AGENDA
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
City Commission Chambers
February 25, 2021 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 January 28, 2021 Historic Preservation Board meeting minutes.

III. Old Business:

   A. Staff suggestion to amend the Historic Preservation Board’s Rules of Procedure to add a formalized procedure for the swearing-in of applicants, staff, and other interested persons giving testimony at either the Historic Preservation Board or Design Review Committee meetings. Assistant City Attorney Jerrod Simpson will assist in this discussion. A motion and majority vote by the Board will be needed to amend the Rules of Procedure.

IV. New Business:

   A. Board Member Update: Welcome New Members Cesar Perez and Michelle Sylvester

   B. Window Policy Workshop for Board Members and Staff (Remote Meeting)

V. Adjourn for Design Review Committee.
MINUTES

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
City Commission Chambers
Thursday, January 28, 2021
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), Lynn Dennis, Landis Fleming, Jeremy Moses, Chris Olson, MeLynda Rinker, and John White were present. Community & Economic Development Department staff Emily Foster, Senior Planner, Historic Preservation and Christelle Burrola, Planning Assistant, were also present.

I. Call to Order and Determination of a Quorum

Chair Dan Fowler called the January 28, 2021 meeting of the Historic Preservation Board (“Board”) to order at 8:33 a.m. A quorum was reached, as seven Board members were present.

II. Review and Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes

Mr. John White motioned to approve the December 17, 2020 meeting minutes as presented. Ms. Lynn Dennis seconded the motion. The motion passed 6-0, with Ms. MeLynda Rinker abstaining from the vote due to being absent at the previous meeting.

III. Old Business: NONE.

IV. New Business:

A. Staff update on Historic District Re-Survey. Staff is working on procuring cost estimates to plan for this project.

B. Discussion with Assistant City Attorney Jerrod Simpson regarding staff suggestion to amend the Historic Preservation Board Rule’s of Procedure rescheduled for February hearing.

V. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 8:37 a.m. for the Design Review Committee. (J. White/L. Dennis, 7-0)

Chair, Historic Preservation Board

Senior Planner, Historic Preservation
I. Call to order, determination of a quorum, and roll call.

II. Review and approval of the January 28, 2021 Design Review Committee meeting minutes.

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

IV. Consideration of Certificate of Review Applications:

A. HPB20-211 – 1121 S. Lincoln Avenue -- Final Approval requested to convert an existing window opening to a doorway and add a small covered roof patio on the south elevation of the house on the subject property. Owner: Merlin Properties of Central Florida LLC. Applicant: Ms. Yelithza Paramo, Paramount Building. Continued from a previous meeting.

B. HPB21-030 – 302 W. Park Street – Final Approval requested to replace existing siding and windows. Owner/Applicant: M & P Restoration, LLC.

C. HPB21-035 – 1114 E. Palmetto Street -- Final Approval requested to demolish aluminum sunroom on the rear elevation of subject house and build an addition. Owner: Mr. Kevin Blanks. Applicant: Mr. Jason Fabrik, Willow Built, Inc.

D. HPB21-038 – 711 College Avenue -- Final Approval requested to build an addition onto the rear elevation of the existing house on the subject property, as well as to expand the existing porte cochere. Owner: Ms. Jennifer Smith & Mr. Roberto Nunez. Applicant: Mr. Leonard Wood.

E. HPB21-040 – 238 N. Massachusetts Avenue -- Final Approval requested major rehabilitation to the subject building to accommodate mixed-use redevelopment consisting of commercial office, retail, food and beverage, and residential uses. Owner: 238 N. Massachusetts LLC. Applicant: Mr. Jon Kirk, Straughn Trout Architects.

V. Other Business: NONE

VI. Adjournment.
I. Call to Order and Determination of a Quorum

The meeting was called to order by Chair Lynn Dennis at 8:37 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 December 17, 2020 meeting minutes. Mr. Dan Fowler seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously, 6-0.

III. Review of Certificates of Review administratively approved.

A list of twenty-six (26) administratively approved Certificate of Review projects covering the period 12/8/20-1/21/21 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. HPB20-211 – 1121 S. Lincoln Avenue – Final Approval requested for the new construction of a one-story, single-family house on the property at this address. Owner: Merlin Properties of Central Florida LLC. Applicant: Ms. Yelithza Paramo, Paramount Building

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

Ms. Emily Foster presented the staff report, stating that the subject property consists of one lot of record and a portion of a second lot of record, which total 0.26 acres in area size. On the subject property is a single-family house, built circa 1954, which features a gabled roof and is masonry vernacular in style. This house has been altered by the installation of replacement windows that appear to be incompatible with the Design Guidelines. A masonry detached two-car garage also exists on the western side of the property. These buildings are non-contributing buildings within the Dixieland Historic District.

The Applicant proposes to reorient the main entrance of the house from the east elevation that currently faces S. Lincoln Avenue, to a new doorway on the south elevation that faces W. Belmar Street. An existing window on the south elevation will be removed to accommodate the new entrance doorway, in which a Masonite full-lite door will be installed. A wooden gabled-roofed*
overhang supported by 6” X 6” wood posts will be added to the new entrance for cover from the elements. The existing front porch and doorway on the east elevation will remain as-is. Ms. Foster stated there the staff report mistakenly described the new overhang as a “shed” roofed structure.

This request originated from the Applicant’s request to the City’s Planning Division to split the property along a proposed new property line running north-to-south and meet the City’s Land Development Code regarding both the zoning district development and subdivision regulations. Splitting the subject property will create a new parcel, which the Applicant may use for the construction of a new single-family house in the future. The site plan for the proposed lot split has been found to meet front entrance, lot dimension, building setbacks, and parking requirements by Planning staff, and will require that the property be given a new address reflecting W. Belmar Street.

Ms. Foster stated that additional work was included on the Application for this request and will be administratively reviewed and approved by staff separately following the approval of the primary request by the Design Review Committee. This additional work includes: demolition of the existing concrete block detached garage on the property, construction of a new 10-ft. wide driveway on the north side of the property, installation of a metal storage shed in the rear yard of the property, and relocation of the existing electric meter from the south elevation to the west elevation of the house.

Ms. Foster stated that the request was evaluated using Secretary’s Standards #9 and #10 and Chapter 6 of the Residential Historic District Design Guidelines.

Generally, changes to individual lot lines from the pattern established by historic platted subdivisions is not supported by staff due to historical development patterns that provide a foundation for historic context, setting, and designation of Lakeland’s historic districts. However, given the change in lot orientation found in the George Subdivision west of S. Lincoln Avenue as compared to the Dixieland Subdivision east of S. Lincoln Avenue, and the variation of orientation of buildings in this area, the splitting of the subject property along a non-platted lot line can be supported.

Alterations to non-contributing buildings may be offered more flexibility than contributing buildings in terms of consistency with the Standards and Design Guidelines, but alterations must not affect the architectural integrity of adjacent contributing buildings or diminish the historical character of the overall historic district. While staff finds that the proposed reorientation of the front door from the east to south elevation will not adversely affect surrounding contributing buildings or the character of the Dixieland Historic District, this alteration could be done in a way that is more compatible with the masonry vernacular character of the house. Staff recommends the following changes to the request:

1. Overhang gable end should be clad in saw-tooth vertical siding, similar in dimension and profile as that existing on the gables of the house; and
2. Install a French or full-lite door on the existing doorway on the east elevation of the home to convey the appearance of a secondary doorway.

As the request meets the intent of the Standards and Design Guidelines, staff recommends final approval of the request with the previously stated conditions.
A representative for this request was not in attendance. Ms. MeLynda Rinker asked when the windows on property were installed and if they were permitted. Ms. Foster stated the windows are not permitted and does not have the date of when they were installed. This is an increasing issue within the Historic Districts and recommends there be a workshop scheduled for solely on windows. Mr. Dan Fowler stated that the proposed entrance appears to be a side entrance and recommends it be enlarged to provide a front porch appearance common on main entrances. There were no further comments from the Board, and there were no public comments.

**MOTION: Table the item until the February meeting. (M. Rinker, D. Fowler 6-0)**

**B. HPB20-215 – 15 Lake Hollingsworth Drive** – Final Approval requested for the conversion of a second-floor window to a double French door and addition of a second-floor balcony. Owner: Mr. John Michael Weber. Applicant: Mr. William Wendel, WenPro, Inc.

Chair Dennis 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 subject property is a corner property consisting of three lots of record with a total area of 0.47 acres in size. On this property is a two-story, Frame Vernacular house built circa 1922, which is a contributing building in the South Lake Morton Historic District. The architectural style of this house was classified as Frame Vernacular on the Florida Master Site File inventory form for the District, but it also exhibits elements of the Prairie, Neoclassical, and Colonial Revival styles. Building features that express these styles include: a hipped roof and eaves with a wide overhang; textured stucco cladding; full-height square porch columns; a modestly pedimented main doorway; and double hung sash windows with an evenly divided upper sash in Colonial pane configurations.

Alterations include a one-story addition on the east elevation, and a significant alteration to the front façade. As evidenced from the 1922 to 1947 Sanborn Fire Insurance Company Maps for Lakeland, a one-story semi-enclosed porch or porch-like structure originally existed on the front of this house during these years. At some point, perhaps in the 1950s or 1960s when the Neoclassical and Colonial Revival styles began to be reinvented and used on modern residences, staff believes this one-story structure was removed and the full-height porch columns were installed. Additional alterations to the front façade of this home may also have occurred. Additional property records indicate that between 1947 and 1957, the one-story residence once located to the north of the subject house was demolished and this lot, Lot 13, was combined with the subject property.

The Applicant proposes to convert the triple window on the second story of the front façade to a pair of fiberglass French doors matching the style and dimensions of the existing French doors on the ground floor front façade. Shutters similar to the existing shutters on the ground floor French doors will be installed on the new doorway. Also proposed is a new second-floor balcony spanning the width of the front façade consisting of wood construction and an ornamental metal handrail in a design similar to the ground floor porch handrail.

Ms. Foster stated that the request was evaluated using Secretary’s Standards #3 and #9 and Chapter 6 of the Residential Historic District Design Guidelines. Second-story balconies and porches can be found on a variety of contributing buildings in Lakeland’s historic districts. In evaluating the request, staff finds that the front façade of the subject house has been altered over time and reflects an eclectic mix of architectural styles. Because of the previous alteration to the
front facade, both the window-to-door conversion and balcony addition will not adversely affect the architectural character of the South Lake Morton Historic District or integrity of this house. The request represents a change that is compatible with the architectural style(s) of this home, while still conveying the full-height nature of the existing columns and openness of the front porch area. Additionally, staff finds that this change is potentially reversible and will be differentiated by modern, but compatible materials.

Staff recommends approval of the request as submitted with the condition that the windows to be removed are done in a sensitive manner and offered for architectural salvage, rather than disposed of.

Chair Dennis asked if the Applicant had any additional comments or questions. Mr. John Michel Weber was present in support of the request. There were no further comments from the Applicant and there were no public comments.

MOTION: Final approval of the request as submitted and recommended by staff (M. Rynker/J. White, 6-0).

C. HPB21-006 – 1920 Pawnee Trail – Final Approval requested for the new construction of a one-story, single-family house on the property at this address. Owner: Ms. Linda Trumble & Mr. Louis Lanzino Jr. Applicant: Mr. Jordan Napoles, Mark Brown Construction.

Chair Dennis introduced the request and stated that it was withdrawn by the applicant.

D. HPB21-008 – 725 W. Park Street – Final Approval requested for the new construction of a single-family house on the property at this address. Owner/Applicant: Ms. Suzzanne Butner.

Chair Dennis 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 vacant platted lot in the Dixieland Historic District and has alley access to the rear. The lot consists of 0.15 acres. The proposed new construction is a one-story single-family house with approximately 1,768 square feet of living space. The house features a Frame Vernacular aesthetic with a gabled roof and an integrated front porch supported by square columns with a triangular gable vent in the front and rear gables. The home also features horizontal lap siding, and one-over-one windows.

Materials proposed for the new house include:
- Concrete stem wall foundation raised 18” above curb, with stucco finish on the foundation;
- Hardie Board lap siding with a 6” exposure;
- Vinyl single-hung sash windows with a 1/1 lite configuration;
- Quarter-lite, 3-panel entry doors and a double glass sliding door on the rear elevation;
- Asphalt architectural shingles on a 5/12 pitch roof, with Hardie fascia and vinyl soffit; and
- Concrete porch floor and steps with wood handrail and Craftsman-style wood columns.

Ms. Foster stated that the site plan proposed for the new house shows orientation of the front facade towards West Park Street. The house maintains setbacks consistent with the Land Development Code’s Urban Form Standards, including a 20' front setback, an 8’-8” side setbacks, and a 50’ rear setback.
Ms. Foster stated that the request was evaluated using Secretary’s Standards #9 and Chapter 4 of the Residential Historic District Design Guidelines. The 700 block of West Park Street features modest single-family houses, many of which are variations of the Bungalow and Frame Vernacular styles. The architectural design of the proposed new home is modeled on the new home proposed for 324 W. Park Street, which was approved by the Design Review Committee in 2017. The design of the proposed new house features a neo-traditional style resembling Frame Vernacular, which will not adversely affect the historic or architectural character of the Dixieland Historic District. The simple architectural detailing is consistent with the Frame Vernacular style, as well as the Design Guidelines. However, further compatibility with the surrounding contributing buildings and the Design Guidelines, as well as to correct a foundation issue not correctly executed on the new house at 324 W. Park Street, staff recommends the following revisions to the proposed home’s design:

- The finish floor height of the house must be 21 inches above grade; finish floor height of the front porch may be slightly lower at 18” above grade;
- Provide wider column capitals and bases to visually differentiate them from the column shaft;
- Align porch columns with entablature beam; column capitals should extend slightly past beam;
- Increase the width of frieze boards to 10 inches to differentiate from the siding exposure and add frieze board to rear elevation gable;
- Window and door trim and casing should be Hardie material and a minimum width of at least 3 inches; windows must have header, sill, and apron trim, and paired windows must have a vertical dividing mullion of at least 3 inches wide; all windows must be recessed to provide a shadowline and cannot be flush-mounted;
- Corner boards at least 6” in width should be added to all corners of house; and
- A small gable or shed-roof overhang with simple wood brackets should be added over the rear entry door for cover from the elements and consistency with the Frame Vernacular style.

Ms. Foster also stated placement of the proposed house on the lot is consistent with the Design Guidelines in terms of orientation and setbacks. A parking area for two vehicles placed at the rear of the property with access from the alley must be shown on the site plan for planning and zoning approval of the building permit. As the request meets the intent of the Standards and Design Guidelines for new construction, staff recommends approval of the request with the following conditions, to be reviewed and approved at staff level prior to permitting:

- The finish floor height of the house must be 21 inches above grade; finish floor height of the front porch may be slightly lower at 18” above grade;
- Provide wider column capitals and bases to visually differentiate them from the column shaft;
- Align porch columns with entablature beam; column capitals should extend slightly past beam;
- Increase the width of frieze boards to 10 inches to differentiate from the siding exposure and add frieze board to rear elevation gable;
• Window and door trim and casing should be Hardie material and a minimum width of at least 3 inches; windows must have header, sill, and apron trim, and paired windows must have a vertical dividing mullion of at least 3 inches wide; all windows must be recessed to provide a shadowline and cannot be flush-mounted;
• Corner boards at least 6” in width should be added to all corners of house; and
• A small gable or shed-roof overhang with simple wood brackets should be added over the rear entry door for cover from the elements and consistency with the Frame Vernacular style.
• On the site plan, add two parking spaces at the rear of the property with access from the alley; and
• Provide an exterior paint color palette.

Chair Dennis asked if the Applicant had any additional comments or questions. Ms. Suzzanne Butner was present in support of the request. Ms. Butner asked if she would have to come back to the board for a new approval. Ms. Foster stated no as conditions can be approved by staff. There were no further comments from the Applicant and there were no public comments.

MOTION: Approval of the request with the conditions recommended by staff (D. Fowler/L. Fleming, 6-0)

E. HPB21-009 – 1923 Pawnee Trail – Final Approval requested for an accessory dwelling unit at this address. Owner: Solid Rock Opportunities, LLC. Applicant: Mr. Kenneth A. Harris.

Chair Dennis 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 platted lot in the Beacon Hill Historic District, which consists of 0.15 acres. On the property is a one-story, single-family house built circa 1922 in the Mediterranean Revival style, which is a contributing building in the Historic District. Architectural features expressing the Mediterranean Revival style include: a flat roof surrounded by a stepped parapet roof, a full-width front porch with stepped parapet roof and segmental arched bays, rough cast stucco cladding; and single round scuppers. Alterations include metal replacement windows and the enclosed front porch. A detached garage matching the materials and design of the house also exists on the property in the southwestern corner.

As the house has not been occupied or maintained for quite some time, the Applicant intends to remodel the home and update all mechanical systems. Roofing on both the house and garage will be replaced; the garage roofing will remain a flat roof surrounded by a stepped parapet wall, but the main roof and parapet of the house will be removed and replaced with a 5/12 pitch gabled roof with a small arched window in the front and rear gables. The flat roof and parapet of the front porch will remain and will be repaired with in-kind materials. Staff has discussed with the Applicant the issue with changing the roof form of the house, which is inconsistent with both the Design Guidelines for Historic Properties and Mediterranean Revival architectural style of the house; the Applicant understands this issue and desired to proceed with the request as submitted.

Ms. Foster stated several alterations are proposed for the front porch. The left side bay (east elevation) of the front porch will be re-opened and converted to a new entryway onto the porch. The existing entryway on the south elevation of the porch will be converted to an arched opening
with a sidewall. The current porch steps at the existing entryway on the south elevation of the porch will be removed and new steps and cheek walls will be installed on the opened left bay (east elevation) of the porch. A new front door is proposed to be installed on the new wall dividing the left and right bays of the porch. With the right side of the porch remaining enclosed, new windows will be installed in the arched bays of both the front (east) elevation and side (north) elevations.

All windows will be replaced in the house with new double-hung sash windows matching the original opening size, and with a 9-lite Prairie style upper sash. A Prairie style front door with transom and sidelights and solid rear door are also proposed. Specific materials proposed for this request include:

- Stucco matching the texture of the existing walls, including repairs and replacement where necessary;
- The existing trim and casing will be maintained or repaired using stucco casing to match the original trim;
- A metal or wood front door;
- The flat roof of the front porch and garage will be repaired in-kind; and
- Architectural shingles or metal roofing is proposed on the proposed gable roof of the house.

With the exception of the new front porch steps, the footprint of the house and detached garage will remain the same as existing, and therefore a site plan was not needed for this request.

Ms. Foster stated that the request was evaluated using Secretary’s Standards #2, #5, #9, #10 and Chapters 5 and 6 of the Residential Historic District Design Guidelines. In evaluating the request with the Standards and Design Guidelines cited, staff has made the following findings:

- Given that all existing doors and windows are replacement features, the proposed replacement windows and doors are consistent in type and style with respect to the Standards and Design Guidelines, as well as Mediterranean Revival Architectural style. The Prairie 9-lite style for both the upper sash of windows and the front door has historic precedent on Mediterranean Revival houses in Lakeland’s Historic Districts.
- The repairs to and/or replacements of stucco and flat roofing with in-kind materials with a similar appearance to the original is consistent with the Standards and Design Guidelines. Staff recommends that the existing round roof scuppers/drains present in the front porch are repaired and maintained, as well as the foundation venting on the front porch.

Ms. Foster also stated given that the front porch is currently enclosed, the alterations as proposed to the front porch are found to meet the intent of the Standards and Design Guidelines and respect the architectural character of this house. However, staff recommends that the right-side bay of the front porch retain the full width of the segmental-arched bay enclosure; it may be necessary to use a grouping of three windows in this bay instead of two to achieve a balanced proportion. Regarding the proposal to change the roof form on the main portion of the house from a flat roof with a parapet to a gable roof, staff finds this alteration to be inconsistent with the Standards and Design Guidelines, as it removes a character-defining feature of the Mediterranean Revival architectural style, destroys historic materials and is irreversible. The Beacon Hill Historic District contains 172 contributing, historic buildings. Out of this number, only six residences are Mediterranean Revival-styled houses with parapeted flat roofs, which makes the subject house a relatively rare resource in this District.
Staff recommends Approval of the request with the following conditions, to be reviewed and approved at staff level prior to permitting:

- Retain and repair with in-kind materials the flat roof and parapet of the main portion of the house. A low-sloped roof hidden behind the parapet may be used instead of a flat roof for drainage purposes.
- Retain the width of the right-side segmental-arched bay enclosure of the front porch enclosure on its front facade; it may be necessary to use a grouping of three windows in this bay instead of two to achieve a balanced proportion/composition in this enclosure.
- Retain and repair with in-kind materials the existing round roof scuppers/drains present in the front porch, as well as the vertical foundation venting slits on the front porch.

Chair Dennis asked if the Applicant had any additional comments or questions. Mr. Kenneth Harris was present and presented pictures in support of the request. Mr. Harris stated the reason for the change to a gable roof is he does not want to place more scuppers on the property. There is not enough room in the attic space to run mechanical for central heat and air. The gable roof would provide room for a return unit in the attic.

In response to Ms. Melynda Rinker, Mr. Harris stated there are about eight to ten scuppers currently. There was further discussion on what can be done to repair the current scuppers on the structure and why Mr. Harris prefers a gable roof. Mr. Harris is concerned with the look of double scuppers on the home. Ms. Foster stated an option is placing scuppers on the rear of the building with a sloped roof. Mr. Harris stated from a financial standpoint, he does not prefer to repair the scuppers which he thinks will also cause issues in the future. He states he thinks it would be difficult to install central heat and air with a flat roof.

There were no further comments from the Applicant and there were no public comments.

MOTION: Approval of the request with the conditions recommended by staff (M. Rinker/L. Fleming, 6-0)

F. HPB21-011 – 730 College Avenue – Final Approval requested for a minor exterior alteration to the house at this address. Owner: Megg Investments of Polk, LLC. Applicant: Mr. Greg Wilhelm, Megg Investments of Polk, LLC.

Chair Dennis 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 0.13 acres. On this property is a one-story, Bungalow house built circa 1922, which is a contributing building in the South Lake Morton Historic District. Architectural features of this house expressing the Bungalow style include a cross-gabled roof, a gabled front porch supported by square brick columns and brick knee walls, exposed rafter tails, decorative gable beams, and four-over-one and eight-over-one double-hung sash windows. Alterations include some replacement windows and a front porch enclosure consisting of siding and jalousie windows, which has been removed, restoring the front porch to an open appearance. Upon removing the front porch enclosure, the upper porch beam spanning the two outer brick columns began sagging. To correct this, the Applicant installed two tapered wood columns on top of the existing brick piers at the center of the porch as additional support for the beam. Craftsman-style tapered columns were chosen by the Applicant as this type of column can be seen on numerous Bungalow-styled homes in the South Lake Morton Historic District. The concrete caps of the brick
piers no longer exist and were likely removed when the front porch enclosure was installed in the 1940s or 1950s. The tops of these piers show only horizontal notches where the previous wall enclosure had been.

Ms. Foster stated that the request was evaluated using Secretary’s Standards #3, #6, #9 and Chapter 6 of the Residential Historic District Design Guidelines. In evaluating the request, staff finds no physical or documentary evidence to support columns placed on top of the existing piers, or that square brick columns, similar to the outer columns, existed at the center of the porch. Historical Bungalow houses often feature front porch piers without columns in the center of the porch for the simple purpose of providing an unobstructed view from the porch. While this request is inconsistent with Standards #2 and #3, staff finds that the addition of tapered columns is compatible with the architectural style of the subject house and consistent with the Design Guidelines in terms of material. Due to the structural concerns of the porch beam sagging, which spans 22 feet, and combined with the determination that these columns may be removed without damage to the piers or beam, staff finds that this alteration does not adversely affect the architectural character or integrity of the subject house or surrounding historic district. While the tapered column capitals and bases are not correctly aligned according to historical porch entablatures, staff does not recommend correcting this, as the current appearance demonstrates that these columns are not original features and should not be construed as such; this appearance also provides a differentiation between historic and modern material. Staff recommends approval of the request as submitted.

Chair Dennis asked if the Applicant had any additional comments or questions. Mr. Greg Wilhelm was present in support of the request. There were no further comments from the Applicant and there were no public comments.

**MOTION: Final approval of the request as submitted and recommended by staff (J. White/M. Rynker, 6-0).**

**G. HPB21-012 – 942 Success Avenue** – Final Approval requested for a bathroom addition and an accessory dwelling unit at this address. Owner: Ms. Keri Murphy. Applicant: Mr. Mark Switzer, ValuePro Remodeling.

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

Ms. Emily Foster presented the staff report, stating that the subject property consists of one interior lot of record measuring 50 feet wide by 140 feet deep and consists of 0.16 acres. An improved alley exists to the rear of the property. This property contains a one-and-a-half story single-family house, constructed circa 1925 house in the Frame Vernacular architectural style, which is a contributing building in the South Lake Morton Historic District. The house features a gabled roof with sloped roof addition, a gabled stoop, lapped weatherboard siding, corner boards, and double-hung sash windows with a 9-lite Prairie style upper sash. Located in the rear yard, at the southeast corner of the subject property, is a one-story, detached garage with a gable roof. The garage is clad in wood lap siding and has an asbestos shingle roof. Built circa 1925, the garage is considered to be a contributing building in the District, but as a deteriorated accessory building, is able to be demolished per the Design Guidelines.

The Applicant’s request is two-fold: A bathroom addition, approximately 200 square feet in size, is proposed to be constructed on the north side elevation of the house, behind the existing addition. The sloped roofline of the new addition will match and meet with the rooftop of the
Existing materials for this addition will include Dutch lap siding with a profile and dimension matching the house; corner boards to match; Jeld-Wen vinyl double-hung sash and single sash windows with a 9-lite Prairie style top sash; pressure treated pine window trim and casing; and architectural shingles to match the existing house. The addition will be supported by footers and piers to match the home's crawlspace height, which will be clad in brick; Hardie board matching the existing crawlspace screening will be installed between piers. Two original windows on the north side elevation will be removed due to this addition. Following demolition of the detached garage structure, an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) is proposed to be built in roughly the same location as the garage. The ADU is a one-and-a half story structure and is 483 square feet in size. The clipped, side-gable roof will be clad in architectural shingles matching the house, and Dutch lap siding and corner boards matching the house will be used. The entrance door features a gabled overhang similar to the house, supported by wood brackets. Jeld-Wen vinyl Prairie style windows will be used, along with two solid four-panel doors.

Ms. Foster stated the site plan submitted for these requests shows that the addition to the house maintains the 7.7 feet building setback established by the existing building addition, which complies with the minimum interior side building setbacks required by the Lakeland Land Development Code. The proposed setbacks shown on the site plan for the ADU are 2 feet, 4 inches from the rear property line and 1 foot 8 inches from the interior side property line.

The request was evaluated using Secretary’s Standards #2, #9, #10 and Chapter 4 of the Residential Historic District Design Guidelines. In evaluating the request with the Standards, staff finds that both the addition to the house and ADU does not disturb the spatial relationships of the principal house, and the essential form and integrity of the existing house is maintained. New but similar materials will be used on both requests, which will be complementary in nature to the design of the house. In evaluating the request with the Design Guidelines, staff finds the materials of the proposed addition and ADU reflect the materials of the house and are consistent with the Design Guidelines. Staff also finds the design of both structures’ trim, windows, door, and roof pitch and overhang to be consistent with the Design Guidelines, as well as simple in design and subordinate to the subject house. The addition is appropriately located to the side of the house, and the ADU is appropriately located to the rear of the lot with access from the alley. Consistent with the development pattern in the Lake Morton neighborhood, accessory dwellings are commonly found in both historic and contemporary form. The building setbacks for the addition to the house meet the requirements of both the Design Guidelines and Land Development Code. However, for compliance with the Design Guidelines and Land Development Code, as well as approval for Compatibility Review by the Planning and Zoning Board, the building setbacks for the ADU will need to be increased to a minimum of 5 feet from both the side and rear property lines. Additionally, the total mean height of the ADU is limited to 12.5 feet.

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

- All new windows must have exterior-mounted Prairie style muntins/grids;
- All new windows must be installed with a recess to provide a shadow line and not be installed flush with the wall plane; and
- The building setbacks of the ADU must be increased to at least 5 feet from the interior side and rear property lines, and the total mean height of the ADU is limited to 12.5 feet.
Chair Dennis asked if the Applicant had any additional comments or questions. Mr. Mark Switzer was present in support of the request. Mr. Switzer stated there is no issue in increasing the setbacks of the five feet. Discussion has already begun with the homeowner regarding the 12.5 median height of the roof. Mr. Dan Fowler asked what the reason was for the height of the room. Mr. Switzer stated it would be for a loft. There was some discussion regarding the guidelines and Land Development Code requirements for the height of the proposed property. Ms. Foster stated that the Applicant can apply for a variance for the higher height request. Mr. Dan Fowler commented that if approved for the loft, the Applicant’s engineer should check window size for minimum egress requirements per building code. There were no further comments from the Applicant and there were no public comments.

**MOTION: Approval of the request per staff recommendation with conditions. (J. Moses/M. Rynker, 6-0)**

**H. HPB21-013 – 960 S. Tennessee Avenue** – Final Approval requested for minor exterior alterations to the house at this address. Owner: RM Group Venture LLC. Applicant: McDonough Construction LLC.

Chair Dennis 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 0.16 acres. On this property is a one-story, masonry vernacular house built circa 1953, which is a non-contributing building in the South Lake Morton Historic District. The house features a hipped roof and carport and block walls and features some incompatible replacement windows. The concrete block front stoop has a low-sloped flat roof supported by metal columns with a scrollwork design. The floor of the stoop is angled and asymmetrical in shape and is covered in terracotta-colored tile; three steps lead from the stoop down to grade. The rear elevation features three uniformly sized window openings and one smaller window opening.

The request proposes to reconfigure the front stoop with a rectangular-shaped floor and steps and install one new rectangular wooden column to support the flat roof. On the rear elevation, the smaller window opening and two of the uniformly sized window openings will be enclosed with concrete block and painted to match the existing wall exterior of the house. The middle window opening will be converted to a doorway and a single French door will be installed, as well as a small concrete stoop with a metal handrail.

Ms. Foster stated that the request was evaluated using Secretary’s Standards #9 and Chapter 6 of the Residential Historic District Design Guidelines. While this house was categorized as noncontributing at the time of the historic district survey in 1984, as the date of its construction was not within the district’s period of significance (1904-1942), this house is now beyond the 50-year baseline criteria for historic designation; as such, this house would likely be included as a contributing structure in any district re-survey, as it retains much of its architectural integrity as a house of the Mid-Century Modern Masonry Vernacular architectural style (as defined in the Design Guidelines). It is staff’s opinion that the metal scrollwork columns on the front stoop of the subject house contribute to its architectural integrity and at a minimum, the column at the corner of the stoop should be retained. However, reconfiguring the shape of the stoop and installing new flooring does not adversely affect the character of the house or the District. Additionally, as the requested window enclosures and window-to-door conversion is located on the rear elevation of the house, staff finds this alteration to be compatible with the intent of the Design Guidelines and...
Standards. Staff recommends approval of the request with the condition that the metal scrollwork column at the corner of the stoop is maintained.

Chair Dennis asked if the Applicant had any additional comments or questions. Mr. Mark McDonough was present in support of the request. Mr. McDonough stated the existing windows will remain; they just want to be able replace them. There was some discussion regarding the types of approved windows and unique features of the home. There were no further comments from the Applicant and there were no public comments.

MOTION: Final approval of the request as submitted and recommended by staff (M. Rynker, L. Fleming 6-0).

I. HPB21-014 – 1201 S. Lincoln Avenue – Final Approval requested for installed replacement windows on the house at this address. Owner: Mr. Brad Rolland. Applicant: Mr. Brad Rolland

Chair Dennis 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 in the Dixieland Historic District that is 0.17 acres in total size. This property contains a one-story, single-family house built circa 1924, which was classified as a contributing building in the Dixieland Historic District at the time of the 1993 historic district survey. The Mediterranean Revival house features gabled, shed and flat with parapet roofs and stucco cladding. At the time of the historic district survey, metal sash windows were present. Several alterations have taken place without building permits since at least May 2011, including the installation of replacement windows, the removal of window trim and casing, and the removal of roof ventilation covers. Several window openings were resized and made smaller than the original window openings, with obvious stucco patching surrounding these. It is the professional opinion of staff that this house no longer retains architectural integrity due to these insensitive alterations; a re-survey of the Dixieland Historic District would likely find that this house no longer contributes to the historical character of the District.

From researching Google Streetview imagery, the windows in the subject house were replaced between May 2011 and January 2019. According to Polk County Property Appraiser records during this time, this property went into foreclosure and was sold three times between April 2015 and October 2018. The Applicant purchased the property in July 2019, after the replacement windows had been installed and without acquiring a building permit. In October 2020, City staff received a Citizens Action Center complaint regarding replacement windows with sandwiched muntins that were not in compliance with the Residential Historic District Design Guidelines, and subsequently, a code violation was issued for this property.

Ms. Foster stated the request was evaluated using Secretary’s Standards #9, #10 and Chapter 6 of the Residential Historic District Design Guidelines. 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 Design Review 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 house as determined by staff due to several insensitive alterations, staff finds that the request does not adversely affect the character of the Dixieland...
Historic District. Additionally, while the request does not comply with the Design Guidelines, the request is also not of the Applicant’s making, which has been a consideration of the Design Review Committee in past decisions regarding incompatible replacement windows. Furthermore, this request is in keeping with the practice of the Design Review Committee and staff to lend flexibility in interpreting the Design Guidelines for non-contributing properties. Staff recommends approval of the request as submitted.

Chair Dennis asked if the Applicant had any additional comments or questions. Mr. Brad Rolland was present in support of the request. Mr. Rolland thanked Ms. Foster as he was not aware of the issue with the windows until October of 2020. Responding to Ms. Rinker’s question, Mr. Rolland stated the property was purchased in July 2019. There was some discussion regarding complaints on sandwiched window muntins within the Historic District. Several code enforcement cases have been opened regarding windows that are not in compliance with the Design Guidelines.

There were no further comments from the Applicant and there were no public comments.

MOTION: Approval of the request per staff recommendation with conditions. (M. Rynker/J. White, 6-0)

J. HPB21-017 – 1215 King Avenue – Final Approval requested for several exterior alterations to the house at this address. Owner/Applicant: Mr. Jason Fabsik.

Chair Dennis 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 platted lots, which measure 100 feet wide and 119.5 feet deep and consist of 0.27 acres in total size. On the property is a one-story, single-family house built circa 1922 in the Craftsman Bungalow style, which is a contributing building in the Dixieland Historic District. Architectural features expressing the Bungalow style include a double front gabled roof and full-width front porch supported by round columns on brick plinths. Two shorter brick plinths without columns also exist at the center of the porch. The home also features novelty pine siding, corner boards, knee brackets and vents in the gables, and exposed rafter tails.

The Applicant proposes to re-open the front porch by removing the aluminum windows and door installed in this area. The existing knee wall, columns and plinths will remain intact. Due to termite damage, the Applicant also proposes to cover all existing double-ogee novelty siding with a 6” exposure with Hardie board siding in a 6” exposure. A small addition on the north elevation of the home that currently has screened-in clerestory is proposed to be framed in and a fixed window installed on the north elevation of this addition in similar size to the screened area.

Finally, the window and door openings in the utility room addition on the rear elevation of the house are proposed to be enclosed with framing and siding matching the house, in order to create a master bedroom bathroom/closet area. One fixed glass window will be installed in the west-façade side of this addition. Ms. Foster stated the request was evaluated using Secretary’s Standards #2, #5, #9, #10 and Chapter 6 of the Residential Historic District Design Guidelines. In evaluating the request with the Standards and Design Guidelines cited, staff made the following findings:
• Given that all the existing historic pine novelty siding features a double ogee profile, which cannot be recreated currently with fiber-cement/Hardie material, staff finds this change inconsistent with the Standards and Design Guidelines as the 6" exposure Hardie board will not recreate the appearance of the original siding.
• The requested alterations to the north and west elevation building additions with regard to screen and window/door removal and window replacement meets the intent of the Standards and Design Guidelines.
• The requested re-opening of the enclosed front porch is consistent with the Standards and Design Guidelines.

Final Approval of the request with the following condition, to be reviewed and approved at staff level prior to permitting:
• Retain and repair with in-kind materials or replace the 6-inch wide, double ogee siding (siding pattern no. 117) with siding to match this profile and dimension.

Chair Dennis asked if the Applicant had any additional comments or questions. Mr. Jason Fabsik was present in support of the request. Mr. Fabsik stated there is extensive termite damage and he wanted a more durable product which was why he chose Hardie siding, in addition to other houses in the area that have Hardie siding. There was discussion regarding the Hardie siding on the home, as well as what other options are available. Ms. Melynda Rinker suggested the option of getting the material needed from the rear of the home and using Hardie siding on only the rear elevation. In response to Mr. Dan Fowler, Mr. Fabsik stated the existing columns would remain as well as all the gable brackets.

There were no further comments from the Applicant and there were no public comments.

MOTION: Approval of the request per staff recommendation with conditions. (J. White/M. Rinker, 6-0)

There was a brief recess at 10:21am. The Design Review Committee reconvened at 10:27am.

K. HPB21-015 – 721 and 725 E. Orange Street – Demolition approval requested for two existing buildings on the subject properties, and Conceptual Approval requested for a 32-unit apartment complex at this address, consisting of five three-story buildings. Owner: 725 E Orange LLC. Applicant: The Lunz Group.

Chair Dennis introduced the request and then asked if there were any conflicts of interest pertaining to this agenda item. There was discussion regarding if Ms. Melynda Rinker had a conflict or not being the neighbor to the subject property. There were no conflicts.

Ms. Emily Foster presented the staff report, stating that the subject property consists of five lots of record and a portion of a sixth lot with a total size of 0.93 acres. Two structures exist on the subject property; the first of which is 721 E. Orange Street. Historically addressed as 711 E. Orange Street, this property contains a one-story, single-family house built circa 1920 in the Bungalow architectural style, which is a contributing building in the East Lake Morton Historic District. The Bungalow styling of this house is expressed by a gable-front roof, a symmetrical façade, triangular knee braces in the gable ends, and an integrated front porch with three, segmental arched bays supported by square columns. Both a triangular gable vent and a three-
bay gable vent exist. The house also has wood drop siding, corner boards, two chimneys and
double-hung sash windows with a one-over-one lite configuration. House also features two
separate front doors, which reflect its conversion from a one-family house to duplex over its
history. City records show this house had up to four dwelling units in its most recent use but has
been unoccupied in some time.

The second structure is 725 E. Orange Street. Historically addressed as 713 E. Orange Street,
this property contains a two-story, single-family house built circa 1925 in the Frame Vernacular
architectural style, which is contributing to the East Lake Morton Historic District. Notable
architectural features include a hip roof, an enclosed porch on the second story with a gable
roofline (likely added sometime after house was built), exposed rafter tails and a wrap-around
front porch on the ground floor that has been partially enclosed. The front porch is supported by
tapered columns on brick plinths. Fenestration consists of double-hung sash windows in one-
over-one, three-over-one, and two-over-two lite configurations and jalousie windows. Alterations
include the porch enclosures and asbestos siding. City records show this house had up to eight
dwelling units and has been used as a multi-family structure for some time.

Ms. Foster stated the current property owner purchased the subject property in October 2020.
Both structures on the property have been poorly maintained over the past thirty years with only
minimal maintenance performed over this time. According to a structural assessment performed
by the Applicant, both buildings are in severe disrepair and are uninhabitable. A repair proposal
from Sharrett Construction for the building at 721 E. Orange Street was estimated at $391,200,
and the proposal to repair 725 E. Orange Street was estimated at $719,774. Demolition for both
structures is estimated at a total cost of $26,000. According to the Polk County Property Assessor,
the subject properties have a just market value assessed at $172,731 ($49,140 land value,
$123,591 building value). The Applicant has determined that the deteriorated structural condition
and estimated cost to restore the buildings are evidence of the infeasibility to reasonably repair
these buildings, and therefore requests approval for their demolition.

If the request for demolition is approved, the Applicant proposes to build five three-story multi-
family buildings on the subject property, which will have a total of 32 dwelling units (16 1-bedroom
units and 16 2-bedroom units). The new buildings will reflect a neo-traditional appearance with
hipped roofs, front porches with tapered columns and decorative arched beams, second-story
balconies with arched bays, windows with a six-lite Colonial-style upper sash, doors in both a
quarter-lite and half-lite style, and exterior cladding in alternating lap and board-and-batten siding
styles. Generally, the buildings will line E. Orange Street, S. Lake Avenue, and the western
property line with building setbacks close to property lines.

Materials for the new buildings include:

- A concrete slab on grade foundation and frame construction;
- HardiePanel lap siding and HardieBoard vertical panel cladding;
- HardieBoard trim and casing;
- Vinyl windows with exterior-applied Colonial muntins on top sash only;
- Masonite doors with fixed glass; and
- Architectural shingles on the 7/12 pitch roof.

Materials were not specified for the porch and balcony elements of fascia and soffit.

The exterior paint palette proposed for this project includes colors that are a dark/light green as
well as an off white.
The site plan for the project indicates a parking lot on the interior of the lot containing 38 parking spaces and two bays for dumpsters and enclosures. Nine parallel parking spaces on E. Orange Street are also proposed. Building setbacks vary throughout the site and consist of:

- Between 11.36 feet and 23.62 feet from the E. Orange Street or north property line;
- Between 7.37 feet and 10.94 feet from the S. Lake Avenue or east property line;
- Between 7.53 feet and 13.40 feet from the interior side or west property line; and
- 38.14 feet from the rear or south property line.

The parking lot edge of pavement is an average of 6.4 feet from the adjacent property to the south, with the dumpster enclosure 5.5 feet away from the adjacent property line.

Ms. Foster stated the request was evaluated using the Land Development Code Article 11, Secretary’s Standards #9, #10 and Chapter 4 of the Residential Historic District Design Guidelines. Regarding the considerations for demolition, the subject buildings are contributing buildings in the East Lake Morton Historic District as they represent the Bungalow and Frame Vernacular architectural styles, were built during the District’s period of significance, and for their association with the World War I and Florida Land Boom historic contexts in Lakeland. The architectural styling and details of both buildings are relatively common and simple. Aside from their connection to statewide historical contexts, the houses have no known associations with persons or events of special significance in Lakeland’s history. While both houses retain architectural integrity, this quality has been diminished somewhat for the house at 725 E. Orange Street due to the front porch enclosures and asbestos siding. Staff finds that neither building would be eligible for an individual listing on the National Register of Historic Places based on its architectural or historical merits but continue to contribute to the architectural history of the East Lake Morton Historic District.

While the Historic Preservation Standards are silent on financial and economic reasons for rehabilitating or demolishing a historic building, the Committee has considered these as supplementary facts for informing their decision with respect to demolition in the past. Additionally, the intent of the Historic Preservation Standards states that the demolition of “sound historic structures” will be discouraged. The Applicant’s assessment suggests that both buildings are not sound structures and have been compromised by deferred maintenance and structural deficiencies that would preclude a reasonable effort and expense to repair. In addition, the Garden District SPI in which these buildings are located is a designated redevelopment area, whose intent is to provide an incentive for quality infill development and redevelopment, reduce regulatory impediments, and ensure architectural compatibility of new construction. Given these facts and the proposal for residential infill redevelopment, staff finds the request for demolition meets the intent of the Historic Preservation Standards, Design Guidelines, and Garden District SPI ordinance. However, staff recommends that the Owner and/or Applicant offer both buildings for architectural salvage for a minimum of 30 days or perform deconstruction itself in order to salvage any intact architectural elements that are able to be reused.

Finally, staff finds that the proposed multi-family apartment proposal meets the intent of the Standards and Design Guidelines in terms of scale, massing, materials, building height, orientation, and setbacks, and overall neo-traditional design. As shown on the site plan, the buildings feature recesses and projections that avoid a monolithic horizontal plane and is compatible with adjacent development. However, as this project has not received approval by the City’s Development Review Team (DRT), Conceptual Approval of the proposed building design and site plan is recommended, with Final Review and Approval by the Design Review Committee.
to occur once approval has been granted by the DRT, as their comments may affect site and architectural design.

Staff recommends approval of the requested demolition after thirty (30) days, during which time the buildings will be reasonably offered for architectural salvage or deconstruction to retrieve building materials and elements that may be reused. Staff also recommends Conceptual Approval for the proposed new multi-family apartment buildings with the following conditions:

- Sidewalk connections should be added from porches to the public sidewalks along both E. Orange Street and S. Lake Avenue;
  1. Sidewalk connections should be added from porches to the public sidewalks along both E. Orange Street and S. Lake Avenue;
  2. All foundations of street-facing buildings must be raised to a finish floor height of 21 inches above grade; porches may have a slightly lower finish floor height;
  3. Ensure that window casing has a drip cap, visible sill, and apron, and that windows have a recessed appearance to provide a shadowline within the wall plane;
  4. Verification of lap siding exposure is needed;
  5. Dumpster placement is not ideal due to potential adverse effect to the adjacent single-family residence to the south; Applicant should consider alternative solutions/location for trash disposal;
  6. Clarification is needed on areas indicated as “storm water” on the site plan, including whether or not these areas will hold standing water in normal conditions and their depth. A front yard appearance is desired along E. Orange Street.

Final Approval for this request will require another review cycle before the Design Review Committee.

Chair Dennis asked if the Applicant had any additional comments or questions. Mr. Steve Boyington, Brittany Prevatt and Jason Lewis, were present in support of the request. Mr. Boyington stated the indoor condition of the house on 721 Orange Street is worse than it looks on the outside. There is no floor in significant parts of the building. Mr. Boyington commented on the 21 inches above grade condition for the floor height and will be coming back with a request against it and request a less amount. Regarding the dumpster placement condition on timing and space will also be further discussed with the City’s Public Works department and the Development Team (DRT) as there are limited options. Mr. Boyington stated that regarding the condition for the stormwater area, that is proposed to be an actively cultivated garden. It is an environmentally responsible option.

Ms. Melynda Rinker commented on a back-end parking and a 6-foot fence option. Mr. Boyington responded and stated they would welcome an enhanced buffer. Ms. Rinker stated that they are happy with the dumpster placement but are concerned with the possible scheduled times for dumpster pick up. There was discussion regarding parking spaces and the amount of allowed parking spaces on the property. Ms. Rinker commented that she believes that there is insufficient amount of parking spaces compared to the number of proposed units. Mr. Boyington stated that the City’s Development Review Team (DRT) only owes for 40 parking spaces. Ms. Foster stated that she would also take all the concerns to the DRT meeting regarding the conditions.

In response to Ms. Rinker, Mr. Boyington stated that the proposed property would not be gated.
In response to Ms. Rinker, Mr. Jason Lewis stated they will implement a “sticker” system to prevent non-residents from parking on the property. Mr. Lewis stated that he also has concerns with the parking and hopes to add the potential four parking spaces on Orange Street. Mr. Dan Fowler brought up a discussion regarding the Land Development Code regarding the 21-inch height requirements and suggests that not be a condition.

There were no public comments.

**MOTION:** Approval of the request for demolition per staff recommendation with conditions. (M. Rinker/D. Fowler, 5-0)

**MOTION:** Approval of the request for conceptual review per staff recommendation with conditions minus condition #2, condition #5 and condition #6. (D. Fowler/L. Fleming, 5-0)

Mr. Jeremy Moses left the meeting at 11:07 a.m., but a quorum was maintained with five DRC members present.

**V. Other Business:** None

**VI. Adjournment:** There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:27 a.m.
719 E PALMETTO ST (Contributing Building) - Remove existing stucco and T1-11 siding on the front facade of the building to restore original brick if salvageable, or replace with similar brick or brick veneer. Remove existing mansard awning and replace with flat awning with wire turnbuckle-type braces.
Subject to the following conditions: (HPB21-029)

1051 SOUTH BL (Contributing Building) - Installation of 87 linear feet of 5 ft. tall ornamental metal picket fence on the west side of the rear yard of the subject property, and 298 linear feet of 4 ft. tall ornamental metal picket fence on the west, north, east, and a portion of south sides of the subject property, along with three gates. The "Viera" style fence will be used.
Subject to the following conditions: (HPB21-031)

316 CHEROKEE TR (Contributing Building) - Replace existing wood privacy surrounding rear yard with new 6 ft. tall board-on-board wood privacy fence.
Subject to the following conditions: (HPB21-032)

314 E RIDGEWOOD ST (Non-Contributing Building) - Rebuilding the existing front and side porch roofs and supporting columns. Rebuilt roofs will maintain the same pitch and form as existing. All materials and architectural elements, including roof shingles, siding, fascia, trim, columns, railings, and gable vent will match or be similar to the existing material or element.
Subject to the following conditions: (HPB21-033)

204 ARIANA ST (Non-Contributing Building) - Installation of an 8' X 14' Eave style Smithbilt aluminum sided shed in the rear yard of the subject property. Shed will be setback 56 inches from the east side property line, 38 feet from the rear property line, and 62 feet, 3 inches from the west side property line.
Subject to the following conditions: (HPB21-034)

1023 OAKHILL ST (Contributing Building) - Replacement of the existing asphalt shingle roof of the subject house with 5V crimp metal roofing panels (FL#30343.01).
Subject to the following conditions: (HPB21-036)

832 OSCEOLA ST (Non-Contributing Building) - Installation of a new double French door opening on the rear elevation of the house on the subject property. The house was built in 2018 and is non-contributing to the East Lake Morton Historic District.
Subject to the following conditions: (HPB21-037)

544 W PARK ST (Non-Contributing Building) - Installation of a 6 ft. wood privacy fence around the perimeter of the rear yard of the subject property.
Subject to the following conditions: (HPB21-039)
9. 806 W PATTERSON ST (Contributing Building) - Installation of an in-ground swimming pool in the interior side yard of the subject property. Subject to the following conditions: (HPB21-041)

10. 132 E BELMAR ST (Contributing Building) - Install 297 linear feet of 6 ft. tall board-on-board wood privacy fence enclosing the rear yard of the subject property. Subject to the following conditions: (HPB21-042)

11. 905 S MISSOURI AV (Non-Contributing Building) - Approval granted for the repairs, replacements, new parking area paving, and new ADA ramp as described in the application proposal and materials. Sign request will require a separate sign permit application and Certificate of Review. Subject to the following conditions: (HPB21-043)

12. 217 CANNON ST (Contributing Building) - Installation of a wood fence, 6 feet in height, along the east and west side property lines and connecting to the front façade wall of the existing house on the subject property. Subject to the following conditions: (HPB21-044)

13. 318 CHEROKEE TR (Non-Contributing Building) - Noncontributing building. Replacing fluted round columns on block plinths on the front porch of the subject house with 12" square by 8' tall square columns with recessed panel with a standard base and capital. Replacing existing non-functional window shutters with new PVC 2-panel nonfunctional shutters. Subject to the following conditions: (HPB21-045)
REQUEST

On behalf of Merlin Properties of Central Florida, LLC, Ms. Paramo requests approval to convert an existing window opening to a doorway and add a small covered roof patio on the south elevation of the house on the subject property. This request was continued from the January 25, 2021 Design Review Committee meeting.

Additional work was included on the Application for this request, and will be administratively reviewed and approved by staff separately following the approval of this request by the Design Review Committee. This work includes: demolition of the existing concrete block detached garage on the property, construction of a new 10-ft. wide driveway on the north side of the property, installation of a metal storage shed in the rear yard of the property, and relocation of the existing electric meter from the south elevation to the west elevation of the house.

SUMMARY OF BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The subject property consists of one lot of record and a portion of a second lot of record (The George Subdivision, Block Y, Lot 5 and south 40 feet of Lot 5) and is 0.26 acres (90 feet X 125 feet) in area size. On the subject property is a single-family house, built circa 1954, which features a gabled roof and is masonry vernacular in style. This house has been altered by the installation of replacement windows that appear to be incompatible with the Design Guidelines. A masonry detached two-car garage also exists on the western side of the property. These buildings are non-contributing buildings within the Dixieland Historic District.

The Applicant proposes to reorient the main entrance of the house from the east elevation that currently faces S. Lincoln Avenue, to a new doorway on the south elevation that faces W. Belmar Street. An existing window on the south elevation will be removed to accommodate the new entrance doorway, in which a Masonite Craftsman-style door will be installed. A wooden gable-roofed overhang supported by 6” X 6” wood posts will be added to the new entrance for cover from the elements. The existing front porch and doorway on the east elevation will remain as-is.

This request originated from the Applicant’s previous request to the City’s Planning Division to split the property along a proposed new property line running north-to-south and meet the City’s Land Development Code regarding both the zoning district development and subdivision regulations. Splitting the subject property will create a new parcel, which the Applicant intends to use for the construction of a new single-family house in the future.
site plan following the proposed lot split has been found to meet front entrance, lot dimension, and parking requirements for RA-4 zoning and subdivision regulations by Planning staff, and will require that the property be given a new address reflecting W. Belmar Street.

**APPLICABLE GUIDELINES:**

The Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation (“Standards”) and the City of Lakeland’s Design Guidelines for Historic Properties (“Design Guidelines”) are the basis for review per the City of Lakeland Land Development Code (“LDC”), Article 11: Historic Preservation Standards.

The following *Standards* apply to this request:

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

The following *Design Guidelines* apply to this project:

Chapter 6: Exterior Architectural Features: Alteration and Maintenance

**ANALYSIS:**

Typically, changes to individual lots from the pattern established by historically platted subdivisions is not supported by staff due to historical development patterns providing a foundation for historic context, setting, and designation of Lakeland’s historic districts. However, given the change in lot orientation found in the George Subdivision west of S. Lincoln Avenue as compared to the Dixieland Subdivision east of S. Lincoln Avenue, and the variation of orientation of buildings in this area, the splitting of the subject property along non-platted lot lines can be supported.

Alterations to non-contributing buildings may be offered more flexibility than contributing buildings in terms of consistency with the Standards and Design Guidelines, but alterations must not affect the architectural integrity of adjacent contributing buildings or diminish the historical character of the overall historic district. While staff finds that the proposed reorientation of the front door from the east to south elevation will not adversely affect surrounding contributing buildings or the character of the Dixieland Historic District, this alteration could be done in a way that is more compatible with the masonry vernacular character of the house. Staff recommends the following changes to the request:

1. The new entrance overhang’s gable end should be clad in saw-tooth vertical siding, similar in dimension and profile as that existing on the gables of the house; and
2. Install a full lite or French door on the existing doorway on the east elevation of the home to appear as a secondary entrance.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

As the request meets the intent of the Standards and Design Guidelines, staff recommends final approval of the request with the following conditions:

1. The new entrance overhang’s gable end should be clad in saw-tooth vertical siding, similar in dimension and profile as that existing on the gables of the house; and
2. Install a full lite or French door on the existing doorway on the east elevation of the home to appear as a secondary entrance.
#1121
ONE STORY (CONG. BLOCK) RESIDENCE

S. LINCOLN AVENUE
(a.k.a. HOLLINGSHORTH STREET, PER FLAT)
50' W.G.V.H.

W. BELMAR STREET
(a.k.a. HOLLINGSHORTH STREET, PER FLAT)
50' W.G.V.H.

SCALE OF WORK
THE SCOPE OF WORK CONSISTS OF:
* EXISTING DETACHED GARAGE TO BE DEMOLISHED
* NEW ENTRY
* NEW CONCRETE DRIVEWAY
* NEW 12' X 10' METAL SHELVING ON 4' CONCRETE SLAB
* NEW COVERED ROOF PATIO
* NEW ENTRY TO BE CONVERT TO OPEN LANAI
* RELOCATE ELECTRIC METER
NEW FRONT ELEVATION

EXISTING FLOOR PLAN

NEW FLOOR PLAN

LIVING AREA

MASTER BEDROOM

KITCHEN

DINING

FAMILY

ENTRY

REMOVE EXISTING WINDOW + INSTALL EXISTENT DOOR

3' 0" X 6' 8"
INT. BIFOLD DOOR

3' 0" X 6' 8"
INT. BIFOLD DOOR

MAST-BED-1

BED-2

BED-3

NOTE:
- All plans and details are for preliminary and are subject to change.
- Carbon Copy of Plans Must Be Made Available to Contractor.
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REQUEST

The Applicant requests approval to replace all existing windows in the subject house with vinyl windows that do not have an appropriate recess or match the opening size of the original windows. In addition, the Applicant requests approval to replace all existing exterior drop-lap siding on the subject house with Hardie board lap siding with a 5.25-inch exposure.

SUMMARY OF BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The subject property is a corner lot of record (Dixieland Subdivision, Block J, Lot 1) that is 0.17 acres in size (60 feet by 145 feet). This lot contains a one-story, single-family house built circa 1921, which is a contributing building in the Dixieland Historic District. The architectural style of the house is Craftsman Bungalow, which is expressed by a gable roof pierced by a brick chimney, a full-width, hipped roof front porch supported by tapered columns on brick plinths, exposed rafter tails, wooden drop-lap siding, and wooden double-hung sash windows with a three-over-one divided lite configuration. Alterations include removal of all original windows as of late 2020 and the screening in of the front porch.

In February 2020, during the Historical Review of the building permit related to this request (BLD20-00238), staff made the following comments, requiring clarification and another review cycle for the building permit:

1. The existing, original wood drop-lap siding does not appear to be deteriorated beyond repair. Installation of new siding is only appropriate where a significant percentage of the existing siding cannot be repaired. Staff recommends repairing existing siding where necessary instead of new siding installation. Additionally, the 5.25-inch exposure Hardie lap siding is not appropriate for use on this house as it does not match the drop-lap profile of the existing siding. If applicant wishes to request new siding, the request must be made to the Historic Preservation Board's Design Review Committee via the Certificate of Review application process.

2. New windows must match the design of the original windows, which feature three vertical panes of glass in the top sash. Muntins/grid/grille must be mounted to the exterior glass. There is no information in the Window Specifications for FL#14104.6 that specify exterior mounted muntins or design of the window.
On March 19, 2020, the Applicant revised the building permit to exclude the replacement siding and clarified the window specifications. As a result, Certificate of Review HPB20-039 was administratively issued by staff on March 23, 2020 for replacement windows for the subject house, as well as a replacement front door. The standard conditions pertaining to replacement windows concerning exterior-mounted muntins matching the grid pattern of the original windows, a recess of at least two inches for each window unit, and a vertical mullion between paired or grouped windows, were clearly stated on the Certificate of Review. While not stated in the Certificate of Review, replacement windows matching the opening size of original windows, per the Design Guidelines, is a presumed condition for all replacement windows in historic buildings.

On January 6, 2021, staff received a complaint from a Dixieland resident concerning the replacement windows on the subject house not meeting historic design guidelines. A stop-work order was issued, and the Applicant was advised by staff to seek Design Review Committee approval for the non-compliant windows. In addition, the Applicant stated that the existing siding was too damaged to repair and requested administrative approval for its replacement. Staff reminded the Applicant that replacing all siding of the entire house required DRC approval.

The following information should not affect a decision regarding the request as each Certificate of Review request is to be evaluated and decided based on the merits of that particular request. This information is provided as additional background on previous, similar projects that the Applicant has completed in the Dixieland neighborhood concerning window and siding replacement. These projects received approval although they feature replacement siding, windows, and window trim that are not in compliance with the Design Guidelines, some of which resulted from oversights made by City staff.

1. 123 Hunter Street, contributing Craftsman Bungalow house (HPB18-146): Original windows: three-over-one wooden double-hung sash. Replacement windows: one-over-one vinyl single-hung sash. Windows were approved administratively by staff as the original windows had already been removed by the time a Certificate of Review was requested by the Applicant; while not compliant with window replacement guidelines, staff granted approval as one-over-one windows are acceptable for the Bungalow style and leniency was granted to Applicant. Replacement windows have a nominal recess (bottom sash only) and window trim provides a nominal recess. Original siding: novelty double-ogee siding. Replacement siding 5.25-inch exposure Hardie lap siding. Siding was approved by the Design Review Committee. Building permit has been finaled.

2. 701 W. Belmar Street, contributing Bungalow house (HPB19-172): Original windows: no longer existed; one-over-one single or double-hung sash windows were present that were not original to the house. Replacement windows: one-over-one vinyl single-hung sash windows. Replacement windows project from the exterior wall and the window trim does not match the detail of the original. Original siding: no longer existed and had been replaced with T1-11 vertical panel plywood siding. Replacement siding: 5.25-inch exposure Hardie lap siding. Windows and siding were administratively approved by staff due to the original windows and siding no longer present on the house, and the replacement siding having a more appropriate profile that T1-11 siding. Historical final inspection mistakenly approved by staff. Building permit has been finalized.

3. 723 Ariana Street, contributing Bungalow House (HPB19-003) three-over-one wooden double-hung sash and several replacement windows consisting of one-over one single/double-hung sash. Replacement windows: one-over-one vinyl single-hung sash. Windows were not approved administratively by staff as the building permit was labeled as an interior remodel that is not subject to historical review; however, permit documents indicated replacement windows, which were not noticed by staff. Replacement windows project from the wall and window trim is not adequate to provide appropriate recess. Original siding: novelty double-ogee siding. Replacement siding: 5.25-inch exposure Hardie lap siding. Siding was approved by the Design Review Committee. Historical final inspection was not scheduled by Applicant or
approved by staff. Building final inspection was mistakenly approved by staff and the building permit was finalized.

APPLICABLE GUIDELINES:

The Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation (“Standards”) and the City of Lakeland’s Design Guidelines for Historic Properties (“Design Guidelines”) are the basis for review per the City of Lakeland Land Development Code, Article 11: Historic Preservation Standards.

The following Design Guidelines apply to this project:


• Architectural details should be compatible with the architectural style of the building’s original design.
• Protect existing architectural details, and retain distinctive features including roofs and porches that give the building its distinguishing character.
• Retain the basic plan of the building.
• Repair or replace deteriorated material with new material that duplicates the old as nearly as possible. If the original detail cannot be maintained or replaced in its original form, it should be modified without disturbing the character of the structure.

Sub-Chapter 6.4 Windows and Shutters (for Contributing Buildings)

• 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 window 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:
  o Must retain the same divided lite/pane pattern as the original;
  o Any muntins must be dimensional and exterior mounted, approximately of the same dimension as the original windows;
  o Must be installed at least 2 inches inside the frame of the window (flush installation is not permitted);
  o 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.
  o Window must be trimmed out with wood or similar of the same design as the original, including angled sill and top drip edge.
  o Possible substitutes must be approved by the Historic Preservation Board.

Sub-Chapter 6.5 Siding and Exterior Wall Cladding (Wood Siding)

• Exterior siding should be similar in style to the original.
• If siding is replaced, all trim board dimensions and joinery details should be maintained and kept visible.
• Use the same species of wood where possible.
• Fiber-cement board siding similar in scale, proportion, texture and finish to wood as an alternative replacement exterior cladding.
ANALYSIS:

Typically, window replacement requires staff-level review and approval if the replacement window complies with the Design Guidelines. Since the request is not consistent with the window replacement guidelines for contributing buildings, this request was referred to the Design Review Committee for review.

Original windows and siding are character-defining features of a historic building, and the installation of replacement features that do not match the appearance of an original feature can adversely affect the architectural integrity of a building. Staff finds that the replacement windows do not appear to match the opening sizes of the original windows; specifically, that many of the windows appear to be too short, and one of a pair of windows is missing. Additionally, the replacement windows are not recessed into the wall plane, as the original windows were, and instead project from the exterior wall surface. The replacement windows also do not feature an upper sash with exterior-mounted muntins matching the three lite appearance of the historic windows. Finally, all window trim and casing has been removed, which is beyond the scope of work approved by Certificate of Review HPB20-039.

In evaluating the request for replacement siding, staff finds that the existing historic drop-lap siding features a recessed channel profile that is different from the Hardie siding lapped profile, and is therefore inconsistent with the Design Guidelines as the 5.25-inch exposure Hardie board will not recreate the appearance of the drop-lap siding.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approval of the request with the following conditions, to be reviewed and approved at staff level prior to permitting:

1. Use replacement windows that have the following characteristics:
   a. Box-framed windows of the same dimensions of the original windows are suggested, which will provide a recess into the wall plane similar to the original windows that were removed;
   b. Windows must have an upper sash with three simulated divided lites and exterior-mounted muntins/grid;
   c. Paired windows must have a vertical mullion in between the window units in a similar dimension as the original windows; and
   d. All window trim must replicate the original in dimension and include a drip edge, header, sill, and apron.

2. Retain and repair the existing siding with in-kind materials or replace with drop-lap siding matching the profile and dimension of the original siding.

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

The Applicant requests Final Approval to construct 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 0.18 acres (60 feet X 130 feet) and contains a Masonry Vernacular house built in 1947, which is a contributing building in the Biltmore-Cumberland Historic District. The one-story house is a side-gabled structure with a front-facing gabled ell, which is constructed of struck concrete block and features a shed-roofed front stoop. The gables of the house are covered in aluminum lapped siding. All windows have been replaced with single-hung sash vinyl windows.

The Applicant’s request proposes to remove an aluminum screen room on the rear elevation of the house and build an addition consisting of 437 square feet onto the rear elevation. The addition will consist of a master bathroom, family room, and utility room. The design and materials for the addition are intended to match the existing house. Materials proposed for the addition include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>Concrete; raised foundation with crawlspace venting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Cladding</td>
<td>Painted struck block; gable end clad with aluminum lapped siding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Vinyl single-hung sash windows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doors</td>
<td>Craftsman style 6-lite, 3-panel door; metal handrail at new rear stoop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof</td>
<td>Architectural shingles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fascia/Soffit</td>
<td>Aluminum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The site plan for the proposed addition shows building setbacks that comply with the Urban Form Standards of the Land Development Code.
APPLICABLE GUIDELINES:

The Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and the City of Lakeland’s Design Guidelines for Historic Properties 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 #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.

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: Historical Development Patterns and New Construction
Sub-Chapter 4.5: Additions

- Ensure that Historic Buildings Remain the Central Focus. An addition should not damage or obscure architecturally important details and materials of the primary structure or other resources on the site. Additions should be distinguishable from the original structure without distorting from it.
- False Historicism/Conjectural History is Discouraged. Design additions should reflect their era of construction while respecting the historic context and architectural style of the original structure. Avoid using architectural details for additions that are more ornate than those found on the original structure or that are not characteristic of the original structure’s architectural character.
- Additions that protect and maintain original architectural features during construction.
- Additions that minimize the loss of any architectural details or features.
- Additions that are subordinate to and compatible with the style and scale of the host structure.
- Side additions that are located behind the principal street-facing façade, or rear additions that are unnoticeable from the street.
- Additions that are designed with some distinction between the historic house and non-historic features.
- Additions that are differentiated from the host structure, e.g. by a recess in wall plane, lower roof height, or vertical trim piece.

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 subject house is maintained.

In evaluating the request with the Design Guidelines, the materials of the proposed addition reflect the materials of the house and are generally compatible with the Guidelines. While aluminum siding is not an acceptable siding material per the Design Guidelines, staff finds the use of aluminum siding in the rear elevation gable of the addition consistent with the other gables of the house and will not otherwise affect its architectural integrity or character of the historic district. The design of the proposed windows, as well as roof pitch and form,
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
LINTEL BEAM NOTE:
WHERE SHOWN ON THE PLANS, THE LINTEL CAN BE CONSTRUCTED AS A DOUBLE 2" X 12" (#2 YELLOW PINE) WOOD BEAM ANCHORED TO TOP OF COLUMNS WITH (2) USP "ETA20" OR SIMPSON "HETA20" STRAPS

| A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N | O | P | Q | R | S | T | U | V | W |
| 1'-6" | 4987 PLF (UNFILLED) | 2'-2" | 3435 PLF (UNFILLED) | 2'-8" | 2777 PLF (UNFILLED) | 3'-2" | 2332 PLF (UNFILLED) | 4'-0" | 1835 PLF (UNFILLED) | 4'-6" | 1624 PLF (UNFILLED) | 5'-2" | 2739 PLF ** | 6'-2" | 2271 PLF ** | 7'-0" | 1987 PLF ** | 8'-0" | 1723 PLF ** | 9'-2" | 1489 PLF ** | 10'-0" | 1354 PLF ** | 10'-8" | 1277 PLF ** |
| 11'-2" | 1200 PLF ** | 12'-0" | 1109 PLF ** | 12'-8" | 1044 PLF ** | 13'-4" | 1398 PLF ** | 14'-0" | 1327 PLF ** | 16'-0" | 1152 PLF ** | 18'-0" | 1016 PLF ** | 18'-8" | 977 PLF ** | 20'-0" | 876 PLF ** | 22'-8" | 789 PLF ** | ** | ** | ** | ** |

"POWER" STEEL BOX LINTEL
7070 PLF L-2
9865 PLF
6626 PLF L-2
6830 PLF
5296 PLF L-2
5549 PLF
4508 PLF L-2
4673 PLF
3535 PLF L-2
3699 PLF
3154 PLF L-2
3288 PLF
2746 PLF L-2
2864 PLF
2298 PLF L-2
2400 PLF **
2025 PLF L-2
2114 PLF **
1768 PLF L-2
2273 PLF **
1545 PLF L-2
1984 PLF **
1414 PLF L-2
1819 PLF **
1325 PLF L-2
1710 PLF **
1230 PLF L-2
1629 PLF **
1178 PLF L-2
1515 PLF **
1116 PLF L-2
1436 PLF **
1387 PLF ** S L-1
1364 PLF **
1321 PLF ** S L-1
1299 PLF
1048 PLF ** S L-1
1137 PLF
828 PLF ** S L-1
960 PLF **
770 PLF ** S L-1
893 PLF
629 PLF ** S L-1
784 PLF
523 PLF ** S L-1
606 PLF

** - DENOTES #5 REBAR X CONT. PLACED IN BOTTOM COURSE AND 16" DEEP BEAM POURED SOLID WITH 2,500 PSI CONCRETE.
** P - DENOTES PRE-STRESSED U-LINTEL WITH #5 REBAR X CONT. PLACED IN BOTTOM COURSE & 16" DEEP BEAM POURED SOLID WITH 2,500 PSI CONCRETE.
** S - DENOTES "POWER" STEEL L-1 LINTEL WITH #5 REBAR X CONT. PLACED IN BOTTOM COURSE & (6)-5/16" SMOOTH STIRRUPS AT 8" O.C. AT EACH END IN A 16" DEEP BEAM POURED SOLID WITH 2,500 PSI CONCRETE.
TYP. CONCRETE STAIR RISER

FORMED @ POURED 3000 P.S.F.

CONCRETE STEPS

NO LESS THAN 11''

WIDE

SHALL NOT EXCEED 7-3/4''

#5 REBAR @ 12'' O.C.

BOTH WAYS

NOTE:
TREAD COUNT TO BE VERIFIED IN FIELD.
REQUEST

The Applicant requests Final Approval to build an addition onto the rear elevation of the house on the subject property, as well as to expand the existing porte cochere.

SUMMARY OF BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The subject property is an interior lot consisting of 0.11 acres (43 feet wide by 108 feet). This lot contains a one-story, single-family house built circa 1917, which is a contributing building in the South Lake Morton Historic District. The architectural style of the house is Bungalow, which is expressed by a gable roof, a full-width front porch supported by square columns on brick plinths and an integrated porte cochere, exposed rafter tails, wooden drop-lap siding, and wooden double-hung sash windows with a one-over-one lite configuration. Alterations include a pair of French doors on the north side elevation and the addition of a wooden deck on this elevation.

The Applicant’s request proposes to remove an existing rear addition and side deck and construct a new addition and deck onto the rear elevation of the house in a similar footprint. The new addition will increase the living area of the house by 129 square feet. The proposed new deck will wrap around the north side elevation to the rear and will be 280 square feet in size. The request also proposes to extend the roofline of the porte cochere by two feet on the north side elevation in order to accommodate wider vehicles. The design of the addition and porte cochere extension is intended to match the existing design of the subject house. Materials proposed for the addition include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>Concrete piers, wood framing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Cladding</td>
<td>Novelty wood siding to match existing drop-lap siding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doors</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof</td>
<td>Architectural asphalt shingles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fascia/Soffit</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deck</td>
<td>Pressure treated lumber</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The site plan for the proposed addition shows interior side building setbacks that do not comply with the minimum setback of five feet that is required by the Land Development Code. If this request is approved by the Committee, the Applicant will need to request a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals and Adjustments from this building setback requirement in order to proceed with construction of the addition and deck.

**APPLICABLE GUIDELINES:**

*The Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation* and the City of Lakeland’s *Design Guidelines for Historic Properties* 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 #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.

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: Historical Development Patterns and New Construction
Sub-Chapter 4.5: Additions

• Ensure that Historic Buildings Remain the Central Focus. An addition should not damage or obscure architecturally important details and materials of the primary structure or other resources on the site. Additions should be distinguishable from the original structure without distracting from it.

• False Historicism/Conjectural History is Discouraged. Design additions should reflect their era of construction while respecting the historic context and architectural style of the original structure. Avoid using architectural details for additions that are more ornate than those found on the original structure or that are not characteristic of the original structure’s architectural character.

• Additions that protect and maintain original architectural features during construction.

• Additions that minimize the loss of any architectural details or features.

• Additions that are subordinate to and compatible with the style and scale of the host structure.

• Side additions that are located behind the principal street-facing façade, or rear additions that are unnoticeable from the street.

• Additions that are designed with some distinction between the historic house and non-historic features.

• Additions that are differentiated from the host structure, e.g. by a recess in wall plane, lower roof height, or vertical trim piece.

**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, staff finds that the materials of the proposed addition reflect the original materials of the house and are compatible with the Guidelines. The design of the French doors, as well as roof pitch and overhang, exposed rafter tails, and drop-lap siding is consistent with the style of the subject house and Guidelines. Furthermore, the addition is appropriately placed to the rear of the house.

Finally, staff finds that the proposed deck is appropriately placed to the side and rear of the home and will use materials that are consistent with the Design Guidelines. The expansion proposed for the porte cochere will continue the form of the existing roofline and will not damage the historic relationship of this feature with the front porch and house.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends Final Approval of the request as submitted, with the understanding that the Applicant will need to obtain a variance for the building setbacks of the addition, deck, and porte cochere extension.

Report prepared by: Emily Foster, Senior Planner, Historic Preservation
Liaison to the Historic Preservation Board
Description of Proposed Work

1) Remove small CMU units from under porch joists and replace with white vinyl lattice.
2) The roof has been replaced but the Porte Cochere is only 12 feet long and 92 inches wide and the supporting posts are 4”x4” steel pained posts with the gable above extending 2 feet North, and would like to move posts 22” to north under same roof system and cover with wood.
3) The residence has had three additions since being originally constructed. The addition in the rear where the previous owner attempted to take a screen porch and make it a third bedroom, with ceiling heights from 84” to 70” in the rear as well as the laundry room. We propose to remove that entire area and with new floor system and 108” ceiling to match the majority of the residence and matching the 12/12 pitch roof add a master bedroom and bath and wrap the side wood deck around to the rear door and french doors out of the proposed master bedroom.
4) No new windows are proposed to be added or replaced for the one over one configuration that is there. The addition has french doors and a new rear door with lite is proposed.
5) The concrete ribbon drive is proposed to be removed and thick brick pavers running through the Porte Cochere for a true parking location and to hide the side wood deck, which is to be replaced as well as offer two car parking, one behind the other.
6) No front/street elevation changes or color changes are proposed, other than covering the 4”x4” with 1”x6” and making a base and top to beautify the post (can't match front porch columns)
7) All exterior wood walls to be covered with novelty siding to match existing residence, and color to remain as white to match existing residence.
8) The new addition will have wood 2”x8” floor joists and 3/4” plywood on 4”x6” p.t. Posts on concrete isolated footings. The new deck and replacement to side and rear deck to be 2”x6” p.t. covered with a 5/4” decking. A 36” high handrail with 2”x2” pickets and white plastic lattice below floor level to ground.
9) Structural plans and full plans submittal to Building Department once committee review and approvals.
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD  
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE  
STAFF REPORT  
February 25, 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>HPB21-040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Major Rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Address</td>
<td>238 N. Massachusetts Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Name(s)</td>
<td>Seaboard Service Station (CD 1926); Victory Grocery and Monarch Grocery (CD 1938); Eli Witt Cigars (CD 1947-1968).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic District; FMS#</td>
<td>Munn Park Historic District; #18/3C PO0358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner/Applicant</td>
<td>West Point One, LLC / Mr. Jon Kirk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Professional</td>
<td>Mr. Jon Kirk, AIA, Straughn Trout Architects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning; Future Land Use; Context District; SPI</td>
<td>C-7; Regional Activity Center; Urban Center; N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Use</td>
<td>Unoccupied Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent Properties</td>
<td>Commercial, Civic, and Multi-Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Approvals</td>
<td>Exterior Wall Sign, 1995-42 (6/2/1995)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REQUEST

On behalf of the property owner, Mr. Kirk requests approval for a major rehabilitation to the subject building, which will accommodate a mixed-use redevelopment consisting of commercial office, retail, food and beverage, and residential uses.

SUMMARY OF BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The subject property is located at the southwest corner of N. Massachusetts Avenue and E. Bay Street, and consists of one lot of record (Munn’s Survey, Block 7, Lot A) with a total area of 0.41 acres. On the property is a two-story commercial building with two one-story buildings attached on its south and west sides. Built circa 1926, this building is a contributing structure in the Munn Park Historic District. The two-story structure is locally known as the Gore Building, and features the Mediterranean Revival architectural style, as expressed in its stucco and brick cladding, terracotta barrel tiles and glazed tiles on the roof parapet, and pierced attic vents. The building’s second-story windows are double-hung sash wood windows with a four-over-one divided lite configuration, and are presently all covered. A storefront consisting of a recessed entry, plate glass display windows with metal framing, glass block, and ceramic tile is present on the east and north elevations, and is covered by a hipped roof canopy with asphalt shingles; both of these features are not original to the building and have been altered over time. The two one-story structures attached to the Gore Building are also clad in stucco with a variety of covered window and door openings and are considered non-contributing buildings within the Munn Park Historic District.

In addition to a total renovation of the interior of the buildings and new mechanical systems, the proposed rehabilitation will include the following work to the exterior of the buildings:

- All existing window and door coverings will be removed.
- The hipped roof canopy on the Gore Building will be removed and replaced with a prefinished aluminum flat canopy attached to the building by metal or cable stays.
- The second-floor windows on the Gore Building will be replaced with prefinished single-hung sash aluminum windows with a three-over-one simulated divided lite appearance and similar size as the
existing windows. New window openings matching the size and configuration of the original window openings may be added to the south elevation wall of the second story in the future.

- The existing storefront of the Gore Building will be removed and replaced by a new aluminum storefront with a defined brick and glass bulkhead, display windows and transom windows. The storefront will be recessed on the northeast corner and north elevation of the building to provide outdoor dining space, but the support columns of the original storefront will remain.
- The arched doorway on the north elevation of the Gore Building will remain, but a new full-lite door with arched transom will replace the existing door. Similarly, a new full-lite door with a transom and sidelight matching the new aluminum storefront will replace the existing entry door on the building’s east elevation.
- On the one-story structure to the south of the Gore Building, two new aluminum storefront windows and a glass entrance door with an aluminum flat canopy are proposed to be installed on the east elevation. New windows and openings matching the style of the Gore Building’s second story windows will be installed in the south elevation wall. On the west elevation, a new double door opening in similar design and materials as the other new doorways will be installed, along with a new roll-up door to replace an existing roll-up door. A 770 square feet portion of this building’s west elevation will be demolished to provide an area for the dumpster and three parking spaces, accessible from Traders Alley. To accommodate a potential roof top patio on this building, a metal guard/handrail may be installed on the roof, but will be stepped back from the existing parapet.
- On the one-story structure to the west of the Gore Building, the existing door and window openings on the north elevation will be removed and a centrally-located recessed entry will be located on this façade. The entry will be enclosed with decorative wrought iron gates, and a sign board area will be located above the entrance. The west elevation of this building will be altered through the removal of existing windows and openings and the installation of two new aluminum storefront windows, as well as the addition of a gated outdoor seating area.
- All three buildings will be repainted. The barrel and glazed tiles on the Gore Building will be preserved. The exposed rafter tails on the south and west elevations of the one-story structures will also remain intact.
- While not requiring review by the Design Review Committee, building/tenant signage and artistic murals are planned for this building rehabilitation project.

**APPLICABLE GUIDELINES:**

The Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and the City of Lakeland’s Design Guidelines for Historic Properties are the basis for review per the City of Lakeland Land Development Code (LDC), Article 11: Historic Preservation Standards.

The following Standards apply to this request:

Standard #1. A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.

Standard #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.

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

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

Standard #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.

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: Historical Development Patterns and New Construction
Sub-Chapters 4.12: Understanding Commercial Area Form
• Retention and maintenance of all original cornice, wall articulation, window, and storefront details and materials.
• Repair, rather than replace deteriorated features.
• Where necessary, replace historic features with “in-kind”, similar historic materials, or compatible substitutes.
• Preserve and repair storefronts in a manner that is compatible with the historic character of the structure itself.
• Design strategies for storefronts that extend the useful life of the structure or brings it up to current day building codes and standards.
• Use of replacement storefront materials that are comparable to original materials in size, color, shape and texture.

ANALYSIS:

Staff finds that the proposed rehabilitation work meets the intent of the Standards and Design Guidelines in terms of treatment of historic architectural features, replacement materials, and reconfiguration of spaces and fenestration. As stated, the storefront and canopy of the Gore Building are not original features of this building, but have been in existence for at least 50 years; as neither of these features have a unique design or distinctive materials, or are otherwise historically important, staff finds that these changes have not acquired historic significance in their own right. The design of the new aluminum and glass storefront restores the traditional functionality and visibility to the ground floor of the building and is appropriate in scale for the building. The proposed recessed storefront area provides a design strategy to serve a variety of uses for the building and extend its useful life, consistent with the Design Guidelines. Also, as evidenced by interior photographs, the original windows appear to be deteriorated beyond repair, and their replacement with windows in a similar size and lite configuration is appropriate.
The changes to the one-story structures attached to the Gore Building are also found to meet the Standards and Design Guidelines, as these structures are subordinate and simpler in design to the Gore Building, as well as considered non-contributing buildings.

The proposed design for building signage is creative in reflecting the history of the building and appears consistent with the design guidelines for commercial signage, but will require a separate sign permit application and review. Artistic murals are exempt from design review for painted building surfaces.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Final Approval for the proposed rehabilitation with the following conditions, to be approved by staff before building permit application submittal:

1. Verify that the original double-hung sash wood windows have a four-over-one divided lite configuration and if so, use a replacement window with a four-over-one simulated divided lite configuration;
2. With exception to the storefront windows and door sidelight and transom windows, the replacement windows should be recessed to provide a shadow line and should not be flush-mounted.
3. All windows must have exterior-mounted muntins/grids, and storefront windows and doors should have dimensional framing/dividing members.
4. Confirm the exterior paint palette and the finish of the aluminum storefront and window framing.
5. Signage will require an additional historical review and sign permit application.

Report prepared by:  Emily M. Foster, Senior Planner, Historic Preservation Liaison to the Historic Preservation Board
Interior Existing Conditions | 238 N. Mass Ave
Existing Context
Proposed Renovations | 238 N. Mass Ave