



**MINUTES  
CITY OF LAKE WORTH BEACH  
HISTORIC RESOURCES PRESERVATION BOARD REGULAR MEETING  
CITY HALL COMMISSION CHAMBER  
WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 08, 2021 -- 6:00 PM**

**ROLL CALL and RECORDING OF ABSENCES** Present were: William Feldkamp, Chairman; Robert D'Arinzo; Bernard Guthrie (Virtual); Judith Fox (Virtual); Geoffrey Harris; Stephen Pickett; Ricardo Martin. Also present were: Jordan Hodges Senior Preservation Coordinator; Abraham Fogel, Preservation Planner; Erin Sita, Asst. Director for Community Sustainability; Susan Garrett, Board Attorney; Sherie Coale, Board Secretary.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

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

Board Secretary administered Oath of Office to new Board Member Ricardo Martin.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

A. July 14, 2021 Regular Meeting Minutes

**Motion:** S. Pickett moved to accept July 14, 2021 meeting minutes as presented; G. Harris 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) 307 North L Street  
617 North K Street

**WITHDRAWALS / POSTPONEMENTS** None

**CONSENT:** None

**PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

**BOARD DISCLOSURE:** W. Feldkamp visited all the sites on the agenda, no other disclosures.

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS:**

- A. HRPB Project Number(s) 21-00100119 and 21-01500004:** A Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for exterior alterations and a variance from base flood elevation requirements of the Florida Building Code for the detached garage located at **732 North Palmway**; PCN #38-43-44-21-15-228-0080. The subject property is located within the

Single-Family Residential (SF-R) zoning district and is a contributing resource to the Northeast Lucerne Local Historic District.

**Staff:** A. Fogel provides a recap to the previous approval and request heard in July 2021. This portion is to change the detached garage to a pool cabana. It includes a bath and kitchenette. Two options: Option A – the hip roof conversion to gable now matches (more similar to the main structure). The height has been reduced overall. The window beneath the gable end is now a decorative vent. Option B - a hip roof design, which would respect the original roof design. The base flood elevation must be met if the valuation is a substantial improvement however the property is a contributing structure and as such is eligible for the relief exemption of 4.67 feet. Both options retain the overall height. The roof height has been reduced from 14 feet 3 inches to 12 feet 2 inches since the July meeting.

**Applicant:** Jeremy Walter prefers the gable option as the repetition of the gables offers a better massing and ties all the renovations together.

**Public Comment:** None

**Board:** S. Pickett continues to prefer the hip roof and would like to ensure that kitchen facilities are not on the plan. With the exception of S. Pickett, all members prefer the gable end.

**Motion:** G. Harris moves to approve HRPB 21-00100119 and 21-01500004 with staff recommended conditions 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.

**Vote:** Ayes all. Unanimous.

**B. HRPB Project Number 19-00100107:** Consideration of a Completed Work Application (Part III) for a Historic Preservation Ad Valorem Tax Exemption and a recommendation to the City Commission for a Historic Preservation Ad Valorem Tax Exemption for the subject property located at **1020 South Lakeside Drive**; PCN#38-43-44-27-01-042-0010. The subject property is a contributing resource to the South Palm Park Local Historic District and is located within the Single-Family Residential (SF-R) zoning district.

**Staff:** J. Hodges- September 11, 2019 the Board previously approved the Pre-Construction Ad Valorem Tax Exemption application. Renovations occurred in the interior as well as the exterior. Three of the nine Conditions relating to the glazing tint and the muntins of the Certificate of Appropriateness were not met. The original windows appear to have had a tint application in addition to bronze framing. This application was approved prior to the change to the low E/ Visual Light Transmittance Resolution of 60% or greater. The contractor did not provide glazing specifications at time of permit review. The renovation has not yet received final inspection. Staff agrees the flat muntins do indeed more closely replicate the original look of the awning windows as opposed to the triangular muntins. Staff visited the site and found the work to generally in compliance with the scope of work proposed in the pre-construction application and has met the conditions with the exception of three conditions. Board may certify the majority of the work and exclude portions should they choose to or approve all of the work.

**Applicant:** Lewis Makepeace is excited to be winding down the process.

**Public Comment:** None

**Board:** B. Guthrie recollects the windows have always had a tint and due to the proximity to the park, it could be a fishbowl effect without tinting. G. Harris confirms the original windows were originally tinted. J. Fox questions if this is an instance of replacing existing as opposed to

changing the glazing. Does it replicate what was there? Would require a COA to clean up the muntins and glazing. W. Feldkamp does take issue with the tinting. Finds the window near the garage does not have tint. Given the year of construction, window tinting was not likely. Considering that the City will take a 10-year tax deferral, those items should be held to the original condition of approval. J. Hodges states the cost of the windows could be eliminated from the tax exemption request. R. D'Arinzo questions how did it get to this point? **Response:** An in progress and final inspection are the only 2 inspections. The Building Division did not review the COA prior to the final. Human error. S. Pickett- would be agreeable to separate window approval. J. Fox ponders the implications of being approved for one thing, doing something else, then asking for forgiveness. R. Martin- what is the precedence? There should be some consistency, have there been previous proportional approvals? J. Hodges this would be the first instance. Board has been consistent in the application of the glazing change that was instituted. B. Guthrie – is there a copy of the Visual Light Transmittance? J. Hodges – does not believe one was submitted. B. Guthrie questions if it is possible that it does meet the newer lower standard of 60%. The Commission did lower the VLT from 70% to 60%. W. Feldkamp - the flat muntins are acceptable as the single hung windows could not properly operate (open) with the triangular muntins. **Staff:** This would be the first time for a proportional approval. Remove the scope of the windows from the exemption. E. Sita- the proposal (pre-Construction application) comes forward as a whole approval not a part. The applicants already agreed to the conditions before the Board, went through the construction process and did not complete what was agreed to with the Board. **Applicant:** Did their best to meet the conditions and had no intent to do something and then come back for forgiveness. This was prior to defining the glazing. Clarifies the garage window is tinted. **Board:** S. Pickett questions if these were the original windows? **Staff response:** It would seem so, the permit file does not show any prior replacement.

Staff suggests that Board may recommend the entirety of the scope of work or alternatively may exclude those components that did not comply with the Development Order and the intent of the Secretary of Interior Standards.

**Motion:** R. Martin moves to recommend approval to the City Commission for a Historic Preservation Ad Valorem Tax Exemption 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 for the subject property located at **1020 South Lakeside Drive**; B. Guthrie 2<sup>nd</sup> The replacement windows replicate the original windows.

**Vote:** S. Pickett, G. Harris, R. Martin, B. Guthrie yea's; dissenting W. Feldkamp, R. D'Arinzo and J. Fox. Motion carries 4/3.

### **NEW BUSINESS:**

**A. HRPB Project Number 21-00100250:** Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the construction of four (4) new ± 1,489 square foot single-family structures on Lots 27, 28, 29, and 30 of Block 90 at **307 North L Street**; PCN #38-43-44-21-15-090-0270. The subject property is located in the Low-Density Multi-Family Residential (MF-20) zoning district and the Northeast Lucerne Local Historic District.

**Staff:** J. Hodges presents case findings and analysis. Staff recommended denial as the proposed roof design is not consistent with the Streamline Moderne style and the Historic Preservation Design Guidelines criteria for new construction. Currently the lot is vacant. The front yards are identical while the backyards have 2 variations, one of which includes a pool and one parallel parking spot. Only one parking stall is required so the parking requirement is met. Staff indicates the landscaping code was met however a tree mitigation plan would need to be

presented. Floor plans and exterior treatments are repeated. The gable roof ends conflict with the Streamline Moderne style. The repetitive design of four (4) identical residences are not compatible within the Historic Districts Qualitative Design requirements.

**Board:** G. Harris has concerns about the lack of exterior space and the relentless repetitiveness. The parking option is confusing. B. Guthrie is concerned with the WWII barracks feel; that it was a 100-foot lot, perhaps staggered footprints would be better; similar in appearance to an apartment building; parking will be a problem; dislikes the gable ends and lack of detail. J. Fox sees it as too sterile and believes it evokes the appearance of Stalag 17. R. D'Arinzo believes the facades could be enhanced and staggered. R. Martin questions the square footage, it is better than an apartment complex, perhaps two (2) stories and staggered would make more sense by allowing for parking and conservation of trees. **Staff response:** these structures are at maximum lot coverage; typically there would be an accessory structure.

**Applicant:** Lori Principe and Jeff Mercier- Vested in multi-family developments in the city, excited about venturing into single family homes.

**Architect for Applicant:** Not trying to mix styles. Could shorten the eaves.

#### **Public Comments:**

Diane Skoglund- 318 N L St- has concerns about the loss of canopy with removal of large trees, in particular the Mango trees.

Eileen Filipowicz-312 North L Street -

Peter Meyerhorfer-218 North K Street- In support of project.

Drew Martin- 1015 North M Street- concerns with tree and landscape removal.

Lawrence Reese -315 North L Street- Is out of place, trying to bring a Miami minimalist feel to Lake Worth Beach, the shotgun style is very different from the cottage homes and impervious coverage will cause a runoff problem.

**Board:** G. Harris - Relentlessly repetitive. If high density is being sought, why not give the homeowner more exterior space such as a two-story or courtyard. B. Guthrie - It does take on the appearance of a barracks. Similar to what one would find in an apartment rental complex where everything is the same. The front and gable end is lacking in detail and appeal. These developers have previously provided other attractive projects, can be better. Parking will be a problem. J. Fox - Reminds one of Stalag 19, very sterile, don't fit in with the Secretary of Interiors design. R. D'Arinzo – Is in favor of bringing back the 25 foot lots; it is an eclectic street and lot. The trash cans will be an issue, (fitting between the houses). Maybe stagger the buildings. It can be taken up a notch. **Staff:** Typically there might be an accessory structure; without that, it does seem bigger. R. Martin – Doesn't see the elongated structures anywhere, what would be the typical square footage of a home on a 25-foot lot. Save some trees by going two-story and staggering the structure.

**Architect for Applicant:** G. Antoniazzi- does not find a two (2) story to be of interest and more comfortable without stairs.

S. Pickett also questions the landscaping (lack of trees). Appreciates there is a market for this type of home for older couples, understands the lot split, however concurs with other Board members assessment of repetition. The "barracks style" appearance is only evident from the aerial view, the streetscape is more important.

Staff explains it is by-right development, this is really a single-family home, although the landscape plan is minimal, a tree disposition plan would be required. This probably won't be the final look of the site. The scope of the COA is the architecture.

W. Feldkamp questions how many trees could be saved and that the gable ends are nearly two-story in height. There is no space left for the amenities that are appreciated or needed.

R. Martin thanks the applicants and gives words of encouragement expressing how important the historic aspect is when building deeper into the neighborhoods.

**Motion:** R. D'Arinzo moves to continue HRPB 21-00100250 to a date certain of October 13; S. Pickett 2<sup>nd</sup>.

**Vote:** Ayes all, unanimous.

**B. HRPB Project Number 21-00100222:** Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the construction of a new +/- 1,790 square foot addition for the single-family residence at **320 North Lakeside Drive**; PCN #38-43-44-21-15-430-0050. The subject property is located within the Single-Family Residential (SF-R) zoning district and is a contributing resource to the Old Lucerne Local Historic District.

**Staff:** J. Hodges present case findings and analysis. At the May 12, 2021 the Board reviewed conceptual plans and asked the applicant to re-consider the proposed use of shipping containers as the method of construction. As a result, the applicant has decided to utilize traditional construction methods. The design has also changed dramatically from the conceptual proposal. Two remaining items of concern are the transition between the two structures and the 16-foot wide garage door which is atypical for the Mediterranean Revival style.

**Applicant:** Per Lorentzen – The addition has to be where it is in order to avoid existing palms to be preserved and the driveway apron to avoid a manhole in the street. Two nine-foot bays would create a tight interior on the garage, preventing any counter or cabinet installation. The purpose of the addition is to create upper level living space and storage away from potential flood waters. Rachel Lorentzen suggests the single garage door is balanced by the wide gate on the opposite side of lot and the adjacent location to a double car garage door. Per Lorentzen states the stairs would impinge upon the garage and interior space, hence the reason for being incorporated on the exterior.

**Board:** R. Martin- why cannot there be one single door and keep the arch?

**Staff:** Generally a historically accurate garage would be a 9-10 foot side-by-side door with a pillar.

**Board:** B. Guthrie- The streetscape does show a balance between the garage door width and the opposite gate. Would not mind the double overhead as the doors appear to swing out. The arch should be retained. G. Harris – it is a beautiful rambling house. This elevation is very bland. The storage is on the exterior walls, move the bathrooms to the exterior to use the natural light instead of faux windows. Suggests turning the gable in the opposite direction would reduce the height and mass of the connection. Because the adjacent garage is tall is no reason for this one to mimic and be so massive.

**Architect:** Lou Canales willing to try to turn the gable and lower the height. It can also be lowered with 16-inch floor joists instead of 24-inch floor joists.

Staff advises that there will not be time for staff to formally review in one week's time so it could be heard on September 15 as a conceptual review and a formal discussion in October.

**Motion:** G. Harris moves to continue HRPB 21-00100222 to the September 15 meeting as a conceptual design; R. D' Arinzo 2<sup>nd</sup>.

**Vote:** Ayes all, unanimous.

**C. HRPB Project Number 21-00100182:** Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the construction of a new ± 1,462 square foot single-family structure and a ± 650 square foot accessory structure at **617 North K Street**; PCN #38-43-44-21-15-178-0240. The subject property is located in the Single-Family and Two-Family Residential (SF-TF 14) zoning district and the Northeast Lucerne Local Historic District.

**Staff:** A. Fogel presents case findings and analysis. The Building Official condemned the original structure and as such does not require a COA to be heard by the Board for the demolition. The proposed single-family construction is consistent with Land Development Regulations as conditioned and generally consistent with the Wood Frame Vernacular style and Historic Preservation Design Guidelines.

**Applicant:** Pamela Russell – Resident of last 20 years. The reason for the faux window on the apartment side of the home is to allow privacy.

**Public Comment:** None

**Board:** R. D'Arinzo likes the proposal, the blank wall in the alleyway is fine. J. Fox likes the boat garage. B. Guthrie would like fenestration on the boat garage, also wary of a specific use and what could occur in the future. R. Martin likes it; G. Harris – The blank wall is suitable as it is a garage. S. Pickett concurs the garage wall can be blank. W. Feldkamp – ensure the skirtboards continue around the home, would like the rafter tails exposed. B. Guthrie inquires about the metal vs. asphalt shingle roof.

**Applicant:** Tyree will not provide the construction document; prefer the asphalt roof but is open to considering the metal roof if Board so desires.

**Motion:** R. D'Arinzo moves to approve HRPB 21-00100182 with staff recommended conditions of approval based upon competent substantial evidence and the staff report pursuant to the City of Lake Worth Beach Land Development Regulations and Historic Preservation requirements; S. Pickett 2<sup>nd</sup>.

**Vote:** Ayes all, unanimous

**PLANNING ISSUES:** None

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

**DEPARTMENT REPORTS:** None

**BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS:** W. Feldkamp suspects the City will eventually allow Accessory Dwelling Units, at some time in the future the end of Single Family will come about.

**ADJOURNMENT** 8:54 PM