



**MINUTES  
CITY OF LAKE WORTH BEACH  
HISTORIC RESOURCES PRESERVATION BOARD REGULAR MEETING  
BY TELECONFERENCE  
WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 09, 2020 -- 6:00 PM**

**ROLL CALL and RECORDING OF ABSENCES:** Present were: William Feldkamp, Chairman; Judith Fox; Bernard Guthrie; Ozzie Ona; Robert D'Arinzo. Absent: Judith Just.

Also present: Abraham Fogel, Preservation Planner; Jordan Hodges, Senior Preservation Coordinator; Erin Sita, Assistant Director for Community Sustainability; Pamala Ryan, Board Attorney; Sherie Coale, Board Secretary.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**ADDITIONS / DELETIONS / REORDERING AND APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

**Motion:** R. D'Arinzo moves to accept the agenda, B. Guthrie 2<sup>nd</sup>.

**Vote:** Ayes all, unanimous

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

A. August 12, 2020 Regular Meeting Minutes

**Motion:** B. Guthrie moves to accept the minutes as presented; R. D'Arinzo 2<sup>nd</sup>.

**Vote:** Ayes all, unanimous.

**CASES**

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

**PROOF OF PUBLICATION**

1) PZHP LDR 20-03100005 and 20-03100006 Proof

Provided in the meeting packet.

**WITHDRAWALS / POSTPONEMENTS:** Discussion of phoning the applicant, re-order, move forward and with the reminder of the Board attorney, the item will be heard with or without the applicant.

**CONSENT:** None

**PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

**BOARD DISCLOSURE:** None

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS:** None

**NEW BUSINESS:** Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for roof replacement for the property located at **814 North Ocean Breeze**; PCN#38-43-44-21-15-232-0040. The subject property is a noncontributing resource to the Northeast Lucerne Local Historic District and is located within the Single-Family (SF-R) Zoning District.

**As the applicant was not present at the time of this item, Board and Staff agreed to move to Item B giving the applicant time to join if having technical difficulties.**

**Staff:** J. Hodges confirms the applicant is now joining the meeting (6:45 pm). J. Hodges presents case findings and analysis. The request is for a roof replacement with terra-cotta barrel tiles as opposed to the flat white tile as recommended by staff. Although classified per the 2002 survey, as non-contributing. 2017 survey brought the suggestion that it become contributing. The impact of allowing the proposed roof would possibly bring about the loss of potential contributing status and those benefits. The design guidelines depict an unsuccessful replacement if utilizing the simulated concrete terra-cotta barrel tile. Minimal traditional style is typically designed with flat white tile, occasionally the **true barrel** tiles in white were utilized. Approval of proposal is not recommended by staff.

Board Secretary swore in Ms. Hillary Broder.

**Applicant:** When she moved in, the roof was professionally cleaned. Believes it collects dirt and unattractive. The trim color would be complementary to the terra-cotta tiles and a nice complement to the house Requires a lot of upkeep in which she has no interest. Insurance for the flat tile was difficult, mentions 18K.

**Public Comment:** None

**Staff:** Question about the insurance, the lifespan of the existing roof was estimated to be 5 years, the estimate was based upon the age of the house. States that this type of tile is not used any more.

**Board:** B. Guthrie asks for clarification about the proposed change impeding the possible contributing status. **Staff:** Roofs are one of the most common factors that reduce a building from contributing to non-contributing. Because most homes here in the City are small and detail is limited so roofs and windows are very important. B. Guthrie asks about the horizontality of the existing roof versus the verticality of the proposed roof. **Staff:** An example is 628 North Ocean Breeze. A true barrel tile is wider with a more pronounced profile. W. Feldkamp asks about the price differential between the proposed options are not huge. O. Ona- commends the improvements already made; asks if she spoke with the planners? **Applicant Response:** She did not but did inquire into storm shutters as that seemed to be something that would possibly affect the historic appearance. Inherited the house from a deceased sibling so no Broker was involved. **Board:** W. Feldkamp states staff makes a compelling argument. O. Ona mentions that although it may be against the wishes of the homeowner, staff spends a lot of time and Board respects their opinion; there are guidelines that need to be followed. B. Guthrie asks if the white flat tile roof products produced today more resistant to mold and dirt? **Staff:** J. Hodges mentions the slurry coat which reduces porosity of the tiles. **Applicant response:** She looked at it and didn't like the look nor the asphalt roofs in the neighborhood.

**Motion:** O. Ona moves to deny HP 20-00100171 because the applicant has failed to establish by competent substantial evidence that the request is consistent with the City LDR's and Historic Preservation requirements; R. D'Arinzo 2<sup>nd</sup>.

**Vote:** Ayes all, unanimous.

Applicant asks for further explanation of contributing versus non-contributing.

- A. **PZHP 20-03100006**: Consideration of an ordinance (Ordinance # 2020-14) to amend Chapter 23 “Land Development Regulations” to update and clarify the quasi-judicial process for land use and zoning matters.

**Board Attorney:** Pamala Ryan presented brief overview of the changes to LDR’s involving Quasi-Judicial processes and Appeals processes. Staff mentions past City practice and procedures were atypical.

Appeals are now further defined and separated; An Affected Party is now defined along with process. Affected parties are required to provide 10-day notice to the City demonstrating how they are an Affected Party if they would like to be considered an Affected Party. An Affected Party is different from an interested party (who receive the courtesy notices and access to the legal notices in the paper). Affected party can be a person or business that has a special interest, working for the business does not make one an affected party. Some cities have moved away from Affected Party processes, they may appeal in Circuit Court if they disagree with the decision. Lake Worth Beach goes above and beyond for their residents.

The presentation by an Affected Party has a time limit of 10 minutes and no new evidence can be introduced to the Board or City Commission. With the requirement of providing documentation and presentation, it allows the Board and City to be better prepared rather than finding out at the time of the Board meeting. Agenda’s can be better adjusted.

**Board:** B. Guthrie mentions the scenario of a project in the neighborhood that once the sign is posted, it has already moved beyond the 10-day requirement and persons would not have had sufficient time to declare Affected Party status; most similar to a naive resident. R. D’Arinzo likes the process whereby no new evidence may be presented.

**Board Attorney:** This is for items that are properly noticed and advertised.

**Motion:** R. D’Arinzo moves to recommend adoption of **PZHP 20-03100006 , Ordinance 2020-14**, to the City Commission; O. Ona 2<sup>nd</sup>.

Discussion: B. Guthrie confirms this is a problem, not a solution looking for a problem.

**Public Comment:** None

**Vote:** Ayes all, unanimous.

- B. **PZHP 20-03100005**: Consideration of an ordinance (Ordinance # 2020-13) to amend Chapter 23 “Land Development Regulations” to provide consistency and clarity for time limitations related to development orders and building permits.

**Board Attorney:** Pamala Ryan presented brief overview of the changes to LDR’s involving time limitations on development orders and building permits. New section-expiration of development orders, will automatically expire three (3) years after issued; irrespective of building permits. The Board could, within the Conditions of Approval, grant up to four (4) years. A phased project which does not perform all phases, would have to come back before Board to complete a 2<sup>nd</sup> phase to a project.

**Board:** B. Guthrie asks for explanation of how State Statute could supersede City ordinances. P. Ryan explains there have also been modifications to the building permit section. Now the time to apply for permit has decreased to twelve (12) months from eighteen (18) months. E. Sita

explains that there were various expirations within the many application types. This has now been eliminated and there is consistency.

Discussion about how Gubernatorial Executive Orders give additional time.

**Motion:** B. Guthrie moves to recommend adoption of PZHP 20-03100005, Ordinance 2020-13, to the City Commission; R. D'Arinzo.

**Public Comment:** None

**Vote:** Ayes all, unanimous.

### **PLANNING ISSUES:**

- A. Consideration of an amendment to the COA Approval Matrix that adds clear glazing standards and consolidates information for actions that impact the exterior appearance of properties located within the historic districts.

**Staff:** A. Fogel- At the previous meeting a moratorium, on all glass types except clear glass, was imposed until further details were made available regarding the visual transmittance and industry standards. This will enable Board and staff to make adjustments, if needed, to the matrix by providing clarity and consistency. Historic Guidelines indicate clear glass is the only appropriate glazing for replacement windows in the Historic districts.

Visible Light Transmittance refers to the amount of light passing through the glass. The rating is a result of the entire window including the frame, sash, muntins and any tints or coatings. Staff's analysis is that a 10 % reduction in VLT would continue to be within the range of "clear glass". Other cities historic preservation programs allow the exception of clear low-E and replicating glass that historically had a color or tint. Board may choose to allow a VLT of 70% minimum. The higher the number, the clearer the glass = more light being transmitted. Further deviance from the design guidelines will create issues with the State of Florida. VLT should be distinguished from COG (center of glass). With the VTCOG only the visual light transmittance from the center of the glass is measured and not prejudiced by the sash, frame and muntins. **The VTCOG should be the standard to measure.**

**Board:** B. Guthrie asks who provides the ratings, specification. **Staff:** It is with the NOA's. B. Guthrie asks if there is any tint that will meet the 70% threshold. **Staff:** Tint is always darker. Tints and coatings are different from low-E (low-E automatically gives green tint due to Argon Gas). W. Feldkamp asks if energy savings is what is driving the low-E, tints and coatings popularity. **Staff:** New construction is a big driver in the changes. **Board:** B. Guthrie mentions a case where the applicant did not want the green tint of low-E and so opted for the grey as it better aligned with the color scheme of the house. Are there any light grey tints that would come in at 70% or higher COG? **Staff:** The tints are coming in darker. Blue and grey tints are add-ons they are not intrinsic to the glass.

Discussion regarding any push-back from the public due to the moratorium. O. Ona asks if Board has the ability to change the glass type? Board Attorney states only the matrix, not the Design Guidelines. B. Guthrie would like to move forward and remove the moratorium, changing the matrix only to clear and clear low-e. If the applicants don't agree, let them come before the Board. W. Feldkamp would like the item to remain for further study. R. D'Arinzo states another month in moratorium will be okay. Staff would like to further investigate the energy savings and ask if there is a low-E grey with no less than 70% VTCOG.

**Grant overviews:** J. Hodges mentions the periods of significance are being expanded within the districts. Most structures are from 1920-1945 and it is missing the post-war boom. The digitization grant has provided the opportunity for the public, residents, potential residents to search online for historic district plans through the interactive GIS map.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** (3 minute limit): None

**DEPARTMENT REPORTS:**

- A. Consideration of candidates that have demonstrated outstanding achievements in historic preservation; 113 South Federal Highway, 407 South Lakeside Drive, 231 North Ocean Breeze, 330 North Palmway, and 1101 North Lakeside Drive.

**Staff:** J. Hodges announces candidates for the 4<sup>th</sup> Annual Historic Preservation Awards normally celebrated in the month of May. It recognizes the outstanding achievements of the citizens and local businesses in their efforts to preserve and restore the unique character and identity of Lake Worth Beach neighborhoods. The criteria for the judging is presented as well as an explanation of the various categories and the Board's prerogative to eliminate categories, disqualify incomplete submittals and eliminated submittals that did not meet the COA process or Code requirements for Historic Properties. The following 5 submittals will be awarded a bronze marker (plaque) in recognition of their contribution:

115 South Federal Highway – Julie Schnee for Rehabilitation

407 South Lakeside Drive – Justin Hu for Rehabilitation and Restoration with Tax Exemption

231 North Ocean Breeze – Daryl and Loretta Shatto for Rehabilitation and Compatible Addition

330 North Palmway – Brent and Peggy Swenson for Rehabilitation

1101 North Lakeside Drive – Kurt Hyde and Evelio Rubiello for Rehabilitation

Many of the applicants are new to Lake Worth Beach from Boca Raton and West Boynton Beach areas. A flyer will be placed into the monthly water bill and notice on the City website.

**BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS:** Board members inquire as to if there is a new appointment to the Board. Staff comments they believe there to be someone that was interviewed. R. D'Arinzo would like Board to revisit the topic of murals as there is fading and graffiti on some of the murals (5<sup>th</sup> Avenue N. and Dixie Hwy).

**ADJOURNMENT: 8:34 PM**