



HISTORIC RESOURCES PRESERVATION BOARD REPORT

HRPB Project Number 23-00100142: Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for door and sidelight replacements with integral mini-blinds at the property located at **129 South Golfview Road, Unit #7**. The subject property is a non-contributing resource to the South Palm Park Historic District and is located in the Medium-Density Multi-Family Residential (MF-30) District.

Meeting Date: September 13, 2023

Property Owner/Applicant: Richard Narowski

Address: 129 South Golfview Road, Unit #7

PCN: 38-43-44-27-52-000-0070

Lot Size: 0.31 acre /13,490 sf

General Location: Northwest corner of South Golfview Road and 2nd Avenue South

Existing Land Use: Multi-Family Residential

Current Future Land Use Designation: High Density Residential (HDR)

Zoning District: Medium-Density Multi-Family Residential (MF-30)



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) and Historic Preservation Design Guidelines. Based on the requirements in the Historic Preservation Design Guidelines, staff cannot administratively approve the proposed integral blinds and recommends denial of the proposed doors and sidelights.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The property owner, Richard Narowski, is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for replacement of Unit #7's entry doors and sidelights on the structure located at 129 South Golfview Road. The application proposes to use integral mini-blinds in the doors and sidelights. 129 South Golfview Road is a non-contributing structure in the South Palm Park Local Historic District.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Staff has not received one letter in support of the COA request. The letter is included as Attachment C in the Board's meeting packet.

PROPERTY DEVELOPMENT HISTORY

The multi-family structure at 129 South Golfview Road was constructed in 1961 in a simple Mid-Century Modern architectural style. The building was originally designed as a 3-story, 8-unit apartment building. Character-defining features of the original design included stucco exterior walls, deep roof overhangs, decorative masonry breeze-block railings, and simple full-light glaze doors and either single-hung or 2-light awning windows.

Major alterations occurred in 1980-1981: a fourth story was added to the building to create a penthouse apartment, and the original decorative masonry railings were replaced with metal railings. Windows and doors on units #1-8 were replaced in 2009.

In 2021, Unit #9 applied for a Certificate of Appropriateness for replacement windows and doors, which was administratively approved by staff. The full-light doors that were installed on Unit #9 have integral mini-blinds; these integral blinds were not noted on the COA application documents and were not approved as part of the COA.

On January 30, 2023, the applicant contacted the Building Official and historic preservation staff regarding whether replacement of the entry doors on Unit #7 with double French doors and sidelights would be architecturally and structurally acceptable. Historic preservation staff confirmed that full-light French doors and full-light sidelights would be appropriate replacements; integral mini-blinds were not discussed during this interaction.

On May 11, 2023, the applicant submitted permit application #23-1600 for replacement of the entry doors and sidelights for Unit #7 with full-light doors and sidelights, both of which proposed glazing with integral mini-blinds. Historic preservation staff disapproved the application on May 25, 2023, noting that integral blinds are not considered architecturally appropriate in historic districts, and therefore could not be approved by staff. Staff recommended revising proposed glazing to clear glass, noting that the applicant could use a white interlayer for privacy, and/or use external blinds to provide shade.

The applicant submitted the documentation required to take the project to the HRPB on July 10, 2023, and the project was scheduled for hearing at the next available meeting on September 13, 2023.

An installation map, photos of the existing doors and sidelights, and quote forms for the proposed doors and sidelights are included as **Attachment A**. The property owner's justification statement is included in **Attachment B**.

ANALYSIS

Consistency with the Land Development Regulations and Historic Preservation Design Guidelines

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 window replacement section of the City's Historic Preservation Design Guidelines, which addresses appropriate glazing, is included as **Attachment D**.

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: Based on the original architectural drawings and the City's Historic Preservation Design Guidelines, staff contends that the proposal's door and sidelight design is architecturally appropriate, with the exception of the integral mini-blinds. The replacement of doors and sidelights with inappropriate glazing would adversely alter the appearance of the resource.

- 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 door and sidelight replacement will have no direct physical effect on any surrounding properties within the South Palm Park Historic District. The replacements on Unit #7 will have a visual effect on the multi-family structure as a whole.

- 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: Per the regulations set forth in the City's Historic Preservation Design Guidelines, replacement windows and doors should replicate the appearance of the original windows and doors. If replacement windows and doors do not replicate the original, the replacements should use design that are appropriate for the architectural style. The proposed doors and sidelights use an appropriate overall style, but the proposed integral mini-blinds do not replicate the historic glazing and are not visually consistent with the glazing on the rest of the structure. The architectural design of mid-century multi-family buildings emphasized visual consistency and repetition, using consistent window and door designs for each unit on the building. Replacement of doors and sidelights on Unit #7 with integral mini-blinds would negatively affect the visual consistency of the glazing, as integral mini-blinds have a different appearance than traditional glazing when viewed from the public-right-of-way. Inconsistent glazing is not consistent with the architecture typically associated with mid-century multi-family buildings .

- 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: 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?

Staff Analysis: The replacement door and sidelight styles are in compliance with the City's Historic Preservation Design Guidelines. However, the proposed glazing with integral mini-blinds is not in compliance with the City's Historic Design Guidelines, Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, and the Historic Preservation Ordinance.

As established in the Historic Preservation Design Guidelines, glazing within historic districts shall be clear, non-reflective, and without tint. Low-E coatings are permitted to promote energy efficiency; while Low-E coatings can have a slightly tinted appearance, they have been determined to be functionally equivalent to clear glazing, as the Low-E surface is a coating applied to clear glazing rather than an integral tint to the glazing. A similar concept applies to blinds in historic districts: external blinds, added to the outside of a window or glazed door, are an appropriate option to provide shade and privacy while leaving the window or door with appropriate clear glazing. Integral blinds, which are permanently affixed between the layers of glass in a window or door, were not used in historic architecture and are an inappropriate glazing option.

Furthermore, the architectural design of multi-family buildings in the second half of the 20th century emphasized the rhythm and consistency of windows and doors on each of the units. With the exception of Unit #9, which installed doors with integral blinds outside the scope of the issued building permit, units at 129 South Golfview Road do not utilize mini-blinds in their glazing. Integral blinds alter the visual transmittance and exterior appearance of glazing, which interrupts the consistency of the building's design. As a result, replacement of the doors and sidelights on Unit #7 with integral mini-blinds would have an adverse effect on the structure's appearance and would not be consistent with the architectural design of the structure.

- 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 structure is designated as a non-contributing resource within the South Palm Park Historic District. As a non-contributing structure, historic review of window and door replacements only extends to openings that are visible from the public right-of-way. While non-contributing structures within historic districts are not held to the same level of review as contributing structures, historic review of exterior alterations is intended to promote architecturally appropriate alterations over time, such that non-contributing structures may eventually be able to gain contributing status. Based on staff interpretation of the Design Guidelines, integral blinds are not an appropriate option for glazing in doors or sidelights at 129 South Golfview Road and would have an adverse effect on the structure's integrity and its relationship with the surrounding historic district.

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

- A. Is this a change to the primary façade?

Staff Analysis: Yes, the doors are located on a façade that is 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?

Staff Analysis: No, the proposed replacement of doors and sidelights with integral mini-blinds on Unit #7 is not in harmony or visually compatible with the overall structure or with other structures in the surrounding historic district.

CONCLUSION AND CONDITIONS

While the proposed door and sidelight styles are appropriate for the structure, the integral mini-blinds are not consistent with the requirements of the Historic Preservation Design Guidelines as the mini-blinds are not visually consistent with the glazing on other units in the building. If the Board moves to approve the replacement doors and sidelights without the mini-blinds, staff has drafted conditions of approval:

Conditions of Approval:

1. The front entry doors shall be replaced with a pair of full-light, clear French doors.
2. The existing entry sidelights shall be replaced with full-light, clear sidelights.
3. All doors shall be installed in their existing openings. Openings shall not be filled in or made larger to accommodate alternately sized products.
4. 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. Glazing for front doors and bathroom windows may use a white interlayer for privacy.
5. All doors shall be installed recessed in the jambs and shall not be installed flush with the exterior wall.

BOARD POTENTIAL MOTION:

I MOVE TO **DENY** HRPB Project Number 23-00100142 for a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for door and sidelight replacements with integral mini-blinds for the property located at **129 South Golfview Road, Unit #7**, 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.

I MOVE TO **APPROVE** HRPB Project Number 23-00100142 for a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for door and sidelight replacements with integral mini-blinds for the property located at **129 South Golfview Road, Unit #7**, 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.

ATTACHMENTS

- A. Installation Map, Photos, and Quote Forms
- B. Applicant's Justification Statement
- C. Public Comment
- D. Historic Preservation Design Guidelines – Windows