AGENDA
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
City Commission Chambers
October 22, 2020 8:30 A.M.

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 September 24, 2020 Historic Preservation Board meeting minutes.

III. Old Business:

   A. Design Guidelines Project Update by staff.

IV. New Business:

   A. Board Member Update by staff

V. Adjourn for Design Review Committee.
MINUTES

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
Virtual Meeting
Thursday, September 24, 2020
8:30 a.m.

(Please note: These meeting minutes comply with FS 286.011 and are not intended to be a verbatim transcript.)

The City of Lakeland Historic Preservation Board met in Regular Session; Tim Calhoon (Chair), Nick Thomas (Vice Chair), Lynn Dennis, Christopher McMachen, Jeremy Moses, 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; and Christelle Burrola, Office Support Specialist II, were present. Jerrod Simpson, Assistant City Attorney, was also present.

I. Call to Order and Determination of a Quorum

Chair Tim Calhoon called the September 24, 2020 meeting of the Historic Preservation Board (“Board”) to order at 8:34 a.m. A quorum was reached, as six Board members were present.

II. Review and Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes

Mr. John White motioned to approve the August 27, 2020 meeting minutes as submitted. Ms. Lynn Dennis seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously 6-0.

III. Old Business:

A. Update on Design Guidelines Project. Ms. Emily Foster stated that the final draft Design Guidelines document was submitted by the consultant team on August 31st, and has been posted on the City’s website for public review. The Design Guidelines Sub-Committee met on September 18th, provided initial comments, and were supportive of this document. Ms. Foster explained the public outreach strategy currently underway for this project, and that the public comment period is expected to end on October 31st after two neighborhood meetings and one public meeting. In November, the Design Guidelines document will be revised to reflect applicable comments and feedback received during the public comment period, and is anticipated to be adopted by the Board at their December 17th meeting.

IV. New Business:

A. Mr. Landis Fleming and Mr. Christopher McMachen were introduced and welcomed to the Board as new members.

B. Annual Nomination and Election of Chairpersons.

   i. Ms. Lynn Dennis motioned to nominate and elect Mr. Dan Fowler as Historic Preservation Board Chair. Mr. Nick Thomas seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved, 6-0.

   ii. Mr. Tim Calhoon motioned to nominate and elect Mr. Nick Thomas as Design Review Committee Chair. Ms. Lynn Dennis seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved, 6-0.

V. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 8:47 a.m. for the Design Review Committee.
AGENDA
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
City Commission Chambers
October 22, 2020, immediately following the Historic Preservation Board Meeting

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 September 24, 2020 Design Review Committee meeting minutes.

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

IV. Consideration of Certificate of Review Applications:

A. HPB20-066 – 923 E. Lemon Street – Final Approval requested for an amendment to the previously approved Certificate of Review for the design of a five-building apartment complex at this address. Owner: Mr. Jason Lewis. Applicant: The Lunz Group.

B. HPB20-122 – 24 Lake Hollingsworth Drive – Final Approval requested for the new construction of four new residential structures at this address. Request continued from August 27, 2020. Owner/Applicant: Mr. Mark MacDonald.

C. HPB20-157 – 1811 Pawnee Trail – Final Approval requested for the enclosure of five window openings on the south side elevation of the house at this address. Owner/Applicant: Ms. Mery Butler.

D. HPB20-158 – 739 S. Clayton Avenue and HPB20-159 – 743 S. Clayton Avenue – Final Approval requested for the new construction of a single-family house at each of these addresses. Owner/Applicant: Artisan Homes, LLC d/b/a Homes by Artisan, Mr. Matthew Longenecker.

E. HPB20-160 – 817 Orange Park Avenue – Final Approval requested for a major rehabilitation to the house at this address. Owner: Mr. Chris Morata. Applicant: Mr. Daniel Sharrett, Sharrett Construction.

F. HPB20-161 –203 W. Patterson Street – Final Approval requested for the demolition of the existing house at this address and the new construction of a single-family house to replace the existing house. Owner: Mr. Brian Holbrook. Applicant: Mr. Jordan Napoles, Mark Brown Construction.

G. HPB20-166 – 1016 Mississippi Avenue – Final Approval requested for replacement windows installed in the duplex located at this address. Owner/Applicant: Mr. and Mrs. Alan Green.

V. Other Business: NONE

VI. Adjournment.
MINUTES

DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
Virtual Meeting
Thursday, September 24, 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; and Christelle Burrola, Office Support Specialist II, 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 8:48 a.m. The Committee roll call was performed and a quorum was present. (Ms. MeLynda Rinker and Mr. Dan Fowler arrived to the meeting after the roll call was taken, but prior to Certificate of Review Applications being heard.)

II. Review and Approval of the Previous Meeting Minutes

Mr. John White motioned to approve the August 27, 2020 meeting minutes. Ms. Lynn Dennis seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously, 5-0.

III. Review of Certificates of Review administratively approved.

A list of 11 administratively approved Certificate of Review projects covering the period 08/19/20-9/15/20 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:


Chair Thomas introduced the request, and 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 lot of record and is 0.15 acres 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 to the east, and was split from this lot recently. This lot is currently vacant.

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 include:

- A concrete stem wall with 21” foundation above grade with smooth texture stucco on foundation;
- HardiePlank lap siding with Cedarmill wood grain texture in a 6” exposure. HardiePanel vertical siding in the front porch gable;
- HardieTrim smooth boards for trim and casing;
- Vinyl single-hung sash Windows with a 1/1 lite configuration;
- Fiberglass front and rear doors; a quarter-lite style will be used for the front door and the rear door will be a two-panel solid door;
- Asphalt architectural shingles on a 5/12 pitch roof;
- Vinyl triangular gable vent;
- Hardie fascia and soffit;
- The porch will have a finished concrete floor and steps with simple columns trimmed out using Hardie material.

Ms. Foster stated that 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.

Ms. Foster stated that the request was evaluated using Secretary’s Standards #9 and #10 and the Residential Historic District Design Guidelines, Chapter 4: Design Principles and Elements for New Construction and Additions and Alterations to Non-Contributing Buildings.

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 found 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 found 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 recommended 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.

As the requested new construction meets the Standards and Design Guidelines, staff recommended 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 shadow-line 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.

Chair Thomas asked if the Applicant understood the conditions recommended by staff and had any additional comments or questions.

Ms. Yelithza Paramo was present in support of the project, and stated that she understood the conditions and would be able to revise the request to meet these conditions. Ms. Paramo had nothing further to add.

There were no questions or comments from the Committee members.

MOTION: Approval of the request with the conditions as recommended by staff (T. Calhoon/J. White, 7-0).


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

Ms. Emily Foster stated that this request was a duplicate of the request for 613 Ariana Street. She presented the staff report, stating that the subject property consists of one lot of record and is 0.16 acres 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 to the east, and was split from this lot recently. This lot is currently vacant.
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 include:

- A concrete stem wall with 21" foundation above grade with smooth texture stucco on foundation;
- HardiePlank lap siding with Cedarmill wood grain texture in a 6" exposure. HardiePanel vertical siding in the front porch gable;
- HardieTrim smooth boards for trim and casing;
- Vinyl single-hung sash Windows with a 1/1 lite configuration;
- Fiberglass front and rear doors; a quarter-litre style will be used for the front door and the rear door will be a two-panel solid door;
- Asphalt architectural shingles on a 5/12 pitch roof;
- Vinyl triangular gable vent;
- Hardie fascia and soffit;
- The porch will have a finished concrete floor and steps with simple columns trimmed out using Hardie material.
- Body: Valspar Lighthouse Shadows; Trim: Valspar Dove White; Accent(door): Valspar Grecian Helmet.

Ms. Foster stated that the site plan proposed for the new houses shows orientation of the home’s front facade towards West Belmar 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.

Ms. Foster stated that the request was evaluated using Secretary’s Standards #9 and #10 and the Residential Historic District Design Guidelines, Chapter 4: Design Principles and Elements for New Construction and Additions and Alterations to Non-Contributing Buildings.

Adjacent to the subject property along West Belmar Street exist several single-family, one-story houses that exhibit the Bungalow, Frame Vernacular, and modern masonry vernacular styles. Staff found 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 found 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 found 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 recommended 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.

As the requested new construction meets the Standards and Design Guidelines, staff recommended 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 shadow-line 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.

Chair Thomas asked if the Applicant understood the conditions recommended by staff and had any additional comments or questions.

Ms. Yelithza Paramo was present in support of the project, and stated that she understood the conditions and would be able to revise the request to meet these conditions. Ms. Paramo verified with staff the steps needed to revise construction drawings submitted with the Building Permit in order to have the Building Permit approved.

Chair Thomas confirmed with staff that this duplicate design would not set a negative precedence for infill housing. Ms. Foster commented that given the separation of the two houses on different streets within Dixieland and the differing exterior paint color palettes, she did not see any issues with setting a precedence.

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

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.

Chair Thomas introduced the request, and 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 lot of record and is 0.24 acres 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. To replace the rear elevation and existing deck, will be the proposed single-story addition to the rear of the house, which will consist 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:

- Concrete stem wall foundation to match elevation of existing house; concrete block foundation skirting with vents to match existing house.
- Hardie plank lap siding with a 5” exposure, similar to the wood siding of the house.
- 4” Hardie trim/casing
- Vinyl double-hung sash windows with a 4/1 lite configuration (exterior-mounted muntins)
- Fiberglass half-lite side door; fiberglass 10-lite French doors on rear elevation.
- Architectural shingles on 5/12 pitch roof to match existing; gable vent material TBD; exposed rafter tails to match existing.
- Wood or Hardie material Craftsman-style columns and wood decking.

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.

This request was evaluated using Secretary’s Standards #9 and #10, and the Residential Historic District Design Guidelines, Chapter 5: Rehabilitation of Contributing Buildings. In evaluating the request with the Standards, staff found 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, staff found 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 found 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 recommended 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. Staff recommended that the Applicants explore the repair and restoration of the original wood windows before replacement.

As the request generally meets the Standards and Design Guidelines, staff recommended 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; and
3. New and Replacement windows must:
   • Be recessed to provide a shadow line and profile depth and may not be flush mounted;
   • Have exterior-mounted muntins matching the four-over-one divided lite appearance; and
   • 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.

Chair Thomas asked if the Applicant understood the conditions recommended by staff and had any additional comments or questions. Mr. Kevin Shannon was present in support of the request, and stated that he understood the recommended conditions. Mr. Shannon added that after discussion with staff, he intended to restore the original wood windows of the house and add new windows only to the new addition.

Mr. John White asked about the roofline over the stepped-in wall plane of the addition; Mr. Shannon responded that the roofline continues from the original roofline, and creates a wider eave overhang at the addition.

Staff responded to Mr. Dan Fowler concerning the vertical trim pieces separating the addition from the original portion of the house, to which Mr. Fowler expressed that the need to differentiate old from new should not be a requirement for residential structures with common architectural styles, such as a lap-sided Bungalow. Further, with the re-siding in Hardie material, Mr. Fowler did not agree with the need to indicate a vertical division between old and new. The Committee discussed this point, but in the subject property’s case, the vertical corner board on the right side elevation indicated a corner where the addition was recessed and therefore needed a corner board. The other vertical dividing trim was a part of the new door opening on the left side elevation.

**MOTION: Approval of the request with the conditions recommended by staff (T. Calhoon/J. White, 7-0).**
D. **HPB20-144 – 830 Johnson Avenue** – Final Approval requested for a new single-family house at this address. Owner/Applicant: Hulbert Homes, Inc., Ms. Rhiannan Holland.

Chair Thomas introduced the request, and 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 lot of record and is 0.24 acres in area size. This lot does not have an alley behind it. Originally, this property contained a one-story Bungalow built circa 1925, which was severely damaged by a house fire in 2016, and subsequently demolished.

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:

- A concrete stem wall with 12” foundation above grade, with cementitious finish on the foundation except for brick veneer at front façade and portions of side façade foundation;
- 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.
- HardieTrim boards;
- Aluminum single-hung sash windows with a 6/6 lite configuration on the front façade and 1/1 lite configuration on all other facades.
- Fiberglass 6-panel solid front door and a full lite fiberglass rear door;
- Asphalt architectural shingles on 4/12 pitch roof;
- Finished concrete floor and steps on front and back porches; HardieTrim used to finish columns; and brick column bases.

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.

Ms. Foster stated that the request was evaluated using Secretary’s Standards #9 and #10 and the Residential Historic District Design Guidelines, Chapter 4: Design Principles and Elements for New Construction and Additions and Alterations to Non-Contributing Buildings. 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 found 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 found 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 recommended several changes to the design of the proposed house, including:

- Ensuring that the foundation height of the house is 21” above grade, with the front porch finished floor at least 18” above grade;
- Increasing the roof pitch to 5/12, similar to adjacent houses;
- Using a frieze board of at least 8 inches wide to separate the front gable from the horizontal siding;
- Using a front door with a rectangular half-lite or quarter-lite appearance; solid front doors are not appropriate for use in the historic districts;
- Properly aligning the front porch columns and capitals with the upper beam entablature;
- Using 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.
- Suggest using a gable roofline on front façade instead of a hipped roof, as the gable profile more accurately reflects the Bungalow style.
- Using 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;
- Not continuing the brick veneer on the side elevations, past the front porch area; and
- Using the window trim and casing that is featured on front façade of the house on all facades.

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.

Ms. Foster mentioned that due to the number of changes recommended by staff to the design of the requested new single-family house, she had recommended Conceptual Approval of the request with the conditions as listed in the staff report, as well as a revised design to be reviewed and approved by the Committee at a future meeting. However, the Applicant submitted revised elevation drawings and a site plan with most of the Condition recommended by staff. Ms. Foster presented the revised drawings and site plan to the Committee, pointing out the changes that were made to meet the recommended conditions. There were three items that still needed minor revision:

1. The alignment of the frieze board in the front gable needs adjustment;
2. The mullion on the paired windows of the left side elevation needs to be widened to match the set of paired windows on the front façade; and
3. The setback of the A/C unit on the south side of the property needs to be a minimum of 3 feet (zoning requirement, not a design guideline).

Chair Thomas asked if the Applicant understood the conditions recommended by staff and had any additional comments or questions. Ms. Rhiannan Holland of Hulbert Homes, Inc. was present in support of the request and commented that they had revised the design of the house per the recommendations of staff, which revised plans she hoped could be approved by the Committee at this meeting. Ms. Holland mentioned that she understood the three conditions recommended by staff for the revised plans. Ms. Holland also mentioned that the clients for whom the house will be built were appreciative of the recommendations and conveyed that they think the changes will make the house better for them as well as neighborhood.

There were no questions or discussion by the Committee.

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

**V. Other Business:** None

**VI. Adjournment:** There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:53 a.m.
Certificates of Review Administratively Approved
Between 9/16/2020 and 10/16/2020

1. 119 W BELMAR ST (Contributing Building) - Installation of a 12' x 24' (288 SF) premanufactured Smithbilt shed. Shed has a gabled roof and aluminum siding and roofing, but will be located in the rear yard of the subject property and screened by an existing privacy fence.
   Subject to the following conditions: (HPB20-149)

2. 106 E PINE ST (Contributing Building) - Façade restoration of existing one story building to include:
   Removal of existing awnings;
   Copper accents at parapet datum;
   New lighting fixtures;
   Existing painted brick is to be painted using shades of brown;
   Backpainted sign panels above storefront with copper letter signs (requires a separate sign permit application);
   Stained wood wall paneling to be installed at storefront; and
   Existing historical plaque to be removed and replaced in same location with a new historical plaque.
   Subject to the following conditions: (HPB20-150)
3. 507 W PATTERSON ST (Contributing Building) - Replacement of 8 existing 1-over-1 windows with M/I series 1620 single-hung sash vinyl window with a 1-over-1 lite configuration (FL# 21637.2). Replacement of existing front and back doors with Plastpro fiberglass full-lite door (FL#15213.9).

Subject to the following conditions: 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. (HPB20-151)
4. 730 COLLEGE AV (Contributing Building) - Removal of front porch enclosure, reopening front porch.
   Replacement of back door with PlastPro fiberglass full-lite door (FL#15213.9)
   Replacement of one window on south elevation with M/I single-hung sash vinyl window with a 1-over-1 lite configuration (FL#21637.2)
   Repair/replacement of a portion of the southeast corner (rear) wall with in-kind materials.
   Subject to the following conditions: CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL:
   TAPERED WOODEN COLUMNS INSTALLED ON FRONT PORCH MUST BE REMOVED;
   CONJECTURAL FEATURES.

WINDOW 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. (HPB20-152)

5. 201 E BELMAR ST (Contributing Building) - Installation of a 6 ft. tall wood privacy fence enclosing the rear yard of the subject property.
   Subject to the following conditions: (HPB20-153)

6. 730 COLLEGE AV (Contributing Building) - Demolition of a two-story accessory building located at the rear of the subject property, which was built circa 1947, but is a noncontributing building in the South Lake Morton Historic District.
   Subject to the following conditions: (HPB20-154)
7. 517 MCRORIE ST (Contributing Building) - Installation of a new concrete parking pad underneath existing porte cochere and small concrete pad for garbage bins adjacent to the porte cochere, taking care to protect porte cochere columns. Increasing the driveway throat and apron to 10 feet wide, with 3 feet flares on either side of the apron. Increasing the parking area between the driveway throat and porte cochere to 18 feet in width.
   Subject to the following conditions:  (HPB20-155)

8. 1715 CHEROKEE TR (Contributing Building) - Installation of a Silverline by Andersen single-hung sash vinyl window in place of the gable vent on the detached garage. Exterior-mounted muntins not required for this window; matches existing replacement windows on house.
   Subject to the following conditions:  (HPB20-162)

9. 806 JOHNSON AV (Contributing Building) - Installation of 119 linear feet of 6 ft. tall white PVC picket "Countess" style fence on the west and south sections of the rear yard, including a walk gate.
   Subject to the following conditions:  (HPB20-164)

10. 823 E PALMETTO ST (Contributing Building) - Repairs and replacements, including repainting house, replacing non-historic vertical siding on the ground floor front façade with lap siding matching the profile and dimension of the existing siding on the rest of the house, adding wood window shutters, replacing the half-lite front door with a new wood half-lite front door, and replacing the front porch columns with wood columns of the same design.
    Subject to the following conditions:  (HPB20-165)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>HPB20-066</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Amendment to Approved Certificate of Review for New Multi-Family Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Address</td>
<td>923 E. Lemon Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic District; FMS#</td>
<td>East Lake Morton Historic District; N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner/Applicant</td>
<td>Mr. Jason Lewis / The Lunz Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning; Context District; SPI; Future Land Use</td>
<td>MF-22; Urban Neighborhood; Garden District SPI, Sub-District 6; Residential High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Use</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent Properties</td>
<td>Single and Multi-Family Residential; Commercial along Bartow Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Approvals</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REQUEST

The Applicants request to amend the exterior design of five (5) two-story, townhome-style apartment buildings, as approved by the Design Review Committee on May 28, 2020.

SUMMARY OF BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The subject property consists of two vacant parcels located on the south side of E. Lemon Street, just west of Bartow Road, and is one acre in total size. This property is located in the East Lake Morton Historic District and Garden District Special Public Interest district.

In May 2020, the Committee approved with conditions* the exterior design and site plan for five two-story buildings, consisting of four buildings with four units each (“Building A”) and one building with six units (“Building B”). The approved design reflects a Bungalow aesthetic with gabled rooflines, horizontal lap siding and shingle siding, and vertically-oriented fenestration reflecting six-over-one windows, Craftsman style quarter-lite doors, and front and rear porch features supported by square columns. The Applicants have revised the exterior design of these buildings according to the property owner’s request for more wall space for furniture on the interior, which has resulted in the removal of several window openings, slightly altering the location of exterior doors, and modifying the roof over the entrance for the four “Building A” type buildings.

*Conditions: 1. Provide an elevated foundation of at least 18” from grade to finish floor for the two apartment buildings located along E. Lemon Street; 2. Increase the width of the second-story frieze boards to match the width of the first-story frieze boards; 3. Windows must be recessed from the exterior wall surface or cased to provide a shadow-line; and 4. Provide a sidewalk to connect the site to E. Lemon Street.
In comparing the approved design with the amended design, twelve (12) window openings have been removed from each of the four buildings with the Building A designation and twenty-four (24) window openings have been removed from the building with the Building B designation. The breakdown of window removal per elevation follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building A as approved May 28, 2020</th>
<th>Building A as amended (proposed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front Elevation</td>
<td>Front Elevation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Windows</td>
<td>11 Windows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Elevation</td>
<td>Rear Elevation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Windows</td>
<td>4 Windows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Elevation</td>
<td>Side Elevation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Windows</td>
<td>2 Windows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Elevation</td>
<td>Side Elevation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Windows</td>
<td>2 Windows</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building B as approved May 28, 2020</th>
<th>Building B as amended (proposed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front Elevation</td>
<td>Front Elevation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Windows</td>
<td>14 Windows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Elevation</td>
<td>Rear Elevation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Windows</td>
<td>6 Windows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Elevation</td>
<td>Side Elevation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Windows</td>
<td>2 Windows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Elevation</td>
<td>Side Elevation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Windows</td>
<td>2 Windows</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPLICABLE GUIDELINES:**

The Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation 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 Garden District Special Public Interest District regulations (“Garden District Regulations”) also apply to this project.

The following Design Guidelines apply to this project:
Chapter 4, New Construction Guidelines, pages 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.
- 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.

The following Garden District Regulations apply to this project:

1. Intent
   - To provide incentive and mechanism for quality infill development.
   - To remove regulatory impediments.
   - To allow a variety of building forms that are sympathetic to the character of the area and that incorporate good urban design.
   - To preserve the historic fabric and assure architectural compatibility of new construction.

2. Sub-District 6 Principle Uses Permitted By Right
   - Multiple-family residential buildings
ANALYSIS:

Staff finds the requested amendments to modify the location of exterior doors and the gable roofline over the entrance of the “Building A” buildings in keeping with the Bungalow aesthetic and intent of the May 28, 2020 approval with conditions by the Design Review Committee.

The number, placement, and design of windows in new buildings plays a significant role in achieving compatibility with historic buildings. The previous approval was granted in part due to the generous amount of fenestration on all four sides of each building, which reflect historical patterns seen in the Historic District. Additionally, the previous design was approved despite not technically having entrance features facing E. Lemon Street due to the number of windows and elevated porches on the rear elevation of the two Building A-type buildings along this public street frontage, which achieved the appearance of entrance features. Given their high visibility from E. Lemon Street, staff finds that the removal of windows from the rear elevations of the two Building A buildings along E. Lemon Street is not appropriate, as it deactivates the appearance of a primary façade. Additionally, removal of windows from the second-floor side elevations of these buildings is not appropriate, as this creates an expanse of blank wall that will be visible from E. Lemon Street at the entrance to this townhome complex, which is not reflective of historical fenestration patterns.

As only two windows were requested to be removed from the front elevation of the four Building A buildings, staff finds this amendment meets the intent of the Committee’s previous approval and is not disruptive to the rhythm of façade elements. Additionally, because the three buildings located to the rear or southern portion of the site will not be highly visible from the public street frontage, staff finds the removal of most windows as requested by the Applicant from these buildings (two Building A-type buildings and one Building B-type building) will affect the overall design of these buildings, but will not adversely affect the historic character of the neighborhood or larger historic district. However, to avoid blank wall space and continue fenestration rhythm along the front façades of these buildings, all window openings on the front elevation of the Building B building should remain.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

In addition to the conditions approved on May 28, 2020, staff recommends Final Approval of the request with the following conditions, to be reviewed by staff prior to permitting:

1. Maintain all window openings as originally approved on May 28, 2020 for the rear and side elevations of the two Building A buildings located adjacent to E. Lemon Street;
2. Maintain all window openings originally approved for the front elevation of Building B.

Report prepared by: Emily M. Foster, Senior Planner, Historic Preservation Liaison to the Historic Preservation Board
Design approved by DRC 05.28.20
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LEMON STREET APARTMENTS
SCHEME F - TOWNHOMES
CONCEPTUAL SITE PLAN

SITE SUMMARY
SITE ADDRESS: E LEMON STREET,
LAKELAND, FL 33801
PARCEL ID: 242818205000008061
PARCEL ACREAGE: 0.2
PARCEL ID: 242818205000008040
PARCEL ACREAGE: 0.8
ZONING: MF-22
FUTURE LAND USE: RESIDENTIAL HIGH (RH)
MAXIMUM DWELLING UNITS/ACRE = 75 DWELLING UNITS (DU) PER COL TOC INCREASE
PARKING REQUIRED: 39
5 SPACES MIN PER 4 UNIT BUILDING
7 SPACES MIN PER 6 UNIT BUILDING

CONCEPT SUMMARY
PARKING PROVIDED: 40 SPACES
TOTAL BUILDINGS: 5
TOTAL BUILDING TYPES: 2
TOTAL BLDG STORIES: 2
TOTAL UNITS: 22
GENERAL NOTES
• SEE G-005 THROUGH G-008 WALL TYPE SECTIONS, FOR ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.
• SEE LIFE SAFETY PLAN FOR RATED WALL LOCATIONS AND UL DETAILS FOR MORE INFO.
• SEE MECHANICAL, ELECTRICAL AND PLUMBING DRAWINGS FOR MORE INFO.

FIRST FLOOR PLAN

BUILDING A.
SECOND FLOOR PLAN

BUILDING A.
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EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS

FIRST FLOOR

BEARING HEIGHT
23' - 0"

TOP OF ROOF
32' - 9"

SHINGLE HARDIE BOARD SIDING

ASPHALT SHINGLE ROOF

MASONITE FIBERGLASS ENTRY DOOR

WITH TOP DIVIDED LITE

1' SQ. FYPON PREMIUM SELECT SQUARE COLUMN WRAP

TYP.

FYPON DECORATIVE BRACKET

BKT24X18X4S (TYP.)

HARDIESOFFIT BOARD VENTED TYP.

1" x 3-1/2" HARDIETRIM BOARD SIDES TYP. ALL WINDOWS

1" x 10" HARDIEPANEL BOARD BEAM WRAP AND PORCH CEILING (TYP.)

SINGLE HUNG VINYL WINDOW

WITH EXTERIOR APPLIED MUNTINS ON UPPER LITE, TYP.

1" x 3-1/2" HARDIETRIM BOARD CORNER TYP.

2 A-301

1" x 10" HARDIETRIM BOARD TYP.

1" x 8" HARDIETRIM BOARD AT HEAD AND SILL TYP. ALL WINDOWS

1" x 3-1/2" HARDIETRIM FASCIA BOARD TYP.

METAL DOWNSPOUNT, SEE ROOF PLAN FOR APPROXIMATE LOCATIONS

METAL DOWNSPOUT, SEE ROOF PLAN FOR APPROXIMATE LOCATIONS

ASPHALT SHINGLE ROOFING OVER DOUBLE UNDERLAYMENT

1" x 8" HARDIETRIM BOARD SURROUND, TYP. ALL DOORS

2 SOUTHLINES

1/4" = 1'-0"
EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS

FIRST FLOOR

SECOND FLOOR

BEARING HEIGHT

TOP OF ROOF

ASPHALT SHINGLE ROOF, TYP.

SHINGLE HARDIE BOARD SIDING

12” X 12” FYPON PREMIUM SELECT SQUARE COLUMN WRAP

HARDIESOFFIT BOARD VENTED TYP.

1” X 10” HARDIEPANEL BOARD BEAM WRAP AND PORCH CEILING (TYP.)

8” X 8” FYPON PREMIUM SELECT SQUARE COLUMN WRAP

ASPHALT SHINGLE PORCH ROOF

WOOD RAILING TYP., SEE SHEET A-501

6” HARDIE PANEL SIDING

ASPHALT SHINGLE ROOF WITH DOUBLE UNDERLAYMENT

1” X 10” HARDIETRIM BOARD TYP.

1” X 8” HARDIETRIM BOARD AT HEAD AND SILL TYP. ALL WINDOWS

1” X 3-1/2” HARDIETRIM BOARD SIDES TYP. ALL WINDOWS

1” X 5-1/2” HARDIETRIM FASCIA BOARD TYP.

1” X 3-1/2” HARDIETRIM CORNER BOARD TYP.

SINGLE HUNG VINYL WINDOW WITH EXTERIOR APPLIED MUNTINS ON UPPER LITE, TYP.

RECTANGULAR DOWNSPOUT, TYP.
BUILDING B
FIRST FLOOR PLAN

GENERAL NOTES
- SEE G-005 THROUGH G-008 WALL TYPE SECTIONS, FOR ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.
- SEE LIFE SAFETY PLAN FOR RATED WALL LOCATIONS AND UL DETAILS FOR MORE INFO.
- SEE MECHANICAL, ELECTRICAL AND PLUMBING DRAWINGS FOR MORE INFO.

FLOOR PLAN LEGEND
- A-201
  1
  2X6 WOOD STUD WALL W/HARDIE WALL EXTERIOR AND GYPSUM BOARD INTERIOR
- A-301
  73' - 7"
  DOUBLE 2X4 WOOD STUD WALL WITH 1" AIR SPACE AND 5/8" GYPSUM BOARD ON EACH SIDE, 1 HR FIRE RATED WALL ASSEMBLY
- A-411
  1' - 0"
  4Z W W3 3 W3 W
  12
  DW
  WH
  REF.
- DW
- WH
- REF.
- 33' - 10"
- 24' - 10"
- 9' - 0"
- 3' - 10"
- 6' - 10" 14' - 2" 7' - 3"
- 4Z
- 16' - 4"
SECOND FLOOR PLAN

GENERAL NOTES
- SEE G-005 THROUGH G-008 WALL TYPE SECTIONS, FOR ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.
- SEE LIFE SAFETY PLAN FOR RATED WALL LOCATIONS AND UL DETAILS FOR MORE INFO.
- SEE MECHANICAL, ELECTRICAL AND PLUMBING DRAWINGS FOR MORE INFO.

BUILDING B.
EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS

FIRST FLOOR

0'

SECOND FLOOR

11'-6"

ROOF

BEARING

23'-0"

TOP OF ROOF

31'-11"

SHINGLE HARDIE BOARD SIDING

6" HARDIE PANEL SIDING

ASPHALT SHINGLE ROOF

MASONITE FIBERGLASS ENTRY DOOR WITH TOP DIVIDED LITE

1' SQ. FYPO PREMIUM SELECT SQUARE COLUMN WRAP TYP.

FYPON DECORATIVE BRACKET BKT24X18X4S (TYP.)

HARDIESOFFIT BOARD VENTED TYP.

1" x 8" HARDIETRIM BOARD AT HEAD AND SILL TYP.

ALL WINDOWS 1" x 10" HARDIE PANEL BOARD BEAM WRAP AND PORCH CEILING (TYP.)

1" x 3-1/2" HARDIETRIM BOARD TYP.

METAL DOWNSPOUT, SEE ROOF PLAN FOR APPROXIMATE LOCATIONS

ASPHALT SHINGLE ROOF CRICKET

1" x 8" HARDIETRIM BOARD SURROUND TYP. ALL DOORS

1" x 10" HARDIETRIM BOARD TYP.

METAL DOWNSPOUT TYP.

SINGLE HUNG VINYL WINDOW WITH EXTERIOR APPLIED MUNTINS ON UPPER LITE, TYP.

GENERAL SHEET NOTES

HARDIE PRODUCTS TO BE INSTALLED PER MANUFACTURER’S RECOMMENDATIONS FOR HZ10.

ALL EXTERIOR CLADDING, ROOFING, DOORS AND WINDOWS TO BE INSTALLED PER THE FLORIDA PRODUCT APPROVAL DETAILS.
EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS

FIRST FLOOR

0' 0"

SECOND FLOOR

11' - 6"

ROOF BEARING

23' - 0"

TOP OF ROOF

31' - 11"

A-301 SHINGLE HARDIE BOARD SIDING

12" x 12"

FYPON PREMIUM SELECT SQUARE COLUMN WRAP

ASPHALT SHINGLE ROOF

HARDIESOFFIT BOARD VENTED TYP.

1" x 10" HARDIEPANEL BOARD BEAM WRAP AND PORCH CEILING (TYP.)

6" HARDIE PANEL SIDING

ASPHALT SHINGLE PORCH ROOF

HARDIETRIM BOARD TYP.

1" x 10" HARDIETRIM BOARD TYP.

SHINGLE ASPHALT ROOFING OVER DOUBLE UNDERLAYMENT

METAL DOWNSPOUT, TYP.

1" x 8" HARDIETRIM BOARD AT HEAD AND SILL TYP. ALL WINDOWS

1" x 3-1/2" HARDIETRIM CORNER BOARD TYP.

1" x 3-1/2" HARDIETRIM BOARD SIDES TYP. ALL WINDOWS

SINGLE HUNG VINYL WINDOW WITH EXTERIOR APPLIED MUNTINS ON UPPER LITE, TYP.

BUILDING B.
BUILDING A - FRONT ENTRANCE AND BACK PATIO
BUILDING B - FRONT ENTRANCE AND BACK PATIO
Mr. Mark MacDonald requests Final Approval for the new construction of four townhouse-type residences on the subject property. This request was continued from the August 27, 2020 Design Review Committee (“Committee”) meeting.

### SUMMARY OF BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The subject property is located on the northwest corner of Lake Hollingsworth Drive and Mississippi Avenue and consists of two lots of record (Cleveland Park Subdivision, Block A, Lots 9 & 10) and is 0.31 acres in total size. A one-story, single-family Ranch house was located on this property, which was granted demolition approval by the Committee on August 27, 2020; demolition of this building has been completed.

As advised from the August Committee meeting, the Applicant has revised the design of the four (4) three-story, single-family structures proposed to be built 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 stairwell enclosure.

Since this development proposal was introduced to the Committee on August 27, 2020, some changes have been made. Below is a summary of the revisions provided by the Applicant:

1. **Building Height**: Modified overall height of buildings to not be taller than 40 feet as measured from rear/side elevations. Entire roof structures are more than 5 feet below the 40 feet maximum elevation with only the top of the stair roofs reaching this height on the two end units (Unit A and Unit C). The stair roofs are located towards the inside center and should not be visible from the street level.

2. **Porch depth**: Front porches are modified to be 8 feet deep on the second and third levels of all units. To create some architectural features and the grand entries on the ground level, the porches range in size as they are designed as entries to the building rather than seating areas.

3. **Siding & Exterior Finishes**: Building siding and finishes are now shown to be consistent on all sides and matching the front elevations.
4. **Stone & Brick:** Stone and brick finishes were modified to be more in line with other properties in the district and used only as an accent material.

5. **Building front setback:** Buildings moved back 2 feet from the original proposed front setback location.

6. **Front window & door header heights:** Front elevation window and doors modified so that the headers and trim heights are consistent across the front of each unit.

7. **Point of building attachment:** Point of building attachment enlarged with a peaked roof (rather than a single low pitch roof) to create a larger visual point of attachment between the units.

The site plan for all four structures shows orientation of the front façades of the buildings to Lake Hollingsworth Drive. The revised building setbacks are indicated:

- Front Street (South) setback: Varies; Average of 20 feet
- Street Side (East) setback: 15 feet
- Interior Side (West) setback: 10 feet
- Rear (North) setback: Between 20.7 and 24 feet

Three of the buildings (Units A-C) reflect a neo-traditional aesthetic, while Unit D reflects a modern design. The materials proposed for each dwelling are detailed as follows:

**Unit A**

Located on the western side of the lot, this building features a Frame Vernacular aesthetic with a hipped roof appearance at the front of the structure and front-facing gable, paired and single columns, multi-paned windows with transoms, and a variety of cladding materials. This building has a three-car garage on the rear elevation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>Concrete stem wall with raised 21” foundation. Faux vents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Cladding</td>
<td>HardiePlank lap siding with a 7” exposure (5” exposure on third floor), wood shake siding, and stone veneer on ground floor; stucco on rear elevation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trim/Casing</td>
<td>Hardie trim and casing; 4” width corner boards; 6” window/door trim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porch/Balconies</td>
<td>Porch floor and steps material TBD; paired column material TBD; column plinths to be covered in stone veneer. Balcony railing TBD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>TBD. Full lite panes with divided lite transoms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doors</td>
<td>Material is TBD; Multi-lite front door with sidelights and transom; Full lite doors at balconies; garage doors material TBD/doors features upper lites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof</td>
<td>Metal roof; type of metal not specified. 8/12 pitch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Paint Colors</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit B**

Located on the western interior side of the lot, this building features a Craftsman Bungalow aesthetic with a gable roof and 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>Concrete stem wall with raised 21” foundation. Faux vents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Cladding</td>
<td>HardiePlank lap siding with a 6” exposure and large stone veneer on ground floor; stucco on rear elevation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unit C

Located on the eastern interior side of the lot, this building 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>Concrete stem wall with raised 21” foundation. Faux vents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Cladding</td>
<td>HardiePlank lap siding with a 5” exposure and stacked stone veneer on ground floor; stucco on rear elevation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trim/Casing</td>
<td>Hardie trim and casing; 4” width corner boards; 4” and 6” window/door trim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porch/Balconies</td>
<td>Porch floor and steps material TBD; square column material TBD; column plinths to be covered in stacked stone veneer. Balcony railing TBD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>TBD. Multi-lite panes with three-over-one proportions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doors</td>
<td>Material is TBD; full lite front door with sidelights and transom; Full lite doors at balconies; garage doors material TBD; doors features upper lites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof</td>
<td>Metal roof with low slope towards back of building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Paint Colors</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unit D

Located on the eastern side of the lot, this building 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>Concrete stem wall with raised 21” foundation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Cladding</td>
<td>Stone veneer on ground floor; stucco on upper floors with horizontal wood siding on a portion of the third floor; stucco on rear elevation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trim/Casing</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porch/Balconies</td>
<td>Formed concrete porch floor and steps; porch knee wall to be clad in stone veneer; metal balcony railings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>TBD. Horizontal panes with a vertical window opening orientation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doors</td>
<td>Material is TBD; Prairie style half lite front door with sidelights and transom; Full lite doors at balconies; garage doors material TBD; doors features upper lites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof</td>
<td>Metal roof with low slope towards back of building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Paint Colors</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The rear yard of each dwelling is proposed to be paved with pervious concrete pavers and function as a shared driveway that would provide access from Mississippi Avenue to the adjacent alley.
APPLICABLE GUIDELINES:

The Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation 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 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/district. 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 Design Principles and Elements for New Construction, pages 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.
- The height of walls, cornices and roofs contributes to the character of existing buildings and districts. While a new building does not necessarily need to be exactly the same height as its neighbors to be compatible, it should be designed to respect existing building heights. Typically, if a new building is more than one story higher or lower than existing adjacent buildings, it will be out of character.
- Building setbacks should maintain the building-to-lot proportions present on adjacent properties. Respecting the existing setback is important when locating a new building in a historic district.
- Materials should respect adjacent historic buildings.
- Details and Ornamentation: a new building should consider the amount, location and elaborateness of details and ornamentation on existing neighboring buildings in its design. Existing details and ornamentation may be used as the basis for those on a new building, but they should not be copied exactly. A contemporary interpretation of historic details and ornamentation can be a good way to differentiate a new from a historic building.
- 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, pitch, and details should reflect those of surrounding buildings
- Colors should complement surrounding buildings.

ANALYSIS:

The neighborhood to the west and north of subject property consists of one and two-story houses. To the immediate east of the subject property is the Christoverson Humanities Building on the campus the Florida Southern College; building and site development on the campus is regulated by a Special Public Interest district, and is not included in the South Lake Morton Historic District.
Except for the overall height and front setback of the buildings, staff finds that the Frame Vernacular, Craftsman, and Mid-Century Modern design of the buildings, including architectural features and fenestration, to be consistent in scale and proportion with contributing residences in the District and consistent with the Design Guidelines. The materials, as revised, are also consistent with the Design Guidelines. Staff recommends the use of 5V crimp or standing seam metal roofing where metal roofing is indicated, as the type of metal roofing was not indicated. 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, which will need to be verified for compatibility.

In terms of building form and placement, the orientation of the buildings is acceptable given the existing house on this property is oriented to Lake Hollingsworth Drive, and many lots terminating on this street have houses with their front façades oriented to it. While the height of the foundation is appropriate, the buildings continue to lack a minimum ground floor front porch depth of 8 feet; however, the second and third story porches do have an 8-feet porch depth.

While the overall design of the proposal is creative and reflects a variety of compatible historic architectural references, staff finds the overall massing of the buildings to be inconsistent with the Design Guidelines, due to the height of these four buildings combined with their volume, and in addition to their average front yard setback of 20 feet, which appears to be out of scale with adjacent residences. While the Design Guidelines state that new buildings should not be more than one story higher than existing adjacent buildings, it is also stated that building setbacks should maintain the building-to-lot proportions present on adjacent properties. The surrounding residences are primarily one-story houses, with a two-story house immediately adjacent to the subject property, and the front yard setbacks of residences along Lake Hollingsworth Drive average approximately 40 feet. Although the Cristoverson building may be of comparable height to the proposed buildings, its front yard setback is approximately 100 feet. Staff recommends either lowering the height of the buildings, or increasing the front yard setback for compatibility with the adjacent properties and consistency with the Design Guidelines.

Finally, as stated in August, the Applicant will have to apply for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to subdivide and develop the property using the Single-Family Attached (SFA) special building type specified in the Land Development Code (Article 3).

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Final approval of the request with the following conditions to be approved by staff prior to permitting:

1. Lower the overall height of the buildings to two and a half stories for Units A and D and two stories for Units B and C, with a maximum building height of 35 feet, OR increase the front yard setback of the buildings to 30 feet for compatibility with adjacent buildings;

2. Windows must not be flush mounted and must have a recessed profile; simulated divided lite windows must have exterior-mounted muntins/grids; and

3. Submit a full list of exterior building materials for staff review, including but not limited to: metal roofing, soffits and fascias, windows, doors, columns, porch floors, balcony railings, decorative brackets and an exterior paint color palette for each building.

Report prepared by: Emily M. Foster, Senior Planner, Historic Preservation Liaison to the Historic Preservation Board
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SCALE 2/" = 1'-0"
Project # | HPB20-157  
--- | ---  
Project Type | Minor Exterior Alteration  
Address; Historic Name | 1811 Pawnee Trail; “Sabiston-Greaser House”  
Historic District; FMSF# | Beacon Hill Historic District; #BH 33  
Owner/Applicant | Ms. Mery Butler  
Zoning; Context District; Future Land Use | RA-1; Urban Neighborhood; Residential Medium  
Existing Use | Residential  
Adjacent Properties | Residential  
Previous Approvals | Fence, 3/31/2010 (2010-043); Remove window and replace with Hardie Board, 4/19/2013 (2013-047).

REQUEST

The Applicant requests approval to enclose five window openings on the south side wall of the house on the subject property with Hardie board siding.

SUMMARY OF BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The subject property is an interior lot of record (Beacon Hill Subdivision, Block 6, Lot 9) and is 0.15 acres in total size (53’ x 125’). On the lot is a two-story, single-family house in the Dutch Colonial Revival architectural style that was built circa 1926 and is considered a contributing building in the Beacon Hill Historic District.

The Applicant proposes to enclose five of six window openings on the south elevation wall of the house, as shown on the photographs submitted with the application, to accommodate an interior renovation to this space. One window opening will be maintained, and this window will either be repaired to operable status, or replaced with an Andersen window matching the double-hung sash, six-over-one lite configuration of the existing windows. The window openings are proposed to be enclosed with typical wood frame construction and insulation, and clad in Hardie lap siding with an exposure and profile matching the existing siding of the house.

The front facade of home will not be affected by the Applicant’s request. The proposed alteration will be located on the side elevation of a one-story section of the house, believed to be an addition and likely a porch of some type originally. The windows in this addition are not the same size as the other windows of this home, and are not the same size as other windows in the house, which are of uniform size. In addition to the window enclosures, the applicant requests to replace some Masonite lap siding on this addition with either Hardie plank siding or salvaged wooden siding to match.

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:

**Windows**
- Windows should reflect the architectural style of the building.
- Existing windows contributing to the building’s character should be retained.
- Window should be kept in the same proportion as originally provided. Window head heights should be consistent throughout the building.
- Modifications that alter the character of the building is not recommended.
- Reducing window size is not recommended.
- Removal of window details (trim, muntins, mullions, etc.) is not recommended.
- Windowpane patterns that are not the same as the original are not recommended.

**Exterior Walls/Features**
- Use the wall finish most acceptable for the architectural style.
- Avoid the removal or concealing of any original wall surface with a material inappropriate to the 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. These products may be used as a replacement material or for new construction.

**ANALYSIS:**

While windows generally contribute to the architectural character of a building, staff finds the request to comply with the intent of the Standards and Design Guidelines, as the alteration affects 1) a secondary wall elevation that does not have direct visibility from the street; and 2) a building addition not original to the construction date of the house. Additionally, the siding materials proposed for both the enclosure and replacement siding will match the profile and dimension of the existing siding. Therefore, staff finds that the request will not adversely affect the overall architectural character of the building or adjacent properties.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Approval of the request as submitted.

Report prepared by: Emily M. Foster, Senior Planner, Historic Preservation Liaison to the Historic Preservation Board
**HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD**  
**DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE**  
**STAFF REPORT**  
**October 22, 2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>HPB20-158 and HPB20-159</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>New Construction of Two Single-Family Houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Address</td>
<td>739 and 743 S. Clayton Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic District; FMSF#</td>
<td>Biltmore-Cumberland Historic District; N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner/Applicant</td>
<td>Artisan Homes, LLC d/b/a Homes by Artisan, Mr. Matthew Longenecker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning; Context District; Future Land Use; SPI</td>
<td>RA-3; Urban Neighborhood; Residential Medium; N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Use</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent Properties</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Approvals</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REQUEST**

The Applicant requests approval to build two (2) two-story, single-family houses on the subject properties, along with a detached garage for 739 S. Clayton Avenue, and the rehabilitation and reuse of the existing garage structure on 743 S. Clayton Avenue.

**SUMMARY OF BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

The subject properties are interior lots in the Biltmore-Cumberland Historic District consisting of 0.16 acres in total area for each lot (Biltmore Park Subdivision, Block 9, Lot 11 less north 50 feet thereof and Lot 12 north 39.08 feet, and North 50 feet of Lot 11). These lots are currently undeveloped and were subdivided recently from the lot to its south, known as 747 S. Clayton Avenue (Lot 12 less north 39.08 feet and Lot 13). This lot subdivision was not reviewed by City staff for consistency with Article 9 Subdivision Standards of the Land Development Code, or the development pattern established by the Biltmore Park subdivision plat recorded in 1925, which is the foundation for the historical character found in the Biltmore-Cumberland Historic District.

The Applicant proposes to build two (2) two-story, single-family houses on the subject properties, each with a total living area of 2,356 square feet. The design for each house reflects neo-traditional styling in the symmetrical front façade and front porch supported by round columns. Each house may feature either a hipped roof front façade, or a gable-on-hip roof featuring a circular gable vent. Fenestration is proposed to consist of a double front door and two-over-two windows on the front facades, with the other facades featuring one-over-one windows and full-lite doors on the rear façade.

Materials proposed for the new house include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>Stem wall; 30” finish floor elevation from grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Cladding</td>
<td>CMU walls with sand finish stucco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trim/Casing</td>
<td>Raised band with stucco finish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Vinyl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Doors</td>
<td>Material TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof</td>
<td>5/12 pitch; asphalt architectural shingles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fascia/Softit</td>
<td>Wood fascia; soffit material TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each is Morton, Lake Hunter Terrace, and Biltmore/Cumberland Historic Districts


Front (street side) setback: 739 S. Clayton Avenue (Lot 11)
Front (street side) setback: 743 S. Clayton Avenue (Lot 12)

Rear setback: 15 feet
Rear setback: 15 feet

Interior side (north) setback: 12 feet
Interior side (south) setback: 6 feet

Rear setback (to easement): 69 feet
Rear setback (to easement): 69 feet

Exterior Paint Colors

Porch: Sand finish stucco columns
Exterior Paint Colors: TBD

The site plans proposed for the new houses show orientation of the front facade towards S. Clayton Avenue. Building setbacks proposed for each house include:

739 S. Clayton Avenue (Lot 11)
Front (street side) setback: 15 feet
Interior side (north) setback: 12 feet
Interior side (south) setback: 6 feet
Rear setback (to easement): 69 feet

743 S. Clayton Avenue (Lot 12)
Front (street side) setback: 15 feet
Interior side (north) setback: 6 feet
Interior side (south) setback: 13.1 feet
Rear setback (to easement): 69 feet

Each house is proposed to have a two-car, detached garage at the rear of the lot, connected to S. Clayton Avenue by a 10 feet wide driveway. The detached garage for 739 S. Clayton Avenue (Lot 11) is proposed to be a new hipped roof, 468 square foot building (21.3’ X 22’). The detached garage for 743 S. Clayton Avenue (Lot 12) is an existing detached garage structure that was previously an accessory building for 747 S. Clayton Avenue.

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/district. 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 Design Principles and Elements for New Construction, pages 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 sitting dimensions.
- The height of walls, cornices and roofs contributes to the character of existing buildings and districts. While a new building does not necessarily need to be exactly the same height as its neighbors to be compatible, it should be designed to respect existing building heights. Typically, if a
new building is more than one story higher or lower than existing adjacent buildings, it will be out of character.

- Building setbacks should maintain the building-to-lot proportions present on adjacent properties. Respecting the existing setback is important when locating a new building in a historic district.
- Materials should respect adjacent historic buildings.
- Details and Ornamentation: a new building should consider the amount, location and elaborateness of details and ornamentation on existing neighboring buildings in its design. Existing details and ornamentation may be used as the basis for those on a new building, but they should not be copied exactly. A contemporary interpretation of historic details and ornamentation can be a good way to differentiate a new from a historic building.
- 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, pitch, and details should reflect those of surrounding buildings
- Colors should complement surrounding buildings.
- Garages should not be a prominent feature on the front façade of a new house. Garages should be either attached to the back of the house or detached on the rear portion of the lot. If possible, alley access is preferred.

**ANALYSIS:**

Blocks 9 and 10 of the Biltmore Park Subdivision contain a predominance of single-story houses constructed from the late 1920s to the post-World War II era. In fact, there are few two-story houses within the Biltmore-Cumberland Historic District. The character of this district is more suburban in comparison to the South and East Lake Morton Districts to the west, as this district was platted with wider lots and many of its buildings were constructed at a later date.

Staff finds the overall design, massing, and materials of the proposed houses to be inconsistent with the Design Guidelines for New Construction due to their nearly identical designs, stucco cladding, and stylistic elements that do not reflect the varied designs of contributing buildings within the Biltmore-Cumberland Historic District. While the window and door openings of the front façade reflect traditional scale and proportions, this pattern is not continued to the side and rear elevations. Although struck block is common on Masonry Vernacular houses, rough textured stucco can be found on houses with Mediterranean or Spanish Revival influences, and some modern applications of stucco can be found in Biltmore-Cumberland, sand-textured stucco cladding is not a generally compatible siding material for house designs or this District, as it is reflective of houses in tract subdivision developments; subsequently, this material not compatible with the historical design and style of adjacent housing. Staff also notes that the front porch depth of both houses does not meet the front entrance standards of the City’s Land Development Code, which requires a depth of 8 feet for front porches.

Finally, while building setbacks (including the detached garages) and lot dimensions meet the minimum development standards required for RA-3 zoning according to the City’s Land Development Code, staff finds the setbacks and spacing of the proposed new houses with adjacent existing houses to be inconsistent with the historical development pattern of the neighborhood, and disrupts the established rhythm of building development along S. Clayton Avenue. The proposal as requested features building footprints that are too close to one another (side setbacks) and too close to the street (front setback) in comparison to adjacent buildings along this block, which results in incompatible character. The average front setback along this block is approximately 27 feet, and the side setbacks average approximately 10 feet.
The proposed setbacks, along with the two-story height of the houses results in a building massing that is out of scale with adjacent properties. While the Design Guidelines state that a difference of one story can still achieve compatibility with adjacent houses, staff finds that with the prevalence of one-story buildings in the Biltmore-Cumberland Historic District (Biltmore Park Subdivision), the presence of two two-story buildings placed next to each other with narrow building setbacks will be incompatible with the character of the District, and will adversely affect its historic integrity. At most, staff could support houses with a total height of one-and-a-half stories along this block.

Finally, while not a concern or consideration for the Design Review Committee, the Applicant is advised that the newly created lots will require subdivision review and a replat, which can be done through application to the City’s Development Review Team via the concept review process.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Due to numerous inconsistencies with the Design Guidelines, staff recommends denial of request as submitted.

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

On behalf of property owner Mr. Chris Morata, Mr. Dan Sharrett requests Final Approval to undertake a major rehabilitation of the two-story house on the subject property.

SUMMARY OF BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The subject property is an interior lot of record (Orange Park Addition Subdivision, Block D, Lot 8 and south 10 feet of Lot 9) with a total area of 0.17 acres (approximately 60’ X 122’). On this property is a two-story, frame vernacular house built circa 1926, which is a contributing building in the South Lake Morton Historic District. Frame vernacular was a prevalent style of residential architecture in Florida and refers to the use of a common wood frame construction technique used by self-taught builders. In fact, the first resident of this home, William W. Hamlin, was a building contractor in Lakeland during the early 20th century.

Architectural features of this house include a side-gabled roof, a full width, hipped-roof front porch enclosed with screen and supported by square columns and a knee wall, a second-story shed-roofed porch enclosed with windows and wood shingle siding, wood lap siding with shingle siding at the foundation, curved rafter tails, and decorative knee brackets. Where original windows exist, they appear to one-over-one, double-hung sash windows with a tall lower sash and a short upper sash. Alterations include several replacement windows, the porch enclosures and several additions, including side and rear additions, as well as the second-story, which were likely added in the 1950s. As late as 1947, this house appears as a one-story frame structure with a full-width, open front porch (per Sanborn Fire Insurance Co. map research).

The Applicant’s request proposes the following exterior alterations to the subject house that will accompany a large-scale renovation to the home’s interior:

- Remove the second-floor shed-roofed porch/sunroom and rebuild as a dormer feature with a 6/12 pitch gable roof and decorative bracing, paired windows on all three sides, lap siding and corner boards;
- Rebuild the front porch façade to reflect a brick veneer foundation, brick veneer column plinths and square columns;
• Relocate the front door from the center of the ground floor front elevation to the right side of the elevation, to accommodate the remodel of interior living space; door will be replaced with a fiberglass door with a half-lite or quarter-lite appearance;  
• Replace both front door openings with two sets of paired windows to accommodate the interior remodel;  
• Enclose an exterior door opening at stoop on the rear elevation and convert stoop to an interior closet space and enclose an exterior door opening on the south side elevation of the house; both openings will be cladded in siding to match the existing lap siding. A new back door and opening will be installed in the rear elevation;  
• Replace several windows with vinyl windows in either a three-over-one or four-over-one lite configuration; and  
• Remove all wood shake siding from house and install wood siding to match existing lap siding.

**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, Article 11: Historic Preservation Standards.

The following *Standards* apply to this project:

#2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

#3. Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

#4. Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

#5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

#6. Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

#9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work 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.

#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 historic design.
• Protect existing architectural details, and retain distinctive features such as size, scale, mass, color, and materials of buildings, including roofs and porches that give the neighborhood its distinguishing character.
• Use the wall finish most acceptable for the architectural style; exterior siding should be similar in style to the original.
• Repair or replace deteriorated material with new material that duplicates the old as nearly as possible.
• Avoid using new material that is inappropriate or was unavailable when the building was originally constructed, such as imitation cast stone, imitation brick siding, or brick veneer.
• Replace significant architectural trim features such as cornices, shutters, brackets, and railings with the same type features.
• Windows and doors should reflect the architectural style of the building.
• Window and door openings should be kept in the same proportion as originally provided; window and door heights should be consistent throughout the building.
• Replacement windows should retain the same pane patterns as the original if at all possible. Possible substitutes must be approved by the Historic Preservation Board.
• Entryways and doors should retain as many original features as possible.
• Decoration and trim should be appropriate to the architectural style and the specific building; rafter ends, exposed beams, decoratively cut ends, and elaborate brackets should be retained or replaced. Respect all trim elements, shingle work, or ventilation louveres 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:**

While the subject house has experienced major alterations in the past, including building additions and the addition of the entire second story, these structural changes appear to be over 50 years old and are viewed to have acquired historic significance in their own right, as part of its architectural context and evolution, per Standard #4.

The alterations proposed will affect mainly the front façade of the house, which is the primary elevation and the most visible side of the house from the public street. Generally, modifications to the front façade of a historic building should be done sensitively and should not change historic features irreversibly or alter their character, which define architectural style.

In evaluating the request, staff finds that several of the proposed alterations are inconsistent with the Standards and Design Guidelines as listed in this report, including:

• Removal of the second-floor shed-roofed porch/sunroom and rebuilding as a dormer feature with a 6/12 pitch gable roof and decorative bracing, paired windows on all three sides, lap siding, and corner boards.

Altering the profile of the shed-roofed secondary porch, removing the shingle siding and adding conjectural features such as the gable roofline, decorative bracing, and corner boards, is not consistent with Standards #2 through #5, as well as the Design Guidelines that address maintaining roof form, original material and decorative features (shingle siding, knee brackets, rafter tails), or providing for similar replacement materials and features.
The shed roof profile and shingle siding of this second-story porch should be maintained, or rebuilt in the same
design.

- Rebuild the front porch façade to reflect a brick veneer foundation, brick veneer column plinths and
  square columns.

While removal of the screen enclosure is a compatible treatment, removing the shingle-sided knee wall and
existing columns and replacing with new columns with brick veneer plinths, a brick veneer foundation, and
railing that does not have historical precedence on this house is inconsistent with Standards #2 and #5, as well
as the Design Guidelines addressing the protection of original porch features. The columns and shingle-sided
knee wall should be maintained or rebuilt in the same design with reuse of original columns, or replacement
with columns of the same design, profile, and dimension.

- Relocate the front door from the center of the ground floor front elevation to the right side of the
elevation, to accommodate the remodel of interior living space; door will be replaced with a fiberglass
door with a half-lite or quarter-lite appearance. Replace both front door openings with two sets of
paired windows to accommodate the interior remodel.

Given the symmetry of the front façade, relocating the front door to the right side of the front façade and
replacing the front door openings is found to meet the intent of Standard #2, as the spatial relationship of
openings to the bays between porch columns will still exist. Additionally, the door itself may be replaced with a
fiberglass half-lite or quarter-lite style door. However, as original paired windows are not present on this house,
single window openings placed in the left and center bays that have a vertical orientation, header heights that
match the door opening header, and are no wider than 48” are recommended for compatibility.

- Replace several windows with vinyl windows in either a three-over-one or four-over-one lite
  configuration.

Per the Design Guidelines, windows should be kept in the original pane configuration to maintain the character
of the home’s architectural style. Since three- and four-over-one windows are not present on this house, it
would be inappropriate to use this style. The original one-over-one windows with a tall lower sash and a short
upper sash should be used for any new window openings, in proportions similar to the original windows extant
in the house.

- Remove all wood shake siding from house and install wood siding to match existing lap siding.

As previously stated, the wood shake or shingle siding is a distinguishing feature and material that conveys the
Frame Vernacular style of this house and should be maintained, or replaced using similar material with the same
dimensions and profile, and laid in the same pattern as existing.

- Enclose an exterior door opening at stoop on the rear elevation and convert stoop to an interior closet
  space and enclose an exterior door opening on the south side elevation of the house; both openings will
  be clad in siding to match the existing lap siding. A new back door and opening will be installed in
  the rear elevation.

As these alterations are located on the rear elevation and do not adversely affect spatial relationships or destroy
historic fabric, staff finds these alterations to be consistent with the Standards and Design Guidelines.
STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The door opening enclosure, relocation of a door and opening, and enclosure of the stoop, all on the rear elevation of the house is recommended for approval.

As the other requests are not generally consistent with the Standards and Guidelines, staff recommends Conceptual Approval of the request with the condition that the project is revised to comply with the revisions as noted in the Analysis section above.

Report prepared by: Emily Foster, Senior Planner, Historic Preservation Liaison to the Historic Preservation Board
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
STAFF REPORT
October 22, 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>HPB20-161</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner/Applicant</td>
<td>Mr. Brian Holbrook / Mr. Jordan Napoles, Mark Brown Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address; Historic Name</td>
<td>203 W. Patterson Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Professional</td>
<td>Mark Brown Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Demolition and New Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic District; FMSF#</td>
<td>Dixieland Historic District; #DL 113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning; Future Land Use; Context District; SPI</td>
<td>RA-4; Residential Medium; Urban Neighborhood; Dixieland SPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Use</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent Properties</td>
<td>Residential; Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Approvals</td>
<td>Additions and Major Rehabilitation, 8/27/20 (HPB20-117)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REQUEST

On behalf of property owner Mr. Brian Holbrook, Mr. Jordan Napoles of Mark Brown Construction requests Final Approval to demolish the subject house and reconstruct this house with the additions as approved by the Design Review Committee (“Committee”) on August 27, 2020.

SUMMARY OF BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The subject property consists of two interior lots of record (Dixieland Subdivision, Block B, Lots 15 and 16) measuring 100 feet wide by 145 feet deep (0.33 acres), and contains a circa 1921 house in the Bungalow architectural style, 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, a partial front porch enclosure, a rear addition, and some replacement windows.

In preparing for the major rehabilitation work on the house as approved by the Committee, the Applicants undertook an interior demolition, removing non-structural building materials down to the framing of the house. Doing this allowed for the contractor to inspect the condition of the home’s roof and floor framing, which revealed several structural deficiencies according to the Applicant, including:

- Though the roof joists are in satisfactory condition, substantial bracing is needed to secure the rafters.
- The ceiling joists are not continuous and are made of 2” x 4” framing.
- Various floor joists are rotting at the ends rendering them unsatisfactory.
- Most of the framing materials inside of the home have termite damage, with the interior walls, window framing, and floor joists being the most affected areas.

The original contracted amount for the Patterson Street project was $319,865.00. Repairs needed for the newly discovered structural repairs represent an estimated $40,548.00 increase in project cost, bringing the new total cost for rehabilitation to $360,413.00. The Applicants also obtained the opinion of Mr. Michael Johnson, licensed professional engineer, who verified the termite damage to floor joists, stud walls, and ceiling joists. Mr. Johnson stated that the damaged structural members could be repaired and/or replaced, but was cost prohibitive.
If demolition is approved by the Committee, the Applicants wish to reconstruct the house in the same design and footprint as the existing house, along with the building additions as approved in August. The new house is proposed to be of concrete block construction. Exterior 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 raised foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Cladding</td>
<td>HardiePlank lap siding with a 6” exposure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trim/Casing</td>
<td>Hardie trim and casing; 4” width corner boards; 8” width frieze boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porch</td>
<td>Concrete floor and steps; brick column plinths and knee wall; square wood columns to match existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>White vinyl single-hung sash with a one-over-one lite configuration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doors</td>
<td>Fiberglass Craftsman-style front door</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof</td>
<td>Asphalt architectural shingles, exposed wood rafter tails, wood gable vent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Paint Colors</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The site plan for the new house will reflect building setbacks matching the existing footprint of the house, but will need to meet current building setbacks required by the City’s Land Development Code.

**APPLICABLE GUIDELINES:**

The Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation 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 are the basis for review per the City of Lakeland Land Development Code, Article 11: Historic Preservation Standards.

Article 11, Section 6.3.c. Demolition is generally discouraged and shall be reviewed with regards to:

1. The architectural significance of the building or structure. Architectural significance shall be determined by the DRC at the time of the demolition request and shall be based upon documentation of the property’s architectural integrity and historical or cultural significance. Designation of the building or structure as “non-contributing” by the most recent historic district survey does not preclude the DRC from making a determination of architectural significance.
2. The contribution of the building or structure to the history or origins of the historic district.
3. The future utilization of the site, including any replacement buildings or structures.

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/district. 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 Design Principles and Elements for New Construction, pages 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.
- The height of walls, cornices and roofs contributes to the character of existing buildings and districts. While a new building does not necessarily need to be exactly the same height as its neighbors to be compatible, it should be designed to respect existing building heights. Typically, if a new building is more than one story higher or lower than existing adjacent buildings, it will be out of character.
- Building setbacks should maintain the building-to-lot proportions present on adjacent properties. Respecting the existing setback is important when locating a new building in a historic district.
- Materials should respect adjacent historic buildings.
- Details and Ornamentation: a new building should consider the amount, location and elaborateness of details and ornamentation on existing neighboring buildings in its design. Existing details and ornamentation may be used as the basis for those on a new building, but they should not be copied exactly. A contemporary interpretation of historic details and ornamentation can be a good way to differentiate a new from a historic building.
- 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, pitch, and details should reflect those of surrounding buildings.
- Colors should complement surrounding buildings.

**ANALYSIS:**

Regarding the considerations for demolition, the subject building is considered a contributing building in the Dixieland Historic District as it represents the Bungalow architectural style, was built during the District’s period of significance, and for its association with the Florida Land Boom historic context in Lakeland. The architectural details of this house are relatively simple and common for the Bungalow style. Aside from its historical link to the Florida Land Boom, the house has no known associations with persons or events of importance in Lakeland’s history. While the house retains architectural integrity, this quality has been diminished somewhat due to its alterations. Staff finds 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, but continues to contribute to the architectural history of the Dixieland Historic District.

While the Historic Preservation Standards (LDC, Article 11) are silent on financial and economic considerations for rehabilitating or demolishing a historic building, the Committee has considered this supplementary information for informing their decision in the past. Additionally, the intent of the Historic Preservation Standards states that the demolition of “sound historic structures” will be discouraged. The engineer’s assessment suggests a building that is has deficiencies that would preclude a reasonable effort and expense to repair. Staff finds that the future utilization of the property as a new single-family house is appropriate and continues the historic use of this property.

As the previous approval for a major rehabilitation of this house by the Committee in August included replacement roofing, siding, windows, doors, trim and casing for the subject house, as well as construction of three building additions, which would effectively replace the exterior historic fabric of the house, this request is interpreted by staff to be a reconstruction effort, as the requested new house is proposed to have the same design, fenestration, architectural elements, materials, and footprint, as approved. Therefore, staff finds that this request is consistent with the intent of the demolition considerations, as well as the Design Guidelines for New Construction.
STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Final Approval of the request with the following conditions to be reviewed and approved by staff prior to submission of the building permit:

1. Windows must be recessed into the wall plane to provide an adequate shadow-line;
2. Roof pitch must be no greater than the existing pitch or 6/12, whichever is less;
3. Lengthen the front porch knee wall slightly and align the front porch columns so that the windows and front door are evenly spaced within each bay formed by the columns;
4. Submit an exterior paint color palette.

Report prepared by: Emily Foster, Senior Planner, Historic Preservation
Liaison to the Historic Preservation Board
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To Whom It May Concern:  

October 5, 2020

Subject: Residential Home  
203 West Patterson Street  
Lakeland, FL

This letter is to certify that site inspection was performed at the subject existing residential home. The scope of this inspection was to determine the structural integrity of the existing structure.

Drywall, ceiling, and flooring were removed to allow for visual inspection of structural members and their connections.

The house is a conventionally framed wood structure that is approximately 70 years old. The inspection revealed many floor joists, stud walls, and ceiling joists that exhibited termite damage. Some of these members will need to be repaired in place, but many will need to be replaced completely.

It is my structural opinion that the house can be repaired structurally but I have been advised by Mark Brown Construction that it is cost prohibitive to make these repairs and that it would be in the best interest to demolish the house.

If additional information is required, let me know.

Michael A. Robinson, P.E.  
Florida License #28317
10/01/2020

Historic Preservation Board
Community & Economic Development Department
228 S. Massachusetts Avenue
Lakeland, FL 33801

Re: 203 West Patterson Street

To Whom It May Concern:

Mark Brown Construction has begun demolition at 203 West Patterson Street in the Dixieland historic district. In anticipation for the start of the project, Mark Brown Construction had removed flooring, sheetrock, and other non-structural elements to the home. Doing this allowed for Mark Brown Construction and the design team to take a look at the condition of the home’s most critical elements, roof and floor framing. The results show that there are extensive structural deficiencies throughout the home.

Though the roof joists are in satisfactory condition, substantial bracing is needed to secure the rafters. The ceiling joists are not continuous and are made of 2” x 4” framing. Various floor joists are rotting at the ends and rendering them unsatisfactory. Most of the framing materials inside of the home have termite damage, with the interior walls, window framing, and floor joists being the most affected areas.

The original contracted amount for the Patterson Street project is $319,865.00. To stick with the current proposed remodel project, repairing the various areas would cause a $40,548.00 increase in the total price of the project, bringing the new total to $360,413.00.

The remainder of this document contains photos taken on-site of some of the deficiencies. If we can be of further assistance, please reach our office at (863) 646-0511 or email us at markbrownconstruction@gmail.com.

Thank you for your consideration,
Jordan Napoles
REQUEST

The Applicants request approval to replace all existing windows with new windows without dimensional, exterior-mounted muntins, as well as to replace portions of asbestos shingle siding with GAF fiber cement shingles of the same dimension.

SUMMARY OF BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The subject property is a corner lot of record (Dixieland Subdivision, platted 1907, block 13, northern half of Lots 8 and 9) that is 0.17 acres in size (72.5’ X 100’). This lot contains a duplex building built circa 1947 and a detached garage apartment built circa 1948, both of which are non-contributing buildings in the South Lake Morton Historic District. The one-story duplex has a rectangular plan oriented to Mississippi Avenue, and features a side gabled roof with a centrally-located front gable, asbestos shingle siding, and integrated front stoops at the entrance to each unit. Prior to the rehabilitation work currently underway by the Applicants, the duplex had Colonial style single-hung sash, double-paned windows with integrated or “sandwiched” muntins. While the former windows do not appear original to the construction date of the building, it is not known when they were installed; appearing in Google Streetview imagery, the former windows had been in place since December 2007.

The Applicants acquired the house in June 2020. In July, the Applicants received a Certificate of Review for the replacement and resizing of the two kitchen windows located on the side elevations of the duplex, as well as for work to remodel the garage apartment. Building permits were also obtained for this work. A condition of approval for the Certificate of Review indicated that exterior-mounted muntins were to be used if the replacement windows featured a divided lite appearance. As the remodel of this duplex progressed, the Applicants encountered termite and dry rot damage around not only the kitchen windows, but all windows in the duplex and replaced them to match the style of window that was removed, thinking that such a replacement was compliant with the Historic District Design Guidelines.

In September, a complaint was received by City staff concerning work done at this house without design review approval and building permits. During the investigation, staff found that not only had the two windows that received Certificate of Review approval been replaced, but all windows and doors in the duplex had also been replaced, and some asbestos siding had been removed. The new windows are American Craftsman aluminum Colonial style single-hung sash windows that have non-dimensional muntins sandwiched between double-pane...
glass. Two windows in the bathrooms are fixed with obscure glass. All new windows are recessed slightly, and will be framed out with dimensional casing, trim, and wood sills. The new doors are Therma-Tru Benchmark fiberglass doors with a Craftsman style lite in the front doors, and solid 6-panel doors for rear doors not visible from the street. GAF fiber cement shingle siding with a wavy profile is being used to replace the asbestos shingle siding where necessary.

Based on the complaint and subsequent investigation, a Stop-Work Order was issued by the City’s Building Inspection Division. The Applicants are currently working to revise the scope of work for the building permit on record for this property to include all replacement windows, doors, and siding.

**APPLICABLE GUIDLINES:**

_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, Article 11: Historic Preservation Standards._

The following _Design Guidelines_ apply to this project:

Chapter 4 Design Principles and Elements for Non-Contributing Buildings and New Construction, pages 4.1 to 4.9.

- Materials should respect adjacent historic buildings.
- Details and Ornamentation: a new building should consider the amount, location and elaborateness of details and ornamentation on existing neighboring buildings in its design. Existing details and ornamentation may be used as the basis for those on a new building, but they should not be copied exactly. A contemporary interpretation of historic details and ornamentation can be a good way to differentiate a new from a historic building.
- 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, pitch, and details should reflect those of surrounding buildings
- Colors should complement surrounding buildings.

**ANALYSIS:**

Typically, window replacement requires only staff-level review and approval, as long as the replacement window complies with the Design Guidelines. Since the request is not consistent with the Design Guidelines regarding exterior muntin requirements, this request was referred to the Committee for review.

Original windows are character-defining features of a historic building, and installation of replacement windows can adversely affect the architectural integrity of a building. However, due to the non-contributing status of this non-historic duplex and the fact it previously had Colonial-style windows with sandwiched muntins for over a decade, which were not likely original to the building, staff finds that this request complies with the intent of Design Guidelines. Additionally, this request is in keeping with the practice of the Design Review Committee and staff to lend flexibility in interpreting the Design Guidelines for Non-Contributing properties.

Staff finds that the style and material of the replacement doors is consistent with the Design Guidelines, and that the GAF fiber-cement replacement is an appropriate replacement siding material per the Design Guidelines.
STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approval of the request as submitted.

Report prepared by: Emily Foster, Senior Planner, Historic Preservation Liaison to the Historic Preservation Board