



**MINUTES
CITY OF LAKE WORTH BEACH
HISTORIC RESOURCES PRESERVATION BOARD REGULAR MEETING
CITY HALL COMMISSION CHAMBER
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 14, 2021 -- 6:10 PM**

ROLL CALL and RECORDING OF ABSENCES Present were: William Feldkamp, Chairman; B. Guthrie, Vice-Chair; Judi Fox, Geoffrey Harris, Stephen Pickett, Robert D'Arinzo (virtual).

Also present were: Abraham Fogel, Preservation Planner; Jordan Hodges, Senior Preservation Coordinator; Erin Sita, Assistant Director for Community Sustainability; Susan Garrett, Board Attorney; Sherie Coale, Board Secretary. Peter Ringle, Building Official. William Waters, Director for Community Sustainability.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ADDITIONS / DELETIONS / REORDERING AND APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Staff advises of agenda item 808 S. Palmway, a conceptual review, to be added to Planning Issues as Item B.

Motion: B. Guthrie moved to approve the agenda as amended; J. Fox 2nd.

Vote: Ayes all, unanimous.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

A. March 10, 2021 Meeting Minutes

Motion: B. Guthrie moved to approve the minutes as presented; S. Pickett 2nd.

Vote: Ayes all, unanimous.

CASES

SWEARING IN OF STAFF AND APPLICANTS Board Secretary administered oath to those wishing to give testimony.

PROOF OF PUBLICATION Provided in meeting packet.

1) LW Herald Proof of Publication

WITHDRAWALS / POSTPONEMENTS None

CONSENT None

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

BOARD DISCLOSURE: G. Harris will recuse himself from Item E; B. Guthrie will recuse himself from Item B; W. Feldkamp discloses he spoke to head of Parrot Cove Association regarding Flood plain issues.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS: None

NEW BUSINESS:

A. HRPB Project Number 20-01500002: Consideration of a variance from base flood elevation requirements of the Florida Building Code for the single-family residence at **312 North Palmway**; PCN 38-43-44-21-15-100-0030. The subject property is located in the Single-Family Residential Zoning District (SF-R) and is a contributing resource within the Old Lucerne Local Historic District.

Staff: J. Hodges gives history of the original structure and the evolution of the structure to this point in time. The project was initially submitted via the permit process and eventually received a Certificate of Appropriateness. The Building Division later failed the permit based upon the need to elevate to nine (9) NAVD. As the structure was a contributing resource, there was the option to apply for relief by variance through the Historic Preservation Board. An independent appraisal of the property and structure was provided and was found to be valued at \$264,000. An improvement is considered substantial when it exceeds 50 % of the pre-improvement value according to the valuation on the permit. In this case the substantial improvement value threshold (to avoid raising the elevation of the entire structure) was 87K and the permit value was declared at 80K. After the permit was issued and the construction had begun, unforeseen structural deterioration and termite infestation caused the structure to be stripped down to the framing, the roof also was included. The result being the substantial improvement threshold was surpassed and the applicant is now in need of a variance from the Florida Building Code regarding the base flood elevation as it pertains to the contributing historical property. Any elevation change may change the contributing status. The existing structure has been at the existing elevation for 82 years. The initial application included work to restore the garage and windows to the original appearance. Staff continues to work with the applicant to revise the COA to include compatible siding and trim replacement as outlined in the Historic Preservation Design Guidelines due to the substantial deterioration.

Staff: The building official, Peter Ringle supports the variance request as the applicant has worked in good faith with the original substantial valuation being so close, the damage to the siding was not included. The scope of the work gradually crept higher and higher.

Board: Chairman, W. Feldkamp, asks how public can be made aware?

Staff: The Building Official states it is one of the first items he addresses when receiving plans. E. Sita mentions there was outreach to Parrot Cove and staff is open to doing presentations in the various neighborhoods, FEMA has conducted meetings and both Advisory Boards had presentations with an eventual presentation to the newly seated Commission.

Board: If not located in a Historic District, would this be a demolition? **Response:** If outside the District, they would have to elevate; a non-contributing structure within the District would also have to elevate. All Board members concur with staff regarding the granting of the variance.

Public Comment: None

Motion: B. Guthrie moved to approve HRPB 20-01500002 with staff recommended Conditions of Approval based upon the competent substantial evidence in the staff report pursuant to the City of Lake Worth Beach Land Development Regulations and Historic Preservation Guidelines. J. Fox 2nd.

Vote: Ayes all, unanimous

B. HRPB Project Number 21-00100069: A Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for a ± 175 square foot addition for the single-family residence located at **116 5th Avenue South**; PCN #38-43-44-21-15-165-0010. The subject property is located within the Multi-Family Residential (MF-20) Zoning District and is a contributing resource to the South Palm Park Local Historic District.

Note: Board Vice-Chair Bernard Guthrie recused himself from the item, left the chambers and did not vote.

Staff: A. Fogel presents case findings and analysis. Known as Lakeside Castle, the property has experienced various changes over time including the addition of a swimming pool, carport addition, roof replacements, stucco repairs and interior remodeling. As the side and rear setbacks are legal non-conforming, the addition will not increase the non-conformity, it is to the west or front, the legal frontage. A condition of approval is that the site plan be changed to reflect South Palmway as the legal frontage. Other conditions include that the maximum lot coverage calculation only include the first floor footprint. Regarding base flood elevation, the structure as it currently exists does not meet new FEMA requirements. However, lateral additions do not constitute a substantial improvement in structures constructed in the A-zone pre-FIRM. The first map was published 1974 and the structure was constructed in 1925. The estimated cost of improvement is \$50K with the assessed value at \$602,042 in 2020. The proposed addition will house a new bathroom and closet. A pair of 3/3 double hung windows will be repurposed on the west elevation; a new impact 3-light casement window will be used on the north elevation. An existing window opening and chimney base will be concealed by the addition but remediated with the repurposing of the 3/3 double hung that otherwise would have been removed.

Motion: S. Pickett moves to approve HRPB 21+00100069 with staff recommended Conditions of Approval based upon competent substantial evidence in the staff report and pursuant to the City of Lake Worth Beach Land Development Regulations and Historic Preservation requirements; J. Fox 2nd.

Vote: Ayes all, unanimous.

C. HRPB Project Number 21-00100071: Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for window and door replacement for the property located at **801 North Palmway**; PCN #38-43-44-21-15-232-0160. The subject property is a noncontributing resource to the Northeast Lucerne Local Historic District and is located in the Single-Family Residential (SF-R) Zoning District.

Staff: J. Hodges presents case findings and analysis. Constructed in 1997, the property has had alterations over time including the addition of a pool, roof replacement, installation of hurricane shutters and a/c upgrades. Initially a COA was not submitted with the permit, after which the subsequent COA submittal failed as it did not meet Historic Preservation Design Guidelines with regard to VLT (visible light transmittance) standard of 70% or more. Otherwise the COA could have been approved with the in-kind replacement of the requested windows and doors. Windows and doors are one of the most character defining features of a home as well as one of the most commonly replaced items. No proof has been provided indicating the VLT of the current windows for comparison to the requested tint. Pursuant to the COA matrix, a non-contributing property is only reviewed for windows and doors visible from the street. As a corner lot the majority of the windows are visible from the street. Staff does not recommend approval as it is non-compatible within the district and perpetuates a non-conformity of a structure built prior to the establishment of the district in 2002.

Board: W. Feldkamp inquires as to whether the new windows have already been purchased?
Response from Raudel Pola: Yes, due to the manufacturing lead time prior to the hurricane season. Also mentions that the label shown with the VLT of .10 is the incorrect label, the actual VLT is .49

B. Guthrie asks if there is a way to determine what the existing window VLT might be? Short of hiring an independent consultant, not possible. Staff has spent considerable time was not able to locate any information on the glass. B. Guthrie asks if the .49 windows closely replicates the existing, could there be a side-by-side comparison of installation in the field and an in-kind decision made by staff?

Staff states that as the scope is different due to data error, photos in the field could be taken and brought back to Board but staff will not be making the determination that is the correct glass. G. Harris asks how the initial choice or determination was made? **Response:** there were three options-.71 clear glass; .49 (the purchased glazing); .10. Ordered less tinted glass, the mid-point of Lawson's offerings.

Applicant: Windows are on the jobsite.

Board: B. Guthrie – would like staff to make the decision if it is in kind whereas staff prefers the Board make the determination.

Chairman would like it brought back to the Board. S. Pickett asks if the prior manufacturer is known and could a professional take a look and make a determination?

Motion: G. Harris moves to continue HRPB 21-00100071 to the following Board meeting; S. Pickett 2nd.

Vote: Ayes all, unanimous.

D. HRPB Project Number 21-00100074: A request for a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the demolition of a ±115 square foot rear enclosed porch, the construction of a new ± 789 square foot addition, and the construction of a new ± 409 square foot accessory structure for the single-family residence located at **122 South K Street**; PCN #38-43-44-21-15-047-0060. The subject property is located within the Medium Density Multi-Family Residential (MF-30) zoning district and is a contributing resource to the Southeast Lucerne Local Historic District.

Staff: J. Hodges presents case findings and analysis. At the previous HRPB meeting this item was heard as a conceptual design. Primary discussion items included the massing, visual compatibility of the two-story addition and utilization of a hyphen to distinguish between old and new. The rear porch, although not contributing, it is in the style and is now over 50 years old; Board should make a determination as to whether it is has gained significance over time and should be retained. The addition and accessory structure both meet all code setbacks and impermeable/lot coverage requirements. The submittal included a hyphen which should connect to the primary structure beneath the overhang rather than tying into the roofline, the other revision was to alter a window on the west façade. The accessory structure will not be eligible for a rental license as an accessory dwelling unit (ADU) as the lot does not meet the lot area and width requirements to allow for multiple dwelling units. Staff recommends re-design or denial.

Architect for the owner-Juan Contin/Faten Almosawi: Is a bit surprised by the staff recommendation. Is in agreement with connecting the hyphen below the roofline. In an effort to increase visual compatibility, the addition was made thinner than the primary structure, believed the smooth stucco to be a good contrast between the old and new but is willing to change to a

vernacular wood if that is more appropriate. Mention is made of the container, modular project approved nearby.

Board: G. Harris- It is blunt due to the contrasting with surrounding structures. There doesn't appear to be a relationship to the primary structure. The front perspective and streetscape seems out of scale. W. Feldkamp asks whether there is a parking requirement for a project this size. Perhaps moving the accessory structure forward by eight (8) feet to provide a perpendicular parking spot. Applicant confirms there is a parking space to the rear of the accessory structure. Staff confirms a parallel spot could be provided. R. D'Arinzo- This is a lot of addition on a little lot. Confirms the accessory structure is extra living space not an ADU. W. Feldkamp- prefers a flat roof instead of a pitched roof, a color that would cause it to recede, would like to retain the screened porch rather than demolition, questions the permeability, the connecting hyphen is too narrow, the new addition is narrow and symmetrical in the front and should be the same as the rear, the 'swoopies' should remain within the rear facade and not wrap around. S. Pickett -There is a better way to integrate into the neighborhood, it is not compatible and the massing is too large. W. Feldkamp suggests flipping the arrangement of primary, addition and accessory, however staff reminds of the prohibition of the accessory building being between the primary structure and the Right-of-way.

Faten Almwasi explains the client's request and how the addition became so large (in order to obtain the square footage for the accessory structure), the laundry/porch area made it difficult to provide a nice transition area.

G. Harris – Points out the streetscape appears to be out of scale; believes the fenestration in the addition could have more rhythm causing a better relationship to the primary structure.

Applicant: Believed the Board response last time was much more positive, in particular the hyphen. Perhaps the city has not had the opportunity to have a project like this, wants to move forward.

Board: G. Harris believes the addition could be more visually empathetic by gently moving it back into the lot, that way it wouldn't be as stark and confrontational to the streetscape. Landscaping such as trees could also aid in obscuring, softening the structure.

Motion: G. Harris moved to continue HRPB 21-00100074 to a date certain of May 12, 2021; S. Pickett 2nd.

Vote: Ayes all, unanimous.

E. HRPB Project Number 21-00100075: A Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for a ± 427 addition for the single-family residence located at **130 North Ocean Breeze**; PCN #38-43-44-21-15-030-0080. The subject property is located within the Multi-Family Residential (MF-20) zoning district and is a contributing resource to the Old Lucerne Local Historic District.

Please note the architect for the project, Board Member Geoffrey Harris, has moved to the chamber floor as presenter for the case. He will be giving his presentation for his client, the applicant, and recusing himself from the Board discussion and vote.

Staff: A. Fogel presents case findings and analysis. A brief re-cap shows the Board approved a COA for the conversion of the existing garage, a waiver for the rear setback and variance from the base flood elevation on this parcel in February 2021. As the proposed lap-siding provides a flat appearance when compared to the existing siding material, staff recommends an alternate material more compatible with the Frame Vernacular style (board & batten or staggered shingle) than the proposed cementitious lap siding. This also will provide the distinction between addition

and original. This recommendation comes as the profiles are similar yet not an exact match and they meet on a visible corner. The window openings have also been conditioned to include mullions of a minimum of 4 inches encased in cementitious material.

Architect for the Applicant: The client would like to maintain the cementitious lapsiding. The architect did look at other materials. As the addition is small and a change won't make a significant impact, the cementitious siding should be allowed and a corner board could be used where they meet. Regarding the windows in Condition #5, they will mimic the other window, and prefers a single hung 1/1 rather than 2/2.

Board: R. D'Arinzo – knows the house well and that there were some repair issues to the siding. Concurs with the window assessment by the architect. W. Feldkamp inquires about the shutters, will they be removed or replicated elsewhere? The applicant would like to replicate the existing clamshell shutters. Would like the gable end brackets moved to align with the upper edges of the window. The applicant is wanting to put a simulated vent in the north facing end of the addition. In which case the brackets could be eliminated. Staff concurs it could be reviewed at time of permit.

Public Comment: None

B. Guthrie would suggest a corner board at the transition

Motion: B. Guthrie moves to approve HRPB 21-00100075 with staff recommended Conditions of Approval based upon competent substantial evidence pursuant to the City of Lake Worth Beach Land Development Regulations and Historic Preservation requirements with amendments to the Conditions as follows: Condition #11 to read "The addition's siding shall be separated from the original building by minimum four (4) inch corner boards"; Condition #5 shall be stricken; S. Pickett 2nd.

Vote: Ayes all, unanimous

PLANNING ISSUES:

A. Conceptual Plan Review for the property located at **321 North L Street**; PCN #38-43-44-21-15-090-0211.

Geoffrey Harris, architect-The proposed addition to the existing structure is in the Frame Vernacular style, coincidentally it is one of the examples in the Design Guidelines. Proposing to add onto the primary structure in order to provide the square footage necessary for the construction of an accessory structure. The two-story addition will have a second-floor deck/balcony facing west. The property to the south has a two-story structure to the rear of that lot. It is connected to the primary structure by an extension of the hip roof. Board members find it to be less intrusive.

Board: The view from the south has a busy appearance with the dormer.

Mr. Harris states he could lower the hip roofline but the stairway is in this location, possibly eliminating the dormer although the light is nice in the stairwell. There will also be landscaping to obscure the height. In the addition, the ceiling will be slightly lower as the floor elevation will remain the same throughout.

Board: J. Fox finds this proposal to be less intrusive. R. D'Arinzo likes the proposal. W. Feldkamp suggests the L-shape area could be eliminated, it might be better if there were just a hip roof. He does not like the look of the "pop-up". As with the previous project, there is no hyphen. A breezeway could be used although it would be considered one building.

Mr. Harris states with an accessory structure one can build closer to the alleyway. S. Pickett likes the look although the massing is more visible from the street, perhaps a flat roof w/ parapet would help. Consensus: The massing is the biggest issue, to make the addition subordinate could be achieved with diminutive architectural features. G. Harris is willing to consider looking at modulating the height as the structure goes back through the lot and even consideration to the making it one structure through a breezeway.

B. Conceptual Plan Review for the property located at 808 S. Palmway (addition to the published agenda)

Staff presents the conceptual idea which is a request for the screen porch windows. The applicant would like the windows on the sunroom to have a darker tint of @ 60% VLT and perhaps more full view windows. The reasoning/justification is the rear of the contributing structure is not seen. Originally built as a room to receive sunlight.

Board: It should meet the requirements of 70 % VLT (visual light transmittance) and follow code. It was built as a sunroom to receive sunlight on a cool winter day. Board members concur the guidelines are in place for a reason. If it were not a contributing structure, it would go through building permit review. They do not want to set any type of precedent for allowing any windows with less VLT. Low-E is allowed as well as windows with 70% VLT, but not lower. Clear glass is warranted and is the historically correct replacement. This property is in an AE flood zone. Residents don't realize the benefits of being a contributing structure in a flood zone such as the exemption from the Building Code requirement of having to elevate all structures for substantial improvements. The approval matrix states all sides of a contributing structure are reviewed while the review for non-contributing structures are only the sides that are visible from any street. At some point the line has to be drawn. The Board goes above and beyond with the 70% VLT which does provide energy savings. Rules are rules and the granting of exceptions can be a slippery slope.

Staff: The non-contributing determination is made via the Historic Grant survey process. The owner previously inquired about the replacement of the front window however no application was submitted after the inquiry and options were provided. Industry trends are toward a lower VLT as well as new products that are close to clear.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: (3 minute limit) None

DEPARTMENT REPORTS: None

BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS: W. Feldkamp expresses his dislike of pop-ups behind primary structures and need to find a resolution.

ADJOURNMENT: 9:31 PM