be placed on secondary facades only and shall not be placed on, nor be visible from, primary facades.

**Analysis:** The applicant has not provided mechanical plans for staff review. Staff has included a condition that all new mechanical systems shall not be visible from the public right-of-way or placed on primary facades.

- (c) New mechanical systems shall not damage, destroy or compromise the physical integrity of the structure and shall be installed so as to cause the least damage, invasion or visual obstruction to the structure's building materials, or to its significant historic, cultural or architectural features.

**Analysis:** The applicant has not provided mechanical plans for staff review. Should the HRPB move to approve the addition, staff has included a condition that all mechanical systems shall be installed so as to cause the least damage to the structure's historic fabric.

- 14) The site should take into account the compatibility of parking facilities, utility and service areas, walkways and appurtenances. These should be designated with the overall environment in mind and should be in keeping visually with related buildings and structures.

**Analysis:** The site plan includes one garage space as well as an estimated 3-4 driveway spaces. With the exception of the garage parking space, all parking spaces on the site plan are existing and will not be altered by the proposed project.

#### **Consistency with the Historic Preservation Design Guidelines: Addition**

The City's Historic Preservation Design Guidelines provide standards and recommendations for rehabilitation of historic buildings, including new additions. New additions should be designed and constructed so that the character defining features of the historic building are not radically changed, obscured, damaged, or destroyed in the process. New additions should be differentiated from, yet compatible with, the old so that the addition does not appear to be part of the historic fabric. The Mission Revival 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 addition is designed with materials and detailing that are consistent with the Mission Revival architectural style. The design uses many elements from the existing structure, including a flat roof with a shaped parapet, stucco exterior wall finish, six-over-six single hung windows, and an arched garage door opening. Although the



addition will be visible from a public right-of-way since 534 South Palmway is on a corner, the addition is appropriately placed on the rear elevation of the structure so as to minimize its visual and physical impact to the historic building.

While many of the architectural design features on the addition mimic those of the historic structure, the addition differentiates itself from the historic fabric by offsetting the addition from the existing structure's west elevation, placing the west elevation of the addition slightly behind the west elevation of the historic structure. Furthermore, the new garage will be the only one-story portion of the building, distinguishing itself from the rest of the 2-story structure.

## CONCLUSION AND CONDITIONS

The proposed garage addition is consistent with the requirements in the Historic Preservation Design Guidelines. Based on the criteria provided in the Historic Preservation Ordinance and analysis provided in this staff report, staff also contends that the proposed demolition of the existing carport meets the required criteria. Therefore, staff recommends approval of the application with the conditions outlined below.

### **Conditions of Approval:**

1. The windows and doors shall be compatible with Mission Revival architectural style, subject to staff review at permitting.
2. All divided light patterns shall be created utilizing exterior raised applied muntins. Exterior flat muntins or "grids between the glass" shall not be used.
3. 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.
4. All windows and doors shall be installed recessed in the jambs and shall not be installed flush with the exterior wall.
5. The roof of the addition shall be flat with a shaped parapet similar to the parapet on the existing structure.
6. The addition shall utilize a stucco finish to match the existing structure.
7. All mechanical equipment shall be located outside of required setbacks, shall not be placed on elevations facing the right-of-way, and shall be installed so as to minimize damage to the structure's historic fabric.
8. Formal and complete review for compliance with the City's Land Development Regulations will be conducted at building permit review.

### **BOARD POTENTIAL MOTION:**

I MOVE TO **APPROVE** HRPB Project Number 24-00100083 for a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for demolition of the existing carport and construction of a new attached garage at **534 South Palmway**, 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 24-00100083 for a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for demolition of the existing carport and construction of a new attached garage at **534 South Palmway**, because [Board member please state reasons].

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

## ATTACHMENTS

- A. Plan Set and Survey
- B. Photos
- C. Design Guidelines – Mission Revival and Additions
- D. Applicant's Justification Statement