AGENDA
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
Virtual Meeting
September 24, 2020 8:30 A.M.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, this meeting will not be held in person and will take place utilizing communications media technology only. Members of the public and interested parties who wish to comment will be able to do so by dialing 1 (646) 749-3122 and entering access code 773-225-421 (no pin required) during the live broadcast on Spectrum Channel 643 or Fios Channel 43 or the webcast on www.lakelandgov.net. Comments may also be submitted by e-mail to planning@lakelandgov.net.

In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and Section 286.26, Florida Statutes, persons with disabilities needing special accommodation to participate in this proceeding, or those requiring language assistance (free of charge) should contact the City of Lakeland ADA Specialist, Jenny Sykes, no later than 48 hours prior to the proceeding, at (863) 834-8444. Email: Jenny.Sykes@lakelandgov.net. If hearing impaired, please contact the TDD numbers: Local - (863) 834-8333 or 1-800-955-8771 (TDD-Telecommunications Device for the Deaf) or the Florida Relay Service Number 1-800-955-8770 (VOICE), for assistance.

Anyone deciding to appeal a decision by the Board on any matter considered at this or any subsequent meeting will need a record of the proceedings, and for purposes of that appeal, may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based.

I. Call to order, determination of a quorum, and roll call.

II. Review and approval of the August 27, 2020 Historic Preservation Board meeting minutes.

III. Old Business:

   A. Design Guidelines Project Update by staff.
      i. Design Guidelines Subcommittee Comments
      ii. Public Outreach Timeline and Document Adoption

IV. New Business:

   A. Welcome New Members Mr. Landis Fleming and Mr. Christopher McMachen.

   B. Annual nomination and election of HPB Chair and DRC Chair (HPB Vice Chair). Elected Officers will begin serving at the October meeting.

V. Adjourn for Design Review Committee.
I. Call to Order and Determination of a Quorum

Chair Tim Calhoon called the August 27, 2020 meeting of the Historic Preservation Board ("Board") to order at 8:33 a.m. A quorum was reached, as seven Board members were present.

II. Review and Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes

Mr. John White motioned to approve the July 23, 2020 meeting minutes as submitted. Ms. Lynn Dennis seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously 7-0.

III. Old Business:

A. Update on Design Guidelines Project: Ms. Emily Foster stated that staff, members of the consulting team, Mr. Thomas, and the Florida Division of Historical Resources staff had submitted comments and suggested edits for the initial draft document. The consulting team is working on completing these changes and a final draft is expected on August 31st.

B. Comments from Board concerning Design Guidelines Draft Document. Mr. Dan Fowler suggested that staff schedule a meeting of the Design Guidelines Project Committee once the final draft has been submitted. Ms. Foster agreed and will set up this meeting for a September date.

IV. New Business:

A. Board Member Update. Ms. Foster relayed that Ms. Ursula Radabaugh had resigned from the Board for personal reasons. Ms. Foster also stated that two new members will be joining the Board in September: Mr. Landis Fleming, a Dixieland Historic District resident, and Mr. Christopher McMachen, a Beacon Hill Historic District resident.

B. Staff Recommendation to nominate John White to the Design Review Committee. To fill the term of Ms. Ursula Radabaugh, Ms. MeLynda Rinker motioned to appoint John White to the Design Review Committee. Mr. Dan Fowler seconded the motion, which passed unanimously 7-0.

V. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 8:40 a.m. for the Design Review Committee.
Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, this meeting will not be held in person and will take place utilizing communications media technology only. Members of the public and interested parties who wish to comment will be able to do so by dialing 1 (646) 749-3122 and entering access code 773-225-421 (no pin required) during the live broadcast on Spectrum Channel 643 or Fios Channel 43 or the webcast on www.lakelandgov.net. Comments may also be submitted by e-mail to planning@lakelandgov.net.

In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and Section 286.26, Florida Statutes, persons with disabilities needing special accommodation to participate in this proceeding, or those requiring language assistance (free of charge) should contact the City of Lakeland ADA Specialist, Jenny Sykes, no later than 48 hours prior to the proceeding, at (863) 834-8444, Email: Jenny.Sykes@lakelandgov.net. If hearing impaired, please contact the TDD numbers: Local - (863) 834-8333 or 1-800-955-8771 (TDD-Telecommunications Device for the Deaf) or the Florida Relay Service Number 1-800-955-8770 (VOICE), for assistance.

Anyone deciding to appeal a decision by the Board on any matter considered at this or any subsequent meeting will need a record of the proceedings, and for purposes of that appeal, may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based.

I. Call to order, determination of a quorum, and roll call.

II. Review and approval of the August 27, 2020 Design Review Committee meeting minutes.

III. Review Certificates of Review administratively approved since the previous meeting.

IV. Consideration of Certificate of Review Applications:


C. **HPB20-140 – 818 Mississippi Avenue** – Final Approval requested for a building addition onto the rear elevation of the house located at this address. Owner: Scott and Jolene McClure. Applicant: Mr. Kevin Shannon.

D. **HPB20-144 – 830 Johnson Avenue** – Final Approval requested for a new single-family house at this address. Owner/Applicant: Hulbert Homes, Inc.

V. Other Business: NONE

VI. Adjournment.
MINUTES

DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

Virtual Meeting
Thursday, August 27, 2020

(Note: These meeting minutes comply with F.S. 286.011 and are not intended to be a verbatim transcript.)

The City of Lakeland Historic Preservation Board, Design Review Committee, met in Regular Session; Nick Thomas (Chair), Tim Calhoon, Lynn Dennis, Dan Fowler, Jeremy Moses, MeLynda Rinker, and John White were present. Community & Economic Development Department staff Emily Foster, Senior Planner, Historic Preservation; Jonathan Rodriguez, Community Engagement Coordinator; Brandy Gillenwater, Planning Administrative Specialist; Christelle Burrola, Office Support Specialist II, and Matthew Lyons, Chief Planner, were present. Jerrod Simpson, Assistant City Attorney, was also present.

I. Call to Order and Determination of a Quorum

The meeting was called to order by Chair Nick Thomas at 8:41 a.m. The Committee roll call was performed and a quorum was present.

II. Review and Approval of the Previous Meeting Minutes

Ms. Lynn Dennis motioned to approve the July 23, 2020 meeting minutes. Mr. Dan Fowler seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously, 7-0.

III. Review of Certificates of Review administratively approved.

A list of 22 administratively approved Certificate of Review projects covering the period 7/11/20-8/19/20 was included with the agenda packet. The Committee reviewed this list, and there were no questions or comments about these projects.

IV. Consideration of Certificate of Review Applications:

A. HPB20-085 – 1011 S. Dakota Avenue – Final Approval requested for a building addition onto the house located at this address. Owner: M & P Restoration, LLC. Applicant: Mr. Mario Falcon.

This item was withdrawn by the Applicant.

B. HPB20-117 – 205 W. Patterson Street – Final Approval requested for building additions onto the house located at this address. Owner: Mr. Brian Holbrook. Applicant: Mr. Mark Brown, Mark Brown Construction.

Chair Thomas introduced the request. Chair Thomas then asked if there were any conflicts of interest pertaining to this agenda item. There were no conflicts.

Ms. Emily Foster presented the staff report, stating that subject property consists of two interior lots of record measuring 100 feet wide by 145 feet deep and is 0.33 acres in size. The subject property contains a circa 1921 house in the Bungalow architectural style, which is a contributing building in the Dixieland Historic District. The house is a single-story structure with a cross-gabled roof and side-gabled porte cochere, and features a front porch with square columns on brick plinths, curved exposed rafter tails,
knee brackets, a sunburst-style gable vent, and double-hung sash windows with a one-over-one lite configuration. Alterations include asbestos shingle siding and a partial front porch enclosure.

Ms. Foster stated that in total, the Applicant’s request includes proposals to construct two building additions, a deck, and a new carport, as well as to make exterior alterations to the existing house. An addition of approximately 148 square feet and a 312 square feet deck are proposed to be constructed on the west side elevation of the house, behind the existing porte cochere. The side addition will extend the existing west side gable roofline, creating a projection in the wall plane, and will require the removal of the existing chimney and two small side windows on either side, which will be replaced with five new full-size window openings consistent with the size of historical window openings on the house. Due to the reconfiguration of the interior space, the front door opening is proposed to be relocated slightly to the left of its current position. The deck addition is proposed to have a shed roof extending from the main roof of the house on the west side elevation, which will be supported by square columns and simple piers, with wood railing and 2” X 2” balusters. Two new door openings and two new window openings are proposed on the west elevation, underneath the roof of the proposed deck. The deck floor is proposed to be pressure-treated deck boards. The Applicant also proposes a rear addition of approximately 722 square feet that will extend the rear and side elevation walls and roofline of the house to construct a master bedroom area. This addition will feature five new window openings in sizes consistent with the historical window openings. Finally, an open-sided, two-car carport with a gabled roof is proposed to be built behind the house and connected to the new rear elevation wall. The carport gable will be stepped down and set inside the new rear elevation wall gable, and will be supported by square columns on simple piers.

Ms. Foster stated that the additions and deck will consist of typical wood framing on a concrete pier foundation to match the crawlspace of the house. New Hardie-board lap siding with a 6-inch exposure will be used on the house and additions. All building trim and corner boards will be Hardie material in dimensions to match the existing trim materials on the house, and new 8-inch wide frieze boards will be used in the gables. All windows are proposed to be replaced with vinyl windows matching original opening sizes and in a one-over-one lite configuration. Where new paired window openings are proposed, a 4-inch mullion will divide the windows vertically. The front door will be replaced with a new fiberglass door in a Craftsman style, with a 6-lite over two vertical panel appearance. The additions will also feature exposed rafter tails and sunburst gable vents to match the house. The roof of both the house and new additions will be covered in architectural shingles. Finally, composite lattice screening is proposed to be installed between the piers of the foundation. As part of the Applicant’s request, the partial enclosure of the front porch will be removed, and the front porch will be restored to its original configuration; all front porch architectural details will be left in place and restored.

In evaluating the request with the Standards, staff found that the additions do not disturb the spatial relationships of the house, and the essential form and scale of the existing house will be maintained. In evaluating the request with the Design Guidelines, staff found that the materials of the proposed addition reflect the original materials of the house and are consistent with the Guidelines. The design and dimension of decorative trim and architectural details, windows, doors, and roof pitch, overhang and exposed rafter tails, are consistent with the style of the subject house and Guidelines. Furthermore, the additions are placed to the side and rear of the house, and the portion of the addition proposed on the home’s west side has an appropriate setback from the front façade and behind the porte cochere.

Staff verified that the building setbacks for the proposed new additions and deck will meet the building setbacks as required by the LDC Urban Form Standards for this property. However, because the subject property consists of two lots of record that have been combined, the construction of the deck and addition on the west elevation will encroach on the minimum interior side setbacks of the platted lot line, thereby precluding the Applicant’s ability to split the two lots in the future. This is for informational purposes only and should not affect a decision with regard to this request by the Committee.
As the request met the Standards and Design Guidelines, staff recommended Final Approval of the request with the following conditions to be approved by staff prior to submission of the building permit:

1. Windows must be recessed into the wall plane and must not be installed flush with the wall plane; and
2. Confirm the material and design of the new side doors on the west elevation.

The Applicant, Mr. Brian Holbrook, and Mr. Mark Brown of Mark Brown Construction, were present in support of the request, stated they understood the conditions recommended by staff, and had nothing further to add. There was no public comment for this request, and the Committee had no questions or discussion about the request.

MOTION: Approval of the request with the conditions as recommended by staff (L. Dennis/ M. Rinker, 7-0).

C. **HPB20-120 – 941 Success Avenue** – Final Approval requested for a second-story accessory dwelling unit to be added onto the existing detached garage located at this address. Owner: Mr. David Rose. Applicant: Mr. Daniel Sharrett, Sharrett Construction, Inc.

Chair Thomas introduced the request. Chair Thomas then asked if there were any conflicts of interest pertaining to this agenda item. There were no conflicts.

Ms. Emily Foster presented the staff report, stating that the subject property consists of one interior lot of record measuring 50 feet wide by 135 feet deep and 0.16 acres in size. The subject property contains a circa 1922 house in the Frame Vernacular architectural style, which is a contributing building in the South Lake Morton Historic District. The house is a single-story structure with a hipped roof and a gable front portico supported by paired round columns, and features wood lap siding. Located in the rear yard, at the southwest corner of the subject property, is a one-story, detached garage. The garage is clad in wood lap siding and has a 5/12 pitch gable roof covered in asphalt shingles. Built circa 1959, the garage is not considered to be a contributing building in the Historic District. Attached to the garage is a small ‘lean-to’ storage closet on the side (south) elevation and a slant-roof carport on the front (east) elevation; these structures are of wooden construction, and the storage closet is also clad in wood lap siding. A portion of the garage space consisting of an interior closet along the south side wall is proposed to be removed and a new wood frame wall clad in Hardie-plank lap siding is proposed to be built in its place. The removal of this closet will reduce the square footage of the garage from 411 square feet to 375 square feet.

Ms. Foster stated that the Applicant’s request proposes to construct a second story onto the existing detached garage to create an ADU consisting of 375 square feet of living area. To access the ADU, an exterior stair will be added to the north side elevation of the garage. The second story addition is proposed to be typical wood frame construction and will have a front-gabled roof with a 5/12 pitch matching the existing roof. Hardie-plank lap siding is proposed to clad the second story, which will also feature Hardie material window and door trim and corner boards. Windows are proposed to be either single- or double-hung sash windows with a 1-over-1 lite configuration, and the entry door will have a half-lite appearance. The total height of the structure will be 21 feet, 4 inches to the peak of the roof.

In evaluating the request with the Standards, staff found that the ADU addition does not disturb the spatial relationships of the principal house, and the essential form and integrity of the existing house is maintained. New but similar materials will be used on the garage addition, which will be complementary in nature to the design of the house. In evaluating the request with the Design Guidelines, staff found the materials of the proposed ADU addition reflect the materials of the house and are consistent with the Design Guidelines. Staff also found the design of the structure’s trim, windows, door, exterior stair, and
roof pitch and overhang to be consistent with the Design Guidelines, as well as simple in design and subordinate to the subject house. The ADU addition is appropriately located to the rear of the subject property over the existing garage. Consistent with the Lake Morton neighborhood’s development patterns, two-story garage apartments are commonly found in most of the City’s residential historic districts, in both historic and contemporary form.

For informational purposes for the Applicant, Ms. Foster commented that while a site plan showing the footprint of the existing garage and house was submitted, building setback dimensions from the garage to the property lines and to the closest point of the house were not indicated. This request appears to comply with the ADU development standards pursuant to Sub-Section 4.3.2 of the City’s Land Development Code in respect to building height and living area requirements. However, to meet the required ADU building setbacks, the existing garage will need to be setback from side and rear property lines by a minimum of 5 feet, and setback from the house per the Florida Building Code. Additionally, this request will require Compatibility Review approval by the Planning and Zoning Board, where this information will need to be provided.

As the request met the Standards and Design Guidelines, staff recommended Final Approval of the request with the following conditions to be approved by staff prior to submission of the building permit:

1. Provide the materials of both the new windows and entry door;
2. Windows must not be installed flush with the wall plane; and
3. A frieze board a minimum of 8 inches wide should be added to the front and rear gables.

Mr. Daniel Sharrett was present in support of the request, stated he understood the conditions recommended by staff, and had nothing further to add. There was no public comment for this request, and the Committee did not have any questions or discussion about the request.

**MOTION: Approval of the request with the conditions recommended by staff (M. Rinker/ T. Calhoon, 7-0).**

D. **HPB20-122 – 24 Lake Hollingsworth Drive** – Final Approval requested for the demolition of the house located at this address, as well as new construction of four new residential structures. Owner/Applicant: Mr. Mark MacDonald.

Chair Thomas introduced the request. Chair Thomas then asked if there were any conflicts of interest pertaining to this agenda item. There were no conflicts.

Ms. Emily Foster presented the staff report, stating that the subject property is located on the northwest corner of Lake Hollingsworth Drive and Mississippi Avenue and consists of two lots of record measuring 100 feet wide and 139 feet deep, and is 0.31 acres in total size. A one-story, single-family Ranch house is located on this property, which was constructed circa 1947 and is a non-contributing building within the South Lake Morton Historic District. This house is of wood frame construction with an asbestos shingle exterior and features a cross-gabled roof, and metal casement and jalousie windows. The single-car garage has been converted into living space.

In March 2018, a small accessory dwelling unit on this property was granted demolition approval due to significant damage from fallen trees caused by Hurricane Irma in 2017. Also damaged extensively in this storm was the principal house, which has been unoccupied and in a state of general disrepair since this time. This property has an active code enforcement case (LCE20-00399) due to several Housing Code violations, including deficiencies in roofing, exterior walls, windows, and protective treatments. The
Applicant did not request demolition of the subject house in 2018, as demolition of principal structures requires the Design Review Committee’s approval of replacement new construction at the same time as the demolition request, and plans for new construction had not yet been created.

Ms. Foster stated that if the request for demolition is approved, the Applicant proposes to build four three-story, single-family structures on the subject property. Each dwelling unit is proposed to have between 2,530 and 3,133 square feet of living area and either a two- or three-car, rear-loaded, attached garage. The two structures at each end (Units A and D) are proposed to also have rooftop decks with a fourth-floor game room/stairwell enclosure.

While intended to replicate a townhouse-like appearance, Ms. Foster commented that the dwellings are not connected by a shared firewall. Instead, the Applicant has chosen to group them in pairs, attached only at the ground floor level through the rear-loaded garages, with no physical connection between the two pairs. Three of the buildings (Units A-C) reflect a neo-traditional aesthetic, while Unit D reflects a modern design. The proposed materials of each dwelling are detailed as follows:

- Located on the western side of the lot, Unit A features a Frame Vernacular aesthetic with a gable-on-hip roof, paired columns, multi-paned windows with transoms, and a variety of cladding materials. This building has a three-car garage on the rear elevation.
- Located on the western interior of the lot Unit B features a Craftsman Bungalow aesthetic with a gable roof with decorative knee brackets on the front façade and a hipped roof at the rear, tapered and square columns, multi-paned windows with transoms, and three cladding materials. This building has a two-car garage on the rear elevation.
- Located on the eastern interior of the lot, Unit C features a Frame Vernacular aesthetic with a flat roof, square columns, multi-paned windows with transoms, and three cladding materials. This building has a two-car garage on the rear elevation.
- Located on the eastern side of the lot, Unit D features a modern aesthetic, with a flat roof, square columns, windows with horizontally oriented panes, and a variety of cladding materials. This building has a three-car garage on the rear elevation.

The site plan for all four structures proposes to orient the front façades of the buildings to Lake Hollingsworth Drive. The following building setbacks are indicated:

- Front Street (South) setback: 10 feet
- Street Side (East) setback: 15 feet
- Interior Side (West) setback: 10 feet
- Rear (North) setback: Between 26.3 and 30.9 feet

The rear yard of each dwelling would be paved with pervious concrete pavers and function as a shared driveway which would provide access from Mississippi Avenue to the adjacent alley, anticipated to be facilitated by a private easement agreement.

Regarding the considerations for demolition, Ms. Foster stated that the subject building is a non-contributing building in the South Lake Morton Historic District as it was built after the District’s period of significance. The architectural details of this house are common and easily reproducible, and the house has no known associations with persons or events of importance in Lakeland’s history. Staff found that this building would not be eligible for an individual listing on the National Register of Historic Places based on its architectural or historical merits, and would likely remain non-contributing if the District were resurveyed and the period of significance extended. Therefore, staff found that this house does not contribute to the District or possess architectural significance. Given the deteriorated condition of this house, including the erosion and breakage of asbestos siding shingles that could pose an environmental
hazard, along with the code enforcement violations for this property, staff recommended approval of this demolition request.

With regard to the requested new construction, Ms. Foster commented that the houses to the west and north of subject property consist of one and two-story residences. To the immediate east of the subject property is the Christoverson Humanities Building on the campus of Florida Southern College. While the design of the proposal is creative, staff found the overall height and massing of the buildings to be out of scale and incompatible with the surrounding residences, which are primarily one and two-story houses. Although the Christoverson building and nearby Florida Southern College buildings are large-scale structures, they are institutional in nature and regulated by a Special Public Interest district, and therefore should not be used as a comparison for new residential buildings.

Except for the height of the buildings, staff found that the Frame Vernacular and Craftsman-style design of the buildings, including architectural features and fenestration, appears to be consistent in scale and proportion with contributing residences in the District and consistent with the Design Guidelines. Except for the stacked stone veneer and usage of stucco on the rear elevations instead of using continuous materials on all facades, the materials proposed are also consistent with the Design Guidelines. Staff recommended the use of 5V crimp or standing seam metal roofing where metal roofing is indicated, as the type of metal roofing was not listed. Several other materials were also not indicated in the plans, such as materials for soffits and fascias, windows, doors, columns, porch floors, balcony railings for Units A, B, and C, and decorative brackets.

In terms of building form and placement, the orientation of the buildings is slightly problematic in that the front façades are not oriented to Mississippi Avenue, which is how the lots were originally platted. However, because the existing house on this property is oriented to Lake Hollingsworth Drive, and many lots terminating on this street have houses with a front façade oriented to it, staff is willing to support this orientation. While the height of the foundation is appropriate, the buildings lack a minimum front porch depth of 8 feet.

Finally, for the project to move forward, the Applicant will have to apply for a Conditional Use Permit to subdivide and develop the property using the Single-Family Attached special building type specified in the Land Development Code. According to the Land Development Code, a Single-Family Attached dwelling is defined as “a building containing a one-family dwelling on its own lot or parcel attached by common vertical walls to one or more other one-family dwellings located on other lots or parcels.” In respect to this definition, it is the opinion of Planning Division staff that the design proposed by the Applicant does not meet the intent for the Single-Family Attached building type. Additionally, the maximum building height for Single-Family Attached buildings is 40 feet and the proposed design appears to have a maximum height ranging from 42 to 46 feet.

Due to incompatible height and massing, uncertainties concerning specific materials, and inconsistency with aspects of building form and Single Family Attached standards, staff is unable to support conceptual or final approval of this request at this time.

Mr. Mark MacDonald was present in support of the request, as were his associates Mr. Tom Gaige and Mr. Sean Harper. Mr. Gaige mentioned that based on some of staff’s comments, the plans for new construction were being modified somewhat. Mr. Harper commented that from the street view, they felt the proposal was in keeping with massing of the Florida Southern College buildings and the two-story house to the west of the property that sits on a hill, even though it was understood that the College buildings were institutional in nature. Mr. Gaige stated that both properties to either side of the subject property had buildings that were topographically higher, and would allow their proposal to be compatible along the street. It was also mentioned that the site would be graded such that the ground floor of the buildings was lower than that of its neighbors resulting in a compatible height. Mr. MacDonald stated that
a three-dimensional rendering would be produced so that the Committee could get a sense of the scale of the proposed buildings in relation to adjacent properties.

There was a brief discussion among Mr. Calhoon, Ms. Rinker, Ms. Foster, Mr. Simpson, and the Applicant concerning the 40-feet height maximum for Single Family Attached buildings, as defined by Table 3.4-11 of the Land Development Code, and how that would be measured since the subject property is lower at Lake Hollingsworth Drive and rises towards the proposed rear of the lot.

Chair Thomas suggested the Committee hold any further questions or discussion until the Applicant was finished making comments in rebuttal to the staff report and recommendation, and also until after any public comment was taken.

Mr. MacDonald commented that they had updated plans to show the Committee, but that none of the buildings were taller than 40 feet. The height of the buildings was not a concern for him, but that the A and D units did have roof features that likely were two feet higher than the 40-feet maximum. Mr. MacDonald commented that the roof peaks and gables could be manipulated to be under the maximum height and that he did not believe height would be an issue. Mr. Gaige mentioned the grade change from the front of the property to the back, but when looking at mean height of the buildings, the height would still be acceptable. Mr. Gaige commented that they would be grading out the rear of the property to achieve a level grade, and they are adjusting the plans to stay under the maximum height.

There was no public comment for this request.

Ms. Rinker commented that the style of the two buildings on the left (Units A & B) complemented the neighborhood buildings to the west and the two buildings on the right (Units C & D) complemented the adjacent structures to the east, and she appreciated the blending of the different styles. She would not want to see a roofline change. Ms. Rinker asked the Applicant how much closer to Lake Hollingsworth Drive would the proposed buildings be located in comparison to the existing house, and what is the difference in height between the proposal and the two-story house to the west and the College building to the east. Mr. Harper replied that the buildings would be closer to the street than the existing house, but still meets the required setback. He also commented that the new buildings would be no taller than the two-story house to the west when looking at both properties from the street, as the house is built upon a hill, and has a 10-12 feet grade change from the subject property, so the roof planes will be similar. In comparing the height of the proposed buildings to theChristoverson Building, Mr. Harper commented that building will still be taller than the proposed buildings. Ms. Rinker asked if the new plans will account for the 8-feet depth mentioned by staff; Mr. Harper responded yes.

Mr. Matthew Lyons stated that the surrounding neighborhood was primarily single-family detached residences with greater front yard setbacks than 10 feet. For reference, Mr. Lyons commented that the two-story residence to the west of the subject property was setback 36 feet, and that this appeared to be a consistent site feature for residences along Lake Hollingsworth Drive. Mr. Lyons asked the Applicant if the buildings could be pushed back to provide for a greater front yard setback due to the visual inconsistency with adjacent properties. Mr. MacDonald said that they could look at increasing the front yard setback, but mentioned that he thinks people are looking for residences closer to the street, referencing the new apartments Florida Southern College has built in the neighborhood. He also mentioned a concern with not having adequate vehicular access space in the back and the closer setback to the front allowed the placement of garages to the rear instead of the front. Mr. MacDonald commented that there were several new three-story apartment buildings being built in the historic districts that were taller than the single-family residences around them, and that his project had support from the community.

Regarding building height, Mr. Jerrod Simpson commented that while the Committee’s jurisdiction includes looking at height in context within the neighborhood, there is case law that suggests that if there
is a height limitation in the Land Development Code that is specific, that limit can be considered an entitlement and if the Committee wants to set a lower height under that limit, then the case needs to be very strong and the Committee needs to be specific in its motion as to why the Applicant would not be able to build up to the ordinary height limitation specified in the Code.

Ms. Rinker asked why the Committee should require the Applicant to place the buildings farther back on the property than what the allowable setbacks. Mr. Lyons replied that building setbacks are regulated by zoning and because the Single Family Attached building type is not permitted by right and requires a Conditional Use Permit, planning staff would look at the proposed building setbacks in context with the established development pattern surrounding the subject property. As part of the Conditional Use review, planning staff could recommend a setback greater than the minimum if it was determined the minimum setback would have a negative impact on surrounding neighborhood.

Ms. Foster commented that staff also had concerns that the overall height of the proposal would adversely impact the one-story properties to the north.

Ms. Rinker asked the Applicants what the height difference was between their proposal and the one-story residences north and just uphill from the property. Mr. Gaige replied that the new buildings will be taller than the one-story house, but even a two-story structure would be taller that it, and therefore they should not be limited in building height because even a two-story house would block the view of the existing one-story house. Mr. Harper mentioned that the grade increases rapidly going north on Mississippi Avenue, and that the houses two and three properties to the north will be higher than the roofline of the proposed new buildings. Mr. Harper mentioned that the existing driveway of the house to the north of the subject property combined with the paved portion of the new development will provide ample space between the new buildings and single-story house.

Mr. John White asked if it made sense to postpone the new construction request and only take action on the demolition request. Chair Thomas mentioned he had questions about this as well, but wanted to get to that after all Committee discussion about the request was finished.

Mr. Dan Fowler asked what the ground plane elevation of the front façade of the building was in comparison to the elevation of the sidewalk. Mr. Gaige replied that the ground plane of the building will be within one foot of elevation change to the sidewalk. Mr. Fowler commented that with the elevation change to the back of the property, a retaining wall would be needed and the back of the buildings will be set in the property, and the height may not be an issue. Mr. Fowler commented that regardless of the use, the large-scale Christoverson Building will still be used to visually compare new development, and scale-wise, Mr. Fowler felt the proposal was compatible.

Chair Thomas asked if there were any further questions from the Committee for the Applicant. Seeing none, the public hearing portion of this case was closed. Chair Thomas then asked the Committee for any further discussion of the request pertaining to consistency or inconsistency with the Standards and Design Guidelines. Because staff was not able to provide a recommendation regarding the new construction portion of the request, the Committee was given three options for handling this: 1) Postpone the request to provide Applicant the opportunity to revise the new construction proposal to meet the Standards and Design Guidelines; 2) Take CONCEPTUAL action on the request to approve as requested or approve with conditions; OR 3) Take action on the request to deny the request.

Mr. Simpson cited Sub-Section 11.6.3.c.3 of the Land Development Code, which refers to demolition consideration procedure, and stated it is not specific as to whether or not the Committee has to approve the new construction at the same time as the demolition decision. Regarding Mr. White’s suggestion to separate the request, in reviewing the demolition today and postponing the review for the new
construction, Mr. Simpson stated that the provision in the Code was ambiguous enough to allow this, if that is the pleasure of the Committee. Ms. Lynn Dennis and Ms. Rinker agreed with Mr. Simpson’s suggestion.

MOTION: Approval of the request to demolish the existing house on the subject property and postponement of the review of the proposed new construction request. (M. Rinker/ J. White, 7-0).

A. Other Business: None

B. Adjournment: There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:58 a.m.
1. **825 E ORANGE ST (Contributing Building)** - Installation of an 8' X 12' gable roofed shed, with LP SmartSide siding and a shingle roof, in the rear yard of the subject property. Subject to the following conditions: (HPB20-132)

2. **1115 S TENNESSEE AV (Contributing Building)** - Installation of 90 linear feet of 6 ft. vinyl privacy fence along the west side property line of the subject property, not to extend past the front façade of the house on the property. Subject to the following conditions: (HPB20-133)

3. **505 S RD 98 (Non-Contributing Building)** - Replacement of 3 existing fixed windows with Plygem 2000 series fixed vinyl windows matching opening size (FL#13841). Subject to the following conditions: (HPB20-134)

4. **506 W PARK ST (Non-Contributing Building)** - Sewer cap/demolition approval ONLY for the accessory building/detached garage and shed located behind the principal building at 502 W. Park Street. Subject to the following conditions: (HPB20-135)

5. **817 SOUTH BL (Non-Contributing Building)** - Replacement of a deteriorated metal stair on accessory structure with an aluminum stair in the same location at the rear of the subject property. Subject to the following conditions: (HPB20-136)
6. 345 CANNON ST (Non-Contributing Building) - 1. Replacement of all windows with Silverline V1/50 series vinyl single-hung sash windows (FL#14911) matching original window opening sizes.

2. Replacement of three exterior doors with Masonite fiberglass 3/4 lite door (FL#22513). Only the front door needs to have glazing. The rear/side doors may be solid panel doors.

Subject to the following conditions:
1. ALL WINDOWS SHALL BE RECESSED A MINIMUM OF 2 INCHES FROM THE EXTERIOR WALL FACE TO THE EXTERIOR WINDOW GLASS. FLUSH-MOUNTED REPLACEMENT WINDOWS ARE NOT PERMITTED.

2. FOR WINDOWS WITH SIMULATED DIVIDED LITES, MUNTINS (GRIDS/GRILLES) SHALL BE DIMENSIONAL AND MOUNTED TO THE EXTERIOR OF THE GLAZING (GLASS) WITH A MINIMUM SURFACE RELIEF OF A ¼ INCH. MUNTINS “SANDWICHED” BETWEEN DOUBLE-PANED GLAZING SHALL NOT BE PERMITTED, EXCEPT WHEN INSTALLED BENEATH EXTERIOR-MOUNTED MUNTINS.

3. ALL PAIRED OR GROUPED WINDOWS SHALL BE INSTALLED WITH A DIVIDING MULLION BETWEEN ADJOINING WINDOWS.

IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE APPLICANT TO ENSURE THAT THE WINDOWS INSTALLED ARE CONSISTENT WITH THE DESIGN AND METHOD OF INSTALLATION STATED ON THE CERTIFICATE OF REVIEW. FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH THESE CONDITIONS WILL RESULT IN DISAPPROVAL OF THE BUILDING PERMIT FINAL INSPECTION AND WILL REQUIRE COMPLIANT WINDOWS TO BE INSTALLED REGARDLESS OF FINANCIAL IMPACT TO THE APPLICANT. ACCEPTANCE OF A BUILDING PERMIT FOR REPLACEMENT WINDOWS CONSTITUTES APPLICANT’S ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THESE CONDITIONS.

WINDOW PRODUCTS STATED ON THE APPROVED BUILDING PERMIT SHALL NOT BE SUBSTITUTED OR REPLACED WITH A PRODUCT FROM A DIFFERENT MANUFACTURER, OR A DIFFERENT MODEL NUMBER FROM THE SAME MANUFACTURER, WITHOUT STAFF APPROVAL. (HPB20-137)
7. 612 W PATTERSON ST (Contributing Building) - Replacement of 50 windows matching original window opening size. 44 windows will be vinyl single-hung sash windows, model SH-610 (FL#17234.1) and 6 will be vinyl fixed windows, model PW-615 (FL#17354.1). All replacement windows will have exterior grids in a 4-over-1 lite configuration to match original windows.

Subject to the following conditions:
1. ALL WINDOWS SHALL BE RECESSED A MINIMUM OF 2 INCHES FROM THE EXTERIOR WALL FACE TO THE EXTERIOR WINDOW GLASS. FLUSH-MOUNTED REPLACEMENT WINDOWS ARE NOT PERMITTED.
2. FOR WINDOWS WITH SIMULATED DIVIDED LITES, MUNTINS (GRIDS/GRILLES) SHALL BE DIMENSIONAL AND MOUNTED TO THE EXTERIOR OF THE GLAZING (GLASS) WITH A MINIMUM SURFACE RELIEF OF A ¼ INCH. MUNTINS “SANDWICHED” BETWEEN DOUBLE-PANED GLAZING SHALL NOT BE PERMITTED, EXCEPT WHEN INSTALLED BENEATH EXTERIOR-MOUNTED MUNTINS.
3. ALL PAIRED OR GROUPED WINDOWS SHALL BE INSTALLED WITH A DIVIDING MULLION BETWEEN ADJOINING WINDOWS.

IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE APPLICANT TO ENSURE THAT THE WINDOWS INSTALLED ARE CONSISTENT WITH THE DESIGN AND METHOD OF INSTALLATION STATED ON THE CERTIFICATE OF REVIEW. FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH THESE CONDITIONS WILL RESULT IN DISAPPROVAL OF THE BUILDING PERMIT FINAL INSPECTION AND WILL REQUIRE COMPLIANT WINDOWS TO BE INSTALLED REGARDLESS OF FINANCIAL IMPACT TO THE APPLICANT. ACCEPTANCE OF A BUILDING PERMIT FOR REPLACEMENT WINDOWS CONSTITUTES APPLICANT’S ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THESE CONDITIONS.

WINDOW PRODUCTS STATED ON THE APPROVED BUILDING PERMIT SHALL NOT BE SUBSTITUTED OR REPLACED WITH A PRODUCT FROM A DIFFERENT MANUFACTURER, OR A DIFFERENT MODEL NUMBER FROM THE SAME MANUFACTURER, WITHOUT STAFF APPROVAL. (HPB20-138)
8. 411 WAVERLY PL (Non-Contributing Building) - Replacement of 16 double-hung sash windows with 16 Simonton/Ply Gem vinyl double-hung sash windows (FL#5167), matching sizes of original window opening.

Subject to the following conditions:

1. ALL WINDOWS SHALL BE RECESSED A MINIMUM OF 2 INCHES FROM THE EXTERIOR WALL FACE TO THE EXTERIOR WINDOW GLASS. FLUSH-MOUNTED REPLACEMENT WINDOWS ARE NOT PERMITTED.

2. FOR WINDOWS WITH SIMULATED DIVIDED LITES, MUNTINS (GRIDS/GRILLES) SHALL BE DIMENSIONAL AND MOUNTED TO THE EXTERIOR OF THE GLAZING (GLASS) WITH A MINIMUM SURFACE RELIEF OF A ¼ INCH. MUNTINS “SANDWICHED” BETWEEN DOUBLE-PANED GLAZING SHALL NOT BE PERMITTED, EXCEPT WHEN INSTALLED BENEATH EXTERIOR-MOUNTED MUNTINS.

3. ALL PAIRED OR GROUPED Windows SHALL BE INSTALLED WITH A DIVIDING MULLION BETWEEN ADJOINING WINDOWS.

IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE APPLICANT TO ENSURE THAT THE WINDOWS INSTALLED ARE CONSISTENT WITH THE DESIGN AND METHOD OF INSTALLATION STATED ON THE CERTIFICATE OF REVIEW. FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH THESE CONDITIONS WILL RESULT IN DISAPPROVAL OF THE BUILDING PERMIT FINAL INSPECTION AND WILL REQUIRE COMPLIANT WINDOWS TO BE INSTALLED REGARDLESS OF FINANCIAL IMPACT TO THE APPLICANT. ACCEPTANCE OF A BUILDING PERMIT FOR REPLACEMENT WINDOWS CONSTITUTES APPLICANT’S ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THESE CONDITIONS.

WINDOW PRODUCTS STATED ON THE APPROVED BUILDING PERMIT SHALL NOT BE SUBSTITUTED OR REPLACED WITH A PRODUCT FROM A DIFFERENT MANUFACTURER, OR A DIFFERENT MODEL NUMBER FROM THE SAME MANUFACTURER, WITHOUT STAFF APPROVAL. (HPB20-139)
1029 SOUTH BL (Contributing Building) - On the south side of the existing house, the "sitting room" will be decreased in size, and existing windows and doors removed, to accommodate a new bathroom. This side addition will be clad in either wood or fiber-cement siding in an exposure compatible with the vinyl siding currently existing on the house. In addition, three windows on the south side of the house will be replaced with aluminum single-hung sash windows with a one-over-one lite configuration.

Subject to the following conditions:

1. ALL WINDOWS SHALL BE RECESSED A MINIMUM OF 2 INCHES FROM THE EXTERIOR WALL FACE TO THE EXTERIOR WINDOW GLASS. FLUSH-MOUNTED REPLACEMENT WINDOWS ARE NOT PERMITTED.
2. FOR WINDOWS WITH SIMULATED DIVIDED LITES, MUNTINS (GRIDS/GRILLES) SHALL BE DIMENSIONAL AND MOUNTED TO THE EXTERIOR OF THE GLAZING (GLASS) WITH A MINIMUM SURFACE RELIEF OF A ¼ INCH. MUNTINS "SANDWICHED" BETWEEN DOUBLE-PANED GLAZING SHALL NOT BE PERMITTED, EXCEPT WHEN INSTALLED BENEATH EXTERIOR-MOUNTED MUNTINS.
3. ALL PAIRED OR GROUPED WINDOWS SHALL BE INSTALLED WITH A DIVIDING MULLION BETWEEN ADJOINING WINDOWS.

IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE APPLICANT TO ENSURE THAT THE WINDOWS INSTALLED ARE CONSISTENT WITH THE DESIGN AND METHOD OF INSTALLATION STATED ON THE CERTIFICATE OF REVIEW. FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH THESE CONDITIONS WILL RESULT IN DISAPPROVAL OF THE BUILDING PERMIT FINAL INSPECTION AND WILL REQUIRE COMPLIANT WINDOWS TO BE INSTALLED REGARDLESS OF FINANCIAL IMPACT TO THE APPLICANT. ACCEPTANCE OF A BUILDING PERMIT FOR REPLACEMENT WINDOWS CONSTITUTES APPLICANT’S ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THESE CONDITIONS.

WINDOW PRODUCTS STATED ON THE APPROVED BUILDING PERMIT SHALL NOT BE SUBSTITUTED OR REPLACED WITH A PRODUCT FROM A DIFFERENT MANUFACTURER, OR A DIFFERENT MODEL NUMBER FROM THE SAME MANUFACTURER, WITHOUT STAFF APPROVAL. (HPB20-142)

526 FRANCIS BL (Non-Contributing Building) - Replacement of existing metal casement windows with seven (7) PVC single hung windows (FL#17234) and six (6) PVC horizontal slider windows (FL#17355)

The replacement windows were installed prior to receiving permit approval. Mr. Kevin Jones with Connor Exteriors and more contacted me on 8/24/20 to see what could be done, as the replacement windows did not match the appearance of the original metal casement windows. After Mr. Jones submitted photos of all sides of the house showing the replacement windows, it was evident that the house has had many alterations that compromise its historic integrity. While this house was considered contributing at the time of the Biltmore-Cumberland Historic District survey, the alterations that currently exist have removed its historic integrity, and therefore, the replacement windows may remain as-is.

Subject to the following conditions: (HPB20-143)
11. 1016 SOUTH BL (Contributing Building) - Scope of work includes the restoration of the enclosed front porch back into an open front porch retaining original character-defining features, such as porch columns and plinths. The front door replacement consists of a quarter-lite door.

(Work done without a building permit; this Certificate of Review is being issued after this work was completed.)

Subject to the following conditions: (HPB20-145)
### REQUEST

On behalf of Merlin Properties of Central Florida, LLC, Ms. Paramo requests approval to build a single-family house on the subject property.

### SUMMARY OF BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The subject property consists of one lot of record (Dixieland Subdivision, Block P, Lot 25, platted 1907) and is 0.15 acres (50’ wide X 127.43’ deep) in area size. An improved alley exists along the northern boundary of the subject property. While this lot is a historically platted lot in the Dixieland Subdivision, it had been combined legally with 609 Ariana Street (Lot 26) to the east, and was split from this lot recently.

The Applicant proposes to build a single-story, single-family house on the subject property, which will have 1,969 square feet of living space. This home features a Bungalow aesthetic expressed by a gable-front roof with hipped rear roof, a gabled front porch supported by square columns with simple capitals and bases. A hipped roof extends from the front porch roof, and covers the left side of the front façade.

Materials proposed for the new house includes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>Concrete stem wall with 21” foundation above grade; smooth texture stucco on foundation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Cladding</td>
<td>HardiePlank lap siding with Cedarmill wood grain texture in a 6” exposure. HardiePanel vertical siding in the front porch gable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trim/Casing/Frieze</td>
<td>HardieTrim smooth boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Vinyl single-hung sash with a 1/1 lite configuration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doors</td>
<td>Fiberglass quarter-lite front door and 2-panel solid rear door</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof/ Gable Vent</td>
<td>Asphalt architectural shingles on 5/12 pitch roof. Vinyl triangular gable vent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fascia/Soffit</td>
<td>Hardie fascia and vented soffit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porch</td>
<td>Finished concrete floor and steps; HardieTrim used to finish columns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Paint Colors</td>
<td>Body: Valspar Crafted White (3007-6C); Trim: Valspar Winter in Paris (5002-1A); Accent( door): Valspar Very Black (5011-2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The site plan proposed for the new houses shows orientation of the home’s front facade towards Ariana Street, with two parking spaces located in the rear yard and accessible from the alley. The proposed building setbacks meet the Land Development Code’s Urban Neighborhood Standards.

**APPLICABLE GUIDELINES:**


The following Standards apply to this request:

- Standard #9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale, and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

The following Design Guidelines apply to this project:

Chapter 4, page 4.1 to 4.9.

- Proportion – the scale and massing of the new building, including its fenestration, roof height and shape, and elevation should be consistent with surrounding contributing buildings.
- Building Form – the front façade of buildings should be closely aligned with other buildings on the block to maintain a uniform setback; consistent spacing of buildings maintains rhythm of historic neighborhood development pattern; the height-to-width ratio of street facing façade should be compatible with adjacent buildings.
- Orientation of new buildings should be toward the primary road and building setbacks should reflect traditional siting dimensions.
- Materials should respect adjacent historic buildings.
- Details and ornamentation should reflect those of surrounding buildings.
- Window material, style, size, and trim should be consistent with historic windows and include dimensional mullions and exterior muntins, if applicable.
- Doors should be of an appropriate design reflective of the architectural style of the building.
- Roof design and details should reflect those of surrounding buildings.
- Colors should complement surrounding buildings.

**ANALYSIS:**

Adjacent to the subject property along Ariana Street exist several single-family, one-story houses that exhibit the Bungalow, Frame Vernacular, and modern masonry vernacular styles. Staff finds that the proposed new house is similar in massing and scale to contributing Bungalow and Frame Vernacular houses throughout the Dixieland Historic District. The building form, scale, and proportion of architectural elements, including roof pitch and floor-to-ceiling height, is compatible with adjacent structures.

Staff also finds that the proposed materials are consistent with residences in the surrounding neighborhood and the Design Guidelines. The design of the house features a neo-traditional style that is compatible with the architectural character of the District. Elements such as the gable-front porch with simple columns, lap siding with corner boards, and one-over-one windows, are consistent with historical architectural styles found in the neighborhood, as well as the Design Guidelines. Fenestration and trim are also compatible.
For further compatibility, staff recommends the use of a triangular gable vent with a 90-degree lattice appearance that is placed flush with the apex of the top gable, instead of the proposed vinyl gable vent that is proposed. Additionally, a soffit that is angled to the pitch of the roof is recommended, in order to avoid the appearance of “pork chop” eave returns and produce a straight eave.

Finally, the proposed placement of the house on the lot is consistent with the Design Guidelines and Urban Form Standards in terms of orientation, building setbacks, foundation height, porch depth, and placement of parking.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

As the requested new construction meets the Standards and Design Guidelines, staff recommends final approval of the request with the following conditions, to be reviewed and approved by staff prior to permitting:

1. Windows must be recessed to provide a shadowline and not installed flush to the exterior wall surface;
2. Use a triangular wood or fiber-cement gable vent with a 90-degree lattice appearance placed flush with the apex of the top gable; and
3. Use an angled soffit to avoid creating “pork chop” appearance eaves.

Report prepared by: Emily M. Foster, Senior Planner, Historic Preservation Liaison to the Historic Preservation Board
BuildBlock ICFs

6" Straight Block

- Product Specifications

**BB-400 Specifications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specification</th>
<th>Imperial</th>
<th>Metric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Product Code</td>
<td>BB-400</td>
<td>96 x 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length</td>
<td>8 ft.</td>
<td>2400 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height</td>
<td>10&quot; (Core)</td>
<td>254 mm (50mm Core)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height</td>
<td>20&quot;</td>
<td>508 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Volume</td>
<td>0.7660 cu ft (21.0511 m³)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>1.91 lb/ft³</td>
<td>0.9764 kg/m³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPS Dimensions</td>
<td>2.5&quot; x 2.5&quot;</td>
<td>64 x 64 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight (per panel)</td>
<td>5 lbs.</td>
<td>2.268 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPS Foam Density (lbs. ft³)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>246.07/60 kg/m³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight (per bundle)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bundle Specifications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specification</th>
<th>Imperial</th>
<th>Metric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bundle Dimensions</td>
<td>9.5 x 40 x 40</td>
<td>240 x 1016 x 1016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bundle Length</td>
<td>20&quot;</td>
<td>508 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bundle Width</td>
<td>20&quot;</td>
<td>508 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bundle Height</td>
<td>20&quot;</td>
<td>508 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bundle Weight</td>
<td>45 lbs.</td>
<td>20.4 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bundle Per Bundle</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Energy Efficiency Specifications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specification</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insual R-Value</td>
<td>4 R-6 Per inch of EPS Foam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studs R-Value</td>
<td>4 R-6 Per inch of EPS Foam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceiling R-Value</td>
<td>4 R-6 Per inch of EPS Foam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steady State R-Value</td>
<td>2-1 Foam Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-Value</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Absorption</td>
<td>Less than 3% (ASTM C279)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Vapor</td>
<td>30.5 perms per m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Safety Specifications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specification</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Compressive Strength (psi)</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Hot Temperature Range</td>
<td>22°F (-5°C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Rating</td>
<td>300 ft to 12,000 psi per one test for 3 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound Class Rating</td>
<td>48 with 1/2-inch sheetrock on one side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound Class Rating</td>
<td>48 with 1/2-inch sheetrock on both sides</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

William H Roberts

[Signature]

[Handwritten]
2017 Florida Building Code - Residential, Sixth Edition

CHAPTER 4 FOUNDATIONS

TABLE 4H1.4-1
PRESSURE-PRF LOAD-BEARING VALUES OF FOUNDATION MATERIALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS OF MATERIAL</th>
<th>LOAD-BEARING PRESSURE (psf)</th>
<th>R value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refractory and Slag</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Fill, at least 4-ft.-thick.</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone Fill, at least 4-ft.-thick.</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravel, sand or similar material.</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Refractory and Slag fill shall be considered as part of the foundation system.

2. A minimum bearing pressure of 700 psf is required for stone fill.

3. This table is intended to provide a general guide. Exact pressures may vary based on local codes and conditions.

(TYP) FOUNDATION NOTES

A. THICK REINFORCED CONCRETE SLAB (E-6764) 1-W, OR FIBER REINFORCED: O/1-M4 VAPOUR BARRIER OVER CLEAN CONTRACTED TREATED EARTH FILL.

B. CONTRACTOR TO ENSURE THAT THE EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS ARE SUITABLE TO ERECT THIS BUILDING BASED ON 1500 psf PER SQUARE FOOT SOIL BEARING PRESSURE.

C. CONCRETE SLAB TO ACHIEVE MINIMUM COMPRESSION STRENGTH OF 2000 PSI WITHIN 28 DAYS AFTER POUR.

D. SOIL UNDER SLAB TO BE POISONED AND TAMPERED TO MEET ALL COMPACTION REQUIREMENTS.

E. FOOTINGS TO BE DETERMINED ACCORDING TO SIZE OF STRUCTURE (SEE FOOTING DETAILS)
REQUEST

On behalf of Merlin Properties of Central Florida, LLC, Ms. Paramo requests approval to build a single-family house on the subject property.

SUMMARY OF BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The subject property consists of one lot of record (Dixieland Subdivision, Block L, Lot 9, platted 1907) and is 0.16 acres (50’ wide X 135’ deep) in area size. An improved alley exists along the southern boundary of the subject property. While this lot is a historically platted lot in the Dixieland Subdivision, it had been combined legally with 202 W. Belmar Avenue (Lot 8) to the east, and was split from this lot recently.

The Applicant proposes to build a single-story, single-family house on the subject property, which will have 1,969 square feet of living space. This home features a Bungalow aesthetic expressed by a gable-front roof with hipped rear roof, a gabled front porch supported by square columns with simple capitals and bases. A hipped roof extends from the front porch roof, and covers the left side of the front façade.

Materials proposed for the new house includes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>Concrete stem wall with 21” foundation above grade; smooth texture stucco on foundation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Cladding</td>
<td>HardiePlank lap siding with Cedarmill wood grain texture in a 6” exposure. HardiePanel vertical siding in the front porch gable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trim/Casing/Frieze</td>
<td>HardieTrim smooth boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Vinyl single-hung sash with a 1/1 lite configuration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doors</td>
<td>Fiberglass quarter-lite front door and 2-panel solid rear door</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof/Gable Vent</td>
<td>Asphalt architectural shingles on 5/12 pitch roof. Vinyl triangular gable vent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fascia/Soffit</td>
<td>Hardie fascia and vented soffit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porch</td>
<td>Finished concrete floor and steps; HardieTrim used to finish columns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Paint Colors</td>
<td>Body: Valspar Lighthouse Shadows (4008-3B); Trim: Valspar Dove White (7002-7); Accent(Door): Valspar Grecian Helmet (3006-9A)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The site plan proposed for the new houses shows orientation of the home’s front facade towards Ariana Street, with two parking spaces located in the rear yard and accessible from the alley. The proposed building setbacks meet the Land Development Code’s Urban Neighborhood Standards.

**APPLICABLE GUIDELINES:**


The following *Standards* apply to this request:

Standard #9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale, and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

The following *Design Guidelines* apply to this project:

Chapter 4, page 4.1 to 4.9.

- **Proportion** – the scale and massing of the new building, including its fenestration, roof height and shape, and elevation should be consistent with surrounding contributing buildings.
- **Building Form** – the front façade of buildings should be closely aligned with other buildings on the block to maintain a uniform setback; consistent spacing of buildings maintains rhythm of historic neighborhood development pattern; the height-to-width ratio of street facing façade should be compatible with adjacent buildings.
- **Orientation of new buildings** should be toward the primary road and building setbacks should reflect traditional siting dimensions.
- **Materials** should respect adjacent historic buildings.
- **Details and ornamentation** should reflect those of surrounding buildings.
- **Window material, style, size, and trim** should be consistent with historic windows and include dimensional mullions and exterior muntins, if applicable.
- **Doors** should be of an appropriate design reflective of the architectural style of the building.
- **Roof design and details** should reflect those of surrounding buildings
- **Colors** should complement surrounding buildings.

**ANALYSIS:**

Adjacent to the subject property along Ariana Street exist several single-family, one-story houses that exhibit the Bungalow, Frame Vernacular, and modern masonry vernacular styles. Staff finds that the proposed new house is similar in massing and scale to contributing Bungalow and Frame Vernacular houses throughout the Dixieland Historic District. The building form, scale, and proportion of architectural elements, including roof pitch and floor-to-ceiling height, is compatible with adjacent structures.

Staff also finds that the proposed materials are consistent with residences in the surrounding neighborhood and the Design Guidelines. The design of the house features a neo-traditional style that is compatible with the architectural character of the District. Elements such as the gable-front porch with simple columns, lap siding with corner boards, and one-over-one windows, are consistent with historical architectural styles found in the neighborhood, as well as the Design Guidelines. Fenestration and trim are also compatible.
For further compatibility, staff recommends the use of a triangular gable vent with a 90-degree lattice appearance that is placed flush with the apex of the top gable, instead of the proposed vinyl gable vent that is proposed. Additionally, a soffit that is angled to the pitch of the roof is recommended, in order to avoid the appearance of “pork chop” eave returns and produce a straight eave.

Finally, the proposed placement of the house on the lot is consistent with the Design Guidelines and Urban Form Standards in terms of orientation, building setbacks, foundation height, porch depth, and placement of parking.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

As the requested new construction meets the Standards and Design Guidelines, staff recommends final approval of the request with the following conditions, to be reviewed and approved by staff prior to permitting:

1. Windows must be recessed to provide a shadowline and not installed flush to the exterior wall surface;
2. Use a triangular wood or fiber-cement gable vent with a 90-degree lattice appearance placed flush with the apex of the top gable; and
3. Use an angled soffit to avoid creating “pork chop” appearance eaves.

Report prepared by: Emily M. Foster, Senior Planner, Historic Preservation Liaison to the Historic Preservation Board
Project # | HPB20-140
---|---
Project Type | Addition, New Siding, Replacement Windows
Property Address | 818 Mississippi Avenue
Historic District; FMSF# | South Lake Morton Historic District; #SLM 13-28
Owner/Applicant | Kevin and Laura Shannon
Design Professional | Patrick Panton Design Inc.
Zoning; Context District; Future Land Use; SPI | RA-4; Urban Neighborhood; Residential Medium; South Lake Morton SPI
Existing Use | Residential
Adjacent Properties | Residential

REQUEST

Mr. and Mrs. Shannon request approval to build an addition onto the rear of the house on the subject property, as well as to replace the existing wood siding and windows of the house.

SUMMARY OF BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The subject property consists of one lot of record (Orange Park Addition Subdivision, Block A, Lot 18, platted 1912) and is 0.24 acres (50’ wide X 204.6’ deep) in area size. An alley exists at the rear of this lot. On the subject property is a one-story Bungalow house, built circa 1922, which is a contributing building in the South Lake Morton Historic District. Character-defining features of this house include the gable roof with large gable vent, a hipped-roof front porch supported by tapered stucco porch columns, and double-hung sash wood windows with a four-over-one lite configuration.

The Applicants’ request proposes to demolish the existing rear elevation of the house and existing rear deck, and build a single-story addition to the rear of the house, consisting of 755 square feet of living space and 236 square feet of outdoor space in the form of a covered rear porch. The addition will be stepped in on the south side elevation to meet minimum building setbacks, as well as to provide a separation between the original house and addition. The addition will consist of typical wood frame construction, and will feature a gable roofline with a gable vent and a hipped roof over the rear porch, to match the front facade. Materials proposed for the new house include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>Concrete stem wall foundation to match elevation of existing house; concrete block foundation skirting with vents to match existing house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Cladding</td>
<td>Hardie plank lap siding with a 5” exposure, similar to the wood siding of the house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trim/Casing</td>
<td>4” Hardie trim/casing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Vinyl double-hung sash with a 4/1 lite configuration (exterior-mounted muntins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doors</td>
<td>Fiberglass half-lite side door; fiberglass 10-lite French doors on rear elevation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof/ Gable Vent</td>
<td>Architectural shingles on 5/12 pitch roof to match existing; gable vent material TBD; exposed rafter tails to match existing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Applicants also propose to re-side the original portion of the house in Hardie plank lap siding with a 5-inch exposure to add insulation to the exterior walls, as well as replace the original wood windows of the house with vinyl double-hung sash windows with a four-over-one lite configuration and exterior mounted muntins.

The site plan shows that building setbacks for the new addition will meet the Land Development Code’s Urban Neighborhood Standards.

APPLICABLE GUIDELINES:


The following Standards apply to this project:

Standard #9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale, and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

Standard #10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

The following Design Guidelines apply to this project: Chapter 5: Rehabilitation of Contributing Buildings.

- Architectural details should be compatible with the architectural style of the building’s original design.
- Use the wall finish most acceptable for the architectural style; exterior siding should be similar in style to the original.
- If siding is replaced, all trim board dimensions and joinery details should be maintained and kept visible.
- One alternative for wood is fiber cement, a mixture of Portland cement, cellulose or wood fiber material, sand, and other components. It can be formed into a variety of siding patterns, have a smooth or embossed face, or be textured for a cedar look. These products may be used as a replacement material or for new construction.
- Windows and doors should reflect the architectural style of the building.
- Window and door openings should be kept in the same proportion as original provided; window and door heights should be consistent throughout the building.
- Existing windows, doors, cornices, siding, brackets, and other decorative details contributing to the building’s character should be retained.
- Window and door openings should be kept in the same proportion as originally provided. Window and door head heights should be consistent throughout the building.
- Replacement windows should retain the same pane patterns as the original. Possible substitutes must be approved by the Historic Preservation Board.
- Decoration and trim should be appropriate to the architectural style and the specific building; in Bungalows, rafter ends, exposed beams, decoratively cut ends, and elaborate brackets should be retained or replaced. Respect all trim elements, shingle work, or ventilation louvers in decorative designs.
• Building additions should be limited to the rear of the main building; the roof pitch of the addition should match or be lower than the original roof pitch. All façade elements need to continue architectural elements and detail.

ANALYSIS:

In evaluating the request with the Standards, staff finds that the addition does not disturb the spatial relationships of the house, and the essential form and integrity of the existing house is maintained. New but similar materials will be used, which will provide some differentiation between the original house and addition.

In evaluating the request with the Design Guidelines, the materials of the proposed addition reflect materials similar to the original materials of the house and are compatible with the Guidelines. The design of trim, casing, corner boards, windows, doors, and roof pitch, overhang and exposed rafter tails, are consistent with the style of the subject house and Guidelines. Furthermore, the addition is appropriately placed to the rear of the house.

Staff also finds the request for new Hardie plank lap siding on the house to be consistent with the Design Guidelines, as long as all corner boards, frieze or other trim boards, and window and door trim and casing are either salvaged and reused, or replicated in dimension and profile in fiber cement material. While window replacement with specific conditions is permitted by the Design Guidelines, staff strongly recommends that the Applicants reconsider replacing the original wood windows of the house, as these are character-defining features that were likely custom made to fit the window openings of this house and are historic building fabric. With several window restoration companies available in Central Florida, staff recommends that the Applicants explore the repair and restoration of the original wood windows before replacement.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

As the request generally meets the Standards and Design Guidelines, staff recommends Final Approval of the request with the following conditions, to be reviewed by staff prior to permitting:

1. Replacement siding shall use corner boards, frieze or other trim boards, and window and door trim and casing that matches the original in dimension and profile;
2. Consider repairing and restoring the original double-hung sash wood windows prior to replacing;
3. New and Replacement windows must:
   a. Be recessed to provide a shadow line and profile depth and may not be flush mounted;
   b. Have exterior-mounted muntins matching the four-over-one divided lite appearance; and
   c. Paired windows must maintain a vertical dividing mullion matching the width of the historical mullion for replacement windows and at least 4” wide for new window openings.

Report prepared by: Emily M. Foster, MAHP, AICP
Senior Planner, Historic Preservation
Liaison to the Historic Preservation Board
REQUEST

On behalf of Hulbert Homes, Inc., Ms. Holland requests approval to build a single-family house on the subject property.

SUMMARY OF BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The subject property consists of one lot of record (Orange Park Addition Subdivision, Block A, Lot 18, platted 1912) and is 0.24 acres (50’ wide X 204.6’ deep) in area size. An alley exists behind this lot. This property

The Applicant proposes to build a single-story, single-family house on the subject property, which will have 1,908 square feet of living space. This home features a neo-traditional aesthetic expressed by a hip roof and gabled ell, integrated front porch supported by square columns on brick plinths, and windows with a six-over-six Colonial-style simulated divided-lite grid. At the rear of the house is an integrated patio and an attached, double-car garage.

Materials proposed for the new house include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>Concrete stem wall with 12” foundation above grade; cementitious finish on foundation except for brick foundation at front façade and portions of side facades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Cladding</td>
<td>HardiePlank lap siding with a 7” exposure on the front façade and wood board and batten siding in the front gable. Cementitious siding on all other facades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trim/Casing</td>
<td>HardieTrim boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Aluminum single-hung sash with a 6/6 lite configuration on the front façade and 1/1 lite configuration on all other facades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doors</td>
<td>Fiberglass 6-panel solid front door and full lite rear door</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof/ Gable Vent</td>
<td>Asphalt architectural shingles on 4/12 pitch roof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fascia/Soffit</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porch</td>
<td>Finished concrete floor and steps; HardieTrim used to finish columns; brick column bases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Paint Colors</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The site plan proposed for the new houses shows orientation of the home’s front facade towards Johnson Avenue, with a driveway placed on the northern side of the property, which leads to a concrete parking area in the rear yard and the rear-loaded attached garage. The proposed building setbacks meet the Land Development Code’s Urban Neighborhood Standards.

**APPLICABLE GUIDELINES:**

_The Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation (“Standards”) and the City of Lakeland’s Design Guidelines: A Guide to the Exterior Design of Buildings in the Dixieland, Beacon Hill, East Lake Morton, South Lake Morton, Lake Hunter Terrace, and Biltmore/Cumberland Historic Districts (“Design Guidelines”) are the basis for review per the City of Lakeland Land Development Code (“LDC”), Article 11: Historic Preservation Standards._

The following **Standards** apply to this request:

- Standard #9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale, and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

The following **Design Guidelines** apply to this project:

- Chapter 4, page 4.1 to 4.9.
  - Proportion – the scale and massing of the new building, including its fenestration, roof height and shape, and elevation should be consistent with surrounding contributing buildings.
  - Building Form – the front façade of buildings should be closely aligned with other buildings on the block to maintain a uniform setback; consistent spacing of buildings maintains rhythm of historic neighborhood development pattern; the height-to-width ratio of street facing façade should be compatible with adjacent buildings.
  - Orientation of new buildings should be toward the primary road and building setbacks should reflect traditional siting dimensions.
  - Materials should respect adjacent historic buildings.
  - Details and ornamentation should reflect those of surrounding buildings.
  - Window material, style, size, and trim should be consistent with historic windows and include dimensional mullions and exterior muntins, if applicable.
  - Doors should be of an appropriate design reflective of the architectural style of the building.
  - Roof design and details should reflect those of surrounding buildings
  - Colors should complement surrounding buildings.

**ANALYSIS:**

Except for the non-contributing duplex across the street from the subject property, the 800 block of Johnson Avenue reflects several one- and two-story, single-family houses exhibiting the Bungalow architectural style. Staff finds that while the massing of the proposed new construction is similar to adjacent one-story houses, the scale and proportion of building features does not reflect the adjacent Bungalows and would detract from the historical and architectural cohesiveness of this block. Staff also finds that while the materials used on the front façade are consistent with the Design Guidelines, these materials are not continued to the side and rear elevations as is typical, and adequate window casing has not been provided on these elevations. Fenestration size and placement is generally compatible, however.

For compatibility with adjacent, contributing houses and consistency with the Design Guidelines for New Construction, staff recommends the following changes to the design of the proposed house:
• Increase the foundation height of the house to 21” above grade, and the front porch height to at least 18” above grade (LDC Urban Form Standards requirement).
• Increase the roof pitch to 5/12, similar to adjacent houses.
• Use lap siding with no more than a 6-inch exposure on all four elevations of the house, compatible with historical construction methods of adjacent homes.
• Use a frieze board of at least 8 inches wide to separate the front gable from the horizontal siding.
• Use a front door with a rectangular half-lit or quarter-lit appearance; solid front doors are not appropriate for use in the historic districts.
• Properly align the front porch columns and capitals with the upper beam entablature.
• The brick veneer on the side elevations does not need to be used past the front porch area.
• Use windows in either a 1-over-1 lite configuration or a 6-over-1 configuration on all windows of the house; suggest not using a 6-over-6 lite configuration due to difficulty in achieving exterior-mounted muntins on the lower sash of a single-hung sash window.
• For paired windows, use a vertical dividing mullion between the window units of at least 3 inches in width.
• Use the window trim and casing that is featured on front façade of house on all facades.
• Suggest using a gable roofline on front façade instead of a hipped roof, as the gable profile more accurately reflects the Bungalow style.

Finally, the proposed placement of the house on the lot is consistent with the Design Guidelines and Urban Form Standards in terms of orientation, building setbacks, porch depth, and placement of parking. However, due to the large amount of side and rear yard space allotted for the driveway, parking area, and garage, which is not a typical arrangement for a single-family home in this District and could potentially create problems with the use of the property in the future, staff suggests redesigning the house to include either a side-loaded garage on the rear elevation of the house, or a detached garage placed in the northeast corner of the rear yard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Due to the number of changes recommended by staff to the design of the requested new single-family house, staff recommends Conceptual Approval of the request with the following conditions:

1. Increase the foundation height of the house to 21” above grade, and the front porch height to at least 18” above grade (LDC requirement);
2. Increase the roof pitch to 5/12, similar to adjacent houses;
3. Use lap siding with no more than a 6-inch exposure on all four elevations of the house, compatible with historical construction methods of adjacent homes;
4. Use a frieze board of at least 8 inches wide to separate the front gable from the horizontal siding.
5. Use a front door with a rectangular half-lit or quarter-lit appearance; solid front doors are not appropriate for use in the historic districts;
6. Properly align the front porch columns and capitals with the upper beam entablature;
7. The brick veneer on the side elevations does not need to be used past the front porch area;
8. Use windows in either a 1-over-1 lite configuration or a 6-over-1 configuration on all windows of the house; suggest not using a 6-over-6 lite configuration due to difficulty in achieving exterior-mounted muntins on the lower sash of a single-hung sash window;
9. For paired windows, use a vertical dividing mullion between the window units of at least 3 inches in width;
10. Use the window trim and casing that is featured on front façade of house on all facades;
11. Provide the material(s) to be used on the soffit and fascia of house;
12. Provide an exterior paint color palette;
13. Suggest using a gable roofline on front façade instead of a hipped roof, as the gable profile more accurately reflects the Bungalow style; and

14. Suggest redesigning the house to include either a side-loaded garage on the rear elevation of the house, or a detached garage placed in the northeast corner of the rear yard, to reflect historical residential siting.

The Applicant is kindly instructed to revise the request according to these conditions and resubmit the revised design for Final Approval at an upcoming or future Design Review Committee meeting.

Report prepared by: Emily M. Foster, MAHP, AICP
Senior Planner, Historic Preservation
Liaison to the Historic Preservation Board
THE CLIENT UNDERSTANDS THAT THE DESIGNER CARRIES NO LIABILITY INSURANCE AND THEREFORE AGREE TO HOLD HARMLESS, INDEMNIFY, AND EXPENSES (INCLUDING REASONABLE ATTORNEY FEES) ARISING OUT OF OR RESULTING FROM THE PROJECT. THE DESIGNER WILL IN GOOD FAITH ATTEMPT TO PROVIDE ERROR FREE CONSTRUCTION DRAWINGS, BUT IN THE EVENT ERRORS OCCUR THE DESIGNER WILL NOT BE LIABLE FOR COST OF REPAIRS OR DELAY TO THE CONSTRUCTION.
EXTERIOR LATH, WEEP, & WATER RESISTIVE BARRIER NOTES:

1. EXTERIOR PLASTER.
   INSTALLATION OF THESE MATERIALS SHALL BE IN COMPLIANCE WITH ASTM C 926 AND ASTM C 1063 AND THE PROVISIONS OF THIS CODE.

2. LATH.
   ALL LATH AND LATH ATTACHMENTS SHALL BE OF CORROSION-RESISTANT MATERIALS. EXPANDED METAL OR WOVEN WIRE LATH SHALL BE ATTACHED WITH 1 1/2-INCH-LONG (38 MM), 11 GAGE NAILS HAVING A 7/16-INCH (11.1 MM) HEAD, OR 7/8-INCH LONG (22.2 MM), 16 GAGE STAPLES, SPACED AT NO MORE THAN 6 INCHES (152 MM), OR AS OTHERWISE APPROVED.

3. PLASTER.
   PLASTERING WITH PORTLAND CEMENT PLASTER SHALL BE NOT LESS THAN THREE COATS WHEN APPLIED OVER METAL LATH OR WIRE LATH AND SHALL BE NOT LESS THAN TWO COATS WHEN APPLIED OVER MASONRY, CONCRETE, PRESSURE-PRESERVATIVE TREATED WOOD OR DECAY-RESISTANT WOOD AS SPECIFIED IN SECTION R317.1 OR GYPSUM BACKING. IF THE PLASTER SURFACE IS COMPLETELY COVERED BY VENEER OR OTHER FACING MATERIAL OR IS COMPLETELY CONCEALED, PLASTER APPLICATION NEED BE ONLY TWO COATS, PROVIDED THE TOTAL THICKNESS IS AS SET FORTH IN TABLE R702.1(1). THE PROPORTION OF AGGREGATE TO CEMENTITIOUS MATERIALS SHALL BE AS SET FORTH IN TABLE 4.

4. WEEP SCREENS.
   A MINIMUM 0.019-INCH (0.5 MM) (NO. 26 GALVANIZED SHEET GAGE), CORROSION-RESISTANT WEEP SCREED OR PLASTIC TOP OF WALL 9'-4" 8'-0" TOP OF WIND. 7'-4" WEEP SCREED, WITH A MINIMUM VERTICAL ATTACHMENT FLANGE OF 3 1/2 INCHES (89 MM) SHALL BE PROVIDED AT OR BELOW THE FOUNDATION PLATE LINE ON EXTERIOR STUD WALLS IN ACCORDANCE WITH ASTM C 926. THE WEEP SCREED SHALL BE PLACED A MINIMUM OF 4 INCHES (102 MM) ABOVE THE EARTH OR 2 INCHES (51 MM) ABOVE PAVED AREAS AND SHALL BE OF A TYPE THAT WILL ALLOW TRAPPED WATER TO DRAIN TO THE EXTERIOR OF THE BUILDING. THE WEATHER-RESISTANT BARRIER SHALL LAP THE ATTACHMENT FLANGE. THE EXTERIOR LATH SHALL COVER AND TERMINATE ON THE ATTACHMENT FLANGE OF THE WEEP SCREED.

5. WATER-RESISTIVE BARRIERS.
   WATER-RESISTIVE BARRIERS SHALL BE INSTALLED AS REQUIRED IN SECTION R703.2 AND, WHERE APPLIED OVER BRICK CAP, WOOD-BASED SHEATHING, SHALL INCLUDE A WATER-RESISTIVE VAPOR-PERMEABLE BARRIER WITH A PERFORMANCE AT LEAST EQUIVALENT TO TWO LAYERS OF GRADE D PAPER. THE INDIVIDUAL LAYERS SHALL BE INSTALLED INDEPENDENTLY SUCH THAT EACH LAYER PROVIDES A SEPARATE CONTINUOUS PLANE AND ANY FLASHING (INSTALLED IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION R703.8) INTENDED TO DRAIN TO THE WATER-RESISTIVE BARRIER IS DIRECTED BETWEEN THE LAYERS. AN EXCEPTION: WHERE THE WATER-RESISTIVE BARRIER THAT IS APPLIED OVER WOOD-BASED SHEATHING HAS A WATER RESISTANCE EQUAL TO OR GREATER THAN THAT OF 60-MINUTE GRADE D PAPER AND IS SEPARATED FROM THE STUCCO BY AN INTERVING, SUBSTANTIALLY NONWATER-AbsORBING LAYER OR DESIGNED DRAINAGE SPACE.