



**MINUTES
CITY OF LAKE WORTH BEACH
HISTORIC RESOURCES PRESERVATION BOARD REGULAR MEETING
CITY HALL COMMISSION CHAMBER
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 14, 2023 -- 6:00 PM**

ROLL CALL and RECORDING OF ABSENCES Present were Bernard Guthrie, Chairman; Robert D'Arinzo; Nadine Heitz; Tricia Hallison-Mischler; Jamie Foreman 6:03 pm. Also present were: Anne Greening, Senior Preservation Planner; Yeneneh Terefe, Preservation Planner; Erin Sita, Assistant 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:

A. April 12, 2023 Minutes

Motion: R. D'Arinzo moves to approve the April 12, 2023 minutes as presented; T. Hallison-Mischler 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 the meeting packet.

- 1) 711 South Palmway
224 North L Street
Ordinance 2023-06
Ordinance 2023-10

WITHDRAWALS / POSTPONEMENTS None

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

BOARD DISCLOSURE: None

UNFINISHED BUSINESS: None

NEW BUSINESS:

- A. **HRPB Project Number 23-00100084:** Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for roof replacement at 722 North K Street; PCN #38-43-44-21-15-218-0060. The subject

property is a contributing resource to the Northeast Lucerne Historic District and is located in the Single-Family and Two-Family Residential (SF-TF-14) Zoning District.

Staff: A. Greening presents case findings and analysis. Last year the Board changed the approval matrix allowing for staff to administratively approve a metal shingle roof to a metal shingle roof. Also agreed was that the shingle option would be considered on a case by case basis and is accompanied by an Economic Hardship application. The applicant is proposing to replace with asphalt shingle. Roofs are one of the character defining features of any style. To replace would diminish the historic character. There are at least 4 metal shingle options that meet wind code. The horizontality of the rooflines is what is visible and notable. The replacement and discussions will have implications for those remaining metal shingle roofs in the City.

Applicant Tom Turner – The hardship would be it would be less affordable for a purchaser. Anticipates the metal shingle roof would cost approximately \$35K. The asphalt shingle quote is just under \$12 K. There is also a flat roof section.

Board: Is it the original metal roof? Yes, it is original.

Are there any preferable environmental options? Metal vs Shingle? The shingle roof will have a shorter lifespan.

Staff: There was previous discussion by the Board regarding a metal roof versus a metal shingle roof and the feasibility of installing a metal roof horizontally. The metal shingle roof was made locally and available locally, they are historic

What does the Economic Hardship program look like? Is it evidenced based?

Staff: Personal information is stricken and staff requests the minimum information necessary to support any hardship claim.

Board discusses the horizontal lines of a shingle roof versus the vertical lines of a 5V crimp roof..

Staff: There are four (4) brands that successfully meet wind load requirements. The Design Guidelines have been adapted to meet the climate in South Florida. These options would not be available in most Historic Districts in the middle of the country or Northeast; i.e. impact windows in place of wood windows would not be a discussion, however the Design Guidelines have adapted to the climate in the form of impact windows due to wind code and insurance coverage.

Public Comment: None.

Motion: R. D'Arinzo moves to continue HRPB 23-00100084 to the July HP meeting allowing time for the applicant to provide/obtain quotes for suggested solutions; J. Foreman 2nd

Vote: Ayes all, unanimous

B. HRPB Project Number 23-00100117: Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for window and door replacement at the property located at 220 Fordham Drive; PCN #38-43-44-15-06-007-3140. The subject property is a non-contributing resource to the College Park National and Local Historic District and is located in the Single-Family Residential (SFR) Zoning District

Staff: A. Greening presents case findings and analysis. Two (2) windows were proposed to be grey tinted and were not approved administratively. Tinted windows are not permitted. Staff conditions to bring the project into compliance would ask for a clear single hung and a clear horizontal roller with applied muntins. The two windows are visible from the street are subject to Historic review and the way that most districts function in the country with emphasis on the front.

Applicant/Owner: Abanoub Boutros – ordered and purchased the windows based on what he saw in College Park. The contractor submitted the permit application in March. Completed the COA application in April. He is willing to place the muntins but cannot afford to replace the windows as it is expected to be \$3,500.00 to change out the two windows. The tint is at .59 and the City recently reduced the Visible Light Transmittance to .60.

Board: B. Guthrie states there has been a compromise if the applicant will install the muntins: The VLT is equivalent to the standard .60 and it is a non-contributing structure;

Staff states that many more requests for grey windows will be reviewed by the Board as it will be on a case by case basis. The tint is a coating, not an inherent part of the glass.

Motion: N. Heitz moves to approve **HRPB 23-00100117** including staff recommended Conditions of Approval but amending staff conditions #1 and #2 by removing the word “clear” for the window replacement of #1 & #2 based upon substantial evidence of the window tinting .59 which is the functional equivalent of what City Commission allows; R. D’Arinzo 2nd.

Clarification of extenuating circumstances leading to the Board decision including: Secretary of Interior Standards requiring clear windows in Historic Districts both contributing and non-contributing structures. The determination was made to allow lowE functionally equivalent to clear; now tinting is being considered functionally equivalent to “clear”.

How is the line to be drawn? The look of the window appears to be equivalent to a low E window; homesteaded property, not an investment property, previously purchased windows with elements of an economic hardship, sense of urgency with leaky windows creating a life safety issue in hurricane season..

Vote: Ayes all, unanimous.

Staff advises all residents to call staff PRIOR to purchasing windows. Historic Districts are noted on the signs on every intersection within the six districts; the City website has an abundance of information.

Staff enforces the Ordinances and the occasional disrespect is not appreciated.

C. HRPB Project Number 23-00100112: Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the construction of a new ±1,881 square foot single-family house and a new ±693 square foot detached garage at 224 North L Street. The subject property is located in the Medium Density Multi-Family Residential (MF-30) zoning district and has a future land use designation of High Density Residential (HDR). The property is a contributing resource in the Northeast Lucerne Historic District.

Staff: A. Greening presents case findings and analysis. A Certificate of Appropriateness was reviewed for reconfigurations to windows and doors. There were fire safety concerns with fire separation on the south side. Subsequent to a Conceptual Board review the Building Official was asked to inspect the property which ultimately led to a declaration of unsafe conditions and condemnation. The previous approval expired in June 2022. The demolition of the existing structure has not yet occurred.. The owners have since chosen a new design. The lot is narrow in width. The design meets all zoning code requirements. The styles are a combination of Contemporary and Mid-Century Modern and not “reading” completely either one. Recommendations are made to “lean” into the Contemporary design. The fenestration pattern should be symmetrical within the “bays”. There are a lot of rooflines and angles. The proposed metal roofing is not typical of a Contemporary design. Architectural details are needed to give the front façade distinction as the front door is on the side. Multiple exterior finishes also lend themselves to a Contemporary design. Recommendation for continuance to give applicant and staff additional time to discuss

Owner: Garrett Scheffler- The property was purchased in 2020-The sectioned roof helps to dissuade the appearance of a container. A relocation of the front door to the front façade will change the floor plan for this narrow, 19-foot wide structure on the lot. Would like to keep the side entry; is willing to add multiple finishes.

Board: Suggestion to look at Seaside in the panhandle for ideas.

Staff: Does not recommend a style but choosing one style is required and doing it well. Would like to achieve a style and to have Board recommendation to work with staff. The metal roof would have to come back before the Board; other items, windows and placement, finishes can all be staff approved.

Architect: Billy Van Ryzin – He tried to create a corridor through the house and a function of the plan. By moving the door to the front, the front room becomes useless as it must function as a corridor. The roof slopes were created with the idea of light and privacy in mind. The multiple bays helps to break the massing of the structure. The roof at the entrance would sharpen up if flattened. Sees a Mid-Century Modern style in this project. Was not prepared for the desire to exactly replicate the style.

Staff: If staff is uncomfortable with certain items within the staff review or cannot reach agreement with the applicant, it will come back to Board. As a perfect architectural example it could become a contributing structure in the future. The side entryway seems to be agreeable to the Board.

Motion: R. D'Arinzo moves to approve HRPB 23-00100112 based upon competent substantial, substantial evidence in the staff report and pursuant to the City of Lake Worth Beach Land Development Regulations and Historic Preservation requirements. J. Foreman 2nd.

Public Comment: None.

Vote: Ayes all, unanimous.

D. HRPB Project Number 23-00100078: Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the demolition of the existing structure and construction of a new ±3,360 square foot single-family house at 711 South Palmway. The subject property is located in the Single Family Residential (SFR) zoning district and has a future land use designation of Single Family Residential (SFR). The property is a non-contributing resource in the South Palm Park Historic District.

Staff: A. Greening provides case findings and analysis. An Agnes Ballard house, with only 3 other known examples in West Palm Beach. Agnes Ballard was the First Female Registered Architect in Florida and the sixth female to be inducted into the American Institute of Architects. Although there have been changes since it's construction in 1956, the structure is recommended to become a contributing resource in the most recent survey. Proposal is for simultaneous demolition and new construction, which is preferred to alleviate the possibility of vacant lots in the City. The structure has not been deemed unsafe, it is repairable. No evidence has been presented that the property cannot produce a reasonable economic return as is currently exists. South Palm Park Historic District reflects all eras of development including this post-WWII era home.

Board opts to discuss the demolition first.

Architect: Boutros Bou-Nahra and Faddiah (?) – As currently exists it is not in the same condition as originally built, many other examples of ranch styles exist in the City. Faddiah believes the memorializing of women in architecture, by saving the structure, goes against the progression of women in architecture. Proposes to document the structure, as required, through digital photography. They agree with 16 of the 17 Conditions of Approval. Requests the Board to provide a stepping stone for other women to progress as Architects.

Board: Can the decision to demolish be appealed to Commission?

Staff: If the decision was determined to be arbitrary and/or capricious, it could be overturned. It is not a re-review of the project merits.

Board: Could the house be renovated to accommodate for elder care? Mention is made of the lot that was divided on the water then sold and the proposed, approved construction never occurred. Discussion of additions. Additions do not affect the validity of the contributing structure status. Additions are meant to mesh with the original architecture, built with reversibility in mind and distinction from the original structure.

Architect: The new structures will be for the children of the owner to occupy, not as an investment property. Contends the renovations have rendered the property beyond historic value. States an addition would not be feasible with more than one family at the residence.

Staff: It does not meet the established criteria for demolition.

Motion: J. Foreman moves to recommend denial of demolition HRPB 23-00100078 because the applicant has not established by competent substantial evidence that the application complies with the City of Lake Worth Beach Land Development Regulations and Historic Preservation requirements.; T. Hallison-Mischler 2nd.

Architect: The initial walk through, with no structural analysis, indicated the structural integrity will become compromised rendering it unsalvageable if left to continue as is.

Staff: There is a City Ordinance and enforcement process for demolition by neglect, which is when the property is intentionally neglected, purposefully not maintained encouraging structural damage.

Architect: Documenting a structure would be far superior to maintaining a structure that is only accessed by the owner. There is so much more that can be done such as digital documentation. It could be studied by students.

Staff: What type of Preservation standard is it where we digitally document any structure, so the structure can be demolished? This would be a precedent and a slippery slope.

Board: It is incumbent upon the Board to uphold the Ordinances of the city. These are evidenced-based decisions, and are tangibly consistent.

Vote: Ayes all, unanimous.

Public Comment: Clark Stephens/Caroline McLaughlin – 731 S Lakeside Drive - against Board review of non-contributing structures.

Board members confirmed the addition of Public Comment has not changed their vote.

E. Ordinance 2023-10: Consideration of an ordinance amending the City’s Comprehensive Plan to adopt a new property rights element as required by F.S. 163.3177(6)(i).

Staff: E. Lenihan reads the Ordinance by title. E. Sita discusses the Property Rights Element addition to the Comprehensive Plan.

Motion: R. D’Arinzo moves to recommend approval of Ordinance 2023-10 to the City Commission; N. Heitz 2nd.

Vote: Ayes all, unanimous.

F. Ordinance 2023-06: Consideration of an ordinance amending multiple sections of Chapter 23 “Land Development Regulations” to address several housekeeping and minor changes for clarity, to provide for a reduction in the side setback requirements to 5 feet for accessory structures and pools on all lot sizes, to provide for new standards for street walls, and to expand and clarify the waiver provisions.

Staff: E. Lenihan reads the Ordinance by title. E. Sita highlights the following changes:

Off Street Parking – uncompacted shellrock permitted when counting toward impermeable; Money Services Business in conjunction with a Pawn shop, the more restrictive rules will apply; Changeable Signs and changeable message signs; Street wall - where buildings are setback and do not meet the build to line/setback. Waivers (which are not as stringent) versus variances clarification. Side setback changes for accessory structures in residential zoning districts. Allowable size percentages for Accessory Dwelling Units (not in Single Family residentially zoned districts); Mechanical equipment not allowed on the property line.

Motion: J. Foreman moves to recommend approval of Ordinance 2023-06 to the City Commission; R.D’Arinzo 2nd.

Vote: Ayes all, unanimous.

PLANNING ISSUES: Gulfstream initial Plat application, a time extension and permit expected by summer’s end has been submitted and other movement.

A few workshops are needed regarding policy discussion: metal shingles, clear vs. tinted. Recall the Dept of Interior receives all minutes and agendas; the adherence to their opinions on items such as glazing and metal roofs etc. can be critical in maintaining CLG status. Discussion of variance criteria and phrasing of reasons when disagreeing with staff recommendations.

Board attorney urges members to call/email to discuss if unclear about disclosures. Disclosures should be made about driving by the subject property or discussions with others.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: (3 minute limit) None

DEPARTMENT REPORTS: None

BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS: B. Guthrie tendered his resignation effective immediately.

ADJOURNMENT 8:53 PM