City of Lakeland  
Historic Preservation Board  
City Hall, First Floor  
Building Inspection Conference Room  

AGENDA  
January 28, 2016  
7:30 A.M.  

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

II. Review and approval of the December 17, 2015 Historic Preservation Board meeting minutes.

III. Old Business.
   A. 929 E. Orange Street (HPB15-092) – Continuation of appeal from Mr. Tim Davis to allow demolition of the house at his address based on new information that rehabilitation of this house is infeasible.
   B. Dixieland Historic District Boundary Revision – Request HPB approval to remove FHPI property directly across from Drane Park from Dixieland Historic District.

IV. New Business.

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

Chairman Brad Lunz called the December 17, 2015 meeting of the Historic Preservation Board (“Board”) to order at 7:32 a.m. The roll call was performed. A quorum was reached, as seven Board members were present.

II. Review and Approval of the November 19, 2015 Meeting Minutes

Mr. John White motioned to approve the October 22, 2015 minutes as presented. Mr. Terry Dennis seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

III. Old Business:

A. Dixieland Historic District Boundary Revision. Ms. Emily Foster provided a revised map of the Dixieland Historic District, showing properties suggested to be removed from the district due to their noncontributing status. Based on comments from the Board at the November meeting, additional properties along Unitah Avenue were removed from the Historic District and the Florida Presbyterian Homes-owned properties fronting Drane Park were placed back into the District. There was agreement among the Board with the revised boundary. Ms. Foster stated that a motion from the Board recommending adoption of the revised Historic District boundary would need to be made in order for the City Commission to consider adoption of an ordinance modifying the boundary. The Board discussed the need to publicly notice the owners of the properties being removed about the modification. Ms. Foster acknowledged the need for public notice. **MOTION: Recommend approval of the modified Dixieland Historic District boundary as presented by staff, but the Board will postpone formal adoption and recommendation to City Commission for 90 days in order to give staff time to notice the affected property owners. (J. White/K. Clyne, 7-0)**

IV. New Business:
A. Ms. Emily Foster asked the Board for guidance concerning a request to remove vinyl siding at 322 S. Lake Avenue and restore the original wood siding underneath it. The request concerned a contributing resource in the East Lake Morton Historic District. Since staff is not permitted to approve wholesale siding replacement, Ms. Foster wanted to confirm whether removing a prohibited siding material would be acceptable for administrative review. Consensus of the Board was that staff should be able to administratively approve vinyl or aluminum siding removal and restoration, including in-kind repair and replacement, of the original wood siding.

V. Adjournment. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:41 a.m.
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
STAFF REPORT
January 28, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>HPB15-092</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner/Applicant</td>
<td>Lime Street Apartments Land Trust/ Tim Davis, Polk County Real Estate Investment Group, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>929 E. Orange Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested Action</td>
<td>Appeal of the Denial of a Demolition Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic District</td>
<td>East Lake Morton; #ELM-131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Public Interest District</td>
<td>Garden District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Land Use; Zoning; Context District</td>
<td>Residential High; MF-22; Urban Neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Use</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent Properties</td>
<td>Residential and Vacant; Commercial nearby at Ingraham Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Approvals</td>
<td>June 25, 2015 DRC denied applicant’s demolition request, and conceptually approved relocation of the subject building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REQUEST

Mr. Tim Davis is appealing the June 25, 2015 decision of the Design Review Committee, in which demolition of the house on the subject property was denied. This appeal was heard on August 27, 2015 and October 22, 2015 but was continued by the Board pending receipt of a licensed engineer’s structural conditions report.

SUMMARY OF BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The subject property contains a frame vernacular house constructed circa 1915, which is a contributing building in the East Lake Morton Historic District. This house has been unoccupied for some time, but was previously used as a residential rental property. In late 2014, the house was damaged by a fire set by vandals, as well as stripped of its wiring. In November 2014, the applicant was issued a code enforcement violation to repair the structure to habitable condition, and boarded up the house in order to secure it. The applicant subsequently obtained an initial cost estimate of $44,200 to repair the house. The applicant submitted a letter dated August 4, 2015 to HPB staff which outlined additional costs discovered in repairing the house, which raised the total repair cost to $68,400. Mr. Dan Gargas, City of Lakeland Building Official, furnished a memo to staff that based upon building cost standards, Mr. Davis’s cost estimate ($68,400) to repair the structure did not meet a 60% threshold that would justify demolition and rebuilding.

On September 25, 2015, staff received from the applicant a letter dated August 27, 2015 from engineer Leonard G. Wood. Mr. Wood’s letter states that “the amount of damage to the roof, ceiling, and floor and inadequate foundations to support the floor and roof repairs, abatement for asbestos shingle removal and replacement, makes this a question of not just economics, but that the structure does not come close to the current requirements of building code compliance... The structure has many inadequate area[s], and in my opinion should be permitted for removal and a new structure, approved by the [Historic Preservation Board] and the Lakeland City Building Department, be built in its place.” After receiving Mr. Wood’s letter from the applicant, staff discovered that Mr. Wood’s professional engineer license had been suspended by the State of Florida Department of Business and Professional Services for negligence associated with 38 projects, as of August 27, 2015. Mr. Wood voluntarily relinquished his P.E. license on September 1, 2015. Because of this, the Board was
not able to recognize Mr. Wood’s opinion as valid, and advised the applicant to procure a structural conditions report from an engineer with a valid license.

On November 23, 2015, the applicant submitted a letter to staff, written by Robert T. Haug, Professional Engineer, which assesses the condition of the house based upon a site visit to the house, as well as a home inspection report prepared by Mikro Home Inspections. Mr. Haug’s letter states that, in addition to the fire damage and lack of wiring, the existing roof rafters have an excessive span of 21’, the house lacks adequate insulation, the windows are frozen and in poor condition, and that the asbestos siding will be costly to remove. Mr. Haug states that “although the exterior of the structure appears sound, the necessary renovations to bring it up to code and make it habitable will exceed an economic return on the investment.” Mr. Haug recommended demolition of the house.

In August 2015, a sign was placed on the house offering it free to whomever was willing to move it. As the DRC conceptually approved relocation of this house in June, a different relocation site and feasibility to move the house would need to be considered before final approval of relocation would be granted. According to the applicant, several inquiries have been received to relocate the house, but none were serious. Additionally, the cost to move and rehabilitate the house resulted in the genuinely interested parties losing interest in this offer.

Regarding future use of the property, the applicant plans to combine the subject property and the lot to its east in order to build a garden apartment complex. A conceptual site plan showing a U-shaped building footprint representing the garden apartment complex was submitted with the applicant’s initial request in June 2015. A letter and informational packet was received on January 14, 2016 from Mr. Steve Boyington of WMB Architecture, which outlines the applicant’s intent to redevelop the property into a garden apartment complex in compliance with the Garden District SPI overlay, as well as several reasons that justify demolition of the house. The reasons for demolition were: the simple architectural design of the house, which is not unique and would not be difficult to reproduce; the poor condition of the house, which is a current threat to public safety and welfare; the offer to give away the house, which resulted in multiple inquiries but no takers – those genuinely interested lost interest after seeing the condition of the house and cost required to rehabilitate it; and the fact that it is not unprecedented for the HPB to consider financial implications in rare cases such as this one.

**APPLICABLE GUIDELINES:**

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

The following section of the LDC applies to this project:

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

1. The architectural significance of the building or structure. Architectural significance shall be determined by the DRC at the time of the demolition request and shall be based upon documentation of the property’s architectural integrity and historical or cultural significance. Designation of the building or structure as “non-contributing” by the most recent historic district survey does not preclude the DRC from making a determination of architectural significance.

2. The contribution of the building or structure to the history or origins of the historic district.

3. The future utilization of the site, including any replacement buildings or structures.

**ANALYSIS:**
In accordance with Article 11.6.3.c of the LDC, the following must be considered in order for demolition to be approved:

(a) The historic or architectural significance of the building.
   The building is a circa 1915 frame vernacular house, which makes it one of the older houses in the East Lake Morton Historic District; it is a contributing building in this historic district. This house retains original character-defining features, as referenced in the Background section above. Alterations to the original design are minimal, and include screening in the front and back porches, and replacement siding. The fire damage and disrepair of fixtures and systems does not affect the historic integrity of the house.

(b) The importance of the building or structure to the historic district.
   The subject property is a part of the traditional residential development pattern in the East Lake Morton Historic District. Unfortunately, intrusion from commercial properties on Bartow Road and Ingraham Avenue at the eastern boundary of the East Lake Morton Historic District has reduced the historic and architectural integrity in this area. A number of properties along East Orange Street remain vacant from previous demolitions. It is important to maintain authentic, historic buildings in this area for the integrity of the District as a whole. Although the subject house’s style is common, the age of this building is somewhat rare within the District. The house features common craftsmanship and materials that would not be impossible to reproduce, but historic building materials are typically better quality than modern materials.

(c) The future utilization of the site, including any replacement buildings or structures.
   The applicant has partnered with WMB Architecture and intends to develop the property as a garden apartment complex compliant with the LDC and Garden District SPI in the future. Following the demolition of the house, the applicant will work with WMB Architecture to create a conceptual design for the new building and master plan for the redevelopment of the property.

STAFF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION:

Staff finds that the subject house retains historic significance and contributes to the integrity of the East Lake Morton Historic District. However, this house is of simple design architecturally and would not be difficult to reproduce. While retaining authentic, historic structures in the District is important, staff finds that the subject property is located in Sub-District 4 of the Garden District, a designated redevelopment area.

After reviewing Mr. Haug’s opinion on the structural condition of the house, staff finds that the stated deficiencies and economic factors are common to many historic houses, and do not necessarily justify demolition on their own. Additionally, the applicant’s previous statements regarding functional obsolescence and unprofitability have no relevance to the historic significance of this building, and the Historic Preservation Standards do not contain provisions directing the Board to consider financial implications of repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring historic buildings.

However, there have been limited situations where the Board has considered the financial implications of rehabilitating a building and allowed demolition, especially when the cost to repair is unreasonably high or burdensome, as the applicant has asserted. The Board has also granted demolition for buildings that were unlivable or a threat to the public’s safety and welfare. Because this property is within the Garden District, which promotes redevelopment, the fact that the house is of relatively simple design architecturally, and only one person has expressed interest to date in relocating the house, these reasons, along with the reasons the applicant has already provided, may cumulatively substantiate demolition in this specific case.

Mr. Boyington’s letter on behalf of the applicant does provide a serious commitment to redevelop the property into a garden apartment consistent with the Land Development Code, Historic Preservation Standards, and
Garden District SPI overlay. In this letter, Mr. Boyington assures the Board that the applicant will move forward with a master plan and conceptual design for the redevelopment of this property following demolition, as requested.

Staff recommends that the Historic Preservation Board take into account these findings in reaching a decision with regard to the applicant’s appeal.

Report prepared by: Emily M. Foster, Senior Planner, Historic Preservation Liaison to the Historic Preservation Board
November 12, 2015

Historic Lakeland, Inc.
P.O. Box 3347
Lakeland, FL 33802-3347

SUBJECT: 929 East Orange Street, Lakeland, FL 33801
Property ID: 24/28/18/205000/007041

To Whom It May Concern:

The above referenced project was site visited and interior pictures were reviewed along with the report prepared by Mikro Home Inspections.

The above structure is a single family residence constructed of conventional framing back in 1925. The exterior walls are constructed of 2 x 4’s at 24” on center, floor is 2 x 8 at 24” on center with concrete piers 6’ on center. The roof is conventionally framed with 2 x 6 rafters at 24” on center. The rafters have a clear span of 21’, which is excessive for that size lumber and spacing. The 2 x 4 studs will have insufficient room to have adequate insulation. Presently, the interior wall finish is plaster on wood lath. The exterior finish is asbestos shingles over a wood sheathing. The asbestos shingles will be costly to remove.

At first glance the above structure appears to be in structurally sound condition and could be renovated for single family occupancy. It has been painted to look good, however, on closer inspection, the existing structure has no insulation in the walls and all of the windows are frozen or are in poor condition and would need to be replaced. Vandals have stripped the interior of the structure of all valuable components.
A fire occurred in the kitchen area that penetrated the outside wall, floor, ceiling, and roof, which has allowed elements to penetrate the structure. Vandals have also broken into the building through the ceiling of the front porch.

Although the exterior of the structure appears sound, the necessary renovations to bring it up to code and make it habitable will exceed an economical return on the investment. It is my recommendation that the building be torn down due to the high cost of making it habitable.

If there are any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Robert T. Haug, P.E.
RTH/sm
January 14, 2016

Attention: Emily Foster
Community Development Department - Historic Preservation Board
228 S. Massachusetts Avenue
Lakeland, FL 33801

Re: 929 East Orange Street, Lakeland, FL 33801
Parcel ID 242818205000007041

Emily,

Regarding Mr. Tim Davis’s appeal for the demolition of the existing house at 929 E Orange Street we offer the following for your consideration.

1) The subject house is located within the city’s Garden District in Sub-area 4 which is a designated redevelopment area. There is an opportunity to re-develop the 929 E Orange property and adjacent vacant property, both owned by Mr. Davis, into a project that would better serve the neighborhood. The property is in the MF-22 residential zoned East Lake Morton neighborhood and is also right on the border of the C-2 commercially zoned area along U.S. Highway 98 to the east. See attached zoning map for reference.

At the moment this border area on east Orange Street has several empty or underutilized lots that are acting more as a buffer zone or gap between the residential and commercial areas of the neighborhood (see attachment showing property map aerial). It appears that these vacant lots tend to be used for occasional parking or driveways from the lots behind them, and they are often taken advantage of by vandals. There is potential in these border properties to develop them into projects that will be of more value to the community and make the connection between the residences and the commercial properties on U.S. 98. There is a project on the corner of East Lime Street and Ingraham that has a similar concept and was recently approved by the HPB.

Being in this border area gives the 929 and adjacent property a unique location that is an ideal place for a building that could serve as the anchor point for the residential part of the neighborhood that could seam the gap to the primarily commercial areas farther east and north. A potential building type that is compatible with the Garden District guidelines and could accomplish this is the Courtyard building type (see attachment from Garden District Ordinance). The owner is interested in exploring the concept of the courtyard building as a possible building type in order to create a small garden apartment community of the appropriate density that can be supported by the site and allowed by the land development code. The proposed building would be built around a central courtyard and garden area that connects to the street. The building would address the street with porches at the build to line. Parking would most likely be located in the back or side of the building. At the moment these ideas are still conceptual and will require some site analysis and schematic design.

Mr. Davis also owns some property directly adjacent to south of 929 on East Lime Street. These properties could also be similarly developed and possibly even linked together with the Orange St properties in some way. A master plan showing the proposed site development concept can be completed once demolition has been approved for the 929 property.
2) Although the existing house is a contributing structure to the East Lake Morton historic district and retains some of the original character, the exterior of the house is fairly simple in terms of architectural design and detailing. There are not any elements that are particularly unique or too difficult to reproduce.

3) The subject house in its current condition is a threat to public safety and welfare. Due to its deteriorating condition the house has been vacant for some time and vandals have broken in and caused damage to the exterior and stripped the house of wiring and anything valuable. There was a fire in the house that left damage to the wall, floor, ceiling and roof in the kitchen area. These conditions were verified on site and reported by Mr. Robert Haug, P.E. whose report was previously submitted to the Board. Mr. Haug also detailed some structural concerns regarding the excessive span of the rafters and the asbestos shingles which should be addressed before the house can be made habitable. In addition to all these items, there are windows and insulation that need to be replaced which makes the restoration of the house quite extensive. Until the house can be demolished or made livable it will remain vacant, a potential target for future vandalism, a safety hazard to the neighbors, and a liability concern for the owner.

4) After the HPB gave conditional approval for relocation of the house in June 2015, a sign was placed on the front of the house offering the house to the public for free if moved off the site. The sign has been up for approximately four months. There have been multiple inquiries as a result of the sign, but none of them have turned out to be serious. Even the genuine inquiries lost interest after seeing the condition of the structure and the cost to move it. Those costs combined with the cost of restoring and renovating the house after relocation has deterred any interested parties from moving forward.

5) Lastly, although it is not required for HPB to take the financial factors into account when making this determination, it does not mean that it cannot be taken into consideration along with the other factors listed above. It is not unprecedented for the Board to do so.

For all the reasons listed above, it is my professional opinion that this demolition request should be approved by the Historic Preservation Board. The owner understands that demolition typically requires a concept design to be submitted prior to approval, however, because the building has been and continues to be a safety hazard to the neighborhood and the amount of time it may take to develop the design, we ask for demolition to be approved so that it can take place as soon as possible. Once approval is received the owner can focus on moving forward with the concept design and master plan to present to the Board for review.

Thank you for your assistance with this issue.

Sincerely,

Steven Boyington, AIA, LEED AP
Vice President
WMB (Architecture)
Courtyard Building

The Courtyard Building type is a building or buildings arranged around a central courtyard that is open to the street. When used for residential purposes, this building type functions as an apartment building or condominium. The building must be at least two stories and may be three stories at the street front. It may be higher if four stories 70-50 feet back from the front property line. A central court is required and must be at least 40 feet deep and 20 feet wide. The front face of the building must be on the “build-to” line. Porches are permitted but not required. If used, porches must span at least 40 percent of the width of each façade and must be at least 6 feet deep. Courtyard Buildings are permitted in Sub-districts 1, 2, 3 and 4. In Sub-district 2 only, the Courtyard Building may be used as an office building. However, a mix of residential and non-residential uses is not permitted in the same Courtyard Building. It must be either all residential or all non-residential. The example illustrates a model with porches that rises to four stories on the back part of the lot. Parking may be located on the first story.
Areas to be Removed From Dixieland Historic District

Dixieland Historic District Boundary

Parcels

Version Approved By HPB 12/17/15

The use of this data is being provided on an 'as is' basis for your convenience and may be subject to change without notice. While every reasonable effort has been made to assure the accuracy of the maps and data contained herein, the City of Lakeland makes no warranty, representation or guaranty as to the content, sequence, accuracy, timeliness, reliability or completeness of any of the data provided. The user of these applications should not rely on the data provided herein for any reason. The City of Lakeland explicitly disclaims any representations and warranties, express or implied, including without limitation, the implied warranties of merchantability and fitness for a particular purpose. In no event shall the City of Lakeland assume liability for any errors, omissions or inaccuracies in the information provided, regardless of how caused. The City of Lakeland shall not be liable for any decisions made or actions taken or not taken by the user of the applications in reliance upon any information or data provided herein.
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City of Lakeland
Design Review Committee
City Hall, First Floor
Building Inspection Conference Room

AGENDA

January 28, 2016
8:00 A.M.

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

II. Review and approval of the December 17, 2015 Design Review Committee Meeting minutes.

III. Review of Certificates of Review administratively approved since December 17, 2015.

IV. Consideration of Certificate of Review Applications:

   A. HPB15-200 – 201 E. Main Street – Mr. Matthew Cantrall, on behalf of property tenant, RP Funding, requests Final Approval for a second wall sign on the building at this address.

   B. HPB15-205 – 421 E. Park Street – Mr. Sal Campisi requests Final Approval of the demolition of the building on this property, as well as Conceptual Approval for a 5-unit townhouse building.

   C. HPB16-002 – 1043 Success Avenue – Mr. Brian Lee requests Conceptual Approval of a front porch and bathroom addition on the house at this address.

   D. HPB16-009 – 730 S. Florida Avenue – Dixie Signs Inc., on behalf of property owner Baron Management LLC and property tenant GraceCity Church, requests Final Approval for placement of two wall signs and one monument sign on this property.

   E. HPB16-012 – 733 E. Palmetto Street – Mr. Richard DeAngelis of Red Door Lakeland requests Final Approval for the enlargement and expansion of the front porch of the building at this address.

V. Other Business: None.

VI. Adjournment.
I. The meeting was called to order by Chairman Derek Hartman at approximately 7:41 a.m. The Committee roll call was performed and a quorum was present.

II. The Committee reviewed the November 19, 2015 regular meeting minutes. A motion for approval of the minutes as presented was made by Mr. Kyle Clyne and seconded by Mr. Brad Lunz. The motion passed unanimously.

III. Certificates of Review administratively approved since November 19, 2015 were reviewed. There were 10 cases administratively approved by staff. The Committee discussed with staff three of the cases, but there were no issues or concerns.

IV. Consideration of Certificate of Review Applications:

   A. HPB15-199 – 814 S. Florida Avenue – Mr. Mark Wilson, on behalf of property owner Harwell Properties and Florida Southern College, requests Final Approval for parking lot at this address.

   Mr. Terry Dennis recused himself as a Historic Preservation Board member due to conflict of interest. Chairman Derek Hartman introduced the request. Ms. Foster presented the staff report, stating that the applicant’s request for a parking lot on the subject property was intended for the overflow parking of Lake Morton Apartments residents, who are currently parking on-street in the neighborhood. The proposed parking lot will have paved asphalt drive aisles with stabilized grass parking stalls, but may be entirely paved with asphalt at some point in the future. Ms. Foster stated that the subject property consists of 3 lots totaling 0.77 acres, and contains the Harwell Building, a 1-story masonry vernacular structure, which is noncontributing to the Dixieland HD; this building will be retained on lot. A frame vernacular accessory building behind Harwell Building will likely be demolished; this building is also considered noncontributing. The two lots at Riggins St. and Tennessee Ave. are vacant.
Ms. Foster stated that the Planning and Zoning Board recommended approval of a Conditional Use Permit for this request, and that the City Commission will make a final decision in January. She commented that the Residential Historic District Design Guidelines do not address parking lots, but that the request was consistent with the applicable CRA Design Guidelines concerning circulation and access. Ms. Foster stated that the proposed lot continues the development pattern seen on adjacent lots between S. Florida and Tennessee Avenues, in which parking lots are placed behind businesses fronting S. Florida Avenue. Also, the installation of a parking lot does not prevent these parcels from being infilled with structures in the future. Ms. Foster stated that the landscaping proposed is appropriate and will buffer the lot from adjacent historic buildings, resulting in no adverse effects to these buildings. The possible demolition of the noncontributing accessory structure behind the Harwell Building also will not adversely affect the Historic District or nearby historic buildings. Ms. Foster recommended approval of the request with the condition that staff is permitted to review and approve the design of the parking lot light fixtures.

Mr. Terry Dennis, representing the applicant, explained the request and provided a background on Florida Southern College’s history with this property, commenting that the College has been mowing it for years. Mr. Dennis also mentioned that during the Conditional Use hearing, staff noted that there were approvals granted many years ago for a parking lot at this location.

The Committee discussed the request. Mr. Lunz questioned whether the DRC needed to approve parking lots. Ms. Foster replied that any large amount of paving has the potential to be detrimental to historic character and may not be appropriate in certain areas within the Historic Districts. She suggested that provisions concerning parking lots be added the Design Guidelines as a revision. Mr. Lunz commented that since there are no guidelines concerning parking lots, it makes it difficult to evaluate them; Mr. Lunz felt that parking lots were a planning and zoning issue, not a design one. Ms. Foster stated that this request could also be evaluated using the Secretary’s Standards as a basis of determining adverse effect on historic resources. Mr. Lunz added that given the demolition part of this request, the lot could be looked at as the future utilization of the site.

**MOTION:** Final approval of the parking lot as requested, with decorative light fixtures to be used that are consistent with the City’s standard for historic district light fixtures, as well as the demolition of the accessory structure on the subject property. (B. Lunz/K. Clyne, 5-0)

B. HPB15-200 – 201 E. Main Street – Mr. Matthew Cantrall, on behalf of property tenant, RP Funding, requests Final Approval for a second wall sign on the building at this address.

Chairman Hartman introduced the request. Ms. Foster presented the staff report, stating installation of an internally-lighted, channel letter wall sign on the west side of the building’s balcony cornice. The requested sign consists of an aluminum raceway and letters, with a plastic blue face and internal LED lighting, and measures approximately 8.63 square feet. Mr. Matthew Cantrall interjected that the sign was actually 14 square feet, and that there was a typo on the sign dimensions submitted with the application. Ms. Foster provided background on this request, stating that the subject building is a circa 1959 masonry commercial building, which is a noncontributing building in Munn Park HD. The applicant/tenant was granted approval for a 17.33 SF internally-lighted, channel letter wall sign with raceway for the front façade in October 2015, which has been installed; the applicant now wishes to place a similar smaller sign on the side façade. Staff was unable to support the request due to the LDDA Design Guidelines pertaining to wall signage, which state that each business or tenant shall have no more than one wall sign per building. Therefore,
Ms. Foster recommended denial of the request, as a second wall sign is inconsistent with the applicable Design Guidelines.

Representing the applicant, Mr. Matthew Cantrall was present in support of the request, and gave a number of examples where businesses located in or near downtown had two or more wall signs. Mr. Cantrall stated that there was also a common recurrence of corner buildings in the Downtown area having two signs. Mr. Cantrall stated that his client was simply requesting something that already had a precedent in Downtown.

The Committee discussed the request. Ms. Foster pointed out that some of the examples Mr. Cantrall provided were not buildings located in the Munn Park Historic District. Mr. Lunz confirmed with staff that the new sign ordinance was adopted in 2013, and several of the signs Mr. Cantrall noted existed prior to the new regulations going into effect. Mr. Lunz stated that the argument of allowing a nonconforming sign simply because there are nonconforming signs already was not adequate justification for the request.

Mr. Lunz asserted that because the LDDA Design Guidelines for signage was being used to evaluate this request, the decision for approval should be in the hands of the LDDA Board, instead of the DRC. Ms. Foster said that because this request was in the Munn Park Historic District, that the DRC had purview over sign requests. Ms. Foster added that typically sign requests are administratively reviewed by staff, but because staff was unable to approve this particular request as it does not meet the Design Guidelines, it was referred to the DRC for a decision. Mr. Kyle Clyne stated that he preferred that the LDDA Board make this decision. Mr. Lunz stated that the requested sign’s design is consistent with the sign that was approved for the front of the building; he preferred to approve the design of the sign but leave placement of the sign to the LDDA Board for approval.

**MOTION: Approval of the design of the requested second wall sign, but consideration of a second wall sign is deferred to the Lakeland Downtown Development Authority Board for final approval. (B. Lunz/ K. Clyne, 4-1, with T. Winslow opposing)**

C. HPB15-206 – 801 E. Main Street – Mr. Joe Diaz, on behalf of The Corner Store and The Poor Porker, requests Final Approval for three accessory structures and metal gates on this property.

Chairman Hartman introduced the request. Ms. Foster presented the staff report, stating that the applicant was seeking approval for three accessory structures on site: a 10’ X 20’ shed sided in galvalume paneling and Lucite rib loc panels with clear stained yellow pine fascia; a 15’ tall canvas and wood teepee; and a seating area made from a repurposed “canned ham” style travel trailer. The applicant also sought approval to use 5V crimp metal roof panels as a gate for a vehicular entrance on the north side of the property and a solid, rusticated metal door incorporated as part of the pedestrian gateway located at corner of E. Main Street and S. Lake Avenue.

Ms. Foster stated that the subject property was a quarter-acre lot zoned C-2. This property is located in Sub-District 6 of the Garden District SPI zoning overlay, which allows for limited commercial restaurant and retail uses along E. Main Street/US 98. Ms. Foster stated that the property was also within the Downtown Lakeland CRA, and contained a circa 1960 masonry vernacular building, originally a gas station and repair garage, which was noncontributing to the East Lake Morton Historic District. Ms. Foster stated that the property was vacant for many years due to underground storage tank contamination, but was purchased by the current owner in 2014, who has...
renovated it for a variety of retail and eatery uses. The principal building and accessory structures house different purposes: the garage building serves as the Bearcat & Big 6 Trading Post mercantile store; The Poor Porker food trailer sells food; The Corner Store shed is a specialty food retailer; “Canned Ham” travel trailer serves as a seating area; and the canvas teepee serves as an outdoor merchandise display area. Ms. Foster stated that the site is enclosed on three sides by wooden planters containing bamboo plants, which function as a decorative fence/kneewall; the fence was administratively approved, but plant material was not reviewed as part of any formal landscaping plan. A rusticated metal pedestrian gate and access gate made from 5V crimp metal roof panels are incorporated into this fence. Ms. Foster showed photographs of the subject property before and after renovation, as well as each of the accessory structures and gates for which the applicant sought approval.

Staff analysis of the request found that subject property was within a designated redevelopment area, surrounded by a mixture of commercial and residential uses and that no historic buildings will be adversely affected by this request. Ms. Foster stated that while the accessory structures are not consistent with the existing urban pattern of development, they are integral to the applicant’s vision for the site. Staff had no concerns regarding placement of the “canned ham” seating area or canvas teepee; however, the hitch or tongue of the travel trailer must be removed for compliance with the Land Development Code (LDC). Staff found that the requested shed was appropriate in scale and would be permitted if not for its location in front of the principal structure. However, Galvalume is not considered an appropriate material in the historic districts, due to its industrial appearance and widespread use in pre-fab construction. Therefore, Ms. Foster recommended that the shed’s Galvalume siding be replaced with a traditional siding material, such as wood or other appropriate material per the Design Guidelines. Additionally, staff commented that while 5V crimp metal panels are appropriate for use as roofing in the Historic Districts, this material’s use on the gate is not appropriate and should be changed to a material approved for fences/gates in the Historic Districts. Both the access gate and pedestrian gate should also be modified to accommodate the LDC’s requirement that the portion of gate exceeding four feet in height shall be made of pickets, wrought iron, chain link or similar open construction having no greater than 50 percent view blockage.

Ms. Foster noted that Community Development staff has worked with the applicants in an effort to encourage the redevelopment of this once unoccupied brownfield into a productive business. She stated staff recognized that the use of recycled materials and an eclectic mix of structures were emblematic to the applicant’s business and brand. However, staff was concerned about the inward-facing orientation of the development and minimal visibility from the street, as this may set a negative precedent for future redevelopment efforts in the Garden District. Staff recommended final approval of the request, with the following conditions: 1) that the Galvalume paneling on the accessory building is changed to a siding material consistent with the Design Guidelines; 2) that the 5V crimp metal paneling on the gate is changed to a fence/gate material consistent with the Design Guidelines; and 3) that both the pedestrian gate and access gate are modified to meet the 50% visibility requirement specified by the Land Development Code.

Applicants Mr. Joe Diaz, Mr. Jarrid Masse, and Mrs. Cynthia Diaz were present in support of the request. Mr. Diaz gave some background on how his and his wife’s business, The Corner Store, came to be and how they partnered with Mr. Masse to bring their business to Lakeland as part of the 801 E. Main Street project. Mr. Diaz commented that their vision was to revitalize an old underutilized space, and turn it into a destination that is visually inspiring and engage the community around food unlike the typical grocery store. Mr. Diaz acknowledged that the Poor Porker and Corner Store
businesses are pioneering in their endeavor, and the various structures are atypical. Mr. Diaz commented that the Corner Store shed structure is a metal carport, steel tube, slipjoint frame structure which requires some type of metal siding to keep the metal structure intact, and the Galvalume siding was a deliberate choice of siding. Mr. Jarrid Masse added that he could change the patina or texture of the siding, but he felt that the shiny nature of the Galvalume was purposeful in order to draw attention to that corner of the site. Ms. Foster clarified that it was not the shiny finish of the Galvalume that was problematic, simply the Galvalume material itself was prohibited as a matter of precedence in the historic districts.

Regarding visibility of the site, Mr. Masse commented that the businesses had not experienced any problems with the partial visibility of the site, and that part of the vibe and feel of the secretive nature site was in a person’s discovery of it. Regarding the gate patina, Mr. Masse stated that the texture alluded to what a person would find inside the site, and was part of their brand. Mr. Kyle Clyne asked if the vehicular gate was always kept closed; Mr. Masse replied that it was sometimes opened and not always closed. Mr. Lunz verified with staff that staff’s recommendation was to require the 50% visibility on both gates above 4 feet in height; Ms. Foster replied yes. Mr. Masse indicated that the 50% visibility would be problematic.

Mr. Tom Winslow asked about the fascia of the shed. Mr. Diaz responded that the framing extended 6 inches from the carport frame and was yellow pine that has a clear stain. There was discussion about how the shed was screened by the planter wall and was not highly visible. Mr. Lunz commented that this was a unique case involving a building that was originally pushed back from the roadside; the applicant’s design intent, which consists of many structures and businesses, brings a solid wall to the roadside that acts as a datum. Mr. Lunz added that the site acted like a marketplace or bazaar, in which the outer wall defines the street edge and contains the marketplace. Mr. Lunz commented that the 50% visibility requirement destroys the quality of the interior space.

Mr. Clyne asked if this project had been through the Building Inspections permitting process. Staff verified that the principal building and pergolas had been permitted, and that Building Official Dan Gargas was aware of this project. Mr. Diaz stated that they had been advised by Mr. Gargas to gain historical approval before pursuing permits on the accessory structures, and that they currently have a zoning application being processed for a conditional use with regard to the shed setbacks and gate visibility. Chairman Hartman agreed with Mr. Lunz’s comments about the visibility, and said that requiring more visibility would detract from the character of the space and not make it as much of a destination. Mr. Hartman also stated that as the area surrounding this property redevelops and more buildings are built, the applicants may want to open up the space.

There was a lengthy Committee discussion about the Galvalume paneling on the shed, and its creative use in folding the paneling over the roof. The consensus was that since the paneling was on a small building screened from view on a commercial property, that use of Galvalume was acceptable for this specific case. The Committee also discussed the difficulty in evaluating the appropriateness of this request due to the lack of guidance. Mr. Lunz mentioned the potential of this case to set a precedent where the outcome is not as high of quality as the applicant’s site. Staff commented that the fact that the subject property was a commercial property located within the Garden District, Community Redevelopment Area, and East Lake Morton Historic District was a highly unique situation, and there are not many properties that could support a development similar to the applicant’s.
MOTION: Final approval for the request as submitted by the applicant. (B. Lunz/K. Clyne, 5-0)

V. Other Business: None.

VI. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 8:54 a.m.

______________________________  ________________________________
Chairman, Design Review Committee  Historic Preservation Planner
1. 1123 Melton Avenue (contributing building) – Installation of a 4’ tall white vinyl picket fence in front yard and 6’ tall wood privacy fence in rear yard. Enclosure of area under existing rear yard carport with Hardie panels in a stucco finish, in order to create a 1-car garage. (HPB15-208)

2. 1034 S. Tennessee Avenue (noncontributing building) – Replace 4 windows on south side of duplex with same size single hung sash vinyl windows. (HPB15-209)

3. 933 E. Lemon Street (noncontributing building) – Selective demolition in preparation for building renovation. The following activities on site affecting the exterior of the subject building are approved: 1. Removal of all canvas awnings; 2. 14 new window openings and 7 resized window openings; 3. Removal of 2 doors: (1) to be infilled with CMU matching building exterior and 1 to be replaced with a window opening; and 4. Removal of existing fence, pool & HVAC equipment, rear concrete stoop, and existing sidewalk and stair to be replaced with new sidewalk/stair. (HPB15-210)

4. 957 S. Tennessee Avenue (contributing building) – Existing 6’ wooden privacy fence and gate along alley at property’s rear. Approval to replace existing gate with a wood 6-panel door and construct a decorative wooden mini-gable roof over gate. Gable roof to have fiberglass shingles and rafter tails matching the existing garage and house. Overhang of gable roof gate canopy is approximately 10”. (HPB15-211)

5. 322 S. Lake Avenue (contributing building) – Restoration of house to include: 1. Removal of vinyl siding and soffits and restoration of the original wood siding and eaves; 2. Removal of the jalousie windows and paneling used to enclose the front porch and restoration of the original open plan of the front porch; 3. Replacement of the existing asphalt shingle roof with Owens Corning Onyx Black architectural shingles; 4. All original windows will be repaired and restored; 5. Removal of all roof mounted television antennas and satellite equipment; and 6. A secondary side porch that is not original to the house will be removed and the house’s exterior repaired with in-kind materials. This approval is subject to the following conditions: Any replacement pieces of siding must be wood siding matching the width, profile and reveal of the original siding; replacement eave boards must match existing eave boards; plywood is not acceptable for eaves; any replacement elements for the front porch must match the original element(s) in material, dimension, and style; and All repairs to house exterior where the non-original secondary side porch is removed must be made with in-kind materials. (HPB15-212)

6. 749 College Avenue (contributing building) – Replacement of the existing screened wall of the front porch enclosure. The replacement wall will consist of new aluminum and wood framing and new screen. (HPB15-213)

7. 923 Cumberland Street (contributing building) – Restoration of front porch back to its original appearance. Restoration work to include the removal of existing enclosure consisting of awning windows and paneling over existing, original front porch columns. Any necessary replacement lumber and siding will match the original in dimension and profile. (HPB15-214)
8. 118 S. Kentucky Avenue (noncontributing building) – Installation of a 6.56 SF hanging sign. (HPB16-001)

9. 1509 S. Florida Avenue (noncontributing building) – Face change to two panels of an existing monument sign. (HPB16-003)

10. 1020 OakHill Street (contributing building) – Installation of a box-eave carport structure in back yard, behind existing house and deck. (HPB16-004)

11. 209 E. Main Street (noncontributing building) – Repainting of building using the following Serwin Williams colors: SW7674 - Peppercorn - 1st floor; SW6001 - Grayish - 1st floor; and SW6321 - Red Bay - 2nd floor.

12. 1009 Johnson Avenue (contributing building) – Replacement of 7 non-original, metal-frame windows on east (front) elevation with 7 aluminum-clad wood windows in a 9/1 lite configuration (Prairie style) to match the original wood windows in other parts of this house. (HPB16-006)

13. 1043 Success Avenue (contributing building) - Approval of various repairs and replacements, to include: 1. Repair or replace pieces of damaged lap siding with wood or fiber cement siding matching the existing siding on house with regards to width, profile, and reveal; 2. Replace jalousie windows with white aluminum casement windows or single hung sash windows with no muntins; 3. Remove aluminum awnings and reinstall original wood shutters; 4. Repair soffits and fascia in-kind; 5. Replace existing roofing shingles with asphalt composition shingles; 6. Detached garage repairs: Reinstall two single garage doors (door to be a 12-panel door with two 9-lite windows or similar); rescreen 2nd story porch; repair broken window glass of single-hung sash windows; and 7. Repair driveway due to tree root damage. (HPB16-007).

14. 711 W. Park Street (noncontributing building) - Enclosing an existing open-sided carport in rear yard. Materials used to enclose carport will be typical frame construction with treated wood board-and-batten panel siding to match existing storage room on carport. (HPB16-008)

15. 115 Hillcrest Street (contributing building) – Repainting commercial building with approved color scheme. (HPB16-010)

16. 1114 E. Palmetto Street (noncontributing building) – Installation of a 10’ X 20’ utility shed in back yard. (HPB16-011)
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
STAFF REPORT
December 17, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case #</th>
<th>HPB15-200</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner/Applicant</td>
<td>HI Shabnam / Matthew Cantrall, Century Signs Inc. for RP Funding (tenant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>201 E. Main Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested Action</td>
<td>Approval for a Wall Sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic District</td>
<td>Munn Park; LDDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use; Zoning; Context District</td>
<td>RAC; C-7; Urban Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Use</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent Properties</td>
<td>Commercial; Recreational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Approvals</td>
<td>Wall Sign on north wall approved by HPB on 10/22/15.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REQUEST

The applicant is requesting an internally-lighted, channel letter wall sign with raceway on the west side of the building at the subject location. The sign consists of an aluminum raceway and letters, with a plastic blue face and internal LED lighting, and measures 8.63 SF.

SUMMARY OF BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The subject building is a circa 1959 masonry commercial building in the Munn Park Historic District; this building is noncontributing to the District.

The applicant/tenant was granted approval for a 17.33 SF internally-lighted, channel letter wall sign with raceway for the front façade wall in October 2015, which has been installed. The applicant now wishes to place a similar smaller sign on the west wall balcony cornice.

APPLICABLE GUIDELINES:

The Sign Guidelines: Munn Park Historic District and Lakeland Downtown Development Authority (LDDA) Design Guidelines for New and Renovated Buildings: Signs are the basis for review per Article 11 of the City of Lakeland Land Development Code.

The following LDDA Design Guidelines apply to this appeal:

- Sign Regulations, Building Signs, Wall Signs (Section 2.c.1)
  - Each business or tenant shall have no more than one (1) wall sign per building.

ANALYSIS:

The existing individually-lit letter sign was approved by staff on the basis of the Design Guidelines, as well as the existence of several other individually-lit channel letter signs in Munn Park. Staff was unable to approve the requested second sign, as the applicable Design Guidelines expressly state that each building tenant may only have one wall sign.
STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends denial of the request, as a second wall sign for the applicant/tenant is inconsistent with the applicable Design Guidelines.

Report prepared by: Emily M. Foster, Senior Planner
Liaison to the Historic Preservation Board
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
STAFF REPORT
January 28, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>HPB15-205</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner/Applicant</td>
<td>CSG Realty II / Sal Campisi, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>421 E. Park Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested Action</td>
<td>Demolition and New Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic District</td>
<td>South Lake Morton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Land Use; Zoning; Context District</td>
<td>Residential Medium; MF-12; Urban Neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Use</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent Properties</td>
<td>Single and Multi-Family Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Approvals</td>
<td>2005 - Approval to construct handicap ramp; 2007 –Approval to replace handicap ramp.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REQUEST

Mr. Sal Campisi requests final approval of the demolition of the building located on the subject property, as well as conceptual approval for a new 5-unit townhouse building.

SUMMARY OF BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The subject building, known as the Tuesday Music Club clubhouse, is a masonry vernacular building constructed in 1954 and is considered noncontributing to the South Lake Morton Historic District. This building features a hip roof with a wide overhanging boxed eave, concrete walls with horizontal joints, and awning windows, as well as fixed mitered corner windows.

The applicant considered renovating the subject building, but found unsafe conditions with the roof framing as well as rotted floors in one location. The applicant has offered the community room at his business (Regal Honda Dealership) to the Tuesday Music Club so that this organization will continue to have a meeting place.

If demolition is approved by the DRC, the applicant wishes to replace the existing building with a new two-story townhouse building containing 5 dwelling units. The conceptual design of the new construction features a neo-traditional aesthetic with a multi-gabled roof, dormers, porches and balconies with grouped, square columns, and wall bays and recesses. 9/9 windows with shutters and French doors are also featured. Materials proposed for the new building include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Cladding</td>
<td>Hardie lap siding, trim, and molding; stacked stone veneer</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>TBD; 9/9 design</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doors</td>
<td>TBD; Double French door design</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof</td>
<td>Asphalt architectural shingles</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porch</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPLICABLE GUIDELINES:

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

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

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

1. The architectural significance of the building or structure. Architectural significance shall be determined by the DRC at the time of the demolition request and shall be based upon documentation of the property’s architectural integrity and historical or cultural significance. Designation of the building or structure as “non-contributing” by the most recent historic district survey does not preclude the DRC from making a determination of architectural significance.

2. The contribution of the building or structure to the history or origins of the historic district.

3. The future utilization of the site, including any replacement buildings or structures.

The following Design Guidelines apply to this project:

Chapter 4, page 4-1 to 4-9.

- Scale – sizing of building should relate to neighboring buildings and be human-scaled. Height to width and width to length scale ratios should be compatible with surrounding contributing buildings. Scale of doors, windows, and other façade elements should be appropriate for the building form.

- Massing of the new building, including its fenestration, roof height and shape, and foundation elevation should be consistent with surrounding contributing buildings. Massing should be articulated through the building’s façade by the use of dormers and other roof projections, as well as façade projections such as bays, porches, and steps.

- Orientation of new buildings should be toward the primary road and building setbacks should reflect traditional siting dimensions.

- Architectural details and ornamentation should reflect those of surrounding historic buildings.

- Window material, style, size, and trim should be consistent with historic windows and include dimensional mullions and exterior muntins, if applicable.

- Doors should be of an appropriate design reflective of the architectural style of the building.

- Roof design and details should reflect those of surrounding historic buildings.

- Materials should respect adjacent historic buildings.

- Colors should complement surrounding buildings.

ANALYSIS:

With regard to the demolition of the existing house on this property, three demolition criteria must be considered in accordance with Article 11.6.3.c, in order for the Board to approve demolition:

(a) The historic or architectural significance of the building.

Built in 1954, this midcentury modern era, masonry vernacular building features a hip roof with a wide overhanging boxed eave, concrete walls with horizontal joints, and aluminum awning windows, as well as fixed mitered corner windows. This building appears to be relatively unaltered, and meets the minimum 50-year criterion for a building to be deemed historic. While this building does have an association with the Tuesday Music Club, founded in 1920, the building is of common design and could be reproduced fairly easily. Although its design is reminiscent of the Prairie Style, this building is not an outstanding example of any particular architectural style.
(b) The importance of the building or structure to the historic district.

The building’s construction date of 1954 is likely the reason it was not included as a contributing building in the South Lake Morton Historic District, due to the District’s period of significance (1904-1942) ending in 1942.

(c) The future utilization of the site, including any replacement buildings or structures.

The applicant proposes to build a new two-story, five-unit townhouse to replace the existing building.

The proposed replacement multi-family building is a permitted use for this property’s MF-12 zoning. While the existing building has a historical association to the Tuesday Music Club, the building itself is not architecturally significant; considering that this building does not contribute to the historical character of the South Lake Morton Historic District, along with a design that does not reflect a defined architectural style, staff finds that the demolition considerations are satisfied.

With regard to the conceptual design of the proposed townhouse, the varied massing, scale and modulated façade is compatible with the surrounding contributing buildings. The use of fiber-cement siding, windows and doors in traditional styles, and simply designed columns, railings, trim, and rafter tails, are also consistent with the Design Guidelines. The porches shown are compatible with the Design Guidelines as well. However, there are a few inconsistencies between the proposed design and the Design Guidelines for new construction. The use of stacked stone as a façade material is relatively modern and not commonly seen on the historic architectural styles in South Lake Morton; because of this, staff recommends that brick, stucco, or a combination of these materials be used instead of the stacked stone. Additionally, for further visual interest in the facades, a different pattern of fiber-cement siding could be used in the gables, such as decorative shakes or shingle siding. The foundation height of this building should be raised a minimum of 12”, to be compatible with the raised foundations of nearby historic buildings, as well as to provide sufficient separation of public and private spaces on the lot.

The conceptual site plan shows an L-shaped footprint on the lot, with doorways on both the north and south elevations; there is no clear “front door” orientation to the street, which needs to be conveyed per the Design Guidelines. A suggestion to define the front door orientation could be to use a solid or half-lite door with a transom and/or sidelight window along with an entry stair for each doorway along the Park Street elevation. Also, flipping the footprint of this building so that the short side of the “L” is towards Success Avenue will more clearly define the rear southwest corner of the property for parking, as well as screen the parking lot from street view. Lastly, the street setbacks for this development are a minimum of 10’ to maximum of 25’ along Success Avenue (collector road) and a minimum of 10’ and maximum of 20’ along Park Street (local road); the setbacks shown on the site plan will need to be adjusted to meet LDC requirements.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends final approval for the requested demolition. Staff recommends conceptual approval of the proposed new construction with the condition that the new building and site plan is redesigned as suggested in this report. Final review and approval of the request for new construction will be determined at a future Design Review Committee meeting.

Report prepared by: Emily M. Foster, Senior Planner, Historic Preservation Liaison to the Historic Preservation Board
Luxury Town Homes
Lakeland, FL

AVONMODULAR
HYBRID INNOVATION • REDEFINING CONSTRUCTION
North end of property

East end of property

Closest townhome to property (east end)
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HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
STAFF REPORT
January 28, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case #</th>
<th>HPB16-002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner/Applicant</td>
<td>Mr. Brian Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested Action</td>
<td>Conceptual Approval for a New Front Porch and Bathroom Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>1043 Success Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic District</td>
<td>South Lake Morton Historic District, #SLM 7-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Land Use; Zoning; Context District</td>
<td>Residential Medium; RA-4; Urban Neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Use</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent Properties</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Approvals</td>
<td>HPB05-083 (6/27/05) Approval to repair garage apartment with Hardie board siding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REQUEST

Mr. Brian Lee requests conceptual approval to add a new front porch onto the subject house, as well as to construct a small addition to the side of the house for an additional bathroom.

SUMMARY OF BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The subject property contains a one-story frame vernacular Minimal Traditional house, circa 1938, which is contributing to the South Lake Morton Historic District. Minimal Traditional houses are characterized by their simple features and compact plan, and the subject house is a good example of this type. Features include a side gabled roof with a brick front entry stoop, an integrated side porch enclosed with jalousie windows, and double-hung 8/8 wood windows. The house is sided in weatherboard lap siding and has an asphalt shingled roof with narrow eaves. The property also contains a two-story detached garage, consistent with or slightly newer than the age of the house, which has been converted into an accessory dwelling unit.

The applicant has already received administrative approval for the following minor repairs and replacements on this property:

- Repair or replace pieces of damaged lap siding with wood or fiber cement siding matching the existing siding on house in width, profile, and reveal.
- Replace jalousie windows with white aluminum casement windows or single hung sash windows with no muntins.
- Remove aluminum awnings and reinstall original wood shutters.
- Repair soffits and fascia in-kind.
- Replace existing roofing shingles with asphalt composition shingles.
- Detached garage repairs: Reinstall two single garage doors (door to be a 12-panel door with two 9-lite windows or similar); rescreen 2nd story porch; repair broken window glass of single-hung sash windows.
- Repair driveway due to tree root damage.

The requested new front porch consists of a front gable frame with open-beam construction and asphalt shingle roof to match the roof of the house; simple square columns and handrails would be used. The requested new porch dimensions are approximately 14’ in width and 5’ in depth.
The proposed bathroom addition would be placed at the rear of the south side of the house; the addition would result in a 72 SF gable-roofed projection on that side. Siding, roofing, and foundation materials for the addition will match the existing materials of the house, and a new window in an 8/8 lite configuration, matching the existing windows on the house, will be used.

**APPLICABLE GUIDELINES:**

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

The following *Standards* apply to this project:

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

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

The following *Design Guidelines* apply to this project:

Chapter 5, Rehabilitation of Contributing Buildings, Building Additions (page 5.25)

- Should be limited to the rear of the main building.
- Some styles such as the Craftsman, Colonial Revival, Modern and Mediterranean may support an addition to the side, but recessed from the main façade. The roof pitch of the addition should match or be lower than the original roof pitch.
- All façade elements need to continue architectural elements and detail.
- Modern style buildings were designed to be small but expandable. Therefore, additions are expected.

**ANALYSIS:**

The subject building is a textbook example of the Minimal Traditional house, in which a simple design aesthetic was characteristic of this style. These types of houses came about during the Great Depression as modest, cost-efficient residences that could be built through FHA-insured loans. The style continued to be popular during and after World War II due to its ease of construction and efficient floor plans that could be expanded. The style gradually faded from popularity in the 1950s, as it was replaced by the larger Ranch house. Lakeland has a number of Minimal Traditional houses in all of its residential Historic Districts, and the subject house is one of the earliest examples.

As a simple style, Minimal Traditional houses do not typically feature porches, and instead have a plainly decorated stoop. However, examples do exist where a small porch is present, or a gable-roof overhang with simple columns is seen at the front entry. The scale and design of the proposed new front porch is not
consistent with Secretary’s Standard #3 above. Therefore, it is suggested that the applicant redesign a smaller porch or front entry overhang that is consistent with examples found in Lakeland’s residential Historic Districts for Final Review and Approval.

With regard to the bathroom addition, as the Minimal Traditional house is considered a modern style, this small addition is consistent with the Design Guidelines in size and placement on the rear side of the house. Preliminary details concerning materials and the window also are consistent with the Design Guidelines. Architectural elevations, a site plan, and floor plan for this addition will be required for Final Review and Approval.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends Conceptual Approval of the request, with the following conditions: 1) that the front porch is redesigned to be smaller in scale and simpler in design, consistent with similar small porches or overhangs found on Minimal Traditional houses in the Historic Districts; and 2) that more detailed architectural elevations, a site plan, and a floor plan be submitted for Final Review and Approval of the bathroom addition.

Report prepared by: Emily M. Foster, Senior Planner, Historic Preservation Liaison to the Historic Preservation Board
A Proposed Bathroom Addition
8' x 9'

Side Elevation
(Patterson St.)

B Proposed Front Porch 14' x 5'

Front Elevation
(Success Ave.)

Concrete Steps
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
STAFF REPORT
January 28, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case #</th>
<th>HPB16-009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner/Applicant</td>
<td>Baron Management LLC / Sarah Abichid, Dixie Signs Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>730 S. Florida Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested Action</td>
<td>Approval for Two Wall Signs and a Monument Sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic District</td>
<td>South Lake Morton; #SLM 1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special District</td>
<td>Dixieland CRA Commercial Corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use; Zoning; Context District</td>
<td>RM/RH; C-2/MF-12; Urban Corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Use</td>
<td>Civic (Church)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent Properties</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Approvals</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REQUEST

The applicant is requesting to install two wall signs on the existing church building, as well as a monument sign on the property. The proposed wall signs will be mounted on the northern brick church tower, on the north and west sides just below the second story tower opening, and consist of cast aluminum letters that read “GraceCity Church;” these wall signs are approximately 24 SF in overall size, and will be externally lit by an 8’ long outdoor LED light bar mounted underneath the sign on the brick tower. The letters and light bar will be stud-mounted to the building into the mortar of the brick wall, not into the brick itself. The proposed monument sign will be placed on the subject property along S. Florida Avenue, just south of the church building, and will be setback 5’ from the property line. The monument sign is 6’ tall with a 16” base depth, and consists of a brick base and sign area of approximately 50.68 SF. This monument sign is proposed to be externally lit with ground lighting.

SUMMARY OF BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The subject building is a circa 1926 Romanesque Revival church formerly known as the Westminster Presbyterian Church. This building is located in the South Lake Morton Historic District and is contributing to the District. Because of the subject property’s location also in the Dixieland CRA Commercial Corridor, the HPB/DRC is tasked with design review for any requested signage.

APPLICABLE GUIDELINES:

The City of Lakeland’s Dixieland CRA Commercial Corridor Design Guidelines are the basis for review of this request per the City of Lakeland Land Development Code, Article 11: Historic Preservation Standards.

The following Dixieland CRA Commercial Corridor Design Guidelines apply to this request:

- Chapter VI. Miscellaneous Standards, Section C. Sign Standards
  - Both monument and wall signs are permitted sign types.
  - Signs shall be positioned so that they appear as a design feature of the overall façade of a particular building.
  - Signs shall relate to, and help define and enhance, the architectural features of the building, rather than cover or disturb design features, and shall be placed to establish façade rhythm, relative to the architecture of a building.
• Signable areas may include: (1) a continuous flat wall surface free of window or door openings or architectural features, (2) areas between the top of the storefront and the sill of the second floor windows, (3) sign boards designed for such use and already in place, (4) panels at the top and bottom of show windows, and (5) transoms over doors and windows.

• The scale of signs shall be appropriate for the building on or near which they are placed and the area in which they are located. The size and shape on a sign shall be proportional with the scale of the structure. Small storefronts shall have smaller signs than larger storefronts.

• Signs shall be designed so that they are integrated with the design of the building and the building’s use. A well-designed building façade or storefront is created by the careful coordination of sign design, architectural design, and color scheme. Signs located on multiple-tenant buildings shall be designed to complement and enhance each other, although not necessarily to match each other.

• Pedestrian-oriented signs are encouraged. These signs shall be read easily and comfortably from the sidewalk or street.

• Creative design is strongly encouraged; Colors shall be selected which contribute to legibility and design integrity.

• Graphics on all signs shall be dimensional in nature.

• Wall Signs: Each business or tenant shall have no more than one (1) wall sign per building. The allowable area for wall signs shall be one square foot of sign for each linear foot of primary building facade, not to exceed 50% of the maximum total building sign area calculation. Sign copy may not exceed two (2) feet in height.

• Monument Signs
  o Each building shall have no more than one (1) monument sign regardless of the number of tenants.
  o Monument signs shall only be permitted if the building is set back a minimum of fifteen (15) feet from the front property line and shall otherwise adhere to the building setback requirements.
  o Monument signs and their bases shall not exceed six (6) feet in height and seventy-two (72) square feet in area.
  o A monument sign shall have a base depth no less than twelve (12) inches or no smaller than the depth of the sign structure, whichever is greater.
  o Monument signs shall be oriented perpendicular to the face of the building.
  o Monument signs shall be illuminated by external lighting only.
  o Changeable copy shall be permitted on monument signs.
  o Monument signs shall be compatible with the architectural style, composition, materials, color and level of detail of the principal structure.

ANALYSIS:

The subject property currently has no wall signs, but a small monument sign with changeable copy did exist on the property for the former Westminster Presbyterian Church. There is also a temporary sign for GraceCity Church located nearby.

Staff finds that the requested wall signs meet the placement, scale, design, and size requirements of the Design Guidelines; the signs are composed of individual letters that are dimensional in nature and scaled appropriately for the tower wall face, at 24 SF in area. The signs are placed appropriately below the second story tower opening, but above the first story banding. However, only one wall sign per tenant is permitted per the Design Guidelines; therefore, the requested number of wall signs is not consistent with the Design Guidelines. External lighting is preferred in the Historic Districts, with which this request complies. Additionally, mounting the wall sign into the mortar instead of the brick is also a preferred installation treatment.
With regard to the monument sign, staff finds that the proposed sign complies with the Design Guidelines in terms of orientation, external lighting, design, and materials. At 6’ tall and approximately 51 SF in sign area, this sign also complies with size and height requirements. While this sign does not comply with the requirement that the building be setback a minimum of 15 feet from the front property line, historical precedence has been to allow a monument sign in the small side yard area of the church, and staff feels the request meets the intent of this particular requirement.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of the request as submitted, with the condition that only one of the two wall signs requested is permitted to be installed; the applicant may determine which of the two wall signs to install.

Report prepared by: Emily M. Foster, Senior Planner
Liaison to the Historic Preservation Board
Option 3

Building Letters
Scale: 1/4" = 1'-0"

Section View
Scale: 1" = 1'-0"

Letters: Custom cast aluminum
"GraceCity" Letter depth: 2"
"CHURCH" Letter depth: 2"
Finish: Standard Brushed finish with low-gloss clear coat
Mounting: Stucco mounted to building with 3/4" standoff.
Lighting: Externally illuminated with (2) 4' Outdoor LED light bars, painted to match brick color as close as possible. Exact fixtures TBD.

Photo Elevation West Elevation
(Facing South Florida Ave.)

Field Survey Required
Prior to Manufacture

Please check thoroughly: We cannot be held responsible if you approve an incorrect art proof.

I have reviewed the above specifications, fully understand the work to be performed, and hereby authorize this project to begin.

Client Approval:
Date: __/__/____
Signed:

Landlord Approval:
Date: __/__/____
Signed:

Job Name:
Grace City Church

Job Address:
730 S. Florida Ave.
Lakeland, FL

Job #: G-022266
Date: 01-14-16

SP: HL

Drawn by: ie
File: PLT/files/2009-present
GiGrace City Church
bldg ltr opt3.cdr

Sheet No. opt3-west

Revisions
Rev/dated by/description

Dixie Signs
2930 Drane Field Rd.
Lakeland, FL 33811
663.644.3521 fax 644.3524
www.dixiesignsinc.com

Notice: This is an original unpublished drawing created by Dixie Signs Inc. It is submitted for your personal use in connection with a project being planned for you by Dixie Signs Inc. This drawing is not to be shown to anyone outside your organization, nor is it to be used, reproduced, copied or exhibited in any fashion without written permission from Dixie Signs Inc.
Option 3

Photo Elevation North Elevation
(Facing Mosswood Rd.)

**Field Survey Required Prior to Manufacture**

**Letters:** Custom cast aluminum
- "GraceCity" Letter depth: 2'
- "CHURCH" Letter depth: 2'
- Finish: Standard Brushed finish with low-gloss clear coat
- Mounting: Stud mounted to building with 3/4" standoff

**Lighting:** Externally illuminated with (2) 4' Outdoor LED light bars, painted to match brick color as close as possible. Exact fixtures TBD.

---

**PLEASE CHECK THOROUGHLY:** We cannot be held responsible if you APPROVE an incorrect art proof.

**I HAVE REVIEWED THE ABOVE SPECIFICATIONS, FULLY UNDERSTAND THE WORK TO BE PERFORMED, AND HEREBY AUTHORIZE THIS PROJECT TO BEGIN.**

**CLIENT APPROVAL:**
- DATE:______/______/______
- SIGNED:____________________
- OK to proceed with NO CHANGES
- OK to proceed with NOTE CHANGES
- Make changes and SHOW ANOTHER PROOF

**LANDLORD APPROVAL:**
- DATE:______/______/______
- SIGNED:____________________
- OK to proceed with NO CHANGES
- Make changes and SHOW ANOTHER PROOF
- OK to proceed with NOTE CHANGES

**DIXIE SIGNS**
2930 Drake Field Rd.
Lakeland, FL 33811
863.644.3524 fax 644.3524
www.dixiesignsinc.com

**NOTICE:** This is an original unpublished drawing created by Dixie Signs Inc. It is submitted for your personal use in connection with a project being planned for you by Dixie Signs Inc. This drawing is not to be shown to anyone outside your organization, nor is it to be used, reproduced, copied, or exhibited in any fashion without written permission from Dixie Signs Inc.
Square Footage:
4' x 12'-3" = 50.67 sf
(Allowed 72 sf, 6 OAH max)
(5' Setback required)

D/F Monument Sign
Scale: 3/8" = 1'-0"

Cabinet: Aluminum fabricated cabinet.
Letters: Custom cast aluminum.
"GraceCity" Letter depth: 1"
"Church" Letter depth: 1"
Hillsong Family" Logo depth: 1"
Finish: Painted White
Mounting: Stud mounted to monument face with 3/4" standoff.

Base: Brick base to match building brick as close as possible.
Address Numbers: Custom cast aluminum.
"730" depth: 1"
Finish: Painted White
Mounting: Stud mounted to brick base with 3/4" standoff.

Lighting: Externally illuminated with ground lighting TBD.
Colors:
Cabinet: Black
Letters: White
Address Numbers: White
Brick: Match building brick as close as possible.

DIXIE SIGNS
2930 Dixie Field Rd.
Lakeland, FL 33811
863.344.3521 fax 644.3524
www.dixiesigns.com

NOTICE: THIS IS AN ORIGINAL UNPROOFED DRAWING CREATED BY DIXIE SIGNS INC. IT IS SUBMITTED FOR YOUR PERSONAL USE IN CONNECTION WITH A PROJECT BEING PLANNED FOR YOU BY DIXIE SIGNS INC. THIS DRAWING IS NOT TO BE SHOWN TO ANYONE OUTSIDE YOUR ORGANIZATION, NOR IS IT TO BE USED, REPRODUCED, COPIED OR EXHIBITED IN ANY FASHION WITHOUT WRITTEN PERMISSION FROM DIXIE SIGNS, INC.
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
STAFF REPORT
January 28, 2016

Case # HPB16-012
Owner/Applicant Mr. Richard DeAngelis/Vinovibe LLC. d/b/a Red Door Lakeland
Requested Action Final Approval for Front Porch Expansion and Enlargement
Location 733 E. Palmetto Street
Historic District South Lake Morton Historic District, #SLM 15-19
Future Land Use; Zoning; Context District Convenience Center; O-1; Urban Corridor
Existing Use Commercial
Adjacent Properties Residential, Commercial, Civic/Institutional
Previous Approvals HPB12-123 (12/11/12) Administrative approval for a fence; HPB12-127 (12/17/12) – Administrative approval for various repairs; and HPB15-131 (7/28/15) Administrative approval for a rear-yard shed.

REQUEST

Mr. Richard DeAngelis requests final approval to expand and enlarge the front porch of the subject building for use as an outdoor dining/seating area for the Red Door Lakeland restaurant.

SUMMARY OF BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The subject property contains a one-story Bungalow house, circa 1927, which is contributing to the South Lake Morton Historic District. This building features a gable-front portico at the center of the front façade supported by round columns, as well as wooden lap siding, cornerboards, triangular knee braces, brick chimneys, and side gabled roof with architectural shingles and rafter tails. The front portico has been altered over the years, and currently features open-beam construction and non-original round columns.

Per the applicant’s request, the portico would be removed and a new, larger front porch added to the building. The requested new porch will run the full width of the subject building’s front façade, is 969 SF in area, and consists of a gable front roof with open-beam construction within the gable, an architectural shingle roof with rafter tails to match the existing roof of the building; tapered square columns on brick piers, and a concrete foundation veneered in stuccoed brick. Side walls covered in fiber cement siding matching the building’s lap siding will be used in between the column piers. The requested new porch dimensions are approximately 38’ by 24’-5”.

A shed-roofed kitchen addition/extension on the west side of the building is shown on the plans submitted by the applicant, but is not proposed to be built at this time.

APPLICABLE GUIDELINES:

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

The following Standards apply to this project:
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 #9. New additions 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 request:

Chapter 4, Additions to Contributing Buildings, pages 4.1 to 4.8.
- Proportion: The size, scale, and massing of an addition should be smaller than the primary building and shall not overwhelm it.
- Rhythm: The spacing of repetitive façade elements should reflect that of the primary building.
- Materials: The materials of an addition should respect the materials used on the primary building, and dimensions, textures, and finishes of materials should also reflect that of the primary building.

Chapter 5, Alterations to Contributing Buildings: Building Additions, page 5.25.
- The roof pitch should match that of the original roof pitch.
- All façade elements need to continue the existing architectural elements or detail.

ANALYSIS:

The subject building is a frame vernacular Bungalow that has had a variety of uses throughout its history. The existing small portico is unusual, as porches are often the most prominent architectural feature of a Bungalow. Staff research found that this feature has been altered significantly over the years, including non-original columns and gable-front.

With regard to compliance with the Standards, full-width porches are common on Bungalow houses, and the proposed porch is not out of context for the subject building. As the existing portico has been altered significantly, staff finds this feature no longer retains historic integrity and therefore, its removal and replacement with a full-width porch will not adversely affect the subject building. Additionally, the new front porch will be differentiated from the existing building by modern, yet compatible materials and its projection from the building. The form and integrity of the existing building will be retained.

With regard to compliance with the Design Guidelines, the porch addition achieves a compatible scale and massing with the existing building, and is compatible with residential Bungalows nearby. The architectural details and materials proposed for the porch are consistent with the Bungalow style in general, as well as with the frame vernacular appearance of the subject building. While the front porches of many local Bungalows are open, short knee walls or railings are not uncommon to this style. The sidewalls of the proposed porch are necessary for building code compliance and safety, and using contrasting, but compatible materials for the sidewalls will convey a traditional appearance.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends final approval of the request as submitted.

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

NEW FLOOR PLAN

NEW AREA:
- KITCHEN EXTENSION: 128 FT²
- COVERED DECK: 969 FT²
1. Electrical Contractor to verify all existing site conditions & make any necessary adjustments.

2. All work shall comply with the National Electric Code, latest edition & any other applicable regulations or codes.

3. Arc fault protection (AFCI) required for all bedroom outlets.

4. All smoke detectors to be hard wired, interconnected & supplied with battery backup.

5. Carbon monoxide detectors to be within 10' of all bedroom outlets.

6. Contractor to prewire for landscape lighting in front & rear of residence.

7. Contractor to prewire for surround sound & security.

8. Contractor to ensure all wiring is in accordance with National Electric Code.

9. All electrical symbols shall comply with the Electrical Symbols Legend.
