



CITY OF LAKE WORTH

1900 2nd Ave N · Lake Worth, Florida 33461 · Phone: 561-586-1687

Agenda
Regular Meeting
City of Lake Worth
Historic Resources Preservation Board
City Hall Commission Room
7 North Dixie Hwy; Lake Worth, FL

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 08, 2016 6:00 PM

1. Roll Call and Recording of Absences

Present were: Herman Robinson, Judith Just, Madeleine Burnside, Tom Norris, Darrin Engel, Erin Fitzhugh Sita

Absent: Jimmy Zoellner

Also present were: Aimee Sunny, Senior Preservation Coordinator; Katie Jacob, Assistant Preservation Planner; Maxime Ducoste, Assistant Director for Planning & Preservation; Brian Shutt, Board Attorney; Sherie Coale, Board Secretary.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Additions/Deletions/Reordering and Approval of the Agenda

Motion: to approve agenda, including the 2 consent agenda items. Madeleine Burnside.

Board Attorney: advises to allow public comment, at this time, on the 2 consent items only.

Public Comment: None.

Vote: Ayes all, unanimous.

4. Approval of Minutes

A. HRPB May 11, 2016 RM Minutes

Motion: M. Burnside 2nd J. Just; as amended by D. Engel to:

Include the separations of motions by case numbers for COA 226 South L St. and Conceptual review case—amend minutes that the city can only prove that it is a one-family structure.

E. Fitzhugh Sita motions as amended. 2nd D. Engel.

Vote: Ayes all, unanimous.

B. HRPB May 18, 2016 Workshop Minutes

Motion: D. Engel would like to amend minutes to quote “different districts have different types of homes “and character””; E. Fitzhugh Sita requests “mini-statement”, incomplete sentence be completed; E. Fitzhugh Sita motions to accept as amended 2nd M. Burnside. All amendments subject to staff verification through audio.

Vote: Ayes all, unanimous.

Chairman Robinson thanks Secretary for conciseness of minutes in light of wordy comments and long meetings.

5. Cases

A. Swearing in of Staff and Applicants

Sworn by Board Secretary

B. Proof of Publication

Provided in meeting packet

C. Withdrawals/Postponements

None

D. Consent

1. HRPB Project Number 16-00100102: Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for an addition and in-ground pool installation for the single-family structure located at 212 Vanderbilt Drive; PCN# 38-43-44-15-07-000-6850. The subject property was constructed in 1953 and is a non-contributing resource within the College Park Local Historic District.
2. HRPB Project Number 16-00100100: Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for a rear screen porch addition to the single family residence located at 404 South L Street; PCN# 38-43-44-21-15-157-0150. The subject property was constructed c.1935 and is a contributing resource within the Southeast Lucerne Local Historic District.

Public Comment: None

E. Public Hearings

1. Board Disclosure:

T. Norris has visited the sites ~~spoken~~ for Agenda items E. 2, 3, and 4 .

H. Robinson- likewise.

D. Engel is employed by REG, firm representing two (2) cases.

2. HRPB Project Number 15-00100134: Consideration of a Revision to a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for construction of a new single-family residence at the subject property located at 313 North Palmway; PCN# 38-43-44-21-15-098-0130. The subject property is located within the Old Lucerne Local Historic District.

Staff: A. Sunny presents the staff case.

Applicant: Owner states when originally submitted they did not know what type of door to utilize. They wanted decorative with some privacy but not too ornate or ostentatious.

Board: E. Fitzhugh Sita asks if the door was permitted?

Staff Response: The original COA and building permit requested a single-light French door, and did not specify a design in the glass.

Staff now has included diagrams requesting applicant to specify the style of door selected, as the NOA is very generic. Information provided differed from what was ordered. Clear glass was approved, leaded glass was installed. The project is coming to the Board again due to a change in the approval, as the COA and building permit were approved with clear glass.

Contractor: Michael Sabetello-architects typically do not specify a door other than a clear glass door because the plans are drawn so far in advance. Does not recall any notation on the plans that it had to be clear glass.

Public Comment: None

Motion: D. Engel motions for approval of HRPB 15-00100134 2nd J. Just, as door is currently installed. Amended to read leaded glass single light as currently installed or clear single light glass as previously approved.

Vote: Ayes all, unanimous

3. HRPB Project Number 14-00100132 and 14-01400006: Consideration of a Revision to an approved Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) and Minor Site Plan Amendment for construction of a new enclosed covered sports pavilion at the subject property located at 402-410 North M Street; PCN# 38-43-44-21-15-108-0010. The subject property is located within the Northeast Lucerne Local Historic District.

D. Engel recused himself at 6:22 pm.

Staff presents case with brief review of previously approved project, currently under construction. Would like a closed pavilion as opposed to the previously approved open-air pavilion. The style remains the same.

Public comment: None

Applicant: Manuel Ayala is in agreement with staff conditions.

T. Norris – Questions whether simple and geometric possibilities would be allowed as opposed to a scene or mural. A. Sunny has left that option open to the applicant, it would need to come back before the Board.

Motion: E. Fitzhugh Sita motions for approval of HRPB 14-00100132 with staff conditions 2nd M. Burnside.

Vote: Ayes all unanimous

Motion: E. Fitzhugh Sita motions for approval of HRPB 1401400006 with staff conditions, 2nd T. Norris.

Vote: Ayes all, unanimous.

D. Engel returns to the dais at 6:30 pm..

4. HRPB Project Number 15-00100022: Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for new construction of an addition to the existing structure at 812 South Lakeside Drive; PCN# 38-43-44-27-01-024-0050. The subject property was constructed in 1942 and is a contributing resource within the South Palm Park Local Historic District. Staff is requesting a continuance for this case.

Motion: E. Fitzhugh Sita moves to continues to a date certain of July 13, 2016 2nd T. Norris.

Vote: Ayes all, unanimous.

F. Unfinished Business

G. New Business

1. HRPB Project Number 16-00100098: Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for window replacement for the subject property located at 720 North Federal Highway; PCN# 38-43-44-21-15-224-0050. The subject building was constructed in 1948 and the property is a contributing resource within the Northeast Lucerne Local Historic District.

Staff: Presents the case. Requests that all previous cases and documents be entered into the

record.

Board: E. Fitzhugh Sita asks if the applicant was given guidance by staff regarding the opportunity of an appeal to City Commission. Staff states yes applicant is aware, they have been before the Board twice. H. Robinson points out applicant has not yet availed themselves of that opportunity.

D. Engel clarifies for other people, the reason for the denial in addition to being vinyl is that the windows are tinted. J. Just inquires about the historic nature of the building. The entire structure is contributing despite additions to the structure as they were designed and built by a protégé of original architect.

Applicant: Elias Contreras, agent for the church, believes the windows in the 1973 addition can be different from the original. The original building will remain. The windows have no energy savings. The new ones can provide safety for hurricanes and energy savings.

Board: E. Fitzhugh Sita mentions the application addresses the old building.

Staff: A. Sunny provides the application does not include the 10 church windows, the application is the same as was submitted for the previous two (2) hearings. The request for the remaining windows is the same. Applicant states it is not tinted glass and church wants lifetime warranty with vinyl which is not available with aluminum. Applicant is stating that he is proposing single hung, 2 over 2 windows, without tinting.

Board: E. Fitzhugh Sita motions to continue item to date certain of July 13, 2016 believes the applicant and staff are not on the same "page".

Staff: A. Sunny - original silver can be repaired which is the criteria. If it could not be repaired then replacement should be a similar/ like / same material.

Board: H. Robinson wants to wait until what is coming in the future. D. Engel wants to follow code.

Applicant: Carlos Quintana, pastor, has been waiting for 3 years. Does not want to go against the code.

Board: D. Engel asks if vinyl windows were allowed, is what the applicant is submitting something that would be allowed? Staff states no, the question is whether replacement is necessary, it has been determined they are repairable and there are other methods that can be used for impact protection, lastly the criteria is the same for design, color, texture, and materials.

Applicant displayed a sample for staff and board and states it is not tinted.

Board: D. Engel does not like the profiles of the sample shown, nor the bulkiness of the vinyl. Knows of narrower profiles that are impact resistant. T. Norris asks if windows that are ordered, (as shown in the photos), are the ones to be installed. Staff responds in the positive, applicant is requesting to install already ordered windows. A review of photos provided indicate they appear tinted but applicant states they are not tinted.

Applicant again reiterates the window is not tinted.

Board: H. Robinson indicates the vinyl is the issue not the tint. J. Just: inquires whether windows on church are silver or white.

Public comment: Chip Gutherie - 823 South Palmway - is bothered by staff suggesting that windows can be repaired. When applicant is proposing to improve and provide safety and impact. We are looking to provide energy conservation, safety and upgrade. Would like more empathy for what the applicant is trying to do.

Board: E. Fitzhugh Sita withdraws previous motion to continue and;

Motion: E. Fitzhugh Sita to approve as staff proposed with Conditions 1-7. D. Engel 2nd.

- 1) The windows on the 1947 church building shall be either 1/1 aluminum single-hung windows or 8-light aluminum casement windows per the original architect's drawings.
- 2) The windows on the 1973 church building shall be aluminum single-hung windows, with a 2/2 divided light configuration to reflect the current window configuration.

- 3) All windows shall have a clear anodized finish and shall not have reflective or tinted glass. All muntins shall be created using exterior raised applied muntins. No flat or internal muntins shall be permitted.
- 4) The Applicant shall utilize light gray screens rather than dark vinyl screens in order to minimize the impact of the panes of glass sitting in different visual planes.
- 5) All windows shall be installed to the same recessed depth in the jam as the existing windows.
- 6) All work shall be subject to staff review during permitting and inspection during construction.
- 7) Only the windows on the 1947 and 1973 church buildings shall be replaced.

Vote: Ayes all, unanimous.

2. HRPB Project Number 16-00100108: Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for window replacement for the single-family structure located at 213 Fordham Drive; PCN# 38-43-44-15-06-008-3290. The subject property was constructed in 1953 and is a non-contributing resource within the College Park Local Historic District.

Staff: A. Sunny presents case, Board should discuss what appropriate replacement/ alternate material should it be found repair is not feasible. Applicant requesting white aluminum single-hung windows.

Board: J. Just agrees with the idea there is a burden of repairing rather than replacement.

Staff: Assistant Director, M. Ducoste indicates it is a difficult position, however we have to follow criteria. The questions should be do we need to repair or replace? If not repairable, is there a compatible material for replacement? Until new guidelines are established, we must follow what we have at the current time, we under an obligation to review it with current standards and code.

Applicant: TJ Davis, contractor for Mr. DeLuca, states the homeowner is in agreement with staff recommendations, anodized is ok. Would have liked white for the color, safety and 90% do not open. Asks about whether this is new criteria as years ago it was never like this.

Board: T. Norris- beautiful home with design elegance.

Public Comment: None

Motion: D. Engel motions to approve with staff conditions. E. Fitzhugh Sita 2nd.

Vote: Ayes all, unanimous.

3. HRPB Project Number 16-00100132: Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for window replacement for the single-family structure located at 822 South Palmway; PCN# 38-43-44-27-01-023-0030. The subject property was constructed in 1953 and is a non-contributing resource within the South Palm Park Local Historic District.

Staff: A. Sunny presents staff findings, and recommends denial.

Board: E. Fitzhugh Sita inquires about horizontal roller window for the large front window, or fixed central with 2 casements. A. Sunny explains the rationale for the location of casement windows vs single hung.

Applicant: William Robeson- appreciates the lack of uniformity of style of the neighborhood. Metal roof was denied, has also made a garage door concession of metal with applique that was more expensive and less attractive. Feels pushed around since the structure is non-contributing. Applicant states he moved out of the home during roof replacement and feels its inferior and not what he wants. Now the windows are problematic. Is being told no to improvements at every turn. Primary concern with awning windows is that they are not safe. Law enforcement will support that, can be jimmying with a screwdriver. Wants energy efficient and safe window. Questions whether

board and staff are dealing with “visual” character? Or what does “historical character of a non-contributing house” mean?

Board: Front window under alternatives, could be a roller window. Staff states that Living room does not have the same egress requirements as a bedroom. Applicant continues that he is trying to improve ventilation.

Public Comment: Chip Gutherie 823 South Palmway- what Mr. Robeson is experiencing is surprising since some neighborhood homes have metal and hip roof. Less energy efficient roof now in place. Driven past many in College Park homes with newer white paned (vinyl) windows also on non-contributing properties. If available at the time the structure was built, it would have been chosen over anodized. White anodized would be nice.

Applicant: wants to address inconsistency. It’s too much of a challenge, may not have purchased the home.

Board: E. Fitzhugh Sita wants Board to be consistent.

M. Burnside states it is a non-contributing structure.

J. Just points out the previous owner was willing to go with anodized (despite only a few windows being replaced.)

H. Robinson wants to be consistent in moving toward changes if we are going in that direction.

M. Burnside states it is a non-contributing structure, dislikes putting an excessive burden on someone.

Motion: M. Burnside motions to approve, with staff recommended conditions and amendment to condition #5 for white to be allowed, and amendment to condition for window #A to be a horizontal roller or casement fixed pane with 2 operable casements on either side. 2nd J. Just.

1) Replacement windows shall be aluminum single-hung or casement windows, match the original window opening sizes, and have a divided light pattern that replicates the original aluminum awning windows. Where 3-light awning windows exist, they shall be replaced with 2/2 (4 light) windows.

2) The divided light pattern shall be created by using exterior raised applied triangular muntins to replicate the pane configuration of the awning windows. No flat or internal muntins shall be allowed. The proper divided light pattern shall be reviewed by Staff at permitting.

3) All windows shall be installed to the same recessed depth in the jam as the existing windows.

4) The aluminum window replacements and sliding glass door replacement shall have a white, clear anodized, or silver mill finish.

5) The Applicant shall utilize light gray screens rather than dark vinyl screens in order to minimize the impact of the panes of glass sitting in different visual planes.

6) No reflective or mirrored glass shall be used.

7) All work shall be subject to staff review during permitting and inspection during construction.

Vote: Ayes all, unanimous.

4. HRPB Project Number 16-00100101: Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for exterior stucco alterations for the single-family structure located at 1516 South Palmway; PCN#38-43-44-27-01-086-0041. The subject property was constructed in 1948 and is a contributing resource within the South Palm Park Local Historic District.

Staff presents the case of stucco texture, stucco should be scored to match coins and not have any relief. Acrylic spray texture was applied at a later date and was not original.

Applicant: Henry Krusinski contractor- believes this recommendation is a misunderstanding. Staff specified not to be the heavy Mexican texture and contractor said that was understood. Applicant has agreed to keep old windows and keeping shutters. Owners deserve the consideration of the

Board. Would be expensive to remove already applied texture. E. Fitzhugh Sita asks if there is anything that could be done to finish without the removal, a skin could be applied but it does not resolve the issue of the coins and further exacerbates the look. Misinterpretation of meaning of "smooth texture". J. Just says it has been vacant and is now being improved.

Applicant: Donna and Thomas Cassano cannot put up hurricane shutters since stucco application it is not complete. Completely smooth vs smooth texture wording is a problem.

Public Comment: Chip Guthrie - finds the finish not garish and smoother than the spray texture.

Motion: E. Fitzhugh Sita motions to approve the request for the alternate finish as proposed by applicant, 2nd J. Just.

Vote: Ayes 4, 2 dissenting D. Engel and T. Norris reasoning it is a contributing structure and changes the depth of the coins.

5. Review of Garage Door Styles and Types

Motion: Board would like all garage doors, regardless of fronting on the alley or street front, to have consistency E. Fitzhugh Sita, 2nd T. Norris.

Vote: Ayes all, unanimous.

J. Just asks about a flyer being included with a utility bill. Staff mentioned this occurred in May. Assistant Director, M. Ducoste agrees that future inserts could be more detailed.

Marketing to the new window / door company, located at old Chucks appliance 8:49 pm

6. Planning Issues:

E. Fitzhugh Sita-believes in a natural progression of a neighborhood, how does that relate to the survey. A. Sunny states that the survey monies come from a State Grant, therefore the guidelines are non-negotiable. H. Robinson inquires about boundary changes, A. Sunny states that would probably be done at City Commission level. June 20 is the first neighborhood workshop, June 27 the second.

7. Public Comments: (3 minute limit)

Board Secretary read the letter from Mr. Pierre Jolicoeur into the record.

8. Departmental Reports:

None

9. Board Member Comments:

H. Robinson in reference to new roofing materials asks about solar energy. These are federally regulated and staff states they work with staff. Solar roof tile are flush at 702 S Lakeside Drive.

A. Sunny- material all vinyl is not equal.

T. Norris – Re: 315 North L expansion joint.

E. Fitzhugh Sita stresses the importance of each Board member stating how they arrive at their decision.

10. Adjournment: 9:16 pm

Attest:


Herman Robinson, Chairman

Submitted By:


Sherie Coale, Board Secretary

Minutes Approved:


Date