



**MINUTES
CITY OF LAKE WORTH BEACH
HISTORIC RESOURCES PRESERVATION BOARD REGULAR MEETING
BY TELECONFERENCE
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 21, 2021 -- 6:00 PM**

NOTE: THE PROJECTS HEARD AT THIS MEETING WERE ORIGINALLY SCHEDULED FOR JANUARY 13, 2021. THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER (CONVENED) AT 6:00 PM AND CONTINUED TO THE FOLLOWING WEEK (JANUARY 21, 2021) BY THE QUORUM OF BOARD PRESENT IN THE CHAMBERS. THE MEETING WAS THEN ADJOURNED AFTER THAT ACTION. TECHNICAL DIFFICULTIES WERE EXPERIENCED WITH THE TELECONFERENCING EQUIPMENT.

Oath of Office – New member Stephen Pickett

ROLL CALL and RECORDING OF ABSENCES Present were: William Feldkamp, Chairman; Robert D’Arinzo (Virtual); Bernard Guthrie; Geoffrey Harris and Stephen Pickett. Absent: Judi Fox; Judith Just. Also present were: Abraham Fogel, Preservation Planner; Jordan Hodges, Senior Preservation Coordinator; Erin Sita, Assistant Director for Community Sustainability; Pamala Ryan, Board Attorney; Sherie Coale, Board Secretary.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Led by those members in the Chambers.

ADDITIONS / DELETIONS / REORDERING AND APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

A. December 9, 2020 meeting minutes

Motion: B. Guthrie moved to accept minutes as presented, G. Harris 2nd.

Vote: Ayes all, unanimous.

CASES

Introduction of Susan Garrett: New attorney with Torcivia, Donlon, Goddeau and Rubin. Has moved from Georgia where, among other duties, she taught Historic Preservation at the collegiate level.

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

PROOF OF PUBLICATION

1) 207 Ocean Breeze Proof of Publication- provided in the meeting packet.

WITHDRAWALS / POSTPONEMENTS: None

CONSENT: None

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

BOARD DISCLOSURE: W. Feldkamp visited all the sites on the agenda. No other disclosures.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS: None

NEW BUSINESS:

A. HRPB Project Number 20-00100233 - A Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of a ± 3,685 square foot multi-family building located at **207 Ocean Breeze (Block 95, Lot 11)**, pursuant to but not limited to Sections 23.2-7, 23.3-10, and Section 23.5-4 of the Land Development Regulations. The subject property is located in the Multi-Family (MF-20) Zoning District and is located within the South Palm Park Local Historic District.

Staff: J. Hodges presents case findings and analysis. Previous structures on the parcel were demolished (approved in 2004, demolished in 2008). A simultaneous request for new construction was granted but never constructed. In 2020 the applicant requested and received a parcel separation from the existing structure on the balance of the parcel. The proposed project reflects many Art Deco architectural characteristics.

Board: Regarding the rooftop appurtenances and screening, the a/c units were originally planned for behind the landscaping, which was against code, but is now on the rooftop with screening. The screening material should be considered so as to blend in with the building. With the pool and parking in the rear of the property it could be an issue at that location. The west side inside the fence would have the pool equipment with landscaping around the equipment.

An extensive discussion is held regarding the situation of the eyebrow features on the building. Board generally concurs the eyebrow should sit as close as possible to the lintel, other suggestions include moving the windows nearer to the corner. The applicant mentions the cost and possible difficulty of moving it closer to corners of the building due to structural and engineering issues.

Public Comment: Noemi McGregor 228 Ocean Breeze-is concerned with the lack of parking spaces. Believes adding housing without sufficient parking will exacerbate the current lack of parking in the area.

Staff: The LDR changes that were made late in 2020 regarding temporary uses (construction parking) will be addressed with the applicant. Infill projects do present challenges when under construction.

Motion: G. Harris moves to recommend approval of HRPB 20-00100233 with the amendment of:

- Condition #11(the space between the bottom of the projecting eyebrows and the window lintels shall be no greater than three (3) inches and if possible placed directly on the lintels, subject to the staff review at permitting.
- Adding a new condition (#13), the eyebrows on the front shall terminate at the interior window edge and shall not extend the proposed one foot four inches beyond the interior window edge. The Board also suggests moving the windows as close to the corners as possible subject to staff review at permitting.

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; S. Pickett 2nd.

Vote: Ayes all, unanimous

B. HRPB Project Number 20-001000277 - Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of a new ± 619 square foot accessory building for the single-family residence at **418 North Ocean Breeze**; PCN 38-43-44-21-15-104-0050. The subject property is located in the Single-Family Residential Zoning District (SF-R) and is a contributing resource within the Old Lucerne Local Historic District.

Staff: A. Fogel presents case findings and analysis. It is recommended the height of the accessory structure be reduced so as to be subordinate to the primary structure. This can be achieved with the roof pitch. The minimal traditional style is depicted in the Design Guidelines. Primary concerns are the feature window on the west elevation, the fan light could be changed to a more compatible transom window. The north elevation depicts a French door with is steel raised panel door with leaded glass inserts, an atypical design for the period and style. Design Guidelines suggests recessed panel doors or French doors with 5 or more lights.

Board: W. Feldkamp requests clarification of the transom light grid alignment over the window. Staff explains it would be 4-light not 6-light.

Architect for the Applicant-Scott Ehrenberg of Berg Design: Only two outstanding issues to address- half round window and overall height, all other conditions can be accommodated. The owner wanted the floor height above flood plain (resulting in one foot higher than the primary structure), nine (9) foot wall height and storage space. This provided cathedral ceilings and trussed attic space. Its not visible from the street.

Board: W. Feldkamp asks about the pitch of the roof. **Response:** 9/12 G. Harris asks how high is the ridge? **Response:** 23 feet, 17 feet on the existing structure. Why does applicant not want to reduce the pitch? **Response:** It has a cathedral ceiling and storage space above bedroom and bathroom. B. Guthrie asks if the property is homesteaded, and how is the attic space accessed? **Response:** It is the primary residence for 14 years and a pull-down stair would be the most likely access. B. Guthrie believes the use will be that of an ADU (accessory dwelling unit). W. Feldkamp states it is impossible to forecast what it will become, should it become an AirBnB it would be a matter for code compliance.

Applicant: It will be for the mother and the existing house is a bit crowded for the husband, wife and in-law. **Response:** B. Guthrie, that was not disclosed earlier in the meeting, his understanding is changed.

Board Attorney: The Conditions will preclude the use of the structure as an Air BnB and the ramifications of violation of conditions.

Board: W. Feldkamp in favor of 5/12 pitch and the transom. R. D'Arinzo inquires as to whether the applicant is in agreement with the suggestion for the door? **Response:** Yes, the door can be changed according to the suggestion and condition. All Board members concur the transom window shall be utilized instead of the fanlight. Discussions of the interior wall height, possibilities and differences (lack of differences) for the construction of a two (2) story house vs a single-story house with a different pitch. The base flood elevation is nine (9) feet proposed at ten (10) feet. W. Feldkamp believes it can be left to the architect how to achieve the subordinate height, whether through reduced pitch, lower walls or lower finished floor elevation.

Architect for the Applicant: Reiterates it is not visible from the street, it will be difficult to get it lower. Believes it will deny the owner reasonable use of the property.

Board: B. Guthrie states it can be done. R. D'Arinzo lives nearby and states it won't be seen from the street. W. Feldkamp would like, at a minimum to match the ridgeline of the existing structure. No motion is made by any Board member to approve or deny but instead suggest the applicant return to the Board the following month with a more graphic presentation depicting the proposed changes.

Motion: G. Harris moves to continue to a date certain of February 10, 2021 with the owner and architect providing more details heights, axis's and dimensions; R. D' Arinzo 2nd.

Vote: Ayes all, unanimous.

C. HRPB Project Number 20-00100268 - Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for roof replacement for the property located at **334 Dartmouth Drive**; PCN #38-43-44-15-06-005-1930. The subject property is a noncontributing resource to the College Park Local Historic District and is located within the Single-Family (SF-R) Zoning District.

Staff: J. Hodges explains after the completion of the 2019 Historic Preservation Grant survey, this structure became eligible to be designated as contributing. Changing a characteristic defining feature such as the roof material may jeopardize the eligibility of that re-designation. That designation also comes with incentives such as the Ad Valorem Tax Abatement Incentive and Building permitting modifications (i.e. flood elevation addition heights). The structure otherwise has several character defining features such as the flat-roof open-air front porch, decorative masonry eyebrow and columns on the front facade, raised planter beds, and steel casement windows. Flat white tiles provide for the horizontal stepped appearance toward the peak of the roof. Dimensional asphalt shingle tiles are uncharacteristic on masonry minimal traditional structures. No hardship claim was made and white tiles are still in production today. Staff recommends against approval as proposed by the applicant as it does not meet the Design Guidelines, Historic Ordinance, LDR's or the Dept of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation.

Applicant: Patti Layton- Primary concern is the cost of the white tiles. Explains the area has mixed roof styles and only about four (4) original roofs remain.

Board: Indicates there are Design Guidelines.

Applicant: Had hoped to obtain a variance to change from tiles to shingles.

Board: No remaining questions.

Staff: J. Hodges points out three types of tiles.

Board: B. Guthrie asks if there is a difference in quality?

Staff: Yes, the insulation factor is very notable, tiles reflect the heat as well as the life cycle of the roof.

Applicant: Asphalt tiles will last the balance of her lifetime (30+ years).

Motion: B. Guthrie moves to deny the request because the applicant has failed to establish by competent substantial evidence the request is consistent with the City of Lake Worth Beach Land Development Regulations and Historic Preservation requirements; R. D'Arinzo 2nd.

Vote: Ayes all, unanimous.

PLANNING ISSUES: There is a lot of investment in the City of Lake Worth Beach with the pending Gulfstream project coming forward in the very near future.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: (3 minute limit): None

DEPARTMENT REPORTS: None

BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS: Welcome to new Board member Stephen Pickett hailing from Canada with a background in Planning & Landscaping.

ADJOURNMENT 8:14 pm