



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, MAY 11, 2016 6:00 PM

1. Roll Call and Recording of Absences
Present: Madeleine Burnside, Jimmy Zoellner, Herman Robinson, Judith Just, Darrin Engel, Erin Fitzhugh Sita.
Absent: Tom Norris
Also present were: Aimee Sunny, Planning Preservation Coordinator; Maxime Ducoste, Assistant Director for Planning & Preservation, Carolyn Ansay, Board Attorney; Sherie Coale, Board Secretary.
2. **Pledge of Allegiance**
3. Additions/Deletions/Reordering and Approval of the Agenda
Motion to approve: J. Just; 2nd M. Burnside
Vote: Ayes all, unanimous
4. Approval of Minutes
 - A. February 17, 2016 Special Meeting
Motion: J. Just 2nd J. Zoellner
Vote: Ayes all, unanimous
 - B. March 9, 2016 Regular Meeting
Motion: J. Just 2nd J. Zoellner
Vote: Ayes all, unanimous
 - C. April 13, 2016 Regular Meeting
Motion: J. Just 2nd J. Zoellner
Vote: Ayes all, unanimous
5. Cases
 - A. Swearing in of Staff and Applicants
Board Secretary swore in all persons giving testimony.
 - B. Proof of Publication
Motion to accept: Approved
 - C. Withdrawals/Postponements
None
 - D. Consent
None
 - E. Public Hearings

1. Board Disclosure
J. Just had discussion with applicant for N Lakeside however it will not affect her decision.
2. HRPB Project Number 16-00100082 and 16-01500006: Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for new construction of an addition, a historic waiver for stairs in the front setback, a variance to allow a building lot coverage above the Code allowance, and pre-construction approval for a historic preservation ad valorem tax exemption, for the existing single-family structure located at 226 South L Street; PCN# 38-43-44-21-15-091-0040. The subject property was constructed c.1925 and is a contributing resource within the Southeast Lucerne Local Historic District.

Staff: M. Ducoste presents staff findings. Recommends the variance for lot coverage be denied as the criteria has not been met. Staff recommends the approval of exterior alterations, new construction and historic waiver for stairs in the front setback with conditions as well as the ad valorem tax exemption with conditions. Reads a letter of support into the record from Joan Brewer.

Board: J. Just questions how long it has been vacant. Consensus is approximately 2006 – 2007. H. Robinson indicates the building was saved, moved from another location and been there about 10 years.

H. Robinson would like to condition the approval with an expiration of the ad valorem, to incentivize the construction.

Applicant: Anne Fairfax Ellett- at the suggestion of staff, retained ten (10) inches of the overhang on the gable front end, but would like to clip it a bit. Applicant stated the property should probably be condemned, it is held together by straps in the interior. She is undecided about what the fate should be. Lot coverage is @ 190 feet over the requirement. Applicant indicates proposed plans are in compliance with the height restrictions. Applicant may elect to return with a revision.

Staff: M. Burnside: asks what it is she would do different. Applicant would choose a different configuration if the lot were empty.

E. Fitzhugh Sita asks why the variance is needed for lot coverage? what makes it too small? Applicant states addition would consist of two (2) bedrooms, shared bath and loggia.

H. Robinson asks if in light of the interest of condemnation, would postponing this case until a later date be of interest? Applicant is interested in the opinion of the board.

D. Engel indicates the interest is the tax exemption benefit, which would not be received with new construction. Asks why the applicant is interested in changing the size of the window openings.

Applicant indicates that she is a traditional architect and if a new structure were to be built it would not be a starkly, modern structure.

E. Fitzhugh Sita stated that she lived on a 25 foot lot beside someone who utilized every inch of the lot, it had a negative impact on her quality of life, therefore she does not support the variance for the lot coverage. A small overage might be acceptable, states she lives in a small square footage home and does so comfortably. Indicates that it does affect the impervious coverage.

D. Engel cannot support the variance since the criteria has not been shown.

J. Zoellner and M. Burnside concur with not supporting the variance request.

D. Engel asks if a waiver is possible for the lot coverage. Staff responds that a waiver doesn't apply to new construction, only applies to historic features.

Motion: E. Fitzhugh Sita motions to deny **HRPB 16-01500006** the variance request.
2nd J. Zoellner.

Vote: Ayes all, unanimous.

Applicant inquires if shortening the structure would be acceptable? Staff indicates that the request already includes a negative 3 feet.

Public Comment: Ms. St. Martin owns a business on J Street and appreciates Ms. Elletts' work. Would like to preserve in a modern space, and make livable with demands of today, in favor of the variance for lot coverage.

Linda Mahoney: very creative way to rehab the property. Support the decision of staff to deny the variance. Code shows they must demonstrate meeting each code criteria. Also would like to know what the ad valorem tax benefit amounts mean to the City tax rolls. The greater portion of this project is new construction and would be exempted. In the event the applicant chooses demo, she would support that decision because not every contributing structure should be saved.

Board: E. Fitzhugh Sita motions, for purposes of discussion, to approve the request for the original historic building except remove condition #2 and modification of condition #5 to replace with dimensional, asphalt shingles light color. J. Just 2nd.

Public comment: None

Board: E. Fitzhugh Sita is in favor of removing the 3 feet on the rear to aid in making the project work. Does not support the eaves being removed or shortened. J. Zoellner agrees.

D. Engel believes per staff recommendation the rear three (3) feet should not be removed, you have to be as honest as possible especially in light of requesting a tax exemption. Uncomfortable with the front windows being changed in shape. Extremely confident they are the original window openings, may have had screens, may have had sliders. As a preservationist for many years, it is a professional opinion, probably knows a little better than others, since a review was recently completed. Believes it dramatically changes it from a Lake Worth cottage to something that looks like it belongs in New Orleans or in Nantucket removing the overhang compounds the issue. This is why we have historic preservation in the City of Lake Worth, is to keep our city's character.

J. Just is in favor of removing the 3 feet from the rear elevation if it allows applicant the ability to work in the back, the windows are not an issue since they are not original.

Applicant finds the current façade unappealing, strongly dislikes the oversized window openings. Does not want to restore a porch to the front of the structure.

Board: Purpose of the exemption is to preserve the historic integrity.

E. Fitzhugh Sita will not support tax exemption with removal of eaves, the rear three (3) feet being removed is ok and change in window opening size.

Applicant indicates rear eave is clipped on new structure. Applicant states the side eaves are the same from the old to the new construction.

D. Engel, asks about height and what was the issue, response was to provide a new survey, it now meets the height.

7:01

Motion: **HRPB 16-00100082** for COA for exterior alterations, new construction and historic waiver including enclosing outdoor dining room and kitchen with a wall of windows subject to staff review at time of permitting, remove Condition #2, and amend condition #5 to asphalt shingle or shake. Strike condition #3 of new construction regarding overhanging eaves. J. Zoellner 2nd

Public Comment: None

Vote: Ayes all, unanimous.

Motion: E. Fitzhugh Sita motions to deny request for ad valorem tax exemption 2nd by J. Zoellner

Public Comment: None

Vote: 4/1 to deny J. Just dissenting.

7:11 pm

3. 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.

Request for Continuance: E. Fitzhugh Sita motions for continuance M. Burnside 2nd.

Vote: Ayes all, unanimous.

F. Unfinished Business

None

G. New Business

7:15

1. HRPB Project Number 16-00100092: Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for exterior alterations including roof, window, and door replacement for the single-family structure located at 402 North Lakeside Drive; PCN# 38-43-44-21-15-428-0 010. The subject property was constructed in 1958 and is a non-contributing resource within the Old Lucerne Local Historic District.

Staff: A. Sunny presents the case, staff does not in support the request due to removal of distinctive features and materials. The proposed roof lacks the thickness, depth and horizontal banding of concrete tile. The opinion of Richard Jones, city building inspector, is that damage to an asphalt shingle is possible from golf balls and hail. The State of Florida advises a coating (slurry) over the concrete tile. Replacement of silver windows with white aluminum is not recommended. As no compatible window replacement can be located, staff defers decision to Board. Board to select window.

7:29pm

Applicant: Would like impact windows and some existing windows do not work.

The roof was replaced in 1990, did not last the projected lifetime and has damage from golf balls. Nearby a neighbor replaced a roof with asphalt. A. Sunny clarifies the neighboring roof was originally barrel tile. There is a variance granted for a golf ball fence on subject property. Discussion around golf ball strikes to concrete roof. Applicant is aware there is a decrease in curb appeal with the asphalt roof. Applicant would like to go with a roofers' opinion as to the preferable material. A composite type roof was not researched. Hail can also damage asphalt shingles.

2. H. Robinson-concrete is the ultimate midcentury material. J. Zoellner - if the property was anywhere but on the golf course, he would not be inclined to even entertain the idea of an asphalt shingle roof.

Roofer: Dry in should last 60 days. Slurry not recommended to coat concrete. Would invalidate warranty. Underlayment needs to breathe. A. Sunny would suggest a different underlayment.

7:40pm

Windows: Applicant prefers white aluminum. E. Fitzhugh Sita indicates that not every home in the neighborhood has changed out to a white aluminum frame. Applicant is fine with muntins.

H. Robinson asks if anodized windows are available; consensus is yes, but not readily. Applicant is open to light grey screens. Provides a list of neighbors approving of the roof and changes.

J. Just also lives on the golf course and thinks asphalt should be granted.

J. Zoellner states in some golf communities, this would not be a topic of conversation as living on the golf course, golf ball strikes should be anticipated. 7:52

D. Engel comments that the area predominately has cement tile roofs.

Motion: E. Fitzhugh Sita motions, for purposes of discussion, to approve with staff conditions with motion amended to read “ The roof shall be a white composite material, in order to most closely replicate the original flat white concrete tile roof as approved by staff, or concrete tile”. D. Engel believes white windows to be okay since they will match the roof. Condition #3 amended to “clear anodized silver mill finish or white window (option depending on roof) (also to include 2 sliding glass door replacements) Design and approval of the midcentury style front door shall be subject to staff level approval”.

D. Engel 2nds the motion.

Public Comment: Linda Mahoney supports the Board motion. Last April a board decision was rendered for a white tile roof. Concerned over people buying without knowing they are in a historic district and what that encompasses.

Richard Stowe, 414 N. Federal Hwy. appreciative that Board encouraged the replacement of the white concrete tile. Asphalt would have a negative impact. Lives near a metal shingle improvement (that A. Sunny worked with the neighbor) and the result is very nice.

Vote: Ayes all, unanimous.

3. HRPB Project Number 16-00100078: Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for exterior alterations for all 12 units in the multi-family structure located at 208 South Lakeside Drive; PCN#'s: 38-43-44-27-18-000-5130, 38-43-44-27-18-000-4030, 38-43-44-27-18-000-4020, 38-43-44-27-18-000-4010, 38-43-44-27-18-000-3030, 38-43-44-27-18-000-3020, 38-43-44-27-18-000-3010, 38-43-44-27-18-000-2030, 38-43-44-27-18-000-2020, 38-43-44-27-18-000-2010, 38-43-44-27-18-000-1030, 38-43-44-27-18-000-1020, 38-43-44-27-18-000-1010, and 38-43-44-27-01-059-0010. The subject property was constructed in 1971 and is a non-contributing resource within the South Palm Park Local Historic District.

Staff: A. Sunny presents staff findings. Staff does not support the request as proposed.

Board: Discussion as to whether this is Mid Century modern.

J. Zoellner is pleased that someone wants to come in and replace everything consistently.

Applicant: Wes Blackman shows new color scheme for paint (which is underway) windows and doors are not visible. Eliminates buyer and seller uncertainty as to what they can and cannot do when purchasing windows.

Public Comment: None

Motion: D. Engel motions to approve with the following conditions.

- 1) Replacement windows may be 1/1 white aluminum single-hung windows where indicated on the drawings.
- 2) Replacement windows may be single light operable or fixed windows where indicated on the drawings.
- 3) Replacement sliding glass doors may be white aluminum impact sliding glass doors where indicated on the drawings.

7) The existing non-original plexiglass sidelights and transoms may be replaced with tempered glass and doors as submitted (replace all original flush panel doors with decorative trim that enter each unit with new 2-panel impact steel doors). J. Zoellner 2nd.

Vote: Ayes all, unanimous.

8:29 pm

4. HRPB Project Number 16-00100079: Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for roof replacement to the subject property located at 817 South Palmway, PCN# 38-43-44-27-01-022-0120. The subject building was constructed in 1940 and the property is a contributing resource within the South Palm Park Local Historic District.

Staff: A. Sunny presents staff findings.

Board: H. Robinson asks about when the aluminum siding. Records indicate the 60s

Applicant: Jim Maxwell and Ann requesting metal roof. Trying to stay consistent with the neighborhood. Trying to upgrade and use product proven to last longer than asphalt shingles. Indicates that asphalt was \$19 K 5vcrimp is @ 11K

8:42pm

Board seems to concur that they would approve this request. J. Just points out that Board is now agreeing that 5Vcrimp is ok, does not know the direction we are heading.

E. Fitzhugh Sita hopes to move forward. Like for like

8:46 pm

M. Burnside agrees the 5 v crimp will be an improvement.

E. Fitzhugh Sita voices her concern of setting a precedent (contrary to what was previously approved.)

Public comment:

Leigh Shinohara: Move forward, history is changing and people are trying to bring back homes without going bankrupt. Practicality should prevail.

9:00 pm

Motion: M. Burnside motions to approve as proposed as by applicant. 2nd J. Just

Replace the existing asphalt shingle roof with a Southeastern Metals 5v Crimp aluminum roof panel system.

Vote: by roll call ayes all, unanimous.

M. Ducoste voices concern over practicality vs the decision to act contrary to staff recommendation and the fact that it is a contributing structure.

Board states if it had been a better example of contributing, the decision may have been different. They are conflicted in their decision and hope this can be a topic at the workshop to come up with some alternatives when the choices are limited by current standards.

5. HRPB Project Number 16-00100049: Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for roof replacement to the subject property located at 922 North O Street, PCN# 38-43-44-21-15-290-0060. The subject building was constructed in 1952 and the property is a non-contributing resource within the Northeast Lucerne Local Historic District.

9:11 pm

Staff: A. Sunny presents the staff findings.

Applicant: Pamela Melvin been there 26 years, prior to existence of Historic Preservation Board. Wants to add character to her house wants to make it feel Key West. Board interjects that metal shingles are not out of reach cost wise. White tile was original roof.

Public comment: Linda Mahoney-believes that based on the last case the decision should be simple. What was permitted for a contributing structure should be given the same consideration to a non-contributing structure.

Applicant states that asphalt roofs are ugly.

Motion: D. Engel approves the request for 5v crimp as applied for by applicant J. Just 2nd

D. Engel and J. Zoellner based their decisions on the non-contributing factor.

Vote: Ayes 3/2 E. Fitzhugh Sita and M. Burnside dissenting. Motion for approval passes.

6. HRPB Project Number 16-00100075: Consideration of a Retroactive Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for gate installation for the single-family structure located at 331 Cornell Drive; PCN# 38-43-44-15-06-005-1770. The subject property was constructed c.1925 and is a contributing resource within the College Park Local Historic District.

9:25 pm

Staff: Staff is in support of a gate, material is not acceptable. Wrought iron or wood would be a historically compatible material.

Board:

Applicant: Asks the Board if they would like to see the renovations and progression of the property conditions over the years. Leigh Shinohara has voluntarily removed a PVC gate on the property and requests to allow this new gate. There are 22 homes with PVC fences and/or gates in the neighborhood. King starboard is a marine material used on the water and is indestructible. Asking for fairness.

E. Fitzhugh Sita asks why this fence is before us. Needs to be worked out with staff and zoning administrator (who has the ability to grant approval of other materials), does it need a variance. Applicant was told the matter would have to come before the Board. Applicant provides brochure that her house was on tour with awnings. They had been removed and are now re-installed and she has been cited. Code heard and withdrew the case then reactivated??

Motion: E. Fitzhugh Sita motions to approve the gate, J. Zoellner 2nd .

Public Comment: Linda Mahoney gate material is under the heading of “nail polish” (in that it can easily be undone) not like a tattoo that is painful and hard to undo.

Vote: Ayes all, unanimous.

To re-install the awnings, a permit is required and will be reviewed at staff level.

E. Fitzhugh Sita departs at 9:55 pm

7. Conceptual Review - HRPB Project Number 16-00100107: Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for exterior alterations for the subject property located at 1019 North K Street, PCN# 38-43-44-21-15-308-0120. The subject building was constructed c.1930 and the property is a non-contributing resource within the Northeast Lucerne Local Historic District.

Staff: Materials not yet completely submitted. Staff submits that it was built as a single family, existed as a duplex but it was never permitted as a duplex. For intents and purposes at this point in time it is a single family structure. Staff suggests removal of asbestos sidings to determine what is beneath. Built approximately 1920's.

Applicant Comments: Carlo Gonzales prefers impact windows as the replacement. No stair inside the building currently, states it cannot be proved there ever was. Maintains that it is a two (2) family structure.

M. Ducoste indicates the biggest challenge for the applicant is proving that it is a 2 family structure. The exterior of the building is secondary as to whether it is a single family or duplex. Legal non-conforming structure? Record of 2 meters, with one being removed because it was not permitted.

Board would like windows to be consistent, cleaned up.

6. Planning Issues
7. Public Comments (3 minute limit) 10:10 pm
Richard Stowe discussion re: North K states that it is single family, asbestos is tricky to remove. 410 North Federal Hwy removed a carport and damaging his tree and siding. He has been before the board twice. This company owns many structures in Lake Worth and clearly knows that permits are required. Unpermitted work continued inside.
8. Departmental Reports
A. Sunny reminds Board members of the workshop. To date, June has an unprecedented 18 items on the agenda. Reiterates that Director William Waters emphasizes the importance of attending the workshop.
9. Board Member Comments
10. Adjournment: 10:25 pm
Ayes all

Attest:


Herman Robinson, Chairman

Submitted By:


Sherie Coale, Board Secretary

Minutes Approved:

9/14/16
Date