



**CITY OF LAKE WORTH**  
1900 2<sup>nd</sup> 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, APRIL 13, 2016 6:00 PM**

1. Roll Call and Recording of Absences
2. Meeting was called to order at 6:04p.m..  
Present were: Herman Robinson, Tom Norris, Jimmy Zoellner, Madeleine Burnside, Judith Just Darrin Engel, Erin Fitzhugh Sita.  
Also present were Maxime Ducoste, Assistant Director Planning and Preservation; Aimee Sunny, Preservation Planning Coordinator; Carolyn Ansay, Board Attorney; Sherie Coale, Board Secretary.
3. **Pledge of Allegiance**
4. Additions/Deletions/Reordering and Approval of the Agenda  
March 9, 2016 minutes to be provided at next meeting,  
Agenda approved.
5. Approval of Minutes
  - A. December 16, 2015 PZB/HRPB Joint Workshop  
**Motion:** E. Fitzhugh Sita 2<sup>nd</sup> D. Engel  
**Vote:** Ayes, all unanimous
  - B. February 10, 2016 RM  
**Motion:** D. Engel 2<sup>nd</sup> T. Norris  
**Vote:** Ayes, all unanimous
  - C. February 17, 2016 Special Meeting  
E Fitzhugh Sita would like to see the setback of the new building and removal of the commercial off the parking garage, 1000 square foot retail discussion expanded.  
John Szerdi and Don Skowron spelled correctly.  
**To be presented next meeting along with March 9, 2016 meeting minutes.**  
**Motion: None**  
**Vote:**
  - D. March 9, 2016 RM
6. Cases
  - A. Swearing in of Staff and Applicants

Board Secretary swore in all persons speaking tonight.

B. Proof of Publication

1 advertised item

C. Withdrawals/Postponements

D. Consent

None

E. Public Hearings

1. Board Disclosure

H. Robinson spoke to applicants from North K Street just prior to the meeting and it will not affect his judgement on the case.

a. Form 8B Recusal

F. Unfinished Business

1. HRPB Project Number 15-00100231: Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for roof replacement to the subject property located at 520 North Palmway, PCN# 38-43-44-21-15-164-0050. The subject building was constructed in 1939 and the property is a contributing resource within the Old Lucerne Local Historic District.

**Staff:** Continuance granted at March meeting. Additional information and 3 quotes from applicant was requested by Board at the February 10 meeting; 3 have since been provided.

Staff has located 3 products of metal shingles that could be utilized for the said roof replacement, provided with staff report. Applicant has requested to replace roof with a standing seam roof. Staff has reviewed the plan according to the Standards from National Park Service and Secretary of the Interior Standards and City Ordinances. Based upon the review, staff does not support the change. The response from the State Senior Preservation Architect indicates the standing seam would not be an acceptable replacement for a historic structure. Metal shingle would most closely replicate the original roof. Recommendation for either metal shingles or a compatible product grey asphalt shingle roof, with grey being the closest in color and texture if metal shingles are not chosen.

**Board:** J. Just questioned why we have defined the color of material. A. Sunny indicates because it is an intrinsic quality/standard being applied. H. Robinson indicates this is type of application that makes this job difficult, based on value and neighborhood of similar standing seam roofs. Finds it difficult to disagree with staff and also not to maintain historic standards. Likes the distinctive, attractive quality of the Key West shingle. Board must move forward with a decision

J. Just: asks about cost comparison.

**Applicant:** Dana McLaughlin, Shane O'Mara- Metal tiles suggested readily available does not mean locally available. Cost escalates from 9K to 15 K roof. Does not understand how Board can ask the applicant to spend that money. The neighboring roof could have a 5 V crimp and she is not allowed a standing seam roof.

**Board:** E. Fitzhugh Sita asks how applicant feels about a grey shingle roof. *Applicant indicates it is not her first preference. If the metal shingles are the recommendation, she would opt for the second choice of grey shingle.* J. Zoellner and T. Norris have misgivings over this decision re: materials and both concur that the grey shingle would be their suggestion as a second choice over the metal shingle. J. Zoellner does not visualize a standing seam roof on the house. D. Engel compliments staff member, Aimee Sunny, with her analysis of the structure and proposal and indicates, in his estimation, the analysis is correct. Acknowledges there are other homes in the area with new roofs. Believes it should have a metal roof, but we are upholding our ordinance by not permitting the standing seam roof, whether he personally likes it or not.

**Public:** Marian Cone, preservationist, says Board member D. Engel is also correct in assessment. Do not replicate mistakes by mimicking the other standing seams in the neighborhood.

**Board:** E. Fitzhugh Sita questions whether a frame vernacular from the 30's would have had a standing seam? Most likely not is the general consensus. D. Engel states there is no question as to what the original roof material is/was. At the time he worked for the city, there was an acceptable notion of "like material for like material" which may explain the reason there are many metal roofs in the neighborhood. H. Robinson brings up the question of utilizing metal shingles on the visible side (as a cost factor) and asphalt shingles on the balance. Manufacturer warranties most likely would be invalidated. E. Fitzhugh Sita has been before the Board personally for similar issues for her home in the City of Lake Worth and expresses her empathy for the homeowner.

Staff discusses option of an economic hardship application, provide a revised application for the metal shingles.

**Motion:** E. Fitzhugh Sita motions to deny request for standing seam. 2<sup>nd</sup> by J. Zoellner.

**Vote:** 3 nays H. Robinson J Just M. Burnside  
4 yeas, motion to deny carries.

#### G. New Business 39:39

1. HRPB Project Number 16-00100071: Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for window and door replacement for the main single-family structure located at 915 North K Street; PCN# 38-43-44-21-15-280-0130. The subject property was constructed in 1941 and is located within the Northeast Lucerne Local Historic District.

**Staff:** Provides overview of staff findings. Public frontage on North K to the east. Has undergone several changes over time. Retains a good degree of original material, setting and design. Impact aluminum casement and horizontal rollers windows and french doors are being requested. Condition of the window elements. Weather stripping should be added Caulk and putty should be applied, ropes and weights should be repaired. Paint failure is not necessarily an indication of wood rot. Double hung to aluminum casement windows, pair of double hung changed to horizontal roller are proposed. Applicant offered to put a muntin on the horizontal roller. Also there is a single double hung window to single casement window. French door.

**Board:** D. Engel inquires as to whether the structure contributing. Staff indicates although it cannot be found in the survey. No information found.

**Applicant:** Jeff Berkoff (Contractor) **Owners:** Phillip Staley and Robert Martin

Mr. Berkoff states he spoke to Katie and was told it was not contributing. Discussion regarding the egress/ingress requirement of 5.7 sq ft, which is currently not there. The horizontal roller, facing the fence in bedroom, could become a casement window. States the price point for new wood windows, such as Pella or Marvin to name a few, becomes prohibitive. States the windows rattle, the glass is thin, the bedroom windows are kept closed, and there is no putty.

**Board:** D. Engel indicates there is no apparent rot of wood, he's very experienced with wood windows.

**Applicant:** The owners want it to look historic. Indicates that interior vs exterior temperature is high/low, the insurance and utility bills are high. This is the reason for impact windows, trying to improve the house. Owner states his home is his castle and wants it to be his castle.

**Public:** Marian Cone, preservationist, questions why contractor didn't come to the Board prior to purchasing windows and agrees with D. Engel's assessment of situation.

**Board attorney:** Advises Board to weigh the source of the given expertise with regard to the decision.

**Board:** T. Norris asks about the front window, is it proposed to have 2 one over one single hung installed? E. Fitzhugh Sita will not support a change of configuration.

**Contractor:** States it is 2016 not 1940. Do not deny the egress/ingress, anything less than 100 % impact is not acceptable. Said they are not repairable.

**Board:** M. Burnside begins to ask about contributing vs. non-contributing. **Staff clarifies.**

**Contractor:** insists that it is a non-contributing structure.

**Staff reminds Board** that although a structure may not be a contributing structure they are all treated the same in the eyes of the ordinances. Confirmed with the Building official provided that the egress/ingress opening size does not decrease over the currently existing opening the type will not adversely affect the building review.

1.11.53

- 1) **Motion:** D. Engel motions to approve with conditions as recommended by staff. With Condition #1 modified to read: Replacement windows shall be wood, wood-clad, or aluminum double-hung windows, to match the original window opening sizes and configuration, and have a 1/1 pattern that replicates the (1) original wood double-hung windows and (2) non-original aluminum windows. The new windows shall be installed at the same depth in the jamb as the existing windows. All decorative wood trim shall remain if possible and if replacement is necessary the trim shall be replicated exactly in size, shape, profile and configuration.

E. Fitzhugh Sita 2<sup>nd</sup> for discussion.

**Vote: Ayes all, unanimous**

## 2. Review of City Initiated Demolition at 914 North M Street

Due to deterioration issued unsafe structure. Board may comment- Q? Why it hasn't been boarded up.

William Waters, Director of Community Sustainability, indicates it is not prudent given the coffers of the City to board and secure and then come back and tear it down. PBSO has the ability to arrest for trespass.

D. Engel- would rather see it boarded, children like to play in empty houses. J. Zoellner says house has been like this a long time. Director indicates unsafe structures do not require notification period. 3 verbal bids, asbestos and lead survey and remediation if necessary, takes @ one month. Unsafe structure is the key. Program allows 250K for

Lot clearings Board & Secure and demolitions. 1/2 spent on this fiscal year. Boarding and lot clearing take most of the \$\$\$. Money will be returned to city coffers beginning FY 2017. Appraisals Vacant lot in Lake Worth may have a lesser value than the same lot with an unsafe structure. H. Robinson states this property, with the decrepit property has increased in value.

Board: D. Engel and H. Robinson want house boarded and secured, tear down the garage. Believes the empty lot is an opportunity for even worse things.

E. Fitzhugh Sita disagrees. J. Zoellner and J. Just would not like to live next to it and would want it torn down.

3. HRPB Project # 16-02900002 for Consideration of a request by Stateside Partners LLC, for a Text Amendment to Section 23.3-14, Downtown (DT) and Section 23.3-6, the Permitted Use Table and Section 23.4-13 of the City's Land Development Regulations (LDRs), to allow Drive Through Facilities as a Conditional Use within the Downtown Zoning District specifically west of Dixie Highway.

1:31:45

**Staff:** Curt Thompson provides a synopsis of the project

**Board comments:** T. Norris asks if all existing drive-thrus are non-conforming, the answer is yes.

E. Fitzhugh Sita would like to know what type of business would like to go at this location. Additional language added to requirements for drive thru. Excludes all drive thru restaurants restrict to west side of Dixie due to performance of properties. The east of Dixie more oriented to pedestrian traffic vs. west side of Dixie which is more oriented to vehicular traffic. Staff recommends approval of this revision to the Land Development Regulations. Conditional use applications will be required.

M. Ducoste clarifies. The DT district is the only district not allowing drive thru as a conditional use. Striped area will be the areas in totality that are allowed drive thru conditional use not restaurant. Does not think Lake or Lucerne should be allowed.

**Applicant:** Jeff Iravani with Stateside Partners- Multi use commercial use development. Believes that pedestrian and drive thru are not incompatible.

E. Fitzhugh Sita would like to amend the text to disallow on Lake and Lucerne west of Dixie Highway. T. Norris agrees and believes this is a pedestrian area, near the roundabout.

1:46:36

Dixie Hwy seems to have a considerable amount of pedestrian traffic.

**CRA:** Joan Oliva- The CRA has acquired much of the land behind and the end result will be a very good pleasing product with underground utilities.

E. Fitzhugh Sita is not concerned about other properties that will now be open to drive thru. Recommendation to approve to cross hatched pink area and eliminate the possibility of Lake and Lucerne frontage being allowed to have drive thrus.

1:54:27

MU-East Federal Hwy allows drive thru for a small area, the balance does not.

Major thoroughfare guidelines are applied and discussion about window size minimum for eligible structures come into question. 2:01:04

E. Fitzhugh Sita would like to clarify the window size opening and the location of the said drive thru window. E. Fitzhugh Sita recommends striking the verbage of residential gate stacking distance.

2:09:20

**Motion:** Approve the main motion and disallow Lake and Lucerne from being included in the change. D. Engel 2<sup>nd</sup> with the addition of 2 E 8 must be part of a multi-tenant or financial institution.

**Motion dies.** The seconded amendment is not accepted to the main motion.

**Repeat motion.** Approve the main motion with the pitched roof stricken, disallowing Lake and Lucerne from bring included and deleting gated entrance to residential development.

**Vote: Ayes all unanimous**

7. Planning Issues

A. Discussion of Historic Preservation Case Studies

Director of Community Sustainability: William Waters- Lake Worth took a very strong stance toward Historic Preservation without the framework. West Palm Beach, on the contrary, took a more gradual path with one property precipitating the inception (a B&B) of their program.

Lake Worth does not have specifically established criteria for the determination. The 3<sup>rd</sup> wed of may will be a workshop to discuss the adoption of design guidelines specific to Lake Worth. Lack of guidelines and misinterpretation or guidelines that do not address the specific issues. Director Waters discusses roof materials, and states that concrete tile roofs are classic Florida roofing material. We must be consistent otherwise we are on shaky ground.

2:23:43

City Commission assesses that we are stymying investment in the City however the historic districts are investing at a greater rate than popular opinion allows. For a period of 7 years there was no any leadership in historic preservation.

E. Fitzhugh Sita offers that non-contributing should not be treated the same as contributing and would have differing criteria. D. Engel concurs, T. Norris believes that overall contributing is specific to a particular district. Board comments on whether public comment should be first then Board or vice versa.

8. Public Comments (3 minute limit)

9. Departmental Reports

Staff: A. Sunny & K. Jacob: Present a slide show and will send it to Board members. Presentation of a sample metal roof. 2:51:54.

July 1 money to be awarded to begin survey, the award would be @ 35 K with preliminary by end of year. A Fellowship for A. Sunny and 2 matching grants applied for. 50K & 30 K each.

10. Board Member Comments:

April 13, 2016 Regular Meeting

D. Engel: 300 N Palmway completed; new house on 200 block of Princeton looks good. 209 & 204 Fordham concrete roof beautiful white. New Book- Living in the Past- choosing a historic house.

J. Just believes the workshop is a great idea and good to involve neighborhood.

T. Norris - Marvin windows sash replacement .

J. Zoellner- what is going on with building, city owned and being sold. Rehabbed and back up by a date certain. Foreclosure property.

M. Sideburn: comes from a museum background art and history, returning to Florida via Kentucky and Key West. Santa Cruz PHD.

C. Ansay advises that the Gulfstream appeal to the rezoning is underway.

H. Robinson: Greasetraps are required by Health Dept.

H. Robinson asks about the projection screen being moved for the internet public. Wm advises he will inquire. Asks about churches in home.

Board attorney cautions about discussion of any application before its received.

11. **Adjournment at:** 9:26 pm

**Motion:** T. Norris M. Sideburn 2<sup>nd</sup>

**Vote:** Ayes all

**Attest:**

  
Herman Robinson, Chairman

**Submitted By:**

  
Sherie Coale, Board Secretary

**Minutes Approved:**

  
Date