AGENDA
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
City Commission Chambers
November 19, 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 October 22, 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.
   B. Recommendation from staff to appoint Mr. Christopher McMachen to the Design Review Committee.

V. Adjourn for Design Review Committee.
MINUTES

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
City Commission Chambers
Thursday, October 22, 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; Dan Fowler (Chair), Nick Thomas (Vice Chair), Tim Calhoon, Lynn Dennis, Landis Fleming, Christopher McMachen, Jeremy Moses, MeLynda Rinker, and John White were present. Community & Economic Development Department staff Emily Foster, Senior Planner, Historic Preservation and Jerrod Simpson, Assistant City Attorney, were also present.

I. Call to Order and Determination of a Quorum

Chair Dan Fowler called the October 22, 2020 meeting of the Historic Preservation Board (“Board”) to order at 8:32 a.m. A quorum was reached, as nine Board members were present.

II. Review and Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes

Mr. John White motioned to approve the September 24, 2020 meeting minutes as submitted. Ms. Lynn Dennis seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously 9-0.

III. Old Business:

A. Update on Design Guidelines Project. Ms. Emily Foster stated that the new Design Guidelines have been noticed to the Lake Morton and Dixieland Neighborhood Associations, as well as through a remote public meeting, and that the public outreach period will end on October 31st. Ms. Foster stated that the final document is expected to be presented to the Historic Preservation Board for adoption in December.

IV. New Business:

A. Staff and the Board members recognized and thanked outgoing member Mr. Tim Calhoon for his six years of service on the Board, and wished him well.

V. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 8:39 a.m. for the Design Review Committee.
AGENDA
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
City Commission Chambers
November 19, 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 October 22, 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. HPB19-152 – 317 E. Park Street – Final Approval requested for the new construction of six (6) two-story duplex buildings on the subject property. This request was conceptually approved on August 22, 2019. Owner: CSG Realty III, LLC. Applicant: Mr. Jon Kirk, Straughn Trout Architects.

B. HPB20-160 – 817 Orange Park Avenue – Final Approval requested for a major rehabilitation to the house at this address. This request was conceptually approved with several revisions and continued from October 22, 2020. Owner: Mr. Chris Morata and Mrs. Lauren Morata. Applicant: Mr. Daniel Sharrett, Sharrett Construction.

C. HPB20-156 – 1016 South Boulevard – Final Approval requested for replacement windows installed in the house located at this address. Owner/Applicant: Mr. Ryan Lopez and Ms. Lillie Weaver.

D. HPB20-185 – 1031 Biltmore Place – Final Approval requested for an addition to the rear of the house located at this address. Owner/Applicant: Mr. Eligio Sanchez.

E. HPB20-189 – 922 South Boulevard – Final Approval requested for the new construction of a detached garage at the rear of the property at this address. Owner/Applicant: Mr. Tom Winslow.

F. HPB20-191 – 501 W. Patterson Street – Final Approval requested for the new construction of a covered porch on the east side of the house at this address. Owner/Applicant: RM Group Venture LLC.

V. Other Business: NONE

VI. Adjournment.
MINUTES
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
City Commission Chambers
Thursday, October 22, 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 (Chairman), 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, and Jerrod Simpson, Assistant City Attorney, were also present.

I. Call to Order and Determination of a Quorum

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

II. Review and Approval of the Previous Meeting Minutes

Mr. John White motioned to approve the September 24, 2020 meeting minutes. Mr. Tim Calhoon seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously, 7-0.

III. Review of Certificates of Review administratively approved.

A list of ten (10) administratively approved Certificate of Review projects covering the period 9/16/20-10/16/20 was included with the agenda packet. The Committee reviewed this list, and there were no questions or comments about these projects.

IV. Consideration of Certificate of Review Applications:

A. **HPB20-066 – 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.

Chairman Thomas introduced the request, and then asked if there were any conflicts of interest pertaining to this agenda item. Mr. Dan Fowler stated he had a conflict, as he is employed by the Applicant, The Lunz Group, and recused himself from voting on this item.

Ms. Emily Foster presented the staff report, and began by recapping the subject property’s location and current condition. 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. Ms. Foster stated that 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. 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.

Ms. Foster stated that this request was evaluated using Standards #9 and #10, Residential Historic District Design Guidelines, Chapter 4, as well as the Garden District SPI regulations. Staff found 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.

Ms. Foster stated that 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 the single 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.

While not addressed in the staff report, the retention ponds shown on the civil site plans in front of the two buildings fronting E. Lemon Street is not acceptable, as this space will not read as a front yard. Additionally, locating the air conditioning units between these buildings and E. Lemon Street and the public entrance to this development is not appropriate, as mechanical equipment should be placed in non-visible areas. These items will be addressed through the City’s site plan review process.

Staff recommended 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; and
2) Maintain all window openings originally approved for the front elevation of Building B.

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

Ms. Erica Craig of the Lunz Group was present and stated that she understood the recommended conditions, but had counter proposals to the recommendation. Ms. Craig stated that she appreciated the Committee’s consideration of what is visible from the street, and because Building B is not visible from
the street, the two windows proposed to be eliminated were due to an interior room being eliminated and having windows there did not make sense anymore. Ms. Craig stated that the two pairs of windows on the second-floor front elevation of Building B could be moved more towards the center of this elevation to lessen blank wall space. Ms. MeLynda Rinker asked Ms. Craig to clarify this, which she did. Ms. Foster interpreted Ms. Craig’s suggestion to satisfy the intent of the Committee’s approval in May, and could be approved if the Committee wished to do so.

Regarding the Building A windows on the two buildings along E. Lemon Street, Ms. Craig stated that the single windows requested for the rear elevations could be widened to lessen blank wall space, and added that many of the buildings on Lemon Street had wider single windows. Ms. Craig commented that proposing to remove the windows from the sides of these buildings was due to the internal space configuration of these buildings, and for these reasons, removal of these windows was still being requested. She briefly commented about the requested changes that were recommended for approval by staff and the reasons for these changes, and added that a wider frieze/beam would be added to the front porch roof of the Building A buildings, as the rendering showed a frieze that was too narrow. Ms. Foster agreed that this slight modification was appropriate.

There was Committee discussion concerning the rear elevation of the Building A buildings adjacent to Lemon Street. Responding to Ms. Rinker’s question, Ms. Craig stated that the proposed single windows were 3 feet wide, but the counter-proposal was to make them 4 feet wide; the center section of wall on the second floor was approximately 15 feet wide. Ms. Rinker questioned whether a window 4 feet wide would make much of a difference in reducing blank wall space. Ms. Rinker expressed her concern that reducing the number of windows would result in inconsistent character with the neighborhood. Mr. Tim Calhoon commented that he understood the Applicant’s request due to the relationship between the window openings and interior space configuration, which limits placement of windows somewhat, but agreed that more window openings conveys architectural character. Responding to Mr. Calhoon’s question, Ms. Craig stated that the small window next to the porch doors was requested to be removed to accommodate more kitchen cabinets, per the client’s request.

There were no public comments.

Chairman Thomas asked for staff to comment on moving the windows on the front façade [of Building B] more towards the center of the façade. Ms. Foster misunderstood the question, and commented on the facades of the Building A buildings along Lemon Street, providing reasoning as to why the number of windows originally approved should remain due to the rear elevation of these buildings acting as the front elevation. Reducing the number of windows removes the appearance of a front façade. Ms. Foster stated that a compromise might be made in pairing the windows on these buildings [three sets of paired windows on the second-story rear elevation] instead of having three single window openings or the 6 single window openings as approved.

Mr. Dan Fowler commented that he was concerned about the visible façades of the Building A buildings along Lemon Street, and mentioned the projecting central wall of the rear elevation draws the eye to it. Mr. Fowler suggested that a set of paired windows could be installed on this center wall section, which would provide better proportions, and single window openings could then be used on the sections of wall on either side of the center section.

Responding to Ms. Rinker’s question, Ms. Foster stated that the integrated porch on the rear elevation of the Building A buildings fronting Lemon Street did not have an exit to the yard. Ms. Rinker commented that she was leaning towards leaving these rear elevations as originally approved, as the request does not read as front facades.
Mr. John White stated he was in favor of Mr. Fowler’s suggestion, but commented it would also make sense to use paired windows on the side portions of the wall elevation also.

There was a brief discussion among Committee members and staff that it was difficult to make a decision on design ideas being mentioned, and that it would be preferable to postpone the decision on the Lemon Street Building A buildings until the Applicant revises the architectural drawings.

MOTION: Approval of the request with the following conditions, in addition to the conditions imposed on 5/28/20:

1) Postpone DRC's review of the requested window opening removal for the two Building A buildings located adjacent to E. Lemon Street, in order for Applicant to provide renderings and/or elevation drawings of the rear elevation of these buildings that are revised according to the discussion between the Applicant, Committee members, and staff during the meeting; and

2) Maintain all window openings originally approved for the front elevation of Building B. (M. Rinker/J. White, 7-0).

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.

Chairman 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, and began by recapping the subject property’s location and current condition. As advised by the DRC in A, the Applicant has revised the design of the four 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. The following changes have been made:

- The overall building height has been reduced to 40 feet.
- The front porch depth has been increased to 8 feet on the second and third levels of all units.
- All siding and exterior finishes have been continued to the side and rear elevations.
- Stone and brick finishes were modified to be more in keeping with other properties in the district and used only as an accent material.
- The front yard building setback was increased by 2 feet.
- The front elevation window and doors were modified so that header and trim heights are consistent across the front of each unit.
- The point of building attachment was enlarged and provided a peaked roof (rather than a single low pitch roof) to create a larger visual point of attachment between the structures.

The site plan for all four structures shows orientation of the front façades of the buildings to Lake Hollingsworth Drive. Building setbacks for the project include:

- 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

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.
Three of the buildings (Units A-C) reflect a neo-traditional aesthetic, while Unit D reflects a modern design. Located on the western side of the lot, Unit A features a Frame Vernacular aesthetic with a hipped roof, paired columns, multi-paned windows with transoms, and a variety of cladding materials. This building has a three-car garage on the rear elevation. Located on the western interior of the lot Unit B features a Craftsman Bungalow aesthetic with a gable roof with decorative knee brackets on the front façade and a hipped roof at the rear, tapered and square columns, multi-paned windows with transoms, and three cladding materials. This building has a two-car garage on the rear elevation. Located on the eastern interior of the lot, Unit C features a Frame Vernacular aesthetic with a low-sloped roof, square columns, multi-paned windows with transoms, and two cladding materials. This building has a two-car garage on the rear elevation. Located on the eastern side of the lot, Unit D features a modern aesthetic, with a flat roof, porch knee wall, windows with horizontally oriented panes, and a variety of cladding materials. This building has a three-car garage on the rear elevation.

Ms. Foster stated that this request was evaluated using Secretary’s Standards #9 and Design Guidelines for New Construction (Chapter 4). 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. Although 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 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.
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 recommended 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.

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

Mr. Mark MacDonald, Mr. Tom Gaige, and Mr. Sean Harper were present in support of the project. Mr. MacDonald provided a packet to the Committee and staff, which contained updated information on the project, including two three-dimensional renderings, door and window specifications, and a general paint color palette. Mr. MacDonald stated there were a few details missing, such as railings, that would be provided to staff for review and approval. Mr. Gaige stated that several of the concerns expressed by the Committee and staff at the August meeting had been addressed. The overall height of the roofline is 35 to 36 feet, with only the stair tower reaching the maximum 40 feet height, and this feature is not visible from the road. In addressing height and staff comments, Mr. Gaige commented that it was not possible to reduce the buildings to two or two-and-a-half stories, as it would not work with the design of the interior space. Additionally, if the buildings were required to be pushed back to keep the 3-story design and increase the front yard setback, this would require the garages to be placed on the front of the buildings because access to the back would be lost; the whole design is not to pay homage to the car, but to have houses with good views on all side. Mr. Gaige mentioned the buildings will have a consistent height as viewed from the street, and in comparison to the white two-story house next door, will not be any taller than this house due to the closer setback of this project to the street. He also mentioned that due to the arrangement of space between the proposal and the single-story house to the north of the subject property, the existing house will still have a view to Lake Hollingsworth. Mr. Gaige mentioned that feedback on this project from the surrounding neighbors has been incredibly positive. Mr. Gaige commented that the architectural line of Andersen windows and doors would be used, with dimensional exterior grilles. He also mentioned the general color palette and they will be narrowing down palettes for each building that are compatible with the neighborhood. Mr. Harper commented that with this design they tried to be consistent with the scale of existing development to the left and right of the subject property on Lake Hollingsworth.

There were no public comments. Chairman Thomas invited comments and questions from the Committee.
Ms. Rinker asked what the difference was in elevation from the front [south side] of the property to the back [north side] of the property. Mr. Gaige responded that the current elevation difference was 8 to 10 feet, but the project proposal would be only 3 to 4 feet. Mr. Gaige commented that when completed, the existing house to the north will be at approximately the same height as the second story of the buildings. Ms. Rinker commented that the color of the modern building on the right in the rendering is jarring. Mr. Gaige responded that the color in the rendering is not accurate, and they will be working more on the color palettes to ensure they blend in.

Mr. Calhoon commented that the proposal is completely different, but still maintains the look of the neighborhood. Mr. Calhoon motioned to approve the request with the second and third conditions recommended by staff only. Ms. Rinker seconded the motion.

Chairman Thomas commented that the front yard setbacks indicated on the site plan were not accurate. Ms. Foster apologized, replying that the front setbacks were not provided by the Applicant, and were incorrectly created using a software tool that was the wrong scale. Mr. Gaige stated that the front setback from the street to the buildings was approximately 20 feet.

Ms. Lynn Dennis commented that the adjacent buildings have a much deeper and consistent setback around the lake, and these buildings will be very prominent from the street. Mr. Gaige responded that there were examples of existing buildings that were closer to the street on Lake Hollingsworth Drive, notably the apartment complex at 1 Lake Hollingsworth and the houses across the street from the subject building. He added that there is enough separation between the proposal and adjacent house for the close setback, and that the existing front yard retention wall would be reconstructed to provide depth.

To Ms. Rinker’s question concerning the depth of the first-floor porches, Mr. Gaige responded that these features were entryways, not really porches, as they were designed not to hold furniture and function as sitting areas. Additionally, the front façade plane of the buildings was designed to be varied and not the same depth. Mr. Gaige said the depth of the first-floor porches varies between 4 and 6 feet. Ms. Foster commented that the intent of the porch depth guideline was met, given the number of porches and that the second and third floor porches were 8 feet deep.

Chairman Thomas relayed his concerns regarding the massing of the project. While the project has 20-foot setbacks, this is much less that existing buildings on Lake Hollingsworth Drive, and the density of the project is greater than any projects seen in the South Lake Morton Historic District. When driving around the lake, this very dense, large mass that is protruding forward from all the adjacent buildings will be seen. Chairman Thomas mentioned that the Christoverson building is larger than the proposal, but is setback from the road by a great amount and is a college building that is intended to be monumental in scale. He commented that he was very hesitant voting in favor of the motion as presented. Mr. Gaige asked the Chairman if he would rather see the garages on the front of the buildings in order to move the buildings to the back of the property. Chairman Thomas responded that he did not agree with the argument that four buildings and four garages were entitled to be placed on this property. He stated that a single-family house was proposed to be replaced with four units, and the compromise should not be capitulating to four units, but to the building on this property being appropriate for the South Lake Morton Historic District. Mr. Gaige responded that the zoning allows this type of structure and the buildings at 1 Lake Hollingsworth are similar in nature to this use, but their proposal is aesthetically nicer to look at than those units. He added that they were trying to do more with less, but in a nice way. Mr. Calhoon commented that he understood why the project’s massing was a problem, and attributed this partly to the project’s location at the end of a block. He mentioned examples of buildings with closer setbacks to Lake Hollingsworth Drive, including the homes across the street from the subject property, although these homes were at a lower elevation than the subject property. Ms. Dennis agreed with Chairman Thomas’s comments.
Mr. Fowler understood the Chairman’s concerns, but pointed out the variety of building types on Lake Hollingsworth and felt this project adds to this diversity. He added that the subject property was a good location for this type of infill development, being on the edge instead of further into the District. Mr. Fowler commented that this project bodes well with concepts for infill development in cities where more density is created using existing infrastructure to minimize sprawl. Chairman Thomas commented that if this project were located closer to downtown, he would agree with Mr. Fowler concerning density and infill, but it is odd to locate dense infill in a block with one and two-story residential buildings. Mr. Fowler stated that being next to the college, one often sees buffer buildings between the college building and single-family homes, and that this project might be the start of a buffer. Mr. Calhoon mentioned that he felt the proposal was similar to the apartments that Florida Southern College built on Ingraham Avenue, which are 3-story buildings on corners in a residential area as well. Mr. Harper mentioned the 3-story apartments being built at Lake Street and Lime Avenue that are less than 15 feet from the road. Ms. Foster commented that the College’s apartments were on property zoned multi-family and with a PUD, and that the apartments being built are located in the Garden District, which is a designated redevelopment area, unlike the subject property.

MOTION: Final Approval of the request with the following conditions (T. Calhoon/M. Rinker, 4-3):

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

Following this agenda item, Chairman Thomas recessed the Design Review Committee meeting at 10:00 a.m. for ten minutes; the meeting reconvened at 10:11 a.m. At the recess, Mr. Tim Calhoon had to leave the meeting early. A Committee quorum was still maintained with six Committee members present.

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.

Chairman 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 is an interior lot of record and is 0.15 acres in total size. 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 to accommodate an interior renovation to this space. One window opening will be maintained, shown with an arrow on this slide, 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 widows. 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.
This request was evaluated using Secretary’s Standards #9 and #10 and Design Guidelines, Chapter 5. 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 recommends final approval of the request as submitted.

Chairman Thomas asked if the Applicant had any additional comments or questions. Ms. Mery Butler was present in support of the project, but had no additional comments or questions. Ms. Rinker asked Ms. Butler if the trim and casing of the remaining window would be maintained, to which Ms. Butler responded that the trim would remain as-is.

There were no public comments.

**MOTION: Approval of the request as submitted (L. Dennis/J. White, 6-0).**

**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.

Chairman Thomas stated that these requests have been asked to be postponed by the Applicant.

**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.

Chairman 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 is an interior lot of record with a total area of 0.17 acres. 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 several exterior alterations to the subject house that will accompany a large-scale renovation to the home’s interior, including:
• 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 clad 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.

This request was evaluated using Secretary’s Standards #2, #3, #4, #5, #6, #9 and #10 and Design Guidelines, Chapter 5. 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 interpreted 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 referenced. Concerning the first alteration, changing 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.

Concerning the second proposed alteration, 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.

Concerning the third proposed alteration, 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.
Concerning the fourth proposed alteration, the Design Guidelines state that 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.

Concerning the fifth proposed alteration, 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.

Concerning the final proposed alteration, as these alterations are located on the rear elevation and do not adversely affect spatial relationships of the house or destroy historic fabric, staff finds these changes to be consistent with the Standards and Design Guidelines.

Staff recommends approval for the door opening enclosure, relocation of a door and opening, and enclosure of the stoop, all on the rear elevation of the house.

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 staff report and as stated per staff’s evaluation of the project.

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

Mr. and Mrs. Chris Morata and Mr. Daniel Sharrett were present in support of the request. Ms. Lauren Morata thanked the Committee and staff for the feedback and explained their intent was to bring the home the glory it deserves and the style it is intended to be. Mr. Morata explained that prior to their purchase of the home several people had looked at it, including Mr. Sharrett, and walked away due to the amount of work it needs. He added that with the additions that were done over the years, the result was more function over form and that the style of the house does not look like other styles in the neighborhood. Mr. Morata stated that their intent was to restore the original style of the home.

Concerning the requested design, Mr. Morata stated that while the shake siding would be removed, they would reflect this material in the new gable over the redesigned second-story dormer. Additionally, the request for brick veneer came from the brick piers that exist at the foundation of the home, but that they would use whatever material was needed to expose and add to the brick piers. Mr. Morata explained that the house does have several Craftsman features that their request builds upon. Mr. Sharrett explained the poor structural condition of the home and several deficiencies, including of the second story shed porch and the reasoning for the gable design.

There were no public comments.

Ms. Rinker asked about the Applicant’s comment in maintaining the shed roof, but on the first floor. Mr. Morata replied that they intended to rebuild the hipped roof of front porch as a shed roof. Responding to Ms. Rinker’s question concerning the width of the existing second story porch to the proposed dormer, Mr. Sharrett responded that the existing is 16 feet wide and the proposed is 12 feet wide.
Mr. White confirmed with Mr. Sharrett that the right side of the second floor was being extended by two feet; the purpose was to re-align the staircase, gain symmetry to the front of the house, and provide more square footage to the master suite.

Ms. Dennis commented that given the issues of this property with regard to condition, additions, and deterioration, that preserving some of the elements seems ill-advised. To bring the house to a livable state, this may be an example where the Committee needs to look to that with a little more weight than trying to preserve everything.

Mr. Sharrett asked for suggestions from the Committee and reiterated that his clients were looking for a major change to the house and keeping the elements requested.

Chairman Thomas reminded the Committee that while they have the purview to make any decision, decisions should be based on the Historic Preservation Standards, Secretary’s Standards and Design Guidelines. He did not agree with the request to remove the kneewalls of the front porch and shake siding, and cited that knee walls have precedent in the neighborhood on front porches. There was a discussion about the brick piers and needing to do some investigation to see what is under the foundation skirting/shake siding. Chairman Thomas also mentioned that the Committee could be flexible with resizing windows on the side of the house.

Mr. Fowler commented that it has been pointed out that the style of this house is unique. That is the very nature of what makes this house wonderful. The Secretary’s Standards clearly state to maintain and preserve our unique heritage. Mr. Fowler understood the need to rebuild certain features of the house due to deterioration, but they can be rebuilt in the same or similar design as existing to maintain the character. He pointed out the shed roof second story porch and shake skirting as unique features. Mr. Fowler added that the width of the second story porch could be decreased as long as proportionality remains. He emphasized the need to retain the essential form of the house.

Chairman Thomas agreed with Mr. Fowler and added that the flare created by the shake skirting was unique and a character-defining feature and should be retained. Ms. Rinker asked about the ventilation issue with enclosed skirting, and Mr. Fowler explained some ways that this issue could be remedied.

**MOTION:** Approval of the rear elevation alterations including the door opening enclosure, relocation of a door and opening, and enclosure of the stoop. Conceptual approval of all other requests was granted with the condition to revise the project to comply with the recommendations in the analysis section of the staff report (J. Moses/L. Dennis, 6-0).

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.

Chairman 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 two interior lots of record and 0.33 acres in size. The property contains a circa 1921 house in the Bungalow architectural style, which is a contributing building in the Dixieland Historic District. The house is a single-story structure with a cross-gabled roof and side-gabled porte cochere, and features a front porch with square columns on brick plinths, curved exposed rafter tails, knee brackets, a sunburst-style gable vent, and double-hung
sash windows with a one-over-one lite configuration. Alterations include asbestos shingle siding, a partial front porch enclosure, a rear addition, and some replacement windows.

In August, the Committee approved a major rehabilitation of this house, including a rear addition and carport and new porch located on the west side of the home. The rehabilitation would also replace all asbestos and other siding on the house with fiber-cement siding, and all windows and doors would be replaced.

In preparing for the major rehabilitation work and additions 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:

- 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 site plan will need to meet current building setbacks as required by the City’s Land Development Code.

Exterior materials proposed for the new house will include:

- A concrete stem wall with raised foundation
- HardiePlank lap siding with a 6” exposure, Hardie trim and casing; 4” width corner boards, and 8” width frieze boards.
- The porch is proposed to have a concrete floor and steps, brick column plinths and knee wall, and square wood columns to match existing columns.
- White vinyl single-hung sash windows with a one-over-one lite configuration are proposed, along with a fiberglass Craftsman-style front door.
- The roof will feature asphalt architectural shingles, exposed wood rafter tails, and wood gable vents to match the existing.

This request was evaluated using Land Development Code Sub-Section 11.6.3.c.; Secretary’s Standards #9 and #10; and Residential Historic District Design Guidelines, Chapter 4: Design Principles and Elements for New Construction and Additions and Alterations to Non-Contributing Buildings.

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 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 recommends 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.

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

Mr. Jordan Napoles and Mr. Mark Brown, both representing the Applicant, were present in support of the request and stated they understood the staff recommendation. They had no further comments for the Committee.

There were no public comments.

MOTION: Approval of the request with the conditions recommended by staff:
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; and
4) Submit an exterior paint color palette. (L. Dennis/M. Rinker, 6-0)

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.

Chairman 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 is a corner lot of record that is 0.17 acres in size. 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.

This request was evaluated using Secretary’s Standards #9 and #10 and Residential Historic District Design Guidelines, Chapter 4: Design Principles and Elements for New Construction and Additions and Alterations to Non-Contributing Buildings. 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 duplex and the fact it previously had Colonial-style windows with sandwiched muntins for over a decade that 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 be flexible in interpreting the Design Guidelines for Non-Contributing properties.
Staff also 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. Therefore, staff recommended approval of the request as submitted.

Chairman Thomas asked if the Applicants had any additional comments or questions. Mr. and Mrs. Alan Green were present in support of the request and had no further comments pertaining to the request.

There were no public comments.

**MOTION: Approval of the request as submitted and recommended by staff (L. Dennis/D. Fowler, 6-0).**

V. **Other Business:** None

VI. **Adjournment:** There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:29 a.m. (J. White/M. Rinker, 6-0).

Chairman, Design Review Committee                                   Senior Planner, Historic Preservation
Certificates of Review Administratively Approved
Between 10/17/2020 and 11/16/2020

1. 107 LAKE MORTON DR (Contributing Building) - Installation of a metal, gable-roofed, 120 SF (10' X 12') storage shed in the rear yard of the subject property.
   Subject to the following conditions:  (HPB19-102)

2. 1016 MISSISSIPPI AV (Non-Contributing Building) - Duplex Remodel:
   Replacing 2 windows, one on the north elevation and one on the south elevation of the subject duplex, with a single or double hung sash aluminum window with a Colonial lite appearance. These window openings will also be resized from 51" tall to 37" tall to accommodate a kitchen remodel in both units. Removal of two small doors on rear façade an enclosing these openings with typical framing and siding to match the existing.

   Replacing porch stoop columns with a single square column on each porch.

   Garage Apartment Remodel:
   Garage doors to be removed and openings to be left open; window on east elevation to be converted into a doorway and existing door on this elevation to be replaced matching size; two new doorways to be constructed on the south elevation storage area;

   Subject to the following conditions:

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

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

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

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

   WINDOW PRODUCTS STATED ON THE APPROVED BUILDING PERMIT SHALL NOT BE SUBSTITUTED OR REPLACED WITH A PRODUCT FROM A DIFFERENT MANUFACTURER, OR A DIFFERENT MODEL NUMBER FROM THE SAME MANUFACTURER, WITHOUT STAFF APPROVAL. (HPB20-113)
Certificates of Review Administratively Approved
Between 10/17/2020 and 11/16/2020

3. 836 E WALNUT ST (Contributing Building) - Construction of a 10' X 20' accessory building in the rear yard; storage and carport. Accessory building to have a front-gabled roof with gable vent, lap siding and corner boards, knee brackets, French doors, two windows, and trim/casing to complement the principal house on this property.
Subject to the following conditions:  (HPB20-169)

4. 609 W BELMAR ST (Contributing Building) - Installation of a metal 10' X 12' gable-roofed shed in the rear yard of the subject property behind house. Shed will be screened by an existing privacy fence.
Subject to the following conditions:  (HPB20-170)

5. 107 LAKE MORTON DR (Contributing Building) - Installation of a 6 ft. tall wood privacy fence on the east and west sides of the rear yard of subject property, connecting with home's west elevation.
Subject to the following conditions:  (HPB20-171)

6. 433 S WILSON AV (Non-Contributing Building) - Installation of a 28' X 16' white aluminum shed roof over existing wood deck on rear elevation of house, not visible from street. Replacement of existing soffit and fascia with vinyl soffit and wood fascia board.
Subject to the following conditions:  (HPB20-172)

7. 329 E MAIN ST (Contributing Building) - Installation of a new double-door opening on west side elevation along alley at first floor level with solid steel doors. Installation of a concrete ramp on this elevation meeting with new door opening.
Subject to the following conditions:  (HPB20-174)

8. 524 S WILSON AV (Non-Contributing Building) - Installation of a 4 ft. tall black chain link fence on south side of property at rear yard, connecting with existing chain link fence along the property's eastern and northern boundaries.
Subject to the following conditions:  (HPB20-175)

9. 207 W MAXWELL ST (Contributing Building) - Installation of an in-ground swimming pool in the rear yard of the subject property.
Subject to the following conditions:  (HPB20-176)

10. 943 S TENNESSEE AV (Contributing Building) - Replacement of 8 ft. tall wood privacy fence along rear (west) property line with a new 8 ft. tall wood privacy fence. New fence will be setback 3 feet from alley edge of pavement.
*subject property abuts commercially zoned property to the west.
Subject to the following conditions:  (HPB20-177)
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Certificates of Review Administratively Approved  
Between 10/17/2020 and 11/16/2020

11. 155 LAKE MORTON DR #4 (Non-Contributing Building) - Construction of approximately 74 linear feet of 6 ft. tall brick lattice wall on interior of property.  
Subject to the following conditions: (HPB20-178)

12. 836 E LEMON ST (Contributing Building) - Installation of a 6 ft. tall wood privacy enclosing the rear and partial side yards of the subject property. Fence will be setback from the alley by five feet, per the property owner.  
Subject to the following conditions: (HPB20-179)

13. 801 CUMBERLAND ST (Contributing Building) - Installation of a 6 ft. tall wood privacy fence at rear/east side yard and setback 3 feet from the alley.  
Subject to the following conditions: (HPB20-180)

14. 122 LAKE MORTON DR (Contributing Building) - Installation of 156 linear feet of 4 ft. tall black aluminum fence in the rear yard of the subject property.  
Subject to the following conditions: (HPB20-181)

15. 1051 SOUTH BL (Contributing Building) - Replace five non-historic, single-hung sash aluminum windows at rear of home with five single-hung sash aluminum Pella windows matching the opening size and one-over-one lite configuration of the existing windows.  
Subject to the following conditions: New windows must not be installed flush with the exterior wall, and must have a recess that provides a shadow-line for adequate reveal and depth. (HPB20-182)

16. 1062 KING AVE (Contributing Building) - Installation of 135 linear feet of 6 ft. tall wood privacy fence with two walk gates enclosing the rear yard.  
Subject to the following conditions: (HPB20-183)

17. 904 S MISSOURI AV (Non-Contributing Building) - Installation of an aluminum monument sign with stucco finish base. Sign will feature dimensional sign face and lettering. The overall height of the sign will be 5'6" with a 3'3" X 6'8" (20 SF) sign cabinet and 2'7" X 6' (15.5 SF) sign face.  
Subject to the following conditions: (HPB20-184)

18. 155 LAKE MORTON DR (Non-Contributing Building) - Installation of 5 ft. tall black coated chain link fence along eastern side of property.  
Subject to the following conditions: (HPB20-186)

19. 5 LK HOLLINGSWORTH DR (Non-Contributing Building) - Installation of a 5 ft. tall black aluminum fence on the eastern side of the property and across the driveway, 25 ft. from the front property line.  
Subject to the following conditions: (HPB20-187)
20. 953 SUCCESS AV (Contributing Building) - Replacement of jalousie windows on rear porch enclosure with horizontal sliding windows, and replacement of vertical bead board siding with Hardie shake siding. Subject to the following conditions: (HPB20-190)
REQUEST

The Applicant requests Final Approval for the new construction of a 12-unit residential complex consisting of six (6) two-story duplex buildings and associated off-street parking on the subject properties.

SUMMARY OF BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The subject property is an irregularly shaped lot consisting of 1.11 acres. The majority of this parcel was created in 2007 by the previous owner through the conveyance of the rear yard portion of properties located at 211, 301, 305 & 309 E. Park Street to a vacant 0.26-acre lot located at the southwest corner of E. Park Street and South Boulevard. Upon receiving approval for a variance from the Land Development Code’s Subdivision Standards from the Planning and Zoning Board in March 2020 for this parcel, the Applicant combined the parcel with the contiguous lot to its south at 1109 South Boulevard.

As approved by the Design Review Committee (DRC) in August 2019, the noncontributing house that was located at 1109 South Boulevard was demolished recently. During the same meeting, the DRC granted conceptual approval of the six duplex buildings and site plan.

The Applicant has revised the design of the six (6) two-story duplex structures, as well as the placement of these structures on the subject property since the August DRC meeting. Each of the duplex buildings has a Neo-traditional aesthetic with side-gabled roofs and projecting gable ells, lapped siding with a brick watertable foundation, front porches supported by tapered columns on brick plinths, and three-over-one windows. Additional decorative architectural features include knee brackets, shingle and board-and-batten siding; corner boards; vertical and horizontal banding; and curved rafter tails.

Three building types are proposed:

- **Type 1 – Units 1 - 4.** Two duplex buildings located at the corner of E. Park Street and South Boulevard and along South Boulevard just south of the intersection. These buildings have one front porch for each dwelling unit that faces each street frontage and addresses corner conditions. Each unit of this building type will contain two bedrooms. Unit A will have 1,506 square feet of living space, and Unit B will have 1,520 square feet of living space.
- **Type 3 – Units 5 through 10.** Three duplex buildings, located on the north and west sides of the interior of the property, with two separate front-facing porches (one porch per dwelling unit). Each dwelling unit of
this building type will contain two bedrooms. Unit A will have 1,506 square feet of living space, and Unit B will have 1,520 square feet of living space.

• Type 6 – Units 11 and 12. One duplex building, located on the south side of the interior of the property, with a centrally-located, shared front porch. This building will be larger than the other building types with each dwelling unit containing three bedrooms. Units A and B will each have 1,946 square feet of living space.

Materials for this project include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Cladding</td>
<td>Hardie Cedarmill or similar fiber cement siding with a 6-inch exposure;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hardie shingle siding straight edge and half-round panels; fiber cement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>panels; brick veneer wainscot/watertable only on front façade and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>portions of side facades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trim/Casing</td>
<td>Fiber cement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Single-hung sash aluminum with both single lite and three-over-one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>simulated divided lite appearances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doors</td>
<td>Fiberglass Craftsman-style doors; front doors feature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof</td>
<td>Asphalt architectural shingles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porch</td>
<td>Concrete steps and floors. Brick veneer wrapped column plinths and side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>walls with concrete caps; Hardie board smooth panel column surround</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knee Brackets and</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafter Tails</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colors</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The building setbacks as shown on the revised site plan for each duplex appear to meet the requirements of the Land Development Code’s Urban Neighborhood Standards for the MF-12 zoning district. The site plan for this project is currently undergoing Site Plan Review by the City’s Development Review Team.

**APPLICABLE GUIDELINES:**

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

The following section of the Land Development Code applies to this project:

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 Design Review Committee (“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 Secretary’s Standards, as summarized, apply to this project:

#9 New construction will not destroy spatial relationships that characterize the historic district. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the historic district.
#10 New construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic district would be unimpaired.

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 designed at the human scale and should respect and be compatible with surrounding contributing buildings.
- **Alignment and Spacing** - The front facades of buildings should be closely aligned with other buildings on the block to maintain a uniform setback. Consistent spacing of buildings maintains the rhythm that was historically intended for the neighborhood and block. The scale (height-to-width ratio) of a street-facing facade should be compatible with and maintain the proportions established by the adjacent structures. Building setbacks should reflect traditional siting dimensions.
- **Orientation** - The orientation of a new building should respect that of its neighbors. The main entrance should be oriented to the street and in full view. Front widths of new construction should correspond with other adjacent building widths. Larger buildings should be designed so their facades are divided into smaller elements that relate to those of the surrounding neighborhood.
- **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
- **The exterior paint color palette** should complement surrounding buildings.
- **Existing plant materials**, such as mature trees, should be retained when a new building is built whenever possible. If this is not possible, new landscaping that complements the new building and the neighboring buildings and their landscaping should be installed.
- **General Standards** - Provide a transition between the street and front entrance; for residential buildings this should be a front porch feature. The intent is to prevent abrupt transitions with little or no definition between public and private space. Align common elements. Maintain the repetitive elements of the surrounding streetscape. Create a sense of layers, using steps, brackets, chimneys, vegetation, and other projecting elements. This can soften the starkness of a flat wall, make a building seem less massive, and help maintain a good relationship with the street.

**ANALYSIS:**

In evaluating this request with the applicable Standards and Design Guidelines, staff finds:

1. The proposed project introduces a nontraditional pattern of development on the interior portion of the subject property, but respects the spatial relationship established by the existing historic buildings located along South Boulevard and E. Park Street. The project represents contemporary construction methods and new materials, but will be compatible with historic materials, features, design, massing, and scale.

2. Building Proportion, Alignment, and Orientation:
   - The foundation height appears to be appropriate, but the dimension is not noted on the elevation drawings; the minimum foundation height is 21 inches.
   - The overall height of the building at 29 feet, 3 inches to roof ridge/peak is appropriate and compatible with two-story buildings in the Historic District.
• The two buildings along E. Park Street and South Boulevard are compatibly aligned with adjacent buildings on this block and oriented towards the streets.
• The four buildings to the interior of the subject property are oriented towards the shared access drive proposed for this development, but do not reflect the traditional alignment or orientation of the neighborhood due to the irregular lot configuration, for which a variance was approved.

3. Materials and architectural ornamentation:
• The proposed materials and architectural ornamentation are consistent with the Design Guidelines.
• The design of the windows and doors is appropriate for use on a building reflecting the Frame Vernacular or Bungalow style.
• Architectural details for each building have been varied slightly for each type of building, such as the dimensions/sizing of porch columns and plinths and type of siding treatment in porch gables, to provide visual interest and distinction between the buildings.
• Knee brackets, exposed rafter tails, and the variety of siding types are appropriate design elements that reflect historic architecture in the Historic District.

4. Entrance Feature: Each of the buildings feature front porches with a minimum depth of 8 feet, as required by the Urban Form Standards, but the front porch depth of Building Type 6 needs to be confirmed to meet this requirement.

5. Design Elements:
• The massing of the front and side elevations of the buildings has been softened by the use of projecting porches, ells, and bump-outs, decorative vertical and horizontal casing, as well as differing materials on the foundation and siding.
• The 6/12 pitch gable roof is an appropriate shape and pitch that is compatible with contributing buildings in the Historic District.
• The diamond-shaped windows on the side elevations of Building Type 6 should be changed to a rectangular or square appearance for consistency with the other window openings.

6. Landscape Elements:
• The interior portion of the subject property features several mature trees and a park-like environment; native landscaping should be incorporated into the site design.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends Final Approval of the request with the following conditions, to be reviewed by staff prior to permitting:

1. Ensure that the foundation height (grade to finished floor) is a minimum of 21 inches;
2. Ensure that the front porch depth of Building Type 3 is a minimum of 8 feet;
3. Change the diamond-shaped windows on the side elevations of Building Type 6 to rectangular or square openings that are proportional to other window openings on this building; and
4. Provide 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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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>HPB20-160</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Major Rehabilitation/Exterior Alterations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Address</td>
<td>817 Orange Park Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic District; FMSF#</td>
<td>South Lake Morton Historic District; SLM 14-13; “William and Anna Hamlin House”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Name</td>
<td>“William and Anna Hamlin House”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner/Applicant</td>
<td>Mr. Chris Morata/Mr. Daniel Sharrett, Sharrett Construction, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning; Context District; Future Land Use; SPI</td>
<td>RA-4; Urban Neighborhood Residential Medium; South Lake Morton SPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Use</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent Properties</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Approvals</td>
<td>Shed, 1997-48 (8/4/1997); Replace fire-damaged 1/1 SHS windows, 2009-009 (1/20/2009); Conceptual approval for Major Rehabilitation with revisions, HPB20-160 (10/22/2020).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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. This request was conceptually approved with revisions recommended by staff and discussed by the Committee on October 22, 2020, and was continued to this meeting.

**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).

Per the direction of staff and the Committee, the Applicant’s request has been revised and proposes the following exterior alterations, which will accompany a large-scale renovation to the home’s interior:

- Rebuild the front porch roof as a 2/12 pitch shed roof instead of a hipped roof (incorrectly shown on Elevation Sheet 3); rebuild shake-sided knee walls; and install square porch columns with brick plinths.
- Install a brick foundation below the shake siding/skirting around the house, which will replace some of the shake skirting on the sides of the house and replace the shake skirting on the rear of the house.
- Rebuild and decrease the front width of the second-floor shed-roofed porch. Proposed new porch will have a 2/12 pitch shed roof, with shake siding covering all three sides and corner boards. Eight windows reflecting the historic window design on this house will be used on this feature including four windows on the front and paired windows on the sides.
- Extend the second floor, north side elevation wall to provide symmetry on the front elevation.
- Replace several windows with vinyl windows in a one-over-one lite configuration matching the historic windows of the house (shorter upper sash/longer lower sash).

The following alterations were proposed by the Applicant and recommended for approval by staff and are still being requested:

- Relocate the front door from the center of the ground floor front elevation to the right side of this elevation; door will be replaced with a fiberglass door with a half-lite or quarter-lite appearance;
- Replace existing front door openings with two single window openings centered in the left and middle front porch bays.
- Enclose an exterior door opening and stoop area on the rear elevation, 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 on the rear elevation in place of two small, existing windows.

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
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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 louvers in decorative designs.
- Building additions should be limited to the rear of the main building; the roof pitch of the addition should match or be lower than the original roof pitch. All façade elements need to continue architectural elements and detail.

ANALYSIS:

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. Modifications to the front façade of a historic building should be done sensitively and should not change historic features irreversibly or alter their character, because doing so diminishes architectural integrity.

In evaluating the request, staff finds the proposed alterations generally meet the intent of the Standards referenced, as distinctive materials, features, and spatial relationships of building components will be maintained or replaced in-kind with similar materials. While staff finds that the introduction of differently-
styled front porch columns and plinths introduces an architectural element not original to the house, the simple style of the column and brick plinth, and the relationship of this feature to the proposed brick foundation below the shake skirting, are compatible with and reflect the Frame Vernacular style of this house.

Regarding the Design Guidelines, staff finds that the proposed changes to materials, fenestration, and building features are consistent with the guidelines for alterations to contributing buildings. The second-floor addition, alterations proposed for both the ground floor front porch and second-story porch feature, and introduction of brick foundation are in keeping with the Frame Vernacular character of the house, while improving the symmetry and structural stability of the house. Staff also finds that the alterations to the door and window openings on the rear and side elevations are consistent with the intent of the Design Guidelines and neighborhood character.

Finally, as noted in the previous staff report, the wood shake siding is a distinguishing feature that conveys the distinctive character of this house and should be maintained, but may be replaced using similar material with the same dimensions and profile, and installed with the same pattern as the existing. Additionally, the decorative knee brackets existing on the second story gable and shed roof were not shown on the elevation drawings, but should be maintained or replicated using wood or a similar material.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

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

1. All replacement windows must match the one-over-one, uneven sash configuration of the original, historic windows and be recessed from the exterior wall plane to provide a shadow-line for both top and bottom sash;
2. All window and door trim and casing should replicate the dimensions and profile of the historic window and door trim and casing;
3. If shake siding is replaced, the replacement material must be similar in dimension, profile, and pattern layout; and
4. Decorative knee brackets should be maintained in the second-story gables and shed-roofed porch feature.

Report prepared by: Emily Foster, Senior Planner, Historic Preservation Liaison to the Historic Preservation Board
Example of Porch Column and Plinth to be used
REQUEST

The Applicants request approval for replacement windows installed without Design Review approval.

SUMMARY OF BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The subject property is an interior lot of record (Dixieland Subdivision, platted 1907, block 11, lot 19) that is 0.16 acres in size (50’ X 135’). This lot contains a single-family house in the Bungalow architectural style, built circa 1925, that is a contributing building in the South Lake Morton Historic District. The one-story house has a rectangular plan oriented to South Boulevard, and features a front gabled roof with a hipped roof front porch with a central gable. The front porch is supported by four tapered columns on struck block plinths, which was previously enclosed. Additional character-defining features of the house include decorative beams in the gables, a 3-bay gable vent, novelty siding, corner boards, lattice brick foundation, and a corbelled brick chimney. Another character-defining feature that has since been removed were all of the original double-hung sash wood windows with a three-over-one divided lite configuration, as well as the window trim and casing.

On September 4, 2020, an anonymous complaint was received by City staff concerning work done at this house over the summer months of 2020, without a Certificate of Review and building permits; specifically, that the enclosed front porch had been reopened and both the front door and all windows had been replaced. Using Google Streetview images from July 2019 compared to the current appearance of the house, a staff investigation confirmed that the enclosed front porch had been restored to an open front porch, the front door was replaced with a new quarter-lite style door (Jeld-wen steel/wood edge door, FL#12769.1), and all original windows were replaced with white vinyl, single-hung sash windows with a simulated divided lite appearance reflecting a Colonial lite pattern (2/2, 3/3, and 4/4 lite configurations) (M/I FL#21637.3) with the muntins or “grid” sandwiched between the double-pane window glazing. In addition, it was found that the two window openings on either side of the chimney had been resized and made smaller, and the set of paired windows on the same south side elevation had been resized into a single window. All original window trim and casing was replaced with what appears to be simple 1” X 4” wood.

Based on the complaint and investigation, a Stop-Work Order was issued by the City’s Building Inspection Division for the work mentioned above. The Applicants applied for and received a Certificate of Review for the replacement front door and restoration of the open front porch, which was granted approval by staff as these items were consistent with the Residential Historic District Design Guidelines. The Applicants also applied for a building permit.
for all work, which is currently pending due to this request. The Applicants acquired the house in January 2020 from Mr. and Mrs. Robert Lopez, and stated in the Building Permit application that this work was undertaken prior to the Applicants’ ownership.

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:

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

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

The following Design Guidelines apply to this project:

Chapter 5: Rehabilitation of Contributing Buildings, page 5-10.

Windows

- Repair of original windows is encouraged and preferred over replacement. Replacement of original windows should only be considered in cases where original windows have deteriorated beyond reasonable repair.
- Windows should reflect the architectural style of the building.
- Existing wood or metal trim and other decorative details contributing to the building’s character should be retained.
- Window openings should be kept in the same proportion as originally provided. Window head heights should be consistent throughout the building.
- Replacement window requirements:
  - Must retain the same size window for the opening;
  - Must retain the same divided lite/pane pattern as the original;
  - Any muntins must be dimensional and exterior mounted, approximately of the same dimension as the original windows;
  - Must be installed at least 2” inside the frame of the window (flush installation is not permitted);
  - Double or grouped windows may not be separated by a standard mull bar and must be separated by a wood or similar mullion of the same dimension as the original mullion.
  - Window must be trimmed out with wood or similar of the same design as the original, including angled sill and top drip edge.
  - Possible substitutes must be approved by the Historic Preservation Board.

Not Recommended/Not Acceptable:

- Modification that alters the character of the building.
- Removal of window details.
- Reducing window size.
- Use of stock windows not compatible with the house.
• Replacement windows that are smaller than the original.
• Window pane patterns that are not the same as the original.

ANALYSIS:

Typically, window replacement requires only staff-level review and approval, if the replacement window complies with the Design Guidelines. Because the requested replacement windows are not consistent with the Design Guidelines for several reasons, this request was referred to the Committee for review.

Original windows are character-defining features of a historic building, and their replacement with modern windows can adversely affect the architectural integrity of a building. The architectural style of this house is Craftsman Bungalow, which is expressed in part by the three-over-one divided lite configuration of its original wooden double-hung sash windows that were removed. In cases of severe deterioration, replacement windows may be used as long as the replacement windows match the window pane configuration of the original windows, have dimensional muntins attached to the exterior glazing, are installed with an adequate recess for the window profile and reveal, and retain or replicate the original trim and casing.

Staff finds the replacement windows requested by the Applicants have a Colonial-style pane configuration (2-over-2, 4-over-4, and 6-over-6) that does not match the pane configuration of the original three-over-one windows, and the window muntins/grids are sandwiched between the double-pane window glass, which does not comply with the exterior-mounted, dimensional muntin requirement. Also, the top sash of the windows does not have an adequate recess from the exterior wall/trim. Additionally, two window openings on the south elevation were reduced, and a set of paired windows were combined, eliminating the mullion, which is not an acceptable treatment per the Design Guidelines. Finally, all original window trim was replaced, eliminating the original profile and dimensional elements of the window openings. For these reasons, this request does not comply with the Design Guidelines.

Potential alternatives for this request include:

1. Removal of the grids in the replacement windows, if possible, to produce a one-over-one lite window, maintaining the new opening sizes on the secondary façade and trim/casing, which may be considered for approval by the Design Review Committee.

2. Replacement of all windows with windows having a three-over-one divided lite configuration and exterior-mounted muntins, matching the size of window openings and appearance of the windows originally in the house, and maintaining the new opening sizes on the secondary façade and trim/casing, which may be considered for approval by the Design Review Committee.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Denial of the request as submitted.

Report prepared by: Emily Foster, Senior Planner, Historic Preservation Liaison to the Historic Preservation Board
A Bungalow Style single-family residence of the 1922-1929 period, in scale and character with its surroundings. The South Lake Morton neighborhood, developed between 1906 and 1926, has changed little in the past fifty-eight years. Developed as Lakeland's first significant suburb, the area absorbed much of the city's rapid growth during the first quarter of this century. The neighborhood has served as home to many of Lakeland's leaders; governmental, business and professional. Today, the South Lake Morton area contains Lakeland's largest concentration of pre-1930 residential buildings and maintains a high degree of architectural integrity.
ARCHITECT

BUILDER

STYLE AND/OR PERIOD: Bungalow

PLAN TYPE: Rectangular

EXTERIOR FABRIC(S): Wood; Weatherboard w/cornerboards

STRUCTURAL SYSTEM(S): Wood Frame: Balloon

PORCHES: W/1-story enclosed porch, 3-Bay

ORIENTATION: West; entrance on southwest

FOUNDATION: Piers: Brick

ROOF TYPE: Cable

SECONDARY ROOF STRUCTURE(S): Hip porch

ROOF SURFACING: Composition Shingles

WINDOW TYPE: DHS, 3/1, wood # Bay on south

ORNAMENT EXTERIOR: Wood

CHIMNEY: Brick, w/corbelled caps

CHIMNEY LOCATION: S: Wall, exterior #E: Wall, exterior

NO. OF CHIMNEYS: 2

NO. OF STORIES: 1

NO. OF DORMERS:

OUTBUILDINGS: Garage Apt.

SURROUNDINGS: Compatible residential

MAP REFERENCE (incl. scale & date): USGS Lakeland 7.5 Min. 1975

Latitude and Longitude:

Site Size (Approx. Acreage of Property): LT 1

LOCATION SKETCH OR MAP

N

Photographic Records Numbers

Please attach photographic print
REQUEST

The Applicant requests Final Approval to build an addition onto the rear elevation of the existing house on the subject property.

SUMMARY OF BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The subject property is an interior lot consisting of 0.24 acres (80 feet X 130 feet) and contains a contemporary house built in 1982, which is a non-contributing building in the Biltmore-Cumberland Historic District. The house is a side-gabled, one-story structure that is constructed of finished concrete block and features a front-loaded, two-car garage.

The Applicant’s request proposes to build an addition consisting of 507 square feet (13 feet X 39 feet) onto the rear of the existing house. Approximately 202 square feet of space will be used for a new sitting room, and the remaining 305 square feet of space will be a new screened porch. The addition will be constructed of finished concrete block to match the house. Screened window and door openings will be used in the porch section, and the sitting room will feature an interior doorway and three windows to match the style and appearance of the existing windows on the house. Shutters matching those on the house will be used on the exterior paired windows on the addition. Asphalt shingles matching the existing roofing are proposed on the addition. Vertical siding and a round attic vent matching these features on the house will be used on the rear-facing gable of the addition.

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.

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 Additions and Alterations to Non-Contributing Buildings, pages 4.1 
to 4.9.

- Architectural details should be compatible with the architectural style of the building’s original 
design.
- Use the wall finish most acceptable for the architectural style; exterior siding should be similar in 
  style to the original.
- Windows and doors should reflect the architectural style of the building.
- Window and door openings should be kept in the same proportion as original provided; window and 
  door heights should be consistent throughout the building.
- Decoration and trim should be appropriate to the architectural style and the specific building.
- Building additions should be limited to the rear of the main building; the roof pitch of the addition 
  should match or be lower than the original roof pitch. All façade elements need to continue 
  architectural elements and detail.

ANALYSIS:

In evaluating the request with the Standards, staff finds that the requested addition does not disturb the spatial 
relationships that characterize the neighborhood, and the essential form and integrity of the existing house is 
maintained.

In evaluating the request with the Design Guidelines, the materials of the proposed addition reflect the original 
materials of the house and are compatible with the Guidelines. The design of the proposed windows, as well as 
roof pitch and overhang, is consistent with the style of the subject house and Guidelines. Furthermore, the 
addition is appropriately placed to the rear of the house.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends Final Approval of the request as submitted.

Report prepared by:   Emily Foster, Senior Planner, Historic Preservation 
                      Liaison to the Historic Preservation Board
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
STAFF REPORT
November 19, 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>HPB20-189</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner/Applicant</td>
<td>Mr. Thomas Winslow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Professional</td>
<td>Mr. Thomas Winslow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address; Historic Name</td>
<td>922 South Boulevard; “Elbert T. Gregg House” (1924 Lakeland City Directory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested Action</td>
<td>Accessory Building over 300 SF; Detached Garage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic District; FMS#</td>
<td>South Lake Morton Historic District; #SLM 8-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Land Use; Zoning; Context District</td>
<td>Residential Medium; RA-4; Urban Neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Use</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent Properties</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Approvals</td>
<td>Maintenance and Window Replacements, 5/6/2016 (HPB16-081)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REQUEST

Mr. Winslow requests approval to build a new detached garage in the rear yard of the subject property.

SUMMARY OF BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The subject property is an interior lot consisting of 0.16 acres (50 feet by 135 feet) with alley access to the rear, and contains a circa 1924 Bungalow house, which is a contributing building in the South Lake Morton Historic District. The one-story house features a front-gabled roof with exposed curved rafter tails, lap siding, and double-hung sash windows with a three-over-one lite configuration. The hipped-roof front porch and side-gabled porte cochere features a gable pediment, tapered columns and brick column plinths.

Accessory buildings over 300 square feet require review and approval by the Design Review Committee instead of staff, and the requested garage is 624 square feet (24 feet by 26 feet) in total area. The proposed new garage structure will be of wood frame construction placed on a concrete slab at the rear of the subject property, and will be clad in Hardie Plank lap siding. The 5/12 pitch, gabled roof of the garage will be covered in fiberglass shingles and will feature exposed rafter tails to match the appearance of the house. Decorative features include corner boards, knee braces, and gable vents reflecting the architectural character of the house. The east elevation of the garage, facing the alley, will have two metal overhead garage doors, while the south elevation will have one metal overhead garage door. The west elevation will have a 6-panel entry door. For access to the garage, a new concrete driveway is proposed to be constructed between the alley and the garage.

The site plan indicates a side yard setback of 3 feet from the north side property line and rear yard setback of 18 feet from the rear (east) property line.

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.

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

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

The following Design Guidelines apply to this project:
Chapter 5: Rehabilitation of Contributing Buildings.
Garages and Carports
- Should be detached and placed behind the main facade.
- Rear or side alley access entry preferred for garages.
- Driveways should be simple.

ANALYSIS:
Staff finds the proposed garage to be consistent with the Standards, as it will not damage the spatial relationships that characterize the building, and will not destroy historic materials or features. New but compatible building materials will be used.

Regarding the Design Guidelines, staff finds the request to be consistent with the guidelines for placement, design, and materials for garage structures on contributing properties. Additionally, the building setbacks and height meet the requirements of the Land Development Code’s development regulations for accessory structures.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:
Staff recommends Final Approval of the request as submitted.

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

Mr. McDonough requests approval to build a covered porch onto the east elevation of the house at this address.

SUMMARY OF BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The subject property is a corner lot consisting of 0.14 acres, which contains a circa 1923 Frame Vernacular house. The one-story house has a hipped roof, a gabled overhang over the front door, and a shed-roofed building addition on the west elevation. While this house was categorized as a contributing building to the Dixieland Historic District at the time of the 1993 historic district survey, staff finds that this building has lost any architectural integrity it may have had in the past; all windows and doors have been replaced, and the vertical paneling siding does not appear to be original. Therefore, staff has determined that this building no longer reflects the architectural character of the Dixieland Historic District and is non-contributing.

The request proposes to remove the existing gabled overhang and add a covered front porch, 128 square feet in area (16 feet wide by 8 feet deep). The new porch will have a shed roof and will be supported by tapered columns on square bases, with the 4/12 pitch of the porch roof matching the existing roof pitch of the western building addition. The sides of the porch roof will be clad in siding matching the existing vertical siding of the house. (NOTE: the elevation drawings submitted by the Applicant show horizontal lap siding, but the existing vertical siding will remain.)

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.

The following Standards apply to this project:

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

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

The following Design Guidelines apply to this project:
Chapter 4: Design Principles and Elements for Additions and Alterations to Noncontributing Buildings.

- Height is a consideration for front porches, which if designed well, provide a smooth transition between the public realm of the street and the private realm of the home. Typically, porches are built as the same grade as the primary structure and are essentially an extension of a home. Height emphasizes the private nature of the space by clearly defining the boundaries with a small degree of separation from the yard below. Thoughtfully framed by railings, stairs, brick piers and knee walls, a well-designed porch can be the defining visual element of a home.

- The materials used for walls, sloping roofs, and other details should respect adjacent historic buildings.

- Existing details and ornamentation may be used as the basis for those on a new building or feature, 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.

- Avoid applying a false sense of historic character to buildings by replicating exact historical details on a new building or feature.

ANALYSIS:

The Dixieland Historic District displays a variety of architectural styles, but the most common is the Bungalow, which is characterized by a front porch. Due to the unusual aesthetics of the subject house and its many alterations that have negatively affected its architectural integrity, staff finds the proposed front porch addition to be consistent with the Standards, as the porch design and materials are compatible with the surrounding neighborhood and will not adversely affect the integrity of the Dixieland Historic District.

With regard to the Design Guidelines, staff finds the request to be consistent with the intent of the guidelines for massing, scale, design, and materials for additions to noncontributing buildings. With regard to architectural ornamentation, in order to be consistent with the Design Guidelines and compatible with the design and scale of surrounding houses, staff recommends that a simple square capital be added to the porch columns that is similar in design and shape to the cap of the column bases.

Lastly, staff finds the proposed front porch to meet the entrance feature design requirements of the LDC Urban Form Standards, except for the 21” height above grade requirement. The porch also encroaches into the principal building street setbacks, which are a minimum of 15 feet for both the W. Patterson Street (south) and S. Dakota Avenue (east) sides of the property. These exceptions will need to be remedied by the approval of a variance by the Zoning Board of Adjustments and Appeals prior to receiving a building permit for this project.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the request with the condition that simple square capitals are added to the porch columns that are similar in design and shape to the cap of the column bases.

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