



MEMORANDUM DATE: March 3, 2021

AGENDA DATE: March 10, 2021

TO: Chair and Members of the Historic Resources Preservation Board

RE: **805 North Lakeside Drive**

FROM: Jordan Hodges, Senior Preservation Coordinator
Abraham Fogel, Preservation Planner
Department for Community Sustainability

TITLE: **HRPB Project Number 21-00100034:** Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for retroactive exterior alterations and window replacement for the property located at **805 North Lakeside Drive**; PCN#38-43-44-21-15-230-0150. The subject property is a contributing resource to the Northeast Lucerne Local Historic District and is located in the Single-Family (SF-R) Zoning District.

OWNER: Charlene C. Rector, Trust
820 North Lakeside Drive
Lake Worth Beach, FL 33460

AGENT: Wes Blackman, CWB Associates
241 Columbia Drive
Lake Worth Beach, FL 33460

PROPERTY DEVELOPMENT HISTORY:

Documentation available in the structure's property file indicate that the building was constructed in 1925 in a Mission Revival architectural style. Although the original architectural drawings are not available, a property card from 1943, included as **Attachment A**, indicates that the structure was designed with a stucco exterior, flat roof, wood windows and doors, and an enclosed front porch. Photos of the structure prior to window replacement, included as **Attachment B**, indicate that the front enclosed porch consisted of two triplets of 6/6 double-hung windows on the east façade and a pair of 6/6 double-hung windows on the north façade. The entry door to the structure occupies on the south façade of the porch. Additionally, the windows on the front façade feature decorative stone masonry window surrounds. Photos of the remaining facades prior to window replacement were not submitted as part of this request. City permit records indicate the structure has received minor site and mechanical alterations over time, and prior to window replacement, maintained a high degree of integrity of setting, materials, design, location, workmanship, feeling, and association.

PROJECT HISTORY:

On June 17, 2020, Historic Preservation staff received building permit application #20-1771 for retroactive window replacement. Staff reviewed the application and disapproved the request on June 26, 2020, as the permit application did not include a Certificate of Appropriateness application or photos of the property. In January of 2021, the Applicant’s agent, Wes Blackman, contacted historic preservation staff and submitted additional documentation. Once the documentation was received, staff recommended that the project be reviewed by the HRPB, as the request could not be approved administratively.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The property owner, Charlene Rector, is requesting a retroactive Certificate of Appropriateness for window replacement performed at 805 North Lakeside Drive without an approved COA or building permit. The subject property is located on the west side of North Lakeside Drive between 8th Avenue North and 9th Avenue North. The property is located in the Single-Family Residential (SF-R) Zoning District and retains a Future Land Use (FLU) designation of Single-Family Residential (SFR).

If approved, the subject application would retroactively allow the replacement of the original wood double-hung windows with new American Craftsman “Silver Line” impact vinyl single-hung windows with internal muntins and glass with a Low-E coating. Additionally, the application proposes to enclose one window on the rear west façade, although site conditions provide evidence that multiple window openings have been removed and enclosed, either over time or during the recent unpermitted work. As a result of window replacement, the original window surrounds were removed and replaced with patchwork stucco that does not replicate the appearance of the removed surrounds. Photos of the property after the window replacement are included in this report as **Attachment C**. The Applicant’s submittal packet and Justification Statement are provided as **Attachment D**.

The application will require the following approval:

1. **Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for retroactive** exterior alterations and window replacement

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends denial of the application as submitted for the reasons outlined on page 9, including that the proposed replacement windows are not compatible with the considerations for window replacement per the City’s Historic Preservation Design Guidelines.

PROPERTY DESCRIPTION:

Owner	Charlene C. Rector, Trust
General Location	West side of North Lakeside Drive between 8 th Avenue North and 9 th Avenue North
PCN	38-43-44-21-15-230-150
Zoning	Single-Family Residential (SF-R)
Existing Land Use	Single-Family Residence
Future Land Use Designation	Single-Family Residential (SFR)



Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan

The proposed project is not consistent with Goal 1.4 of the Comprehensive Plan, which encourages preservation and rehabilitation of historic resources. Policy 3.4.2.1 insists that properties of special value for historic, architectural, cultural, or aesthetic reasons be restored and preserved through the enforcement of the City's Historic Preservation Ordinance to the extent feasible. Per the City's Historic Preservation Ordinance (LDR Sec. 23.5-4), the Lake Worth Beach Historic Preservation Design Guidelines, and the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation, the replacement of missing features should be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence. The pictorial evidence provided illustrates that the unapproved window replacement does not seek to preserve historic architectural elements and does not seek to adequately replicate the historic materials that were removed.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION ANALYSIS:

Historic Preservation Design Guidelines

The City's Historic Preservation Design Guidelines provide a guide for compatible window replacement for historic structures within the historic districts. Windows are amongst the most important character-defining architectural features, but they are also one of the most commonly replaced features of a building. Replacement products for historic structures should match the original features in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials.

Although the City's Design Guidelines allow for the replacement of historic materials; specifically, windows, doors, and roofs, due to severe weather-related events associated with South Florida's climate, replacement features must replicate original features and the replacement process should take into consideration the historic detailing and craftsmanship that historic structures inherently possess.

Page 198 of the City's Historic Preservation Design Guidelines, included as **Attachment E**, provides a guide for the special considerations that should be reviewed when replacing historic windows. Below please find the criteria and staff's responses.

1. Replacement windows should be installed in the original window openings, and the openings should not be altered in size or made smaller by building in the framing.

Staff Response: As detailed in the application, the applicant is requesting approval for the enclosure of a window opening on the rear façade. Per the photos provided in the application and from photos taken during staff's site visit, several window openings have been enclosed, specifically on the south and rear façades, either as a result of the current unpermitted work, or work performed on the property overtime. The difference in stucco texture evident on enclosed openings suggest that some windows have been enclosed more recently than others. Additionally, the historic window surrounds, trim, and sills have been removed as a result of window replacement, which could have resulted in changes to opening sizes.

2. Replacement windows should be installed to the same depth in the jamb as the existing windows, and should not be installed flush with the exterior of the wall.

Staff Response: The historic windows have been removed without permits. Photos of the building prior to window replacement illustrate that the historic windows were recessed in the window jambs, as typical amongst building of this style and period of construction. The replacement windows are installed recessed in the jambs.

3. The original wood window trim, window sills, and mullions should be retained when replacing windows. Where original trim and surrounds needs to be replaced due to severe deterioration, the replacement elements should match what is being removed in profile, design, shape, size, configuration, and location.

Staff Response: As evident in the photo of the building prior to window replacement, Staff can substantiate that that aside from the front of the enclosed porch, which utilizes decorative stone window surrounds, the building also utilized wood surrounds, which was typical for double-hung window openings on Mission Revival structures from the 1920s. The historic window surrounds, sills, and mullions were removed during the window installation process and replaced with inappropriate patchwork stucco surrounds that do not seek to replicate the historic materials that were removed.

4. If decorative divided lights are appropriate and compatible for your replacement windows, they should be created by utilizing exterior raised applied triangular muntins. Exterior flat muntins or “grills between the glass” should not be utilized. When utilizing a divided light pattern, monolithic glass is recommended over insulated glass, as the additional glass width associated with insulated products removes the exterior space in the window sash needed to accommodate exterior muntins.

Staff Response: Photos of the wood windows on the enclosed porch illustrate double-hung windows with a 6/6 divided light pattern that utilized a historic raised profile muntin. The replacement windows utilize a combination of 6/1, 4/1, and full-view replacement windows where the divided light patterns are sandwiched between two sheets of glass. Windows that utilize “grills between the glass” have a flat, one-dimensional appearance that do not successfully replicate the appearance of historic windows. They are not appropriate for historic structures within historic districts and are not allowed administratively. Additionally, there is no confirmed way to remove the “grills between the glass” so that exterior raised applied muntins could be retrofitted.

5. Windows historically utilized clear glass, and therefore clear glass is the most compatible type for historic districts. Windows with Low-E or Solarban coatings, applied tint, and mirror finishes are not recommended.

Staff Response: The HRPB has further clarified the clear glass requirement, with the additional language added the COA Approval Matrix, “All glazing shall be clear, non-reflective and without tint. Low-E (low emissivity) is allowed, but the glass shall maintain a minimum 70% 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.” Per

documentation provided by the Applicant as part of this application, the visual transmittance of the Low-E coating is 39%. A VLT measurement from center of glazing was not provided.

6. It is important to verify with your contractor or design professional that your existing window openings and framing will support your desired replacement window product. Often, additional or reinforced structural support is needed to accommodate impact products. This may require all internal trim and wall space abutting your current windows to be demolished, which may remove original materials, increase the cost of the project, and result in additional construction time.

Staff Response: Additional bucking and framing is typically required when replacing historic wood double-hung windows. This is typically accomplished by reframing the windows from the interior of the structure, leaving the exterior window surrounds in place. The original window mullions have been removed and have been replaced with masonry surrounds.

Review

The windows that were installed without permits cannot be approved administratively for the criteria-based reasons provided in the section above. The replacement windows do not successfully replicate the historic windows per the regulations set forth in the Historic Preservation Design Guidelines. Additionally, per the COA Approval Matrix, changes to and the removal of opening sizes, opening locations, and historic detailing must be reviewed by the HRPB for contributing resources, regardless of an opening's visibility.

Although staff was not provided with photos of the structure aside from the front enclosed porch, due to the opening sizes, window locations, and architectural style of the structure, the remainder of the window types were likely also double-hung windows with varying divided light patterns based on the size of the opening. Staff can administratively review and issue Certificates of Appropriateness which accurately replicate the historic window types as outlined in the Historic Preservation Design Guidelines.

Additionally, the original window surrounds, sills, and mullions are character-defining features which should be retained and preserved. These architectural details are important features that are directly tied to integrity of the historic building's materials, design, and workmanship. Window surrounds, mullions, and sills on Mission Revival structures are significant, as these are generally simple buildings void of additional embellishments. A recent example of window replacement for a Mission Revival structure is the property located at 231 North Ocean Breeze. As evident in the photos provided in **Attachment F**, the original wood window surrounds, mullions, and sills were retained and preserved while new impact products that successfully replicated the original windows were installed. The structure is also diagramed within the Historic Preservation Design Guidelines chapter on Mission Revival structures, included in this report at **Attachment G**.

Certificate of Appropriateness

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.

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 proposed window replacement with new American Craftsman “Silver Line” impact vinyl single-hung windows with internal muntins and glass with a Low-E coating (unverified VLT measured from center of glazing) do not successfully replicate the historic wood double-hung windows that were removed without approvals. The removal of the historic detailing and window openings severely alters the appearance of the historic 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 window replacement will have no direct physical effect on any surrounding properties within the Northeast Lucerne Local Historic District, although the products and construction methods utilized on this proposal may detract from the district’s visual significance 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: The proposed replacement windows do not replicate the historic windows that were removed without approvals. The removal of the historic window surrounds and the replacement of these features with incompatible fenestration detailing directly detracts from the contributing resource’s architectural style, design, arrangement, texture and materials.

- 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 his property.

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

Staff Analysis: The applicant’s plans have already been implemented without approvals.

- 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 City's Historic Preservation Design Guidelines places significant importance on successful window and door replacement. The proposal is not in compliance with the Design Guidelines as the replacement products do not seek to replicate the original design and utilize incompatible materials. The proposed windows and replacement surrounds also do not comply with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation or the City's Land Development Regulations, Historic Preservation Ordinance, §23.5-4(k).

- 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 contributing resource within a local historic district. The resource is a Mission Revival building, which has a distinct set of architectural characteristics. The removal of the original windows and the window surrounds and their replacement with incompatible materials cause significant adverse effects to the structure that should be corrected, as the work performed was done so illegally without approvals.

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 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.

Staff Analysis: Distinguishing original qualities that characterize the building were removed and destroyed without approvals.

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

Staff Analysis: No. Windows with internal muntins and glass with a Low-E coating (unverified VLT measured from center of glazing) are not approved within the historic districts per the Historic Preservation Design Guidelines. Neighboring structures largely retain their original

windows or have replacement windows that were approved with a Certificate of Appropriateness.

- 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: No, the proposed window and door replacement would not conform to original openings.

- (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: The windows were installed illegally without permits. A proposal illustrating the cost of window replacement with an administratively approvable option has not been submitted.

- (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: The replacement windows do not match the old in design, color (glass), texture, or materials, nor are they considered compatible alternatives per the Historic Preservation Design Guidelines.

- (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.

Staff Analysis: Staff defers to Applicant. The evidence presented within this report illustrate that the replacement products used and methods of construction are not historically accurate or compatible.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Staff has received public comment for this item. Public comments will be read into the record at the March 10, 2021 meeting.

CONCLUSION:

The proposed window replacement with new American Craftsman “Silver Line” impact vinyl single-hung windows with internal muntins and glass with a Low-E coating (unverified VLT measured from center of glazing) result in a substantial and detrimental change to the structure’s appearance. The removal of the original window surrounds that characterize the Mission Revival structure have caused direct adverse effects to the contributing resource’s architectural integrity. **The window replacement proposal is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan, Historic Preservation Ordinance, Historic Preservation Design Guidelines, and Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation.** Staff recommends denial of the application, and that the applicant submit a revised application with new window products that can be approved administratively. Staff also recommends that the original window surrounds be reconstructed based off of pictorial evidence, as they were removed without approval and replaced with incompatible alternatives.

POTENTIAL MOTION:

I MOVE TO **APPROVE** HRPB Project Number 21-00100034 for a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for retroactive window replacement and exterior alterations for the property located at **805 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 21-00100034 for a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for retroactive window replacement and exterior alterations for the property located at **805 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 – 1943 Property Appraiser’s Card
- B. Photos Prior to Window Replacement and Exterior Alterations
- C. Photos After Window Replacement and Exterior Alterations
- D. Applicant Submittal Packet and Justification Statement
- E. Historic Preservation Design Guidelines – Window Replacement Special Considerations, pg. 198
- F. Successful Window Replacement – 231 N Ocean Breeze – Mission Revival
- G. Historic Preservation Design Guidelines – Mission Revival