



Planning Zoning Historic Preservation Division  
1900 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue North  
Lake Worth Beach, FL 33461  
**561.586.1687**

**AGENDA  
REGULAR MEETING  
CITY OF LAKE WORTH BEACH  
HISTORIC RESOURCE PRESERVATION BOARD  
CITY HALL COMMISSION CHAMBER  
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 11, 2020 -- 6:00 PM**

**ROLL CALL and RECORDING OF ABSENCES**

Present were: William Feldkamp, Chairman; Judith Just, Vice-Chair; Judith Fox; Ozzie Ona; Bernard Guthrie; Robert D'Arinzo. Absent: David Cavorsi.

Also present were: Abraham Fogel, Preservation Planner; Jordan Hodges, Senior Preservation Coordinator; Pamala Ryan, Board Attorney; Sherie Coale, Board Secretary

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

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

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

A. February 12, 2020 Minutes

**Motion:** J. Just moves to approve the February meeting minutes as presented, R. D'Arinzo 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) Proof of Publication: Provided in the meeting packet.

**WITHDRAWALS / POSTPONEMENTS: None**

**CONSENT: None**

**PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

**BOARD DISCLOSURE:** RE: 1130 S. Lakeside Dr. - J. Just has been in the house, knows the applicant, and had a discussion about the architect but it won't affect her decision. W. Feldkamp drove by each location and had a discussion with the architect. B. Guthrie is familiar with the properties in S. Palm Park and had a discussion with architect Ken Brower.

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS:** None

**NEW BUSINESS:**

A. Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the demolition of the +/- 5,987 sq. ft. single-family structure at **1130 South Lakeside Drive**; PCN# 38-43-44-27-01-051-0010. The

subject property is a non-contributing resource to the South Palm Park Local Historic District and is located within the Single-Family Residential (SF-R) Zoning District.

**Staff:** A. Fogel presents case findings and analysis. Gives a brief history of the property and evolution of the structure. Due to substantial alterations it was given a non-contributing designation during the creation of the district. It is a two phased project to be developed as two individual lots.

**Applicant Architect:** Ken Brower shows additional photos of the property as existing. The final slide depicts what will become the dividing line of the properties. 2 separate single family residences on each lot. Nothing has been finalized as to the style, it will be more contemporary, explaining that the owner, Jim Ridder, will be printing the houses in concrete. This technology is of interest to many and will likely draw some attention to the area. A re-plat will be necessary, trying to get to the next commission meeting.

**Board:** W. Feldkamp requests clarification that the demolition approval of a non-contributing structure does not require simultaneous presentation of new construction plans? J. Hodges confirms that is true. B. Guthrie asks how much destruction will there be to the existing vegetation whether due to the phased demolition? **Architect response:** The front vegetation will stay as is reasonable with the movement of trucks and equipment. On the north side it is not critical that the vegetation be removed. On the eastern side (rear) some clumps remain and the pool has been demolished. Most of the vegetation on the southern side of the property has been removed. J. Fox- asks whether the vegetation removal requires a permit? J. Hodges states the removal of mature trees require permits regardless of the whether or not it is a non-contributing structure. R. D'Arinzo states the new construction will provide a landscape plan. J. Fox asks about the size of the lots and why it is in phases. **Applicant Architect:** The lots will be 75 feet, and phased due to the unconventional manner of construction. It can only be done one structure at a time. J. Fox has concerns about the way it will look - J. Hodges confirms there will be plans brought to the Board for approval. Questions regarding the time line. **Applicant Architect:** The equipment will be left out and the tennis court will be used for storage, the garage will be used for some storage. Beyond that it will look like any construction site.

**Staff:** J. Hodges mentions the proposal for the replat will be heard before the Board prior to a recommendation to the City Commission. The building must first be demolished. W. Feldkamp thinks it is good that the garage structure can house some of the construction materials. Discussion of the sequencing of demolition, construction and re-plat as the City Code does not allow the parcel with the remaining structure to be on a newly platted lot. A Certificate of Occupancy will not be issued for the 1<sup>st</sup> new structure on the southerly lot until the demolition is complete on the northern most lot. O. Ona would like to hear from neighbors.

**Public Comment:** James Kelly of 1202 S. Lakeside Drive questions what will happen to the fence and drain on the City R-O-W between his parcel and subject parcel? The survey depicts the fence on city property; the drain is for the entire neighborhood.

**Applicant Architect:** States the fence can come down immediately. It was encroaching by previous owners.

**Board:** B. Guthrie asks the owner if he is willing to take it down since he has the equipment? Can staff give permission, or the Board? J. Hodges states that he is not able to give authorization for work on city property nor is the Board able to do so. **Applicant Architect** is unwilling to take the risk of removing the fence from City property. W. Feldkamp would like to preserve as much vegetation as possible to ameliorate the disturbance to the neighborhood. Would like a condition that reads no vegetation shall be disturbed in the front setback nor any further than 15 feet from the structures being demolished. Applicant Architect has concerns with that condition because of the size of the equipment and trucks. He does not want any issues with having run over a shrub or plant. Applicant Architect did offer the Royal Palms to the City, they are in very close proximity to the structures.

**Motion:** B. Guthrie moves to approve HRPB 20-00100030 based upon competent substantial evidence pursuant to the City of Lake Worth Beach Land Development Regulations with staff recommended

Conditions of Approval and the addition of Condition #5: The perimeter vegetation shall be maintained during construction; R. D'Arinzo 2<sup>nd</sup>.

**Vote:** Ayes all, unanimous.

- B. Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the new construction of a ± 2,256 square foot single-family structure at **722 North Ocean Breeze**; PCN# 38-43-44-21-15-226-0060. The subject property is a vacant lot within the Northeast Lucerne Local Historic District and the Single-Family Residential (SF-R) Zoning District.

**Staff:** A. Fogel presents case findings and analysis. The proposed structure is to be constructed with elements of the Anglo-Caribbean style. This is not a common style found in Lake Worth Beach. A. Fogel references a document from Jensen Beach, prepared by Treasure Coast Regional Planning, the same consultant that developed the City of Lake Worth Beach Historic Design Guidelines. In particular the application of two different stucco textures (smooth and textured) and the use of a water table and stucco sill on the front façade, are atypical features of the style.

**Applicant:** Not present

**Board & Staff:** Staff reviews the conditions of approval. R. D'Arinzo inquires about the shutters (Condition #12), J. Hodges mentions the shutters are purely decorative, not functional. The water table separated from the sill is an unusual combination, normally the water table height allows the projecting water table (approximately 1-1/2 -2 inches) to be used as the sill. B. Guthrie asks about the finished floor height? J. Hodges states it may require a step up, less than one foot, there are discussions in progress with the Building Official to ensure the finished floor meets floodplain requirements. W. Feldkamp would like a condition have the gates recessed approximately one to two feet behind the front façade so there is distinction, the rafter tails be exposed all around, and the water table around the entirety of the structure and the addition of sills at the smaller windows.

**Public Comment:** None

**Motion:** B. Guthrie moves to approve HRPB 20-00100053 based upon competent substantial evidence pursuant to the City of Lake Worth Beach Land Development Regulations and staff recommended Conditions of Approval 1-12 altering Condition #13 to extend the water table around the entire exterior at the base of the windows with a minimum projection of 1-1/2 inches incorporating the sills into the water table, stucco sills shall be added to the smaller windows; Condition #14 the rafter tails shall be exposed on the north and south rooflines; Condition #15 -the front fence and gates shall be recessed behind the front façade a minimum of one foot. R. D'Arinzo 2<sup>nd</sup>.

**Vote:** Ayes all, unanimous.

- C. Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness for Exterior Alterations and a Pre-Construction Approval for a Historic Preservation Ad Valorem Tax Exemption for the contributing resource located at **910 North M Street**; PCN# 38-43-44-21-15-286-0030. The subject property is a contributing resource to the Northeast Lucerne Local Historic District and located within the Single-Family and Two-Family Residential (SF-TF 14) Zoning District.

**Staff:** J. Hodges presents case findings and analysis. Some remaining character defining features are the corner casement windows and the decorative wrought iron columns supporting the entryway roofline. The property owners are proposing removal of the asphalt shingle roof and returning to a concrete roof.

**Applicant:** Frank and Jennifer Viera – Hope to improve the house that belonged to his father. Appreciates an upswing in the neighborhood with road improvements and news that the vacant lot next door will be developed instead of remaining as a dog park. B. Guthrie asks whether the wrought iron door over the screen will remain? Applicant states for the near future it will, but once there is a new roof, paint and landscaping it is possible the door will change especially as the impact windows will give an insurance credit. B. Guthrie also asks why the applicant is requesting a barrel tile roof instead of a flat tile? **Applicant** believes the dimension of the barrel tile roof will make it more attractive as opposed to the flat concrete tile since it is a small structure.

**Public Comment:** None

**Board:** Review of the proposed Conditions of Approval. Board wants the windows to be recessed to the same plane as the existing windows. Discussion of the window frame color being mill finish aluminum or white; and choice of flat or barrel tile roof.

**Motion:** R. D'Arinzo moves to approve HRPB # 20-00100061 a request for approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness for the requested exterior alterations and Ad Valorem Tax Exemption based upon competent substantial evidence and staff recommended Conditions of Approval amending Condition #3 for the windows to be recessed to the same plane as the existing windows.; J. Fox 2<sup>nd</sup>.

**Vote:** Ayes all, unanimous.

- D. Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for roof replacement with a 5V-Crimp metal roof for the single-family structure at **522 South Palmway**; PCN# 38-43-44-27-01-004-0040. The subject property is a contributing resource to the South Palm Local Historic District and located within the Single-Family Residential (SF-R) Zoning District.

**Staff:** J. Hodges presents case findings and analysis. Original character defining features were the flat concrete tile gable roof, a front-facing integral garage, masonry knee-wall with a terrace, and casement windows with brick sills on a masonry structure. Over time the roof was replaced with shingles, the garage was converted to living space and the windows and doors have been replaced. Staff points to The National Park Service Preservation Brief #4 which discusses alternative materials for roof repair. This brief indicates there may indeed be reasons for which an alternate material could be used including if the material is no longer available or the cost is prohibitive. The decision should be weighed carefully. Distinction is also made between readily visible roofs and non-visible flat roofs, indicating the materials should match as closely as possible the scale, texture and coloration of the historic roof. In this case the material does not match and the preferred material is readily available. Staff has concerns regarding the choice of roofing material which could lead to a false sense of historical development and lends a vertical feel to the structure rather than maintaining the correct horizontal style.

**Applicant/Owner:** Ms. Jeannie Gedeon- The windows (with bronze frames) were replaced according to Historic guidelines after conversations with a previous Historic planner. The metal roofing was decided upon after speaking with roofers as it exceeds other styles in hurricane conditions. Explains there are many metal roofs in the area, provides photos of neighboring properties with those roofs at someone's suggestion.

**Board:** J. Fox states she is a fan of metal roofs but not a copper coloration. Every roof shown on the display was aluminum color, none were copper. Are there samples?

**Applicant's Contractor:** The advantage of a metal roof near salt water is evident, the silver mill finish of a 5-V crimp will not last as long as a painted roof. It is 26 gauge steel, galvalume with premium paint.

**Board:** J. Just inquires as to if a roof is painted white and they want to change to red, could the City stop them from painting it red? Staff responds depending upon if the roof color was specified in the COA. Staff can approve metal roofs on Frame Vernacular and Frame Minimal Traditional homes. It was not extended to the masonry homes, it was disallowed by the State of Florida. Masonry homes typically have materials applied in a horizontal direction.

B. Guthrie explains many masonry homes do have metal roofs which may have had a metal roof before the designation of the district. Also due to the weight of the tiles and insufficient structural support of some homes, some metal roofs were approved. Staff has no knowledge of that. Staff explains many may have been approved by a Board, or they were just put on without approval. Staff reminds Board that metal shingles as well as metal panels have also been approved in the past and are a better choice for the masonry vernacular style. Staff reminds the Board when the Historic Ordinance was written in 2018/2019 the State did not allow metal standing seam roofs.

**Applicant:** Believes house styles are eclectic.

**Applicant's Contractor:** Concrete shingle and asbestos tile is the same thing. States in 2 years the shiny color of the asbestos will dull and the difference will not be apparent.

**Board:** Chairman states the Secretary of the Interior is very strict or rigid. The Board does not have the right to change to metal and absolutely not painted copper color. Board has a duty to uphold. Board members have questions about metal shingles and panels. Staff states other alternatives are metal panels or metal shingles that preserve the horizontal appearance of the roof. B. Guthrie states he has no problems with metal roofs. The concrete tile was removed and a shingle roof installed prior to the designation of the district. Asks if the applicant would consider a change to silver since the color copper seems to be an issue? Applicant states yes, she would consider that option. B. Guthrie believes the energy efficiency is higher with the metal roof. Staff again points to the decision making criteria provided by the State.

**Board Attorney:** Advises the State was opposed to metal roofs in recent changes to the City Historic Ordinance and Board should pay attention to the criteria.

**Board:** R. D'Arinzo reminds members that the CLG monies from the State are dependent upon following certain guidelines set forth by the Secretary of the Interior Historic Preservation Division.

**Board Attorney:** Advises Board members to refer to Attachment D. R. D'Arinzo reads from Attachment D "In a rehabilitation project, there may be valid reasons for replacing....But if the roof is readily visible, the alternative material should match as closely as possible the scale, texture and coloration of the historic roofing material."

**Board:** Chairman states we have a duty to follow the City Historic Ordinance, State guidelines and City Historic Preservation Guidelines. Members may want to grant the request but should follow what was approved and recommended by the Board to the City Commission. B. Guthrie asks for the Criteria to be read, staff states the criteria is word for word the Ordinance.

**Public Comment:** None

**Motion:** J. Fox moves to deny HRPB 20-00100032 because the applicant has not established by competent substantial evidence that the application is in compliance with the City of Lake Worth Beach Land Development Regulation Section 23.5-4, the City's Comprehensive Plan, and the City of Lake Worth Beach Historic Preservation Design Guidelines. J. Just 2<sup>nd</sup>.

**Vote:** Motion to deny carries 5/1, B. Guthrie dissenting.

- E. Consideration of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for exterior alterations and additions to the existing single-family structure located at **1209 N Lakeside Drive**; PCN# 38-43-44-21-15-362-0142. The subject property is located in the Single-Family Residential (SF-R) Zoning District and is a Non-Contributing resource to the Northeast Lucerne Local Historic District.

**Staff:** J. Hodges presents case findings and analysis. The requests are twofold: Additions and alterations to non-contributing structures not visible from a public street requiring only staff review according to the review matrix and for construction to portions of the structure visible from the street. The property has also been the subject of a debate as to when the most recent FEMA floodplain regulations would apply to the structures. The most recent information/stance from FEMA is that the best available data must be used regardless of whether or not the Municipality has enacted ordinances pertaining to the changes. As the structure is non-contributing, it would not be eligible for an exemption to the elevating of the structure.

Previously the front door was removed from the structure and the applicant proposes to add the door back to the structure. Other changes/additions are for window replacement, paver walkway installation, an elevated covered front porch and a front addition to the existing master bedroom. Proposed items not reviewed by Board include the demolition of a rear sunroom and reconstruction of a new family room; Demolition of half the two car garage, reconfiguring the rear driveway and addition of new paver patio, pool and outdoor shower.

**Applicant:** Jeff Arnold- the current elevation of the finished floor is 6ft 8 inches; the living room if elevated by 3 steps will be at approximately nine feet. The master closet and seating area will be stepped up, the sunroom will be an issue.

**Staff:** Should Board choose, the review details could be approved at staff level. The Board agrees. Staff does have some remaining concerns with the window placement and stucco banding on the new front addition and front porch wall. The windows feature two types of windows, one faux circular and one horizontal slider, staff recommends either 2 equally spaced or one larger window. The recessed stucco band under the new addition and front porch addition is atypical. Applicant mentions it is for a vine (privet).

**Board:** J. Just cites an example of a house that became contributing and was able to become exempt. Staff states unfortunately the home was built in the 80's and is a long way from the 50 year minimum to be designated as contributing. W. Feldkamp inquires about the privet, applicant states it would be within the front plane of the structure and not extend outward. R. D'Arinzo inquires as to what type of stucco will be used? Applicant prefers smooth but it is currently rough. The pavers will be travertine and a single light at front door. J. Fox likes the round window, applicant states there is one on the side as well.

Staff recommends Condition #7- Final design and site plan of structure shall be reviewed and approved by staff at time of permitting.

**Public Comment:** None

**Motion:** R. D'Arinzo moves to approve HRPB 20-00100028 based upon competent substantial evidence pursuant to the City of Lake Worth Beach Land Development Regulations and subject to staff recommended Conditions of Approval and Condition #7- Final design and site plan of structure shall be reviewed and approved by staff at time of permitting. O. Ona 2<sup>nd</sup>.

**Vote:** Ayes all, unanimous.

#### **PLANNING ISSUES:**

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** (3 minute limit) Mr. Jeff Arnold commends Jordan Hodges and Abraham Fogel for the work they do.

**DEPARTMENT REPORTS:** The Historic Preservation Awards ceremony will be in May, nominations will be accepted in the weeks ahead. Mark Stivers last day at the City will be Friday, March 13, 2020, he is leaving for a position in Columbia, PA. Erin Fitzhugh Sita will begin on Tuesday, March 17 in a part-time capacity with Community Sustainability.

**BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS:** J. Just would like to discuss and implement changes to the code regarding hazardous conditions. More specifically, the ability for the City to hire a neutral party expert witness to render an opinion on a topic in addition to the hearsay testimony of an applicant's witness. In a recent case, Board had nothing with which to refute the evidence presented to the Board. Board Attorney states it is not strong in the code, it could be a good addition to the process presenting an unbiased opinion on a topic. The party would be retained and paid by the City. The cost would then be reimbursed by the applicant. B. Guthrie asks in the event of conflicting expert testimony, which side would prevail? Board Attorney believes the one retained by the City because the City has no interest as opposed to the other expert who has a vested interest in finding for his client. Staff states as the City runs out of vacant lots, this may occur more frequently, as when the survey is complete there will be many more contributing resources.

B. Guthrie states when he applied for the Board position, he was aware of the metal roofs in his area and his own house having vinyl windows, questions what is wrong with vinyl windows and fences. He advises neighbors coming before the Board to bring photos of surrounding properties suggests that eventually they will be historic. R. D'Arinzo mentions the property at 3<sup>rd</sup> Ave N and N. Ocean Breeze and how nice it looks.

**ADJOURNMENT:** 8:37 pm