



**MINUTES
CITY OF LAKE WORTH BEACH
HISTORIC RESOURCES PRESERVATION BOARD REGULAR MEETING
CITY HALL COMMISSION CHAMBER
WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 15, 2021 -- 6:05 PM**

ROLL CALL and RECORDING OF ABSENCES: Present were- William Feldkamp, Chairman; Bernard Guthrie, Vice-Chair; Robert D'Arinzo; Stephen Pickett; Ricardo Martin. Absent: Judith Fox. Also present- Erin Sita, Assistant Director for Community Sustainability; William Waters, Director for Community Sustainability; Elizabeth Lenihan, Board Attorney; Sherie Coale, Board Secretary.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ADDITIONS / DELETIONS / REORDERING AND APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: None

CASES

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

PROOF OF PUBLICATION

- 1) 226 North K Street
307 North L Street

WITHDRAWALS / POSTPONEMENTS: None

CONSENT: None

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

BOARD DISCLOSURE:

Board Attorney, Elizabeth Lenihan, clarifies for Board members precisely what a 'disclosure' should include. Among those items would be a demonstrated bias or prejudice toward any party in the hearing, any direct or indirect monetary interest in the outcome of any quasi-judicial item, pre-judgement of the issue at hand prior to hearing the facts on record; ex-parte investigations and the inability to render an impartial judgement. If the answer is yes, there will be a follow-up question.

S. Pickett received a voicemail from CC Herman Robinson expressing concern with the re: 4 individual 25-foot lots; saw Facebook posts about that issue and stopped reading so as to remain unbiased. Is able to render an impartial decision.

R. Martin received a voicemail from CC Herman Robinson; also spoke with staff. Is able to render an impartial decision.

B. Guthrie states both of these projects have been collectively discussed by the Board, with opinions at prior meetings. Additional investigations included speaking to several elected persons, CC Herman Robinson, included to obtain ideas mostly on the concept rather than the project. Can decide impartially, most of the additional investigation was focused on 307 North L Street. Also posted on Facebook to obtain opinion.

W. Feldkamp had no contact from anyone but drove by the site as usual.

R. D'Arinzo received a call from CC Robinson; is able to render an impartial decision.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS: None

NEW BUSINESS:

- A. HRPB Project Number 21-01400023:** Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the construction of (1) new ± 4,125 square foot multi-family structure with four (4) units on Lots 12 and 13 of Block 48 at 226 North K Street. The subject property is located in the Medium-Density Multi-Family Residential (MF-30) zoning district and the Northeast Lucerne Local Historic District.

Staff: E. Sita provides case analysis. The project was heard conceptually at the November 17, 2021 HRPB meeting. Mentions that new construction may include a type other than the 10 primary types found in the Preservation Design Guidelines. Staff recommends Option A or C and that Board discuss the fenestration of the proposal. The proposal is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan as it relates to density and provides a supply of housing for the community. The landscape plan is being reviewed at time of permitting for compliance with the City Landscape Code; this minor site plan is also being reviewed administratively at this time. The Board is responsible for the Certificate of Appropriateness, finding the proposal visually compatible with the surrounding historic area as well as 14 guidelines for new construction and additions. Styles should not be mixed. The flat roofline and façade design most closely resemble a modern architectural style.

Agent for the Applicant: Faten Almosawi. provides brief powerpoint of examples of fenestrations in the surrounding neighborhood.

Public Comment: Gael Silverblatt-414 N Ocean Breeze- Asks if the project meets Landscape Code requirements; If 3 mango trees and oak tree can be relocated to the Bryant Park bandshell.

Cuyler Ten Eyck/Debra Shulmier 219 North L Street #110– Overlooking the construction site. Concerns with alley access and construction noise.

Diane Skoglund/Michael Starr-318 North L Street – Does not believe it fits the neighborhood; dislikes the paint colors; finds the parking spots are confusing and insufficient; appreciates one or two trees will remain and the green spaces on north, south and west sides.

Elizabeth Bartlett -211 North L Street-Alley is shared by other properties and concerns with potential for accidents in the alley. No Handicap access and no elevator so why have a handicap parking space; Questions pervious calculations; doorways appear to open inwards and walkways too narrow; Garden area should be flipped to be on the south side. Stairwells should be more private so female residents and/or visitors do not feel vulnerable if staying alone at night. Mango trees are being removed and the mangos from those trees are especially delicious.

Agent for applicant: Juan Contin- The pervious/impervious requirement has been well vetted by staff and one unit has actually lost downstairs area to provide more parking beneath. Tandem parking on-site provides more on street parking. The alleyway parking should be afforded to this project as there are two other properties with the same occupancy. Sideloaded units have two, some have four, others have 6 allows for a garden in the front.

Board: S. Pickett-believes the front façade is still appearing a bit blank, prefers Option C. Recalls that the North façade (previously) was the favored side and suggested it for the south façade and it appears that it went in the opposite direction. R. Martin- Is okay with the Modern Architecture. Where will the eight trash cans will be accommodated? **Response:** in the front (west façade), screened from view. B. Guthrie- Option C is more in keeping with the architecture of the neighborhood. **Response:** The bronzed, copper metal screens lends privacy, diffused light to keep it open and airy; also lends privacy to neighbors. W. Feldkamp appreciates the patio areas; sees the parking code is met, however does not see compatibility or associated style. All of the powerpoint examples showed a cap at the roofline and were from Dixie Hwy, but not in this Historic District. The front is relentlessly vertical; bathroom windows could be larger and dislikes fins that are being used for shade **Response:** The applicant is willing to work with the color; explains the rationale for unifying each façade of the building to the whole. The fins work for shading the garden as well as providing shade to the rooms. R. D'Arinzo would prefer breeze blocks as opposed to the bronzed metal at stairwells and that reads 'rust'. S. Pickett believes the color blocking accentuates the verticality of the structure.

Public Comment: Janet Labanara - 223 North K Street believes the parking is tight and it is different from everything else in the neighborhood.

Staff discusses the ramifications of a denial versus a continuation. A denial would prevent the proposal/project from returning to the Board for a period of one year. Redesign would allow a return to Board.

Motion: R. D'Arinzo moves to continue **HRPB Project Number 21-01400023** to the February 9 2022 meeting; S. Pickett 2nd.

Discussion: B. Guthrie- is sufficient information being provided to the applicant to revise?

R. D'Arinzo reiterates the suggestions to: Improve upon the street facing façade including the fenestration and the coloration; raising the horizontal element to the 10-foot height. R. Martin-modern or contemporary, does it match the neighborhood? Verticality could be reduced by changing color scheme, better match the windows on the front and raise the horizontal element to ten feet.

Applicant prefers the January meeting.

Motion amended and 2nd by original motion makers- to January 12, 2022 meeting date.

Vote: Ayes all, unanimous.

Recess: 7:00 pm-7:10 pm

- B.** 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: Previously heard at the September 8, 2021 HRPB meeting and the applicant has re-submitted based upon comments/suggestions from the Board. Suggestions/advise included adjusting the setback, reconsidering the elevations, utilization of materials for one style of structure (not combining one style with materials from another). Particularly Frame Vernacular cottage with materials utilized in Art Deco and Streamline Moderne. The revised style now is more fully a Wood Frame Vernacular. Board also suggested a staggered building placement. Staff received a request from the property owner to split the single parcel back to the original 25-foot wide platted lots of record. New parcel control numbers have yet to be issued by Palm Beach County Property Appraiser. Each lot would require COA approval/disapproval by the Board. The Board shall review for Certificate of Appropriateness only. The single-family site plan will be reviewed at time of permit as they are permitted by right to be constructed on the 25-foot wide lots. The purview of the Board is for compatibility with the architectural style and Historic Preservation Design Guidelines for new construction.

Attorney for the applicant: Spencer Siegel – 1600 S Dixie Hwy. Boca Raton, FL. Suggests the proposed structures are in the vernacular style and compatible with the neighborhood with the gable roofs, materials and design. Can't bring back the Craftsman style or order a house from Sears. References page 47 of the Design Guidelines, only criticism was the repetitiveness. Different finishes, to which the developer may agree, could resolve that issue. Two-story homes are not as attractive to tourist and retirement homes as they do not provide the cottage feel. It is the highest and best use for the property making single family homes in a multi-family zoning district.

Architect: Giorgio Antoniazzi- Continuous improvement to the project that meets staff requirements, Board requirements and are not maximizing the potential density of the project. Unequivocally Lake Worth Beach style with a cohesive style, urban rhythm in form and design. From the street/sidewalk realm it is Lake Worth Beach. Board is straddling a line between conscientiousness and delirium, time for moving on to realizing the project.

Board: R. Martin – where will the trash containers be placed? **Response:** Screened from view in the front.

Architect: The landscape comments- would love to keep the oak tree, but the project cannot be realized with the tree in that location. Will meet every landscape requirement in the code and mitigate the tree. The developer has graciously invited interested parties to find a place and relocate the tree.

Public Comment:

Diane Skoglund/Michael Starr – 318 North L Street – Concerns the replacement vegetation will not provide shade canopy due to removal of large mature trees. Questions why there is not more creativity with design and only two (2) designs being duplicated. Is concerned that the parking requirement is not being met.

Rich Raphael – 832 North J Street - The four designs were too homogeneous in appearance, requests the developer be required to plant replacement mango trees as opposed to the unspecified "shade trees". Requests a continuance to have the opportunity to evaluate the project.

Elizabeth Bartlett – 211 North L Street – The proposed structures resemble Hurricane Katrina Era FEMA trailers. Suggests the developer would better serve the community by building on two (2) fifty-foot lots.

Larry Reese/Mary McDermott – 315 North L Street – Believes the redesign is not significantly different from the previous and that the style is out of place for Lake Worth Beach. Density is different from the area's shorter homes and detached rear yard structures. Believes the impermeability of the lot will cause problems, there is a lack of landscaping and outdoor space. Parking seems insufficient for the unit. The architecture of four homes of the same shape, color and scale is out of character for the neighborhood.

Board: W. Feldkamp questions the height of the windows and doors? **Response:** Eight (8) foot. B. Guthrie questions why these are not four separate agenda items. Board previously spoke of staggering and/or going with 2- story structures. Why are they called non-conforming lots? **Response:** There will be findings for four (4) lots of record. Parcel is terminology utilized by the Property Appraiser for tax purposes. They are platted lots of record, platted prior to 1976. B. Guthrie questions why there a for sale sign suggesting all the possibilities for development specifically two single-family homes on two fifty-foot lots? Are we setting precedent and going to allow 50-foot parcels to be split into 25-foot non-conforming lots?

Chairman: The size of the lots are not under Board review at this time. The scope of the approval for this project is for Certificate of Appropriateness.

Assistant Director: Currently the Board is not acting as a Local Planning Agency (LPA). The Land Development Regulations shall be met and are not under review. A common type of 25-foot lot structure is a shotgun style home

Director of Community Sustainability: Platted lots of record have a right to be built upon. Meeting the Land Development Regulations for the district are not in question. If this were not in a Historic District, it would never be seen by this Board but go straight to permitting. Mass and bulk are the only two items that can be reviewed in this instance for being in harmony and complimentary to the neighborhood. Mass is an overall experience of a structure on a lot.

Architect: The perspective is not from the sky, a drone, or nearby high rise. The street view does not show the massing. Lot coverage is met.

Board: Other two-story townhomes in the area fill the lot. The "massing view" from the air is immaterial as there are many examples in the immediate neighborhood.

Chairman: Appreciates the parking as it is good urban design; visually compatible; clear glazing. Suggests the removal of the fence between the lots, recess the gates in the front, provide a jog in the front fence; reduce the width of the sidewalk, allowing more space for trash cans; remove the horizontal railing on the front porches. **Staff:** Although the project is not located in a flood zone, staff is considering bringing forth changes that may increase the required ground floor elevation to one foot above the crown of the road or FEMA plus one foot of freeboard.

R. D'Arinzo: The garbage cans being seen from the street seems to be a common issue especially as it brings code violations. The fence could be hedged. **Staff:** Each is an individual lot, neighbors frequently hook into each others' fences however it would be four individual fences, there would be a post at the corner of each lot.

Review of Conditions, some of which are standard requirements normally imposed by the Board, others are Land Development Regulations. Mention is made of Condition #9 and the one-foot setback of any impervious surface between the lots (i.e. sidewalk) Condition #11 contains a

typographical error, please disregard “Staff recommends horizontal fencing...slat aluminum fencing.”

Motion: S. Pickett moves to approve HRPB Project Number 21-00100250 with staff recommended Conditions of Approval for a Certificate of Appropriateness 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; R. D’Arinzo 2nd.

Motion amended and 2nd by original motion makers to include the mention of each lot number 27,28,29,30.

Vote: 3/2 motion carries. R. Martin and B. Guthrie dissenting.

PLANNING ISSUES: New City Manager began in early December; a Principal Planner, Scott Rodriguez, with about 16 years experience has been hired. Still seeking Historic Planners.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: (3 minute limit)

DEPARTMENT REPORTS: See above

BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS: R. Martin believes the parking spaces have to be looked at despite the urbanism, it can’t be ignored. B. Guthrie discusses the example of the Habitat for Humanity homes having to come before the CRA to get permission to build on the 25-foot wide lots.

William Waters –In 2010, the Land Development Regulations did not allow a 25-foot lot to be built upon unless by special exception, that was changed in 2013. Parking regulations have been adjusted at least twice since 2010. At one point there was a push to eliminate parking on the property altogether. Discussion will be coming regarding the City parking situation. The parking garage at the Bohemian will be opening soon giving an additional 120 spaces downtown. Dana Little from Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council, will be facilitating a Downtown Visioning Workshop.

B.Guthrie believes that any proposal to build on a non-conforming lot should come in front of a Board.

Board Attorney interjects that the topic was discussed at length in the previous meeting.

William Waters suggests that what Mr. Guthrie is speaking about would be form based code.

W. Feldkamp believes the future is higher density. Somehow during the Annual Street Painting Festival, 100,000 people manage to find parking. Mentions the publication ‘High Price of Free Parking.’

Staff: Direction is taken from the City Commission in regards to parking as there are really two camps and staff is in between those camps. It is illegal to require someone to mitigate/remedy with/on their property, a parking situation created by someone else. That is denying someone a property right. Alternate transportation is becoming more prevalent especially among the younger generations.

S. Pickett mentions the ugly side of exclusionary planning which creates unaffordability.

W. Feldkamp would like to discuss, at a future time, the size of the window sill reveal.

ADJOURNMENT : 8:32 PM