



**MINUTES
CITY OF LAKE WORTH BEACH
HISTORIC RESOURCES PRESERVATION BOARD REGULAR MEETING
CITY HALL COMMISSION CHAMBER
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 10, 2021 -- 6:00 PM**

ROLL CALL and RECORDING OF ABSENCES: Present were: William Feldkamp, Chairman; Bernard Guthrie, Robert D'Arinzo, Judi Fox, Geoff Harris, Stephen Pickett. Also present were: Abraham Fogel, Preservation Planner; Jordan Hodges, Senior Preservation Planner; Erin Sita, Assistant Director for Community Sustainability; Susan Garrett, Board Attorney; Sherie Coale, Board Secretary.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ADDITIONS / DELETIONS / REORDERING AND APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:

Item C on the agenda was withdrawn by the applicant as they will seek a Certificate of Appropriateness administratively through staff review.

Addition of Item D. under Planning Issues: A Conceptual Review for 222 S Lakeside Drive

Motion: B. Guthrie moved to accept the amended agenda as presented; S. Pickett 2nd.

Vote: Ayes all, unanimous.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

A. February 10, 2021 Regular Meeting Minutes

Motion: B. Guthrie moved to accept minutes as presented; S. Pickett 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

CONSENT: None

PUBLIC HEARINGS: W. Feldkamp drove by the various sites.

BOARD DISCLOSURE: None

UNFINISHED BUSINESS: None

NEW BUSINESS:

- A. HRPB Project Number 21-00100031: A Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the partial enclosure of a carport, construction of a new +/- 72 square foot carport extension, construction of a new +/- 90 addition, and window and door replacement for the single-family residence at 1209 North L Street; PCN #38-43-44-21-15-372-0140. 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 presents case findings and analysis. The approval of the request would accommodate a new master suite, new dining room addition, a new carport extension and window and door replacement. The home was designed by Edgar S. Wortman in a mid-century modern style. The request is in compliance with the City of Lake Worth Beach Land Development Regulations (LDR). Regarding the visual compatibility: Changes to the carport will change the appearance but staff and the applicant have worked to reduce the visual impact. It will maintain the vehicular use from North L Street, as historically designed. The Dining Room addition includes a reveal line providing for differentiation from the original structure as well as a flat roof line to differentiate from the main structure roof. Proposed windows are horizontal sliding and full view windows. Casement and awning windows were prevalent for the style. The changes are to add muntins to the windows themselves. The muntins will replicate the casement and awning look. The south elevation kitchen window is smaller which would result in a 6-light or 3-light window depending upon whether it was a casement or awning window. The driveway in the rear would add off-street parking and is found to be compatible. With regard to the Conditions of Approval, the sill detail should be removed from the drawings as the original did not have sill detail.

Applicant: Corey Kirk, Contractor and Anthony Moran, owner. In agreement with the Conditions of Approval with the exception of the muntins. Would prefer the awning style windows if they cannot proceed with the full view windows (do not want the casement look with additional muntins).

W. Feldkamp: Does the carport protect the full length of the car? **Response:** Yes, it will be extended approximately nine-ten feet. Is the screen purposeful? No, simply visual. Will the hurricane protection remain? **Response:** No, with impact window replacement it will not be necessary. Lastly, a slight color distinction between old and new would be nice.

B. Guthrie: Explain the size of the kitchen window, why it's smaller. **Response:** It is a bit smaller but still proportional. **Applicant:** It was a bedroom, so the height was egress at the time, now with the kitchen counter beneath; only the height is lessened. The top of all windows are of consistent height.

Public Comment: None

Chairman: As it is understood, it will be left to the applicant to choose between the awning style look or casement look.

Staff: The applicant is seeking full view.

Board: G. Harris-does not care for the appearance of muntins and would prefer full view windows in this instance. W. Feldkamp concurs as does B. Guthrie.

Motion: B. Guthrie moves to approve HRPB 21-00100031 with staff recommended Conditions and striking Condition #10 based upon finding that full view windows are architecturally appropriate for the mid-century style; 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. G. Harris 2nd.

Vote: Ayes all, unanimous

- B. **HRPB Project Number 21-00100034**: Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for retroactive exterior alterations and window replacement for the property located at **805 North Lakeside Drive**; PCN#38-43-44-21-15-230-0150. The subject property is a contributing resource to the Northeast Lucerne Local Historic District and is located in the Single-Family (SF-R) Zoning District.

Withdrawn at request of applicant. Continued at a staff level review.

- C. **HRPB Project Number 21-00100051**: Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for window and door replacement for the property located at **615 7th Avenue North**; PCN #38-43-44-21-15-176-0160. The subject property is a contributing resource to the Northeast Lucerne Local Historic District and is located in the Single-Family and Two-Family Residential (SF-TF 14) Zoning District.

Staff: J. Hodges presents case findings and analysis for the window and door replacement for the subject parcel. Constructed in a Mission Revival Style in 1924, it now has a moderate to low degree of integrity of setting, materials, design, location, workmanship, feeling and association. The project came to Historic Preservation through the building permits process without a Certificate of Appropriateness, the subsequent resubmittal was also failed as it did not meet preservation requirements. A full window replacement must meet current standards. The proposed windows have already been purchased. They are CGI aluminum single-hung impact windows with grey-tinted glass. Also proposed are a pair of French doors, a raised panel door with glass insert, and a panel door all impact rated and of fiberglass. The VLT is at 35% rather than the 70% VLT which is the current minimum. The openings will most likely have to be re-framed. The applicant has proposed an in-kind replacement of the windows on the south, east, west elevations with single-hung divided light patterns which could be administratively approved.

The applicant is proposing to change the design of the two front windows with 50/50 horizontal sliders. Staff could approve an in-kind replacement with a pair of single-hung windows per opening or alternatively a 1/3,1/3,1/3 horizontal slider in each opening replicating the look of a triplet of eight light casement windows. The surrounds, sills and mullions were previously removed and a surround should be re-instated. The current front door was never permitted and as such an in-kind replacement could not be granted administratively. An in-kind replacement of the French doors could be approved. Divided light options are a suggested option in the Design Guidelines. The back door is currently a raised panel door, historically accurate is a recessed panel door.

Owner: Fred Lummis Alicia Heine; Jason Hutchins. Regarding the grey glass, they were unaware they were in a Historic District it was never brought to their attention; it would help to keep the lights from traffic shining through the house day and night. As there are many leaks around the openings there will be some stucco work and repair needed to the openings. Regarding the horizontal rollers, there are other buildings in the area with rollers although staff mentioned the windows were unpermitted. The proposed door is the same style of door, and could possibly find another suitable panel door. Is agreeable to the raised muntins on a horizontal roller.

Board: Would there be an issue with the 3-part horizontal rollers? **Response:** Yes, new window would need to be ordered. Alicia Heine thought there would be concern with fire code and the 3-part horizontal roller.

Staff: J. Hodges –Contributing buildings in Historical districts are exempt provided egress is not made worse. There is still the option of paired hung windows.

Board: If the room to the right of the entrance is the living and kitchen room, any egress from a 3-part horizontal roller would not be an issue, and the room to the left of the entrance has a door (bedroom) exiting to the rear, there would not be an egress issue with that window either. Were the existing windows permitted? **Response:** Yes in 2001.

J. Hodges: The challenge with ‘grandfathering a tint’ is that it was never documented in earlier permits. This makes “in-kind’ replacement impossible.

Board: W. Feldkamp suggests 1/3, 1/3, 1/3 rollers for the front window. R. D’Arinzo states it is a prominent house. The Historic District did not just pop up, there is plenty signage around the neighborhood indicating it is in a Historic District. Would like 6/1 or 3/1 windows, there were many meetings on the tint. J. Fox states the Board spent much time on the tint issue and is not willing to give up on it.

Staff: Suggests the Board look to a continuance.

Motion: G. Harris moves to continue the project to the April 14, 2021 Board meeting if they so choose to return to Board. Work with staff to reduce the inconsistencies with the Guidelines; 2nd B. Guthrie.

G. Harris supports R. D’Arinzo’s point that it deserves a better approach.

Vote: 5/1 R. D’Arinzo dissenting.

D. PZB/HRPB 21-03100001 (Ordinance 2021-01): Consideration of an ordinance to Chapter 23 “Land Development Regulations” regarding changes to allow for takeout establishments by zoning district and to clarify that only one (1) continuance is permitted for all affected parties to ensure that the City does not run afoul of development review time limitations for local governments as set forth in Florida law, and several minor amendments related to definitions and use review processes.

Staff: E. Sita outlines the provisions and changes within the Ordinance.

Board: Questions regarding the interests from a take-out sandwich shop in the Downtown area. Staff mentions the business type would not be allowed without this change to the use table and LDR’s. The pandemic also contributed to this type of use being looked at from a fresh perspective. The Planning & Zoning Board recommended approval with no conditions.

Public Comment: Makayla Clanton discussed ordering out during the pandemic.

Staff: Clarification that the LDR change is for the entire ordinance, not the approval of the sandwich shop which will be reviewed through the Administrative Use review process.

Motion: B. D’Arinzo moves to recommend approval of PZB/HRPB 21-03100001 (Ordinance 2021-01) to City Commission; J. Fox 2nd.

Vote: Ayes all, unanimous.

PLANNING ISSUES:

A. 2021 Election of Board Chair & Vice-Chair

Floor opened to nominations:

Motion: R. D’Arinzo moves to nominate W. Feldkamp and B. Guthrie as Vice-Chair. J. Fox 2nd.

Vote: Ayes all, unanimous.

B. Conceptual Plan Review for the property located at **224 North L Street**; PCN #38-43-44-21-15-046-0130.

Staff: A. Fogel gives an introduction- The Board did review last year for window replacement but there were distance/separation issues having been constructed so close to the property line. Is inn the process of being re-assessed by the Building Official pending unsafe conditions and possible condemnation.

Future Applicant: Garrett Scheffler- Peter Ringle is evaluating the site, which has led to the possibility of this design. Emulating the design of Mark Stewart and a home from the Seattle area. Compatibility wise the adjacent properties are similar in design, including 230 North L Street and the modular approval. It is a contemporary mid-century Fixed windows and tilt-turn style for egress areas. Would like a black metal roof, keeping it universal for any other color palette. Using spray foam for insulation in areas without vaulting ceilings on the second floor.

Board: The design and presentation is better than many architect's coming before the Board. The second-floor wall, nearest to the one-story home, becomes important due to visibility. Discussion of the window orientation and size, shed roof design. Most agree the angled roof over the front porch should be flat. Add more verticality to the front windows. Staff states the visual compatibility requirements for new construction in Lake Worth Beach mirrors many of the same concepts from the Town of Seaside in the panhandle.

C. Conceptual Plan Review for the property located at **122 South K Street**; PCN #38-43-44-21-15-047-0060.

Faten Almosawi: What began as an accessory structure changed to an addition to a contributing property along with an accessory structure and garden between the two. The owner wanted something modern.

Board: More successful examples show the juxtaposition of ornate detail and starkness. This main structure does not have the strong presence to foil the starkness of the addition. Historic Guidelines state the height should be lower than the primary, suggestion of more distinction between old & new. Such as joint and finish. Staff states compatibility is still a requirement of a successful addition. No parapets. Possibly step-back to reduce the impact of the massive addition.

Architect: The windows can be reworked to keep window sizes the same yet give the modern look the homeowner is looking for. Will review comments and suggestions

D. Conceptual Plan Review for the property located at **222 South Lakeside Drive**; PCN# 38-43-44-21-15-101-0030. Approval is typically with a mill finish, unless the color is intrinsic to the material. What is the leeway on roof finishes? Does Board want staff to research colors? Should the applicant fix it to the mill finish or come before the Board with justification on why the color should be acceptable? Should there be a revised COA issued administratively? R. D'Arinzo asks if this is a case of asking forgiveness after the fact? The applicant states it is a dark bronze and also intends on coming before the Board for dark bronzed window frames; they did not like the galvanized roof color. Are there guidelines for metal roofs from the Dept of the Interior? and what colors were available in 1920? Come back before the Board for the color, not administratively. C. Guthrie asphalt shingle colors and barrel tile roof colors are somewhat left up to the homeowner. W. Feldkamp wants to move forward since it's done. Many have been painted. Should there be a limited palette? J. Fox- why dictate the roof color

when the structure color is not dictated? R. D'Arinzo- Historically they were silver. Resolution: Color requests will be brought before the Board.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: (3 minute limit) None

DEPARTMENT REPORTS: One notice of demolition due to condemnation by the Building Official. Any owner-initiated requests for condemnation will come before the Board for review with simultaneous application for new construction. Building Official condemnations will only be noticed. 617 North K Street, a contributing property to Northeast Lucerne has settling and foundation issues as well as extensive termite damage.

BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS: B. Guthrie would like tinted window clarification and asks for distinction between visible and not visible review types. J. Hodges- for non-contributing buildings only the windows visible from the street are reviewed. Previously only clear glass was permitted, now the clear low-E is also allowed. B. Guthrie states rumor of contractors is that low-E does not exist any longer at 70% VLT. The Board would recognize there are not many options but any revision to the Guidelines would require work. The choice is to stay or go to the extreme with the industry. B. Guthrie states the phase-out of 70% VLT will be a significant cost factor. The City is not willing to lose CLG status with the State simply to keep up with the industry changes. Window blinds and curtains also curtail the effects of sun. Due diligence on the part of the homeowner is still necessary and the City mapping is very user friendly with an abundance of information. Most permits are halted at intake if missing a COA application which starts the conversation. Contractor and homeowner communications may be lacking especially since the homeowner signs authority for the contractor to act on their behalf. There are checklists for the COA and building permits as well.

ADJOURNMENT: 9:15 PM