



**MINUTES**  
**CITY OF LAKE WORTH BEACH**  
**HISTORIC RESOURCES PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING**  
**CITY HALL COMMISSION CHAMBER**  
**WEDNESDAY, JULY 10, 2024 -- 6:00 PM**

**ROLL CALL and RECORDING OF ABSENCES** Present were: R. D'Arinzo, Chair; Edmond LeBlanc; Laura Devlin; Edmund Deveaux; Elaine DeRiso. Absent: Nadine Heitz. Also present were: Annie Greening, Principal Planner; Yeneneh Terefe, Preservation Planner; Anne Hamilton, Sr. Preservation Planner; Scott Rodriguez, Asst. Director for Planning & Preservation; Elizabeth Lenihan, Board Attorney; Sherie Coale, Board Secretary.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**ADDITIONS / DELETIONS / REORDERING AND APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA** None

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

A. June 12, 2024 Regular Meeting Minutes

**Board:** E. Deriso states the minutes sounded as if the Board was making a recommendation on the mural, a few Board members made comments but it should not say it was the Board's opinion.

**Excerpt of original minutes:** Applicant: ...Intent is to be complete by September however the weather will be a factor in the completion date. The Board finds all three to be visually appealing however preference is for Mural #1. Question about the condition of the building being repaired before the mural is installed. Motion: E. Deveaux moves to approve HRPB 24-00100097 and HRPB 24-000012, installation of a mural, with staff recommended Conditions of Approval as it meets the mural criteria based on the data and analysis in the staff report; L. Devlin 2nd .

**Revised minutes with recorded time stamp:** 6:56 - R. D'Arinzo opines preference for Mural #1 as it is in keeping with the same flavor and theme of what is existing. 7:33 - E. LeBlanc believes they are all appropriate. Applicant, PBC Cultural Council: Public feedback ... Board: E. DeRiso had a question about the mural removal agreement and the purpose. How long has the existing mural been there? Applicant response: The normal lifespan would be 4-5 years but the existing is about 7 years old. 10:16 - E. Deveaux, because it is based on unity, his preference would be Mural #1. The Iconic message should remain. 11:32 - Question about the condition of the building being repaired before the mural is installed. ... The intent is to be complete by end of September however the weather will factor into the completion date. 11:55 - Collectively the preference is for Mural #1 (round table) 12:25 - L. Devlin opines preference for Mural #1, round table and unity as that is in the spirit of what is being replaced. 13:03 - Motion: E. Deveaux moves to approve HRPB 24-00100097 and HRPB 24-000012, installation of a mural, with staff recommended Conditions of Approval as it meets the mural criteria based on the data and analysis in the staff report; L. Devlin 2nd . Vote: Ayes all, unanimous

L. Devlin asks if the minutes can be modified? E. DeRiso suggests leaving it out.

**Board Attorney** advises to modify, not delete the section, indicating Board members gave opinions.

**E. DeRiso moves to amend the minutes to state:** The Board did not have an official opinion as to what mural should be selected; E. Deveaux 2<sup>nd</sup>.

**Vote:** Ayes all.

**CASES**

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

**PROOF OF PUBLICATION** Provided in the meeting packet

- 1) 31 South Ocean Breeze  
1209 N Lakeside Drive

**WITHDRAWALS / POSTPONEMENTS** None

**CONSENT** None

**PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

**BOARD DISCLOSURE:** R. D'Arinzo recuses himself from New Business A. as his real estate office sold the property to the applicant.

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS:** None

**NEW BUSINESS:**

- A. HRPB Project Number 23-00100276:** Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) to construct a 4-unit apartment building at 31 South Ocean Breeze. The subject site is located in the Medium-Density Multi-Family Residential (MF-30) zoning district and has a future land use designation of Downtown Mixed Use (DMU). The property is a non-contributing resource in the South Palm Park Historic District.

Board Chair, R. D'Arinzo left the dias and room.

**Staff:** A. Greening presents case findings and analysis. This parcel has been vacant since the 1979 demolition of the 1922 single story frame residence. Parking is met through a combination of on-stie parking, a bike rack as well as on-street parking. As it is in a Mixed-Use district on street parking can be counted toward the required total. The project received a Minor Site Plan approval through staff review in 2024. This review is for Historic design review only.

The style proposed by the applicant is described as Modern Vernacular with inspiration from the Wood Frame Vernacular style. It is typically characterized by little ornamental detailing. Covered front stoops and tall vertical windows, rafter ends, decorative brackets under the gable ends, decorative gable vents and ornamental columns are other features that may be found on Wood Frame Vernacular homes. The proposal generally adheres to the Guidelines for new construction in a Historic District. With respect to the Historic Design Guidelines- although new construction is not limited to any one design, it is important that only one style is selected with dedication to those characteristics and no hybridization of styles. In this case the smooth stucco, found on units 1 and 4, is not characteristic of Wood Frame Vernacular. It is tempered by the vertical siding on Units 2 and 3.

**Applicant, Kevin Fernandez- Contin Architecture:** The clients wanted a single-story structure. The desire was to differentiate the center units (2 and 3) hence the vertical siding as well as the heightened gables (@ 17 feet) giving a feel of a two-story. Units one and four have shutters and smooth stucco. Contends both the end units and center units reference the wood frame vernacular style.

**Board:** Are they rentals? **Response:** Yes. **Board:** A Board member requests the traffic report. **Response:** The traffic statement is not part of the Historic review. **Board:** The traffic is too heavy for on-street parking. Quad units are being built on these lots and there isn't sufficient parking on the lot.

**Staff:** The mixed-use district code allows on-street parking to be counted toward the total required parking.

**Board Attorney:** The Minor Site Plan previously approved by staff includes the parking plan. The Board is here tonight for the review of the Certificate of Appropriateness.

**Board:** Why is a single-family home not being built? **Staff:** That is possible but not the proposal before the Board.

**Staff:** Review of the Conditions of Approval. **Board:** Why is standing seam suitable in this instance?

**Staff:** It is new construction. Standing seam roofing, although atypical/not historically prevalent in Lake Worth Beach, is found elsewhere in Florida on historic structures. Standing seam changes the visual profile.

**Board:** L. Devlin recaps the responsibilities of the Board, how staff reviews proposals, presents analysis to the Board and requests thoughts, input and decisions (according to Code) from the Board regarding the proposals.

**Motion:** E. DeRiso moves to approve HRPB 23-00100276 with staff recommended Conditions of Approval 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.; L. Devlin 2<sup>nd</sup>.

**Vote:** 3/1 motion passes, E. Deveaux dissenting.

**B. HRPB Project Number 24-01500005:** A request for a variance to allow 43.5 linear feet of up to 7.5-foot high fencing along the south side property line at 1209 North Lakeside Drive. The subject property is a non-contributing resource within the Northeast Lucerne Historic District and is located in the Single Family Residential (SFR) zoning district. The future land use designation is Single Family Residential (SFR).

**Staff:** A. Greening presents history of renovations and permits. The subject fence was installed without the benefit of permits. Staff is not recommending approval based on variance criteria below. In addition to not meeting the criteria, the height of the installed fence varies between 7-7.5 feet rather than the 6-foot maximum height.

- a. The lot is the most common size in the city; maximum fence height of six (6) feet is consistent throughout the city on side property lines. The property line on the south is 1.5 feet from the neighbor's two (2) story home.
- b. The property has accommodated a home for over 40 years, a six-foot fence would not deprive the homeowner of reasonable use of the Single Family home.
- c. The variance is not required for the reasonable use of the land.
- d. The granting of the variance would be contrary to the intent of the fence regulations.

**Applicant:** Jeff Arnold-The chain link fence between the properties suffered damage during Irma in 2017. Believed that after the hurricane there may have been some relaxing of repair rules such as not needing a permit. It was unattractive to see the service meters on the side of the neighboring home.

**Public Comment:** A letter of support was received by the neighbor to the south.

**Motion:** E. DeRiso moves to disapprove HRPB 24-01500005 as the application does not meet the variance criteria based on the data and analysis in the staff report; L. Devlin 2<sup>nd</sup>.

**Vote:** Ayes all, unanimous.

## **PLANNING ISSUES:**

**A. COA Approval Matrix Amendment:** Consideration of an amendment to the COA Approval Matrix to provide flexibility for administrative review of roofing replacement on non-contributing resources with flat white concrete tile roofs, and to clarify review processes for replacement of flat white concrete tile roofs on contributing resources and replacement of metal shingle roofs.

**Staff:** Currently non-contributing resources with flat white concrete roof tiles can receive staff approval with replacement in kind. Alternative materials must be brought to the Board. As roofs age and anticipated numbers of requests to replace those existing concrete tile roofs (non-contributing) increase, it was suggested that the Board consider other replacement materials for non-contributing structures.

- Dimensional asphalt shingles: Seeking to mimic the repetitive shingle, keeping horizontality appearance. Should be as light grey as possible with preference for white.
- Stone coated steel shingles (longer lasting but not necessarily less costly than shingles).
- Metal Shingles – White, grey or pewter

Staff confirmed with the State the proposed changes for non-contributing resources would provide flexibility for homeowners without negatively impacting the City's CLG status. Implementation would include footnotes #6 and #7 to the matrix. The approval matrix clarifies the review process rather than changing the guidelines.

**Motion:** E. DeRiso moves to amend the Approval Matrix; E. Deveaux 2<sup>nd</sup>.

**Vote:** Ayes all, unanimous.

Presentation of new staff member, Anne Hamilton, Senior Preservation Planner. Advised Board that the August meeting may need to be held on the 3<sup>rd</sup> Wednesday. There is an ongoing need for a new Board member so that it is not difficult to reach quorum.

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

**DEPARTMENT REPORTS:** None

**BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS:**

**Board Attorney:** Minor site plans are staff review. Major site plans are Board review.

**Board member:** On-street parking is an ongoing problem.

**Staff:** Parking requirements are reviewed per the Land Development Regulations. Alternative transportation modes include bikes, motorcycles, Uber etc. Other departments can comment at time of Site Plan review. The discussion must come from the City Commission.

**Board:** Proposals cannot be turned down if they meet Code just because on additional traffic on the road.

**ADJOURNMENT** 6:06 PM