



**MINUTES  
CITY OF LAKE WORTH BEACH  
HISTORIC RESOURCES PRESERVATION BOARD REGULAR MEETING  
CITY HALL COMMISSION CHAMBER  
WEDNESDAY, JULY 14, 2021 -- 6:00 PM**

**ROLL CALL and RECORDING OF ABSENCES:** Present were: William Feldkamp Chairman; Bernard Guthrie Vice-Chairman; Judith Fox; Robert D'Arinzo; Geoffrey Harris; Stephen Pickett. Also present were: Abraham Fogel, Preservation Planner; Jordan Hodges, Senior Preservation Coordinator; 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 for New Business- The applicant has requested the item be postponed until the August meeting.

**Motion:** R. D'Arinzo moves to continue New Business Item C HRPB Project Number 19-00100107 to the August 11, 2021 meeting; J. Fox 2<sup>nd</sup>.

**Vote:** Ayes all, unanimous.

**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) Lake Worth Herald Proof of Publication  
129 South K Street  
732 North Palmway  
131 South Palmway

**WITHDRAWALS / POSTPONEMENTS:** None - New Business Item C only.

**CONSENT:** None

**PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

**BOARD DISCLOSURE:** S. Pickett received phone calls and an email regarding 1130 S Lakeside Drive, also met on site with a planning representative and the architect.

J. Fox- Spoke with architect for the 1130 property on phone.

B. Guthrie-Had communications with the architect regarding the property at 1130 S. Lakeside Drive.

W. Feldkamp looked at drawings with the architect for 1130 S Lakeside Drive.

R. D'Arinzo visited the site at 1130 S. Lakeside Drive.

G. Harris was contacted by the architect for 1130 S Lakeside Drive but never met with him at the site.

### **UNFINISHED BUSINESS:**

**A. HRPB Project Number 20-00100273:** Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the construction of a new  $\pm 7,328$  square foot ( $\pm 5,217$  square feet air-conditioned) single-family structure located at **1130 South Lakeside Drive**; PCN #38-43-44-27-01-051-0010. The subject property is located in the Single-Family Residential (SF-R) zoning district and is located within the South Palm Park Local Historic District.

**Staff:** J. Hodges presents case findings and analysis presents a brief history of the parcel of land. The Board previously approved a demolition of structures on the parcel. A lot split was also granted allowing for two 75-foot wide lots. The garage space, placed forward of the residence, is uninhabitable and as such is not required to meet base flood elevation. The forward placement obscures the additional foundation height required to make the 1<sup>st</sup> floor in compliance with Florida Building Code. It is a 3- D printed home. Generally compatible with visibility criteria, Streamline moderne style is austere in terms of ornamentation, emphasizes simple geometry by utilizing curvilinear forms, long horizontal lines and occasional nautical elements such as rooftop railings and porthole windows. Other characteristic features are deep, staggered, cantilevered overhangs with horizontal railings; smooth stucco and a regular fenestration pattern. The horizontal details and stepped massing draw the eyes downward as the building is taller than surrounding structures. Curved walls at the entry point and a cylindrical tower feature are found on the south and southeast facades. The project is largely compatible with the architectural style.

Review of Conditions of Approval are reviewed

**Agent for the Applicant** - Wes Blackman; **Architect** - Ken Brower Property Owner - Jim Ritter  
The runoff is channeled into the cistern of 21K gallons to be used for irrigation of yard. **Board:** S. Pickett hoped the 3-D printing process could be explained. **Architect:** Possible game changer in industry. Computer driven on-site. Concrete mix trucks show up and drop in layers of anywhere from 3/4 inch to 1-1/2 inches thick; the print head is about 6-8 inches in width. Provided the hopper is kept full, the process could continue 24 hours excepting allowable hours of construction.

**Board:** J. Fox was concerned about the height and water retention on site but understands the cistern concept. B. Guthrie notes it would be nice to add a porthole on west elevation or garage wall- **Response:** Architect would be glad to add portholes. Regarding the setback one foot from property line. **Staff:** Clarifies the walls are allowed to go to the sideline, only flat paved surfaces should be held off the property line by one foot. B. Guthrie-what are the hours for construction? **Response** – governed by code; 8am -7pm weekdays. With respect to the encroachment on south, owner's previous response was that he would not remove the chain link fence located on the City property, the encroachment it is not on his property, despite having been placed there by a previous owner.

G. Harris- Is there any railing detail? **Response:** Standard cable system. Is the entire house being printed including the walls and columns? **Response:** Yes, everything will be 3-D printed, some of the larger flat pieces will be printed on site and lifted into place. The entire building will be stuccoed after printed. R. D'Arinzo and W. Feldkamp questions have been answered.

**Public Comment:** Jim Kelley 1202 Lakeside Drive to the south. His concern is the seven (7) foot berm that essentially directs the water (runoff) toward his property as it is required to be elevated. Suggests the drainage pipe has no slope, is level with the intracoastal. City should look at R-O -W to handle water runoff from street. 2<sup>nd</sup> concern is the traffic and visibility near the subject parcel. Although he respects the design, it doesn't conform to his 1924 house.

**Board:** S. Pickett states it is an interesting project and it will be exciting to see it in progress. B. Guthrie questions the amount of noise generated by the continuous pumping of concrete, how long will it take? Regarding the fence, will the applicant be required to clean up the fence?

**Staff:** The applicant cannot be compelled to do so as it is not on his property. He would need to agree. Applicant shall remove the segment of fence as previously installed on the city property as permitted by the appropriate City Department (Public Works).

**Condition #15:** The applicant shall agree to the removal of the fence prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy subject to the approval of the appropriate City Department.

**Motion:** B. Guthrie moves to approve HRPB 20-00100273\_with staff recommended conditions of approval including the addition of Condition #15 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 2<sup>nd</sup>.

**Architect:** Questions whether the added condition is a recommendation or requirement. **Staff response:** It is a condition that is being agreed upon.

**Vote:** Ayes all, unanimous.

**B. HRPB Project Number 21-00100135:** Consideration of Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for roof replacement and an Unreasonable Economic Hardship Application for an Income Property for the property located at **326 Columbia Drive**; PCN #38-43-44-15-06-001-0110. The subject property is a contributing resource within the College Park Local Historic District and is located within the Single-Family Residential (SF-R) zoning district.

**Staff:** A. Fogel presents case findings and analysis. In the masonry vernacular architectural style it maintains historic integrity. The property file reveals only that the roof has never received a permit for replacement, it is most likely the original roof. The structure was designated contributing in 1996. The tiles are still manufactured and available. As a character defining feature, the flat white concrete tile is the appropriate replacement providing the needed horizontality that is seen throughout the construction. The Design Guidelines label asphalt shingles as an unsuccessful replacement for flat white concrete tile. The estimated difference in cost between asphalt shingle and compliant white flat concrete tile is \$6,000.00. The burden of the hardship shall be upon the applicant to demonstrate the requirement will cause an unreasonable economic hardship for the property owner. The item was continued from the June 16, 2021 agenda as the applicant was not in attendance to respond to Board questions.

**Applicant:** No additional information.

**Board:** B. Guthrie does not believe there is a hardship. J. Fox- Clarifies that this is the third of three rental properties and the other two (2) properties are okay.

**Applicant** states she inherited several properties from parents. They were in bad shape when they received from her parents and have paid off the code issues. This is the last to be repaired, it has been vacant since January and cannot afford it.

**Board:** S. Pickett- Did the roof need to be replaced or is this just something being pursued?

**Applicant Response:** There are a few leaks, nothing horrible. Contractors do not want to repair leaks only a full replacement. They've had no tenants since January.

**Public Comment:** None

**Board:** B. Guthrie is concerned about the application for economic hardship for an income property. Board is cognizant of importance of a homesteaded property applying for the hardship. The threshold should be higher for an income property. The 6K difference will affect the neighborhood for the next 20-30 years. A tile will last longer and look better and is stylistically proper.

**Applicant** states many roofs in the area have been changed to asphalt shingle. States that 6K alone does not seem onerous however when combined with the previous monies spent and not recouping any funds, it seems to be a hardship.

W. Feldkamp concurs with other Board members in not seeing a hardship especially as there are no major leaks. Suggests waiting until the roof needs replaced, until then save for the expense. J. Fox – with two other income producing properties, write off this repair on the taxes. S. Pickett – the financial situation appears to be a temporary situation. Once the roof is gone its gone. There is no mortgage. B. Guthrie has concerns about replacing the asphalt shingles in perpetuity mentioning those changed before the implementation of the Historic Ordinance. Suggestions of an equity loan to finance the roof. G. Harris doesn't see any relief as the precedent would be set for asphalt roofing going forward.

**Motion:** J. Fox moves to deny HRPB 21-00100135 as the applicant has not established by competent substantial evidence that the request is consistent with the City of Lake Worth Bach Land Development Regulations and Historic Preservation requirements because replacing the roof with a Design Guidelines compliant roof does not pose an unreasonable economic hardship. S. Pickett 2<sup>nd</sup>.

**Vote:** Ayes all, unanimous.

### **NEW BUSINESS:**

**A. HRPB Project Number 21-00100087:** A Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the construction of a new ± 4,392 square foot, 4-unit, multi-family structure located at **129 South K Street**; PCN# 38-43-44-21-15-049-0310. The subject property is located in the Medium Density Multi-Family Residential (MF-30) zoning district and is located within the Southeast Lucerne Local Historic District.

Hearing Procedures are reviewed with respect to quasi-judicial rules for this project.

**Staff:** A. Fogel presents case findings and analysis. The non-contributing structures on the parcel were declared unsafe by the City Building Official in October 2020. A COA is not required for demolition when the structure is the subject of a condemnation. The project is consistent with City Land Development Regulations. The proposed project is designed in a Mediterranean Revival architectural style with visually compatible details. The parcel is a corner lot with two facades that should meet visual compatibility standards.

**Agents for the Applicant:** Michael Sanchez and Scott Disher, Architect, believes it will enhance the area. Spoke with the property owner to the north, Affected Party Ms. Debra Robert, regarding

three items of concern. Grass was high and that has been resolved, the Mango tree on Ms. Roberts property will be trimmed to everyone's satisfaction in conjunction with staff horticulturist. The third item is the location of the A/C units. The request by Ms. Robert to re-locate the A/C units to the rooftop would present several problems, the units would be seen despite the parapet, if the parapet were to be made higher, the overall height would be an issue and access to those units would be via an exterior stair. Applicant requests the A/C units be maintained on the ground. The affected party also requested the north façade be dressed up. In response, sills were added on all windows and muntins to the glazed areas.

**Affected Party Ms. Debra Robert:** 127 S K Street- Is generally pleased with the parcel and the design is nice. The concern is the noise generated by the four A/C units running day and night. Despite being a Mixed-Use zoning district there is still an expectation of quietness. Proposes there are three sides that should be visually compatible. The north wall when looking south will be very prominent. Alexander Schultz- 612 2<sup>nd</sup> Ave S.- Concurs with Ms. Robert about the noise being generated by the A/C units just outside a bedroom window, points to Hammon Park with the units located in front of the units.

**Board:** S. Pickett is within the 400-foot radius. Believes he can be unbiased and does not have a material interest in the project.

**Affected Party:** Has there been consideration given to relocating the A/C to the front?

**Agent for the Applicant:** Esthetically doesn't like them in the front, cannot put them on the roof, would have to move building back if they were to be located in the front.

Affected Party A. Shultz inquires how it was allowed at Hammon Park.

**Staff:** Code does not allow for the units to be placed in the front. Hammon Park was a Planned Unit Development with a common driveway in the rear of the property.

**Applicant:** The building could be moved four (4) feet north if the units were placed on the roof however that would cause a ladder to be mounted to the building.

**Board:** W. Feldkamp- As there is a six (6) foot fence on the affected party property, could the units be moved ten (10) feet eastward? J. Fox lived in a townhouse for 20 years with a unit nearby and it never bothered. The newer units are much quieter. Discussion about the distance between the air handler and condenser and drop in efficiency. **Staff:** With new construction, it is easier to place the units outside the setback, with existing structures the placement is limited to where it fits and sometimes that is within the setback.

**Board:** W. Feldkamp suggests moving them eastward between the demising wall. **Architect** suggests moving the two units further east at the demising wall so as not to be located beneath a window. The sills will be thicker on the north elevation, muntins were added. The landscaping is generous. There is nine (9) feet between the structure and the affected party property.

Affected Party asks if there is something else that could be added to the north façade to create more interest.

**Board:** W. Feldkamp the façade is treated well with the arched parapet. S. Pickett agrees several facades are visible and there are many small treatments that could be placed. Suggestions of the half circle inset near the parapet, adding brackets over the 4 windows on the north façade; more jointing in the stucco, faux shutters; 3 downspouts and overflow scuppers through the parapet wall; color changes, demarcation lines to break up the length. G. Harris prefers simple responses will make a huge difference without too much cluttering.

**Public Comment:** None

**Motion:** R. D'Arinzo moves to approve **HRPB 21-00100087** with staff recommended Conditions of Approval adding Condition #15 moving A/C units eastward to the center of the demising wall and condition #16 to add a matching medallion near the parapet of the north façade; add vertical demarcation lines to stucco near the center of the building allowing for a different paint color, to be approved by staff. B. Guthrie 2<sup>nd</sup>.

**Vote:** Ayes all, unanimous.

**Recess -8:07 PM- 8:15 PM**

**B. HRPB Project Number 21-00100190:** A Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the construction of a new ± 944 square foot accessory dwelling unit located at **131 South Palmway**; PCN #38-43-44-21-15-039-0160. The subject property is located in the Medium Density Multi-Family Residential (MF-30) zoning district and is located within the South Palm Park Local Historic District.

**Staff:** A. Fogel presents case findings and analysis. A historically insensitive renovation occurred in 1992. Including window replacement and stuccoing over the lap siding. The structures were designated as non-contributing; in July 2021 the garage was declared unsafe and condemned by the City Building Official. The new structure is designed to replicate a two-story detached Wood Frame Vernacular garage structure. The proposal is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, Land Development Regulations and Historic Design Guidelines.

**Applicant:** Thomas Forlenza.

**Board:** B. Guthrie questions the metal roof with color on the primary structure. The proposal indicates a mill finish.

**Applicant:** Has a proposal with a roofing company to replace the primary structure with a mill finish.

**Board:** G. Harris suggests a drip edge or skirting for the transition from the lap siding to the stucco.

**Staff:** Add: Prior to the issuance of a building permit for construction, a demolition permit must be approved.

**Public Comment:** None

**Motion:** R. D'Arinzo moves to approve HRPB 21-00100190 with staff recommended Conditions of Approval (18) and the addition of Condition #19 – A skirt board with drip-edge shall be added; Condition #20- A demolition permit shall be approved prior to the issuance of a permit for construction; based upon competent substantial evidence in the staff report and pursuant to the City of Lake Worth Beach Land Development Regulations and Historic Preservation Guidelines; B. Guthrie 2<sup>nd</sup>.

**Vote:** Ayes all, unanimous.

**Request granted for Postponement to August 11, 2021**

**C. HRPB Project Number 19-00100107:** Consideration of a Completed Work Application (Part III) for a Historic Preservation Ad Valorem Tax Exemption and a recommendation to the City Commission for a Historic Preservation Ad Valorem Tax Exemption for the subject

property located at **1020 South Lakeside Drive**; PCN#38-43-44-27-01-042-0010. The subject property is a contributing resource to the South Palm Park Local Historic District and is located within the Single-Family Residential (SF-R) zoning district.

**D. HRPB Project Number(s) 21-00100119 and 21-01500004:** A Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the additions, exterior alterations, and site improvements, and a variance from base flood elevation requirements of the Florida Building Code for the property located at **732 North Palmway**; PCN #38-43-44-21-15-228-0080. 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:** J. Hodges presents case findings and analysis. Staff has concerns with the wall height and roofline of the detached garage substantially altering the structure enough to impact its status as a contributing resource. Qualifying as a substantial improvement, both structures are required to meet the nine (9) foot NAVD base flood elevation. The applicant has applied for a variance from the requirement as both are eligible under the Florida Building Code as they are of contributing status. It is the analysis of staff that the proposed additions to the primary structure will not jeopardize the contributing designation, and the granting of the variance (not requiring the floor height to be increased) will meet the variance criteria. Due to the substantial alterations to wall height, massing and visual qualities of the proposed, detached garage the contributing designation of that structure will be jeopardized. Board shall decide as to whether the increasing wall height is visually compatible. If Board approves of the height, a variance would likely not be needed as there will be sufficient headroom in the structure after raising the floor height. The applicant is proposing raising the beam height 4 (four) feet contributing to the increased wall height.

Staff has concluded that 1. The strict interpretation of the FBC could result in a height that is incompatible with surrounding properties. 2. If the Board determines the height is compatible with surrounding properties a variance would not be required as the floor height could be raised allowing for adherence to FBC.

In order to qualify for the variance the structure must remain contributing. The applicant is seeking to avail himself of the relief from increasing the floor height by applying for the variance which necessitates the structure remaining contributing, yet the proposed wall height could render the project non-contributing and thus ineligible for the granting of the variance. Despite the wall height, the applicant is not intending to meet the FBC regarding the base flood elevation. Solutions could be to lower the roof height and retain the hip roof; this would allow the variance to be granted. Questions about necessity of a window in the storage space versus vents.

**Architect for Applicant:** Jeremy Walter explains the reason for the added height in the garage is to add storage above the bathroom area. The streetscape does not elevate much above the neighboring homes. Points to other 2-story structures in the neighborhood.

**Public Comment:** 802 N Lakeside- Kathryn Costantino and Janice Watson- concerned with investment properties, in particular, being considered for a variance and the Historic Guidelines not being followed. Although the application is for a pool cabana (additional living space) it would seem it to be a rental with kitchen and bath and living room.

Applicant states it is currently rented and will be owner occupied.

**Board:** Suggestion to lower the garage roof and change the pitch to 4:12 not 6:12; the proposed ribbon driveway in the front will be reasonable. Other suggestions are the gable roof should be eliminated and retain a hip roof to soften the appearance and not exaggerate the height.

Applicant states he prefers a gable end.

The Conditions of Approval are briefly reviewed.

**Motion:** B. Guthrie moves to approve the Variance **21-01500004** and the Certificate of Appropriateness **21-00100119** for the primary structure with staff recommended Conditions of Approval (excluding Conditions 9, 10,11 and 13 pertaining to the garage) including site improvements 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 2<sup>nd</sup>.

**Vote:** Ayes all, unanimous.

**Motion:** B. Guthrie moves to continue the hearing for the Accessory Structure to the August 11, 2021 Historic Resources Preservation Board meeting; R. D'Arinzo 2<sup>nd</sup>.

**Vote:** Ayes all, unanimous.

**PLANNING ISSUES:**

A. A conceptual plan review for the construction of a new accessory structure and historic waiver for the square footage limitation at **226 South L Street**; PCN #38-43-44-21-15-091-0040. The subject property is located in the Low-Density Multi-Family Residential (MF-20) zoning district and is located within the Southeast Lucerne Local Historic District.

**Applicant:** Anne Fairfax explains a preliminary proposal for a secondary structure to be located behind the primary structure. Included would be a garage on the lower level and bedroom, closet and bath on the second floor. Of concern is the square footage limitation on the secondary structure. Explains the topography of the lot and the slope would diminish the impact of height. Prefers to have it separated from the cottage and preserving the integrity while also allowing the area between to function as a garden. It would be greater than a driveway at the rear with additional impervious area and loss of landscape.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** (3 minute limit) None

**DEPARTMENT REPORTS:** None

**BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS:** As most Board members will not be available to meet on either the 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> Wednesday of August. There will be no meeting until September.

**ADJOURNMENT:** 9:50 PM