



**MINUTES
CITY OF LAKE WORTH BEACH
HISTORIC RESOURCES PRESERVATION
CITY HALL COMMISSION CHAMBER
WEDNESDAY, JULY 08, 2026 -- 6:00 PM**

ROLL CALL and RECORDING OF ABSENCES: Present -Robert D'Arinzo, Chair; Elain DeRiso; Ken Gross; Michelle Huffman; Edmund Deveaux; Edmond LeBlanc; Laura Devlin. Also, present-Anne Hamilton, Senior Preservation Planner; Lauren Pruss, Principal Planner; Scott Rodriguez, Asst. Dir. for Planning & Preservation; Glen Torcivia, City Attorney(virtual); Sherie Coale, Board Secretary.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

ADDITIONS / DELETIONS / REORDERING AND APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

A. June 10, 2026, Regular Meeting Minutes

Motion: E. Deveaux moves to accept June 10, 2026, meeting minutes as presented; K. Gross 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.

WITHDRAWALS / POSTPONEMENTS None

CONSENT None

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

BOARD DISCLOSURE K. Gross discloses on or about May 4, 2026, he responded to a post on Facebook from the applicant for New Business Item B. Subsequently he disclosed to the Board Attorney and staff that he responded to the post.

City Attorney acknowledges the disclosure and questions if Mr. Gross can remain objective and hear the item without prejudice.

Mr. Gross responds in the affirmative.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS: None

NEW BUSINESS:

- A. HRPB Project Numbers 26-00100160 and 26-00000008:** Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) and planning/zoning application for installation of a mural at 728 Lake Avenue. The subject site is zoned Downtown (DT) and has a future land use designation of

Downtown Mixed Use (DMU). The subject property is a contributing resource in the Old Town Historic District.

Staff: A. Hamilton presents case and mural proposal by the CRA on behalf of the property owner. The mural will be placed on the north alley facing façade. The theme is ***“Find Your Flavor, Find it Downtown”*** and is a culinary focused initiative highlighting local restaurants and downtown as a dining destination. The previous approved mural was for Island Water Sports in 1994 with possible later murals since painted over. A recent Ordinance change for murals and sculptures now eliminates the recording of a removal agreement however a building permit is still required. The Major Thoroughfare Design Guidelines prohibit the installation on street facing facades except as found by PZB or HRPB. The Guidelines do encourage connecting public art installations to businesses. Staff finds the proposal to be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, Strategic Plan and LDR's as conditioned.

Board: K. Gross believes the message could be interpreted as advertising. **Staff response:** This was examined and determined to be innocuous; brought forth by the CRA, a government entity.

Public Comment: None

Motion: M. Huffman moved to approve HRPB 26-00100160 and 26-00000008 with staff recommended conditions of approval as it meets the mural and Certificate of Appropriateness criteria based on the data and analysis in the staff report; E. DeRiso 2nd.

Vote: Ayes all, unanimous.

B. HRPB Project Number 26-00100153: Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for roof replacement at **242 Cornell Drive**. The subject property is a non-contributing resource to the College Park Historic District and is located in the Single-Family Residential (SFR) Zoning District.

Staff: L. Pruss presents case findings and analysis. At the time of the last survey (2020) the property was recommended to be considered contributing as the age of the structure is over 50+ years old and has had few alterations over time. A portion of the Historic District is located within the National Register of Historic Places. This parcel is just outside of the National Register area. Original plans on file indicated the roof was a white cement tile with the style described as Minimal Masonry. The roof shape would typically have been a hipped roof. Federal Department of Emergency Management indicates preservation or removal and replication of historic materials such as windows, doors, porches, eaves, roofs, siding, trim and finishes. Storm resistant materials such as hurricane straps, clips, self-adhesive membranes and improved sheathing are encouraged. Mention is made that the character, with a contributing factor being the roof, should be preserved in form and materials whenever possible due to the decorative patterning and form. The white concrete tile provides a horizontal visual aspect to the structure as opposed to the vertical look from a standing seam roof. (Several images of the two contrasting roof material applications were shown demonstrating the appearances of both). Previously at the direction of the Board, standing seam roofs were not approved. Staff were unable to locate a permit for the subject roof when the change was made from original construction concrete tile to the current asphalt shingle roof. The COA review criteria are explained with determinations for each criterion. The property is located on a corner lot, and the roof is visible from both Right-of-Ways.

The COA application submitted concurrently with a building permit on April 24, 2026, was denied on April 30, 2026. The applicant was advised via written comments that the appropriate replacement would not be a standing seam metal roof but a new dimensional asphalt shingle roof, an alternative material previously approved by staff.

On May 21, 2026, the applicant opted to pursue the metal roof through Board review by submitting the COA application and documentation to the Building Division rather than to Planning Zoning Historic Preservation Division. The result was a delay in processing and a missed deadline for inclusion on the June HRPB agenda.

Applicant: Christine Sylvain- The applicant finds herself in this position as her insurance company dropped coverage. The due diligence indicated the standing seam upgrade would be the best option.

States there are at least four standing seam roofs within walking distance. Believes the phrase “where possible” in Standard 6 would allow for other types of roofs and would give the Board the latitude to approve.

Board: Question to staff if standing seam is the only metal roof allowed? **Staff Response:** No, stone-coated steel shingles were suggested which provide horizontality and 3-dimensionality of the asphalt shingle roof. This preserves the visual compatibility with the Masonry Minimal style of the structure. Board gave staff the ability to approve at staff level through the approval matrix.

Board: Does the stone-coated shingle have an NOA? **Response:** Yes.

Board: K. Gross informs the applicant that one of the most important elements of successful re-roofing or new roof is the underlayment.

Board: Question as to whether there are any standing seam roofs in the College Park Historic District. **Staff response:** The photos provided with the application materials were of homes not located in the Historic district except for one new construction.

Board members mention there may be instances where metal roofs were installed prior to the district designation. Those already installed prior to the institution of the Historic district may continue to exist.

Board: L. Devlin inquires as to where and if standing seam is allowed or appropriate. **Staff response:** Yes, it could be appropriate as evidenced with original construction plans and if a home was frame vernacular in style. **Board:** E. LeBlanc mentions in the instance of new construction it could be used as a differentiator between original and new construction. Staff clarified the Standard 9 comes into play more frequently with new construction such as Coastal Contemporary.

Applicant asks Board member, K. Gross, a contractor for a price estimate. **Staff** reminds everyone this is not a hardship application and as such economics cannot be taken into consideration. The review is about the criteria.

Board: E. Deveaux explains metal roofs have been around since 1700, metal shingles since 1880, and asphalt shingles since 1901 and modernized in 1903. Nowhere in the Guidelines does it say that metal roofs cannot be used.

Board Chair: Reminds Board members the Design Guidelines and Dept of Interior opinions should be followed. Many hours were spent by previous Boards to arrive at the Guidelines.

Staff: Reiterates the Dept. of Interior written opinion regarding metal roofs. Will forward the email from the Dept of the Interior from @ 10 years ago regarding the State’s opinion on metal roofs. Will reach out to the current St. of Florida Historic Preservation Office.

Applicant: States that can’t be correct or current as it was from 10 years ago; the Guidelines are just suggestions.

Board: L. Devlin objects to the applicants’ characterization of the Design Guidelines as “suggestions.” They are not arbitrary. K. Gross responds that the regulations are promulgated by professionals who spend years studying the architecture of different styles.

Board: K. Gross reads his comment to the applicant: Advised that staff does not have latitude to approve and is governed by Guidelines, but she has a right to appeal to the Board. Certain criteria are considered.

Staff: In contrast to the applicant statement that the roof cannot be seen from the street, it can be seen from the Right-of-way (sidewalk) and across the street.

Board: Asks what the applicant wants and why? What is the objection to the steel shingles?

Applicant She was surprised at the staff denial and provided the information to her contractor on May 8, 2026, as she could not digest the amount of information as she is a busy working mother. Applicant states she assumed the Board was reasonable and they would just approve the request. Does not have an objection to anything but was in progress with what she believed to be the best material. Her contractor advised the stone coated shingles would be more money.

Board: What is the difference in resiliency?

Applicant: Does not know.

Board member cites from personal experience and board experience, the best avenue is to work with staff to save time and follow their advice of steel shingles, one can never know what a “jury” may think or do.

Applicant: The guiding principle for the Design Guidelines is whatever is reasonable.

Board: E. Deveau inquires whether a metal roof without seams would be possible? Staff is not aware of any material meeting that description. The stone coated shingles are steel.

Staff: Standard #6 provides relief when historic products are no longer available nor replicated by artisans, it is not driven by economics.

Public Comment:

Bridget Margolis – 228 Dartmouth Dr – in support

Bryan Schmidt – 242 Cornell Dr (fiancé) practices jujitsu, points out 335 Cornell also has a standing seam roof.

Barbara Seigfried - 304 Columbia Dr– supports the proposal as it performs better in this climate.

Carl Shulte - 303 Columbia Dr - can't see the roof, concrete tiles are twice the weight, these are not historic, Mizner homes. Vertical seam roofs are the strongest, he looked it up. This should not be code. This is a huge waste of time

Mr. Zirkelbach - 2313 N. Federal Hwy. – recent renovation chose the type because he likes it. She wants it and it is hurricane season. Choice is important.

Jacqueline Delgado - 226 Princeton Drive cannot see the roof, it's non-contributing and doesn't believe the Dept of Interior Regulations apply to Florida due to the weather experienced in the area.

Board: Standing seam metal \$12- \$18 per square foot installed; stone coating shingles are estimated at \$8- \$18 per square foot.

Board: L. Devlin: Perhaps the Board should look at possible revisions for hurricane hardening. R. D'Arinzo: The Board explored possible changes to roofs, windows and doors for over two (2) years, and the result is what is shown in the Guidelines.

Staff: The preservation ethic is very different in the north; here, staff, Board and the State of Florida, are very mindful of the weather. Balancing the visual appearance of the structure is important. Evidence and experience show that shingle roofs do survive hurricanes. An insurance company is not going to say a shingle roof won't survive a hurricane. As for the benefit of standing seam over shingle what is really being heard is the longevity which is put forth by insurance companies. In conversation with State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), it is not considered an appropriate replacement. Contrary to public comment and applicant statement, the subject roof can be seen from the Right-of-Way (sidewalk).

Staff: The Preservation guidelines should be applied to the request. As a Certified Local Government (CLG) the guidelines should be respected.

Board: L. Devlin questions the criteria for being seen. **Response:** One of the exhibits included with the staff report included a photo where the roof can be seen from the sidewalk, although not the most visible, it is visible.

Board: E. LeBlanc mentions Board has never approved a standing seam and consistency is important.

Motion: M. Huffman moves to approve HRPB 26-00100153; E. Deveau 2nd. Criteria findings are as follows:

A: Preserving the property with more resilient material.

B: Applicant proposal will not detract from the overall historic character of the neighborhood. Neighbors testified they agreed with the proposal.

C: It does not.

D: Preserving the structure due to longevity.

E: Yes

F: Yes

G: Non-contributing structure, it does not apply

H: Yes

A: Yes

B: Yes

Vote: 4/3 motion denied. E. DeRiso, R. D'Arinzo; K. Gross; E. LeBlanc dissenting.

Staff: Appeal to the Commission only examines whether the decision was handled in an arbitrary and capricious manner.

City Attorney: Appeals would need to be filed within 14 days, but the applicant should verify the timeline.

Motion: K. Gross moved to deny HRPB 26-00100153 as the applicant did not establish by competent substantial evidence that the application complies with the City of Lake Worth Beach Land Development Regulations and Historic Preservation Requirements. E. LeBlanc 2nd.

Vote: 4/3 motion carries. E. Deveau, M. Huffman, L. Devlin dissenting.

Board: How does the city financially benefit from the Historic Guidelines and the surveys?

Staff: Cities that have similar standards, Place Economics, have analyzed the benefits and overwhelming findings are that it is a positive economic driver. Palm Beach is the nearest town but other smaller municipalities in the USA have been included. Adverse effects of acting contrary to the Historic Guidelines could result in loss of CLG status.

Board: E. Deveau would like to hold the Joint workshop separately from Planning & Zoning.

C. Ordinance 2026-10: Consideration of an ordinance amending Chapter 23 "Land Development Regulations" related to artificial turf, associated definitions, and installation standards.

Staff: S. Rodriguez discusses the amendment to the Land Development Regulations pertaining to artificial turf. This includes establishing definitions, standards, permitting requirements and reviewing procedures for installations in the City. The State rule is that it is semi-permeable. The standards include limitations on front yard use, restrictions within required landscape areas, drainage features, utility easements and public rights-of-way. Of note, the City requires review and approval prior to installation, maintenance obligations, tree protection requirements, permit application procedures and inspection requirements. Florida Statutes adopted in 2024 established limitations on local government regulation of synthetic turf on certain residential properties. Staff recommends motion to recommend approval to the City Commission.

Motion: E. Deveau moves to recommend adoption of Ordinance 2026-10 to the City Commission; M. Huffman 2nd.

Vote: 3/3 tie vote. **Dissenting:** K. Gross – environmental detriment, lots of maintenance. E. LeBlanc – Plastic particles in the groundwater. L. Devlin –Increase in the heatscape, unsafe for pets, runoff is a concern.

D. Ordinance 2026-09: Consideration of an ordinance amending Chapter 23 "Land Development Regulations" related to vacation rentals, transient public lodging, residential uses, and associated definitions.

Staff: S. Rodriguez discusses the intent of the Ordinance and steps required to remove the City's current prohibition on residential rentals of less than 30 days. This includes changes to the Use Table, definitions and other sections of the Land Development Regulations. Current state law prohibits regulations related to duration or frequency of occupancy with respect to vacation rentals. The changes align with State law.

Board: E. Deveaux is not appreciative of the possibility of noise and party atmosphere in the residential neighborhoods five nights a week. Other Board members mention they can party five nights per week and lives here year round. R. D'Arinzo reminds all that an approved business license can be pulled or revoked for nuisance reasons. It gives the City more oversight if they have a business license. L. Devlin – does it create more or less Air BNB's? Concerns are so many transients and no connection to the neighborhood. Other Board members mention due to the nature of the business, the properties are frequently the best looking (maintained) properties.

Motion: M. Huffman moves to recommend adoption of Ordinance 2026-09 to the City Commission; K. Gross 2nd. **Vote:** Ayes all, unanimous.

D. Ordinance 2026-11: Consideration of an ordinance amending Chapter 23, "Land Development Regulations," related to nonconforming pole signs and establishing a definition for "Sign Face."

Staff: S. Rodriguez explains the amendment to the existing pole sign code. Since 2013 new pole signs have been prohibited, existing signs, legally permitted prior to August 16, 2013. The amendment provides clarity for distinguishing between the replacement of the supporting structure and the sign face. Under the proposed amendment only display panel, frame and trim may be replaced without any alteration to the supports, poles and mounting hardware nor does it authorize construction of new pole signs, expansion of existing nonconformities or replacement of structural components.

Board: Board asks for clarification on what a pole sign is and how it differs from other signs. **Response:** Typically 5-6 feet high with advertising for tenants. This ordinance allows for the face change, not structural elements.

Motion: L. Devlin moves to recommend adoption of Ordinance 2026-11 to the City Commission; E. Deveaux 2nd. **Vote:** Ayes all, unanimous.

PLANNING ISSUES:

A. June 17, 2026, Joint Workshop Summary & Potential Policy Discussion Items- this will be forwarded to the City Commission.

DEPARTMENT REPORTS: The Planning & Preservation Division of Community Sustainability will now be charged with complete permit processing for certain types of permits previously administered through the Building Division. As a result of State of Florida House Bill 803 fences (unless a pool barrier or structural CMU wall), sheds/pergolas, driveways, and tree removals and landscape cases meeting certain parameters (< \$7500.00 in value) will be received, reviewed, and inspected by Planning & Preservation. Florida Building Code and Land Development Regulations will continue to be in effect for those permit types. Fees will include administrative, permit, review and one inspection. There will be a public information release by the Public Information Officer. The City website is updated. Board question as to whether the Statute speaks to inspections? **Response:** Yes, it does.

BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS: E. Deveaux inquires about the inspections for the new permit process. There will be a mid and long term process, training forthcoming. E. Deveaux believes the Board is not doing things correctly. R. D'Arinzo disagrees as the Board has put so much time into windows, doors, roofs etc. and the rules have been vetted for the State and Federal regulations. The City pressed for leniency and this is what we have. E. LeBlanc reiterates the importance of consistency in decisions. E. Deveaux believes some issues are over massing, roofs, doors and windows. Board Chair explains that

during his time on the Board, all of those items have been reviewed, discussed and revised. The result of is the Design Guidelines, revised review matrix.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: (3-minute limit) Bryce Combs of 1310 S Palmway is building a new home next to where he lives and plans to install a standing seam or 5V crimp roof. Looks forward to working with staff.

ADJOURNMENT: 8:15 PM