City of Lakeland
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
City Hall, Building Inspection Conference Room
AGENDA
February 28, 2019
7:30 A.M.

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

II. Review and approval of the January 24, 2019 Historic Preservation Board meeting minutes.

III. Old Business: None

IV. New Business: None

V. Adjourn for Design Review Committee.

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. Due to the fact that providing a reasonable accommodation may require outside assistance, organizations, or resources, the City asks that any request be made with as much notice as possible, preferably 72 hours, but no later than 48 hours in advance of 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.
City of Lakeland
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
Minutes of the January 24, 2019 Meeting
Building Inspection Conference Room
(Please note: These meeting minutes comply with FS 286.011 and are not intended to be a verbatim transcript.)

MEMBERS PRESENT         MEMBERS ABSENT         STAFF PRESENT
Tim Calhoon, Chairman   Derek Hartman            Emily Foster, Historic Preservation Planner
Kyle Clyne, Vice Chairman   Lynn Dennis          Mike Mustard, Cablecast Producer
Dan Fowler               Jeremy Moses            GUESTS
Ursula Radabaugh         Barry Friedman
Nick Thomas              Chuck Welch
Linda Trumble

I. Call to Order and Determination of a Quorum
   Chairman Tim Calhoon called the January 24, 2019 meeting of the Historic Preservation Board ("Board") to order at 7:30 a.m. The roll call was performed. A quorum was reached, as eight Board members were present.

II. Review and Approval of the Previous Meeting Minutes
   Ms. Lynn Dennis motioned to approve the December 20, 2018 meeting minutes as submitted. Mr. Kyle Clyne seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

III. Old Business: None

IV. New Business:
   A. Ms. Emily Foster explained the recent amendment to the Garden District SPI that was adopted by City Commission, which returned design review authority to the Historic Preservation Board for new construction and demolition within the Garden District area.

   B. Ms. Foster provided the Board with the evaluation by the Florida Division of Historical Resources of the City’s Certified Local Government status, which continues in good standing.

V. Adjournment. There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:33 a.m.

Chairman, Historic Preservation Board                    Senior Planner, Historic Preservation
City of Lakeland
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
City Hall, First Floor, Building Inspection Conference Room

AGENDA

February 28, 2019, immediately following the Historic Preservation Board Meeting

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

II. Review and approval of the January 24, 2019 Design Review Committee meeting minutes.

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

IV. Consideration of Certificate of Review Applications:

   B. HPB19-006 – 322, 324, 325 S. Lake Avenue and 810 E. Lime Street – On behalf of property owner Lake Lime LLC, Mr. Steve Boyington and Ms. Erica Craig of WMB-ROI request final approval for the construction of two new three-story apartment buildings on the subject property.

   C. HPB19-022 – 723 Success Avenue – Mr. and Mrs. Duke Chadwell request final approval to enclose two window openings on the north elevation wall of the house on the subject property and relocate these windows to the south (rear) elevation wall.

   D. HPB19-032 – 915 E. Palmetto Street – Mr. Andrew Boccia requests approval to replace all original wood casement windows in the north building on the subject property with vinyl single-hung sash windows matching the window opening sizes.

   E. HPB19-002 – 116-118 W. Park Street – Mr. Gregory Fancelli and Mr. Albert Moore request approval to demolish the existing duplex residence on the subject property in order to undertake a larger redevelopment project involving residential infill and alley enhancements.

V. Other Business: None.

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

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Kyle Clyne at 7:34 a.m. The Committee roll call was performed and a quorum was present.

II. Review and Approval of the Previous Meeting Minutes

Ms. Lynn Dennis motioned to approve the December 20, 2018 meeting minutes. Mr. Tim Calhoon seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

III. Review of Certificates of Review administratively approved.

A list of 25 Certificate of Review cases covering the period 12/12/18 to 1/16/19 was included with this agenda packet. There were no questions or discussion about these cases by the Committee.

IV. Consideration of Certificate of Review Applications:

A. HPB18-198 – 1061 Success Avenue – Continuation from October 25, 2018. Ms. Janet Sauls requests approval to replace the exterior front doors on the apartment building at this address.

Chairman Clyne introduced and gave a summary of the request. Chairman Clyne then asked if there were any conflicts of interest pertaining to this agenda item. There were no conflicts.

Ms. Foster presented the staff report, stating that the subject property is a urban neighborhood lot at the northwest corner of Success Avenue and East Park Street consisting of 0.17 acres. On this
property is a two-story Mediterranean Revival apartment building built circa 1926, which is a contributing building within the South Lake Morton Historic District. As a historic apartment building, it originally and currently contains four apartment units. This building features a parapet roof with barrel tile accents, a curved and stepped parapet section at the southeast corner displaying medallions, and medium texture stucco walls. A cast stone surround at the front door supports a small second-floor balcony with wrought-iron handrail. The front door originally consisted of two 10-lite doors underneath a 4-lite transom. This door was removed in September 2018 and replaced with a modern full-lite door and sidelight with frosted glass.

In October 2018, the DRC granted approval for the replacement doors on the rear elevation and the Applicant has obtained a Building Permit for these doors. Design review for the front door replacement was postponed to this meeting pending further research by the Applicant to source replacement doors similar to the originals. Ms. Foster reported that Ms. Sauls inquired with Mills and Nebraska (Orlando), Joyner Lumber (Lakeland), and Schiller’s Salvage (Tampa), and only Joyner Lumber was able to provide a quote for similar 10-lite replacement doors. According to Ms. Sauls, Joyner Lumber advised that they cannot guarantee that the door grids will line up with the grids on the second story balcony door, and they stated that the original transom will also have to be removed and replaced for their custom doors to work in this opening. The estimate provided for the replacement doors and transom is $4,093.82 and does not include the cost of labor, which has been estimated at an additional $4,000. Additionally, clear glass panels for the replacement door that was installed have been located by the applicant, which could replace the frosted design glass currently in this door.

The Design Guidelines for contributing buildings relating to windows and doors were used to evaluate this request. Staff found that while clear glass inserted into the existing replacement door would help to convey the transparency of the original door, the asymmetrical composition of this modern door and sidelight does not produce the historic character of this entrance feature. Therefore, staff found that the 10-lite custom doors and new 4-lite transom as quoted by Joyner Lumber is an appropriate replacement that is consistent with the Design Guidelines. This option is the most appropriate match, given the design of the original door, and will maintain the character-defining symmetry of the fenestration on the subject, contributing building. Staff recommends approval of the 10-lite replacement doors and 4-lite transom, quoted by Joyner Lumber, as an appropriate front door replacement for the subject building.

Ms. Janet Sauls was present in support of the request and summarized her experience in looking for the kind of door the Committee wanted. She restated that she did not realize her request needed design review approval and has never been given notice that her building is in a historic district. Chairman Clyne mentioned that the door replacements also needed a building permit, and she would have been advised about historic district design review had she applied for a permit first. The Committee and Board members discussed the request and the two replacement options presented by staff. The high cost of the Joyner Lumber quote and removal of the original transom as they had recommended, was a concern to the Committee and Ms. Sauls. It was suggested that as an alternative to the staff recommendation, a single, 36-inch wide 10-lite door with mullions on either side to fill in the gaps of the original door opening, would be an acceptable and likely more cost-effective option. If this option were to be used, the original transom would remain as-is. Chairman Clyne verified with Ms. Sauls that this option would be acceptable.
MOTION: Approval of a front door replacement consisting of a 10-lite single door centered in the front door opening, with mullions on either side and no sidelight, and painted to match the red trim of the building. The original transom must be maintained. The DRC directed staff to review the replacement door prior to permitting. (T. Calhoon/U. Radabaugh, 6-0)

B. HPB18-263 – 806 W. Patterson Street – On behalf of property owners Mr. and Mrs. Ian Fritzsche, Mr. Jeff Nilius of Green Construction Services requests the Major Rehabilitation of the house on the subject property, as well as an addition and carport at the rear of the house.

Chairman Clyne introduced and gave a summary of the request. Chairman Clyne then asked if there were any conflicts of interest pertaining to this agenda item.

Ms. Foster presented the staff report, stating that the subject property is a corner urban lot measuring 0.32 acres. The subject property contains a circa 1940 Frame Vernacular house, which is a contributing building in the Dixieland Historic District. This house is a single-story structure and features a gable-on-hip roof pierced by a brick chimney, cross gable extension, weatherboard exterior cladding, 8-lite casement windows, and six-over-six double hung sash windows.

The request proposes to build an addition of approximately 59 SF to the west side elevation of the house and an addition of approximately 273 SF to the rear elevation, consisting of a master bathroom, closet, and carport. These additions will consist of typical wood framing on a raised or at-grade foundation to match the existing house. Ms. Foster pointed out the location of the additions and carport on the existing and proposed floor plans. The existing floor plan included in the agenda packet was incorrect and revised after the agenda packets were sent to the Committee. The corrected floor plan was shown. The west side addition will enclose a porch area between two ells, resulting in a new single gable roofline on the west elevation. The rear addition and carport will continue the existing gable roofline at the rear of the house and create a new gable on the east side elevation. Materials proposed for the additions include: Hardie Board lap and vertical siding with an exposure and orientation matching the existing siding and Hardie trim, casing, and corner boards; Asphalt roofing shingles to match house; and Hardie soffit and fascia. The gable vent material is to be determined, but will match the style of existing vents on the house. Three windows will be added in the master bathroom addition, which will be vinyl single hung sash with a six-over-six Colonial style divided lite appearance.

Ms. Foster stated that this home was damaged by a fire that occurred in the attic several months ago. While most of the home was not damaged by the fire itself, smoke and water damage has affected the home’s interior. As part of the project to repair the home, the following work will be undertaken: 1) the roof will be rebuilt at the same pitch and configuration that currently exists and covered with similar asphalt shingles; 2) all windows will be replaced using vinyl windows matching the existing opening size, window type, and divided lite configuration; and 3) damaged siding, soffit, fascia, and trim will be replaced as needed with Hardie board matching the dimension and orientation of the current wood siding, soffit, fascia, and trim. This type of work is typically reviewed by staff under the Minor Review process, but was included in the Major Review application in order to be considered for approval in one step.
Secretary’s Standards 9 and 10 and Chapter 5 of the Design Guidelines were used to evaluate the request. Staff found that the request meets the Standards, as the additions and carport will not destroy historic materials and features or disturb existing spatial relationships of the house or surrounding neighborhood. Additionally, new but similar materials will be used, which will provide some differentiation between the old and new construction.

Staff also found the materials as proposed in the request are consistent with the Design Guidelines. Additionally, the additions and carport reflect a compatible design with straight eaves, corner boards, and roof pitch, and are appropriately located at the rear of the subject house. As the additions and carport are generally within the existing footprint of the house, setbacks for these structures appear to comply with the Urban Form Standards. As the request is consistent with the Standards and Design Guidelines, staff recommends Final Approval of the request with the following condition, to be reviewed and approved by staff prior to permitting: All new windows must be installed with a recess of at least two inches, measured from the exterior wall to the exterior surface of the window glass, and feature exterior-mounted, dimensional muntins (or grid) matching the lite configuration of the original windows.

Mr. Ian Fritzsche and Mr. Scott Beamer were present in support of the request. Mr. Fritzsche commented that he and his family loved this house and neighborhood, and that the additions were desired to accommodate his growing family.

**MOTION:** Approval of the request as submitted and with the condition recommended by staff that all new windows must be installed with a recess of at least two inches, measured from the exterior wall to the exterior surface of the window’s glazing, and feature exterior-mounted dimensional muntins (or grid) matching the lite configuration of the original windows (T. Calhoon/L. Dennis, 6-0).

C. **HPB18-265 – 829 Pennsylvania Avenue** – On behalf of property owners Mr. and Mrs. Alton Masters, Mr. Victor Prebor requests approval to construct a garage apartment accessory building at the rear of the subject property.

Chairman Clyne introduced and gave a summary of the request. Chairman Clyne then asked if there were any conflicts of interest pertaining to this agenda item. There were no conflicts.

Ms. Foster presented the staff report, stating that the subject property is a urban neighborhood lot at the southwest corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and Ridgewood Street consisting of 0.17 acres. The principal building on the subject property is a two-story house consisting of 1,872 square feet. This house is an American Foursquare building type in the Frame Vernacular architectural style, built circa 1902, which is a contributing building in the South Lake Morton Historic District. Features of this house include a hipped roof with a wide eave overhang, a projecting two-story hipped roof porch supported by round columns, wooden drop siding with corner boards, and double-hung windows in a one-over-one lite configuration.

The request proposes the new construction of a two-story garage apartment at the rear of the subject property. The garage apartment will consist of a single-car garage and open space on the ground floor and a 707 square feet accessory dwelling unit on the second floor. This structure will have a height of 22 feet and will be of wood frame construction. Access to the apartment will be from an interior stair. The garage apartment will feature a Foursquare Frame Vernacular aesthetic similar to the principal
house. Features include a hipped roof with a wide eave overhang and frieze, hipped roof entry stoop supported by brackets, a second story false balcony, lap siding with trim and corner boards, and windows in a one-over-one lite configuration. Materials for the garage apartment include: Concrete slab foundation at-grade; Hardie Plank lap siding with a 6” exposure and 3.5” Hardie Trim for trim, casing, and corner boards; Vinyl single-hung sash windows in a 1-over1 lite configuration; Fiberglass quarter-lite and full divided lite doors, and a steel sectional garage door; Wrought iron balcony. Wood brackets under stoop; and Fiberglass roof shingles and aluminum fascia to match that on the house. The site plan submitted for this project shows that the existing concrete driveway off of Ridgewood Street will be removed and a 10’ wide driveway with 3’ apron flares aligning with the garage door will be installed. The setback dimensions for the proposed structure have been revised since application submittal and now include: a 13’-6” setback from the street side, a 6’-2” setback from the interior side, and a 5’ setback from the rear property lines.

Secretary’s Standards 9 and 10, and Chapters 4 and 5 of the Design Guidelines were used to evaluate the request. Staff found the request to be consistent with the Standards, as the garage apartment will not disrupt the spatial relationships that characterize the property, and new but compatible materials will be used. The scale and massing of the garage apartment is consistent with the Design Guidelines and appropriately subordinate in size and placement to the principal house. The practice of building a smaller dwelling at the rear of properties in the Historic Districts is common and numerous examples of both historic and new two-story accessory buildings exist in this neighborhood. The overall design, materials, and scale of architectural features proposed are also consistent with the Design Guidelines and compatible with the design of the principal house on the subject property. Finally, the new driveway is an appropriate width and consistent with the Design Guidelines, and setbacks for the structure are compatible with similar structures in the neighborhood. Regarding zoning requirements, the Applicant is aware that an Administrative Adjustment will be necessary for relief from the street side setback, as the minimum setback required by the Urban Form Standards is 15 feet. The request appears to comply with all other LDC requirements concerning Accessory Dwelling Structures; however, Compatibility Review before the Planning and Zoning Board will be required. As the request meets the Standards and Design Guidelines, staff recommended approval for the request as submitted.

Mr. Alton Masters and Mr. Victor Prebor were present in support of the request. Mr. Prebor mentioned that this project was intended to be compatible with the subject house. Chairman Clyne asked if they had applied for Compatibility Review, to which the applicant said he had not. Ms. Linda Trumble asked if the stepped windows on the west elevation were historically appropriate. Ms. Foster replied that on the other side of these windows was the internal stair. Mr. Tim Calhoon mentioned that as long as they are of an appropriate type, they would be compatible. Mr. Prebor mentioned that historically, window placement could be a bit eclectic in two story buildings and sometimes components of historic homes were selected that were not exactly characteristic of an architectural style. Mr. Prebor mentioned that Mr. Masters intends to replace all the windows in the house with a 4-over-1 divided lite window in the future.

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

D. **HPB19-002 – 116-118 W. Park Street** – Mr. Albert Moore requests approval to demolish the existing duplex residence on the subject property.
Chairman Clyne introduced the request and explained that the applicant has requested to postpone the hearing of the request to a future meeting in order to provide staff and the Committee with additional information. Ms. Foster commented that the information will likely be submitted in February in time for the February 28th meeting.

E. HPB19-003 – 723 Ariana Street – Mr. Mario Falcon of M&P Restoration LLC requests approval to install new siding and make other improvements to the house on the subject property.

Chairman Clyne introduced and gave a summary of the request. Chairman Clyne then asked if there were any conflicts of interest pertaining to this agenda item. There were no conflicts.

Ms. Foster presented the staff report, stating that The subject property is an urban corner lot consisting of 0.17 acres. The building on the subject property is a one-story Bungalow house built circa 1925 and is a contributing building in the Dixieland Historic District. This one-story house features a front-gabled roof with a hipped roof front porch that has been enclosed, a side-gabled porte cochere supported by simple square columns, exposed rafter tails, wooden novelty siding, corner boards, and a brick chimney. Original wood one-over-one double-hung sash windows appear to be present. In addition to installing new Hardie plank siding, the Applicant also intends to replace all windows with single-hung sash vinyl windows in a one-over-one lite configuration, matching the original window opening sizes. Additionally, the front and rear entry doors are proposed to be replaced with fiberglass doors, with glazing to be determined. The enclosed front porch is proposed to be reopened and restored with new Hardie board-wrapped square columns. Finally, the house will be re-roofed with new asphalt shingles. While this work is subject to Minor Review, it was included in this request so that all work could be considered for approval in one step (as opposed to separate DRC and Administrative reviews), as well as in substantiating the overall rehabilitation of the subject house.

Secretary’s Standards 9 and 10, and Chapter 5 of the Design Guidelines were used to evaluate the request. Staff found the request to install new fiber-cement lap siding on the subject house to be generally consistent with the Standard #9 in terms of appropriate replacement material. The request is also consistent with the Design Guidelines in that fiber-cement board is an acceptable replacement material for wood lap siding and the 5.25” width fiber cement board is an appropriate size, which will result in a 4” exposure. However, staff suggested removing the original siding before installing the new siding, to result in an appropriate profile for all window and door openings. Original architectural features, such as gable vents, exposed rafter tails, corner boards, and window trim and casing, must be maintained. Corner boards and window/door trim may be replaced with fiber-cement board of the same dimension, style and profile as the original. Staff found the replacement materials for windows, doors, roofing, and porch restoration to be consistent with the Design Guidelines. However, the style of the doors to be used needs to be reviewed and approved by staff prior to permitting in order to verify that proper glazing (lites/window) is used. Additionally, the front porch columns need to be aligned with the beam such that the column capitals slightly overlap the beam to reflect the correct construction technique for a historic Bungalow house. Staff recommended final approval of the request with the following conditions, to be reviewed by staff prior to permitting: 1) Original architectural features, such as gable vents, exposed rafter tails, corner boards, casing, and trim, must be maintained; corner boards, casing, and trim may be replaced with fiber cement board of the same dimension, style, and profile as the original; 2) The style of the exterior doors to be used must be submitted to staff; and 3) Align the front porch columns with the upper beam such that the column capitals slightly overlap the beam.
Mr. Mario Falcon was present in support of the request, but had nothing further to add. Chairman Clyne confirmed with Mr. Falcon that he understood the conditions recommended by staff.

**MOTION: Approval of the request with the following conditions per staff recommendation:** 1) Original architectural features, such as gable vents, exposed rafter tails, corner boards, casing, and trim, must be maintained; corner boards, casing, and trim may be replaced with fiber cement board of the same dimension, style, and profile as the original; 2) The style of the exterior doors to be used must be submitted to staff for review and approval; and 3) Align the front porch columns with the upper beam such that the column capitals slightly overlap the beam. A detail drawing of this feature must be submitted for staff review. (K. Clyne/ T. Calhoon, 6-0).

**F. HPB19-006 – Northwest and Northeast corners of S. Lake Avenue and E. Lime Street** – On behalf of property owner Lake Lime LLC, Mr. Steve Boyington of WMB-ROI requests conceptual approval for two apartment buildings on the subject property.

Chairman Clyne introduced and gave a summary of the request. Chairman Clyne then asked if there were any conflicts of interest pertaining to this agenda item. There were no conflicts.

Ms. Foster presented the staff report, stating that The subject property consists of four individual, vacant parcels located northwest and northeast of the intersection of East Lime Street and South Lake Avenue. The western parcel consists of 0.46 acres and the eastern parcel consists of 0.88 acres. Two new three-story buildings are proposed to be built on the subject properties; the western building will have a total floor area of approximately 24,500 square feet with 36 units and the eastern building will have a total floor area of approximately 36,750 square feet with 54 units. On the ground floors of each building, about half of the units will have a small porch approximately four feet deep by nine feet wide with a decorative metal railing. On the second and third floors, these features are balconies. The corner units will have sliding glass doors with ‘Juliet’ balconies with decorative railing. The windows are to be awning or single-hung sash windows. The roof is a low-sloped roof behind a low parapet wall. The buildings will each have an approximate building height of 35 feet measured to the finished surface of the highest elevation of the roof surface, which excludes the parapet. The proposed apartment buildings feature a contemporary aesthetic and monolithic massing featuring a combination of cladding styles, a modern fenestration pattern, and stylized gable and rounded parapet features. According to the Applicant, the materials are subject to change pending budget pricing and approval of the property owner. Materials being considered for this project include: Wood frame construction with painted Hardie board siding and trim; Precast concrete panels with painted/textured finish; or CMU walls with painted stucco or Hardie siding for exterior cladding; Vinyl or Aluminum windows and doors with low-E glazing; Powder coated aluminum or steel decorative railings; Membrane roofing behind a parapet wall.

Setback dimensions were not shown on the submitted site plan, but appear to meet the setbacks required by the property’s MF-22/Urban Neighborhood Context District zoning district. The site plan shows a rain garden feature along the street frontages of both buildings and east elevation of the eastern building. Each building will have two full-lite entry doors into a shared corridor from the respective parking lot.

Chapter 4 of the Residential Design Guidelines and the Garden District Special Public Interest district regulations were used to evaluate the request. With regard to building bulk and massing, staff found that the monolithic horizontal massing of the street facing walls reads as flat despite the porches and...
balconies, and is inconsistent with the small scale massing of contributing buildings within the district. Building façades should be articulated to provide recesses and projections, a minimum of three feet in depth, in order to break up this massing and relate to the scale of the surrounding residences. Additionally, the front width of new buildings should be compatible with that of surrounding residences and could be accomplished by pushing out/pulling in façade sections to create the appearance of separate or a series of buildings. To continue the building pattern and street rhythm of the district, the buildings should be extended further along the S. Lake Avenue frontages. This would also help to hide the surface parking lot on the interior of the site. Alternatively, a decorative knee wall could be used on the S. Lake Avenue frontages. Staff also found that a distinct public entrance should be provided for both buildings along the E. Lime Street frontage and/or at the corners of S. Lake Avenue to establish compatible orientation toward the primary street and create a pedestrian connection between the building and sidewalk.

With regard to design elements, staff found that the ground floor should be distinguished from the upper floors along the building façade through significant changes in building material and texture. This also provides a distinct base or foundation for the building as well as provides a visual break in the vertical plane of the façade. The Juliet balconies on the ground floor elevations are not appropriate, as they create a visual barrier between the public (sidewalk/street) and private (dwelling units) areas of the building and site; terraces that extend toward the street from the building setback are suggested and will provide a transitional zone between these public and private spaces. These balcony features should be limited to second and third floors only. Also, the gable and rounded parapet details are abstract and postmodern in terms of how they are applied to the roofline. While these details reference elements of historical styles found in the district, they are not integrated as part of a coherent architectural style. The profile of the parapet should be simplified using horizontal parapet features in a consistent style or a defined cornice. With regard to materials, staff finds that the proposed materials are consistent with the Design Guidelines; precast concrete panels are compatible for use as long as a finish material or veneer is provided, such as brick, stone, or stucco, and in conjunction with using two or more such finishes.

Finally, staff also shared observations with the Applicant concerning conformity with the Urban Form Standards of the Land Development Code as included in the staff report; however, the Design Review Committee is not tasked with evaluating zoning requirements.

Staff recommended Conceptual Approval of the request with the following conditions, to be reviewed by the DRC for Final Approval at a future scheduled DRC meeting:
1. To lessen the massing of the buildings, articulate the facades with a minimum offset of three feet in the horizontal plane of street-facing elevations and extend ground floor porches across the rain garden to connect the building to the sidewalk;
2. Create a publicly accessible entrance feature on the E. Lime Street elevations to establish proper orientation for the buildings and create a pedestrian connection to the sidewalk/street.
3. Extend the buildings along S. Lake Avenue frontages or construct a knee wall on these frontages;
4. Remove the Juliet balcony railing from the ground floor units and convert this feature to a patio area;
5. Convert the gable and arch parapet features to a squared profile or use a defined cornice; and
6. Use significant texture, such as brick or rusticated stone, on the ground floor wall cladding to differentiate the base of the building from the smoother textures of the second and third floors.

A dimensioned site plan and elevation drawings for this project will be required for Final Review and Approval by the DRC. Ms. Foster added that Planning staff met with the property owner and applicants
prior to the meeting and discussed the points made in the staff recommendation, and the applicants felt that revisions can be made to accommodate the recommendation.

Mr. Shaun Puri, Mr. Steve Boyington, and Ms. Erica Craig were present in support of the project. Ms. Craig stated that most of the recommendations provided by staff were able to be done and revisions would be made to the plans to reflect those. However, the three-foot articulation recommended would probably change to two feet in order to accommodate building setbacks and buffer issues. Ms. Craig invited additional feedback from the Committee in order to consolidate revision to the project. Mr. Steve Boyington added that they would like to receive final approval at the next meeting and avoid resubmitting the project multiple times.

Ms. Lynn Dennis commented that the staff recommendation was exceptionally well thought and she expressed appreciation to the applicants for working with staff.

Mr. Boyington provided background on the project, stating that they have accomplished more density (60 units per acre) in three stories without requiring a variance for height, which has led to using every inch of the site. Mr. Boyington asked for the Committee’s endorsement of the project for flexibility from some of the other departments for standards for parking in order to do a better buffer.

Mr. Dan Fowler commented that this project was difficult for the Committee to evaluate because it is going into a so-called historic district and a district that has languished for decades that needs this sort of thing strongly. Mr. Fowler stated that when he came back to serving on the Historic Preservation Board, he refreshed his understanding of what preservation is and reviewed the Secretary’s Standards. Mr. Fowler mentioned that the Standards are written for additions and alterations directly related to historic buildings; they were never intended to be used for standalone new construction unrelated to a historic building. As we go into having the design guidelines rewritten and updated, these are some thoughts we need to consider in terms of where we want to take the design standards for the historic districts. This project is a freestanding building that has nothing to do with preservation and has more to do with an area of redevelopment. Mr. Fowler stated that he is mindful of telling the architects what to do, not that the ideas put together by staff are not good ideas. Mr. Fowler agreed with removing the ground floor balconies and providing some articulation, but stated that only about 12 inches was needed to provide a shadow line. He commented that the parapet features were playful and should remain. Mr. Fowler commented that we should let the professional architects continue to bring design to the city.

Mr. Nick Thomas commented that historically, and what staff has suggested for the base of the project, a neighborhood had a lot of connection between the houses and the street, and even though the project is new construction, it still affects the whole context of historic neighborhood if you start pulling those elements out of the neighborhood. You have a few historic houses here that have porches with that connection, but with modern architecture we abandoned that and it really starts affecting the historic homes. Mr. Fowler replied that society has transitioned from people sitting on their porches looking to the street; this project’s entrance faces the parking lot and is concerned with security.

Mr. Boyington acknowledged the difficulty in the Committee’s decision regarding this project and its potential to set a precedent. He explained the challenges with this project in meeting density and economic considerations and the City’s site development standards. Mr. Boyington commented that
because of the precedence of this project and an earlier controversial project in the Garden District the Board needs to be careful how it treats these projects because this issue is being watched.

Ms. Lynn Dennis commented that in more recent years, the Board has been sensitive to the economic impact on individuals and on business clients who bring their projects forward. There is common sense on the Board and a responsibility to not simply turn away designs but to suggest minor changes that would allow the project to fit within its context. Ms. Dennis felt that the Board has not done anything to dissuade new construction in the Garden District and has tried their best to work with applicants and find cost-effective solutions for projects and not demanded things that were unreasonable, while maintaining the duty to protect historic resources. The Board welcomes new construction but has input on everything together so it works for everyone in our community.

Mr. Boyington reiterated his concern for the Committee’s endorsement of the project, as a citizen board, recognizing potential hurdles with standards that the staff-led Development Review Team (DRT) may impose. Ms. Teresa Maio commented that there is some administrative discretion provided for in the DRT process. The Planning Division has been in communication with Public Works in coming to some consensus on where exceptions can be made and parking is one area that historically exceptions have been made to either the number of spaces or design requirements. At a staff level, we will commit, as part of the DRT process, that we will push to have alternative [parking] design standards for this project as long there will be no negative impacts to neighbors surrounding the project.

Ms. Ursula Radabaugh commented that the district was aspirationally named the Garden District and for the Applicants to keep that description in mind in their design revisions in order to create a cohesive design theme that is respectful of the surrounding neighborhood.

**MOTION:** Conceptual approval of the request per staff recommendation with the following conditions (T. Calhoon/L. Dennis, 6-0): 1) To lessen the massing of the buildings, articulate the facades with a minimum offset of three feet in the horizontal plane of street-facing elevations and extend ground floor porches across the rain garden to connect the building to the sidewalk; 2) Create a publicly accessible entrance feature on the E. Lime Street elevations to establish proper orientation for the buildings and create a pedestrian connection to the sidewalk/street; 3) Extend the buildings along S. Lake Avenue frontages or construct a knee wall on these frontages; 4) Remove the Juliet balcony railing from the ground floor units and convert this feature to a patio area; 5) Convert the gable and arch parapet features to a squared profile; a cornice can be used; and 6) Use significant texture, such as brick or rusticated stone, on the ground floor wall cladding to differentiate the base of the building from the smoother textures of the second and third floors. A dimensioned site plan and elevation drawings for this project will be required for Final Review and Approval by the DRC.

**V. Other Business:** None.

**VI. Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:52 a.m.
1. **837 S INGRAHAM AV (Non-Contributing Building)** - Installation of 23 linear feet of 5 ft. tall vinyl "Dogwood Harbor" style fence and 4 ft. gate at the south side yard behind the house on the subject property, and 120 linear feet of black aluminum 4.5 ft. tall fence surrounding pool in rear yard.  
   Subject to the following conditions: (HPB18-243)

2. **1521 BANKS PL (Contributing Building)** - Extending existing "bump-out" on rear addition 30.6 SF for a 8'9" X 6'6" bathroom addition. Asphalt shingle roof over extension and T1-11 siding matching existing to be used on this small addition.  
   Subject to the following conditions: (HPB19-011)

3. **63 LAKE MORTON DR #B (Contributing Building)** - Installation of two rectangular skylights on the rear elevation of the roof.  
   Subject to the following conditions: (HPB19-012)

4. **824 LEXINGTON ST (Contributing Building)** - Replacement of the existing wood decking and railing of the front porch with new wood decking and railing similar in dimension and profile to the original.  
   Subject to the following conditions: (HPB19-013)

5. **806 W PATTERSON ST (Contributing Building)** - Installation of a 12' X 24' (288 SF) gable roofed, metal storage building in the rear yard of the subject property.  
   Subject to the following conditions: (HPB19-014)

6. **1107 BILTMORE PL (Contributing Building)** - Installation of a 8' X 6' (48 SF) pre-manufactured metal gable-roofed shed in rear yard of subject property, which is enclosed by privacy fence.  
   Subject to the following conditions: (HPB19-015)

7. **113 S TENNESSEE AV (Contributing Building)** - Face change of existing pylon sign - same design as existing. 68.68 SF non-illuminated sign face.  
   Subject to the following conditions: (HPB19-016)

8. **523 FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT WY (Contributing Building)** - Demolition of an existing, dilapidated 8' X 12' wood shed in the rear yard and replace with an 8' X 14' pre-manufactured metal and wood construction shed with a gable roof. The new shed will be painted to complement the principal house.  
   Subject to the following conditions: (HPB19-017)

9. **902 SUCCESS AV (Contributing Building)** - Demolition of a non-historic shed, which is located in the rear yard of the subject property, and was storm-damaged.  
   Subject to the following conditions: (HPB19-018)
10. 725 SIKES BL (Non-Contributing Building) - Replace the picture window on the front façade of the home with white vinyl windows matching size and style of original picture window; replace two entry doors with fiberglass doors with composite jambs, full-lite style with internal mini-blinds; replace existing screen enclosure at the rear of the house with a new screen enclosure consisting of white aluminum framed screen walls and a 3” aluminum roof; replace all soffit and fascia on overhangs with white vinyl vented soffit and aluminum fascia; and replace aluminum siding on side gable ends with Hardie plank siding with an 8” exposure.

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

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

WINDOW PRODUCTS STATED ON THE APPROVED BUILDING PERMIT SHALL NOT BE SUBSTITUTED OR REPLACED WITH A PRODUCT FROM A DIFFERENT MANUFACTURER, OR A DIFFERENT MODEL NUMBER FROM THE SAME MANUFACTURER, WITHOUT STAFF APPROVAL. (HPB19-019)
11. 305 W BEACON RD (Contributing Building) - Replacement of 44 windows on subject house. Original, double-hung sash wood windows with a Prairie style lite configuration (9-over-1) to be replaced with ViWintech SL 2100 series (FL#17134) vinyl single-hung sash windows with a Prairie style lite configuration (9-over-1) grid to be mounted to the exterior upper sash. All other windows to be replaced with ViWintech Series SL 3100 (FL#8957.1) vinyl single-hung windows with a 1-over-1 lite configuration. All replacement windows to match the original opening size of existing windows. Subject to the following conditions: 1. ALL WINDOWS SHALL BE RECESSED A MINIMUM OF 2 INCHES FROM THE EXTERIOR WALL FACE TO THE EXTERIOR WINDOW GLASS. FLUSH-MOUNTED REPLACEMENT WINDOWS ARE NOT PERMITTED. 2. FOR WINDOWS WITH SIMULATED DIVIDED LITES, MUNTINS (GRIDS/GRILLES) SHALL BE DIMENSIONAL AND MOUNTED TO THE EXTERIOR OF THE GLAZING (GLASS) WITH A MINIMUM SURFACE RELIEF OF A ¼ INCH. MUNTINS “SANDWICHED” BETWEEN DOUBLE-PANED GLAZING SHALL NOT BE PERMITTED, EXCEPT WHEN INSTALLED BENEATH EXTERIOR-MOUNTED MUNTINS. 3. ALL PAIRED OR GROUPED WINDOWS SHALL BE INSTALLED WITH A DIVIDING MULLION BETWEEN ADJOINING WINDOWS.

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

WINDOW PRODUCTS STATED ON THE APPROVED BUILDING PERMIT SHALL NOT BE SUBSTITUTED OR REPLACED WITH A PRODUCT FROM A DIFFERENT MANUFACTURER, OR A DIFFERENT MODEL NUMBER FROM THE SAME MANUFACTURER, WITHOUT STAFF APPROVAL. (HPB19-020)

12. 127 E PARK ST (Non-Contributing Building) - Replacement of existing cedar horizontal panels in the existing fence/wall at the rear of the subject property with Hardie board in a width similar to the original cedar. Masonry columns of this fence/wall to be left as-is; no change in footprint of existing fence. Subject to the following conditions: (HPB19-021)

13. 820 LEXINGTON ST (Contributing Building) - Undertake structural repairs to the roof of the house on the subject property due to deflection of exterior load bearing walls caused by Hurricane Irma. The roof will be re-shingled with GAF asphalt shingles (FL#10424) and the existing soffit will be replaced with vinyl soffit. Where needed, the asbestos shingle siding in the project area will be removed and replaced with Hardie or other fiber-cement panel siding to produce an appearance similar to the existing. Subject to the following conditions: (HPB19-023)
14. 812 W HANCOCK ST (Contributing Building) - Installation of an open-sided aluminum cover structure at the southeast corner of the house, located in the rear yard. Structure is white in color and has a slightly sloped flat roof and simply designed support posts. Structure will not be seen from the street. Subject to the following conditions: (HPB19-025)

15. 1028 S FLORIDA AV (Contributing Building) - Installation of a 6 SF (18" x 48") metal hanging sign under existing building canopy on subject property. Sign must maintain 8 feet of clearance from the sidewalk to the bottom of the sign. Subject to the following conditions: (HPB19-026)

16. 801 JOHNSON AV (Contributing Building) - Restoration of the front porch of the house located on the subject property. The porch is located on the home's southeastern corner and has been enclosed with two large windows. Work to include: 1) removal of window enclosures on east and south elevations of the porch and finishing the opening with materials and trim similar to the existing materials and trim of the house; 2) installation of a pair of JELD-WEN French doors (FL#14569.2) in the south elevation of the porch interior; and 3) installation of two Pella single-hung vinyl windows (FL#12602 R9) in the east elevation of the porch interior subject to conditions below. Subject to the following conditions: 1. ALL WINDOWS SHALL BE RECESSED A MINIMUM OF 2 INCHES FROM THE EXTERIOR WALL FACE TO THE EXTERIOR WINDOW GLASS. FLUSH-MOUNTED REPLACEMENT WINDOWS ARE NOT PERMITTED. 2. FOR WINDOWS WITH SIMULATED DIVIDED LITES, MUNTINS (GRIDS/GRIFFLES) SHALL BE DIMENSIONAL AND MOUNTED TO THE EXTERIOR OF THE GLAZING (GLASS) WITH A MINIMUM SURFACE RELIEF OF A ¼ INCH. MUNTINS "SANDWICHED" BETWEEN DOUBLE-PANED GLAZING SHALL NOT BE PERMITTED, EXCEPT WHEN INSTALLED BENEATH EXTERIOR-MOUNTED MUNTINS. 3. ALL PAIRED OR GROUPED WINDOWS SHALL BE INSTALLED WITH A DIVIDING MULLION BETWEEN ADJOINING WINDOWS.

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

WINDOW PRODUCTS STATED ON THE APPROVED BUILDING PERMIT SHALL NOT BE SUBSTITUTED OR REPLACED WITH A PRODUCT FROM A DIFFERENT MANUFACTURER, OR A DIFFERENT MODEL NUMBER FROM THE SAME MANUFACTURER, WITHOUT STAFF APPROVAL. (HPB19-027)
425 W BEACON RD (Non-Contributing Building) - Replace 23 windows with 22 Winforce double-hung sash vinyl windows with a 1-over-1 pane configuration (FL#22300.2) and 1 Winforce horizontal slider vinyl window (FL#22293.2), matching size of original window openings.

Subject to the following conditions:

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

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

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

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

WINDOW PRODUCTS STATED ON THE APPROVED BUILDING PERMIT SHALL NOT BE SUBSTITUTED OR REPLACED WITH A PRODUCT FROM A DIFFERENT MANUFACTURER, OR A DIFFERENT MODEL NUMBER FROM THE SAME MANUFACTURER, WITHOUT STAFF APPROVAL. (HPB19-028)
Certificates of Review Administratively Approved  
Between 1/17/2019 and 2/21/2019

18. 638 CORNELIA AV (Non-Contributing Building) - Replace 6 windows with 5 Winforce double-hung sash vinyl windows with a 1-over-1 pane configuration (FL#22300.2) and 1 Winforce horizontal slider vinyl window (FL#22293.2), matching size of original window openings.

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

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

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

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

WINDOW PRODUCTS STATED ON THE APPROVED BUILDING PERMIT SHALL NOT BE SUBSTITUTED OR REPLACED WITH A PRODUCT FROM A DIFFERENT MANUFACTURER, OR A DIFFERENT MODEL NUMBER FROM THE SAME MANUFACTURER, WITHOUT STAFF APPROVAL. (HPB19-029)

19. 1029 SUCCESS AV (Contributing Building) - The following work is approved for the 2-story accessory structure at the southwestern rear corner of the subject property:

Removal of the existing wooden balcony structure on the east elevation of the accessory structure and replace with a gable roofed balcony with wooden structure and flat panel aluminum roofing. A new concrete slab will be poured underneath balcony at-grade.

Subject to the following conditions: (HPB19-030)

20. 124 S FLORIDA AV (Non-Contributing Building) - Installation of 3 new tenant panel signs on existing Colonial Square monument sign. The monument sign has three sides, for a total of 9 tenant panel signs (3 on each side). Each new tenant panel sign is 11" X 32" (2.45 SF) and consists of a brushed gold aluminum pan with black vinyl letters.

The existing monument sign's base will be modified from a tiered/stepped profile to a flat profile in order to accommodate these requested signs. The foundation of the monument sign will be maintained at 12".

Subject to the following conditions: (HPB19-031)
21. **820 PARK HILL AV (Contributing Building)** - Construction of a custom-designed shed in rear yard. Shed consists of an 8’ X 19’ (152 SF) workshop and an 8’ X 4’ (32 SF) storage closet. Shed will be built of wood frame construction on a concrete foundation and clad in Hardie plank lap siding with corner boards and a frieze board, and will feature a slant roof covered in asphalt shingles. Vinyl awning or hopper windows and fiberglass or Masonite solid doors to be used on this structure. Cladding and roofing to match the principal house on the property.

Subject to the following conditions: (HPB19-033)

22. **1703 CHEROKEE TR (Contributing Building)** - Enclosure of two garage door openings on the north elevation of the house on the subject property. Enclosure will consist of wood frame construction and stucco siding to match the cladding of the house. Four new window openings will be placed in the enclosed areas: two PGT fixed vinyl windows with diamond shaped window panes (FL#5012R18) to match similar windows on the house and two PGT single hung sash vinyl windows with a 3-over-1 lite configuration (FL#1439R19).

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

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

WINDOW PRODUCTS STATED ON THE APPROVED BUILDING PERMIT SHALL NOT BE SUBSTITUTED OR REPLACED WITH A PRODUCT FROM A DIFFERENT MANUFACTURER, OR A DIFFERENT MODEL NUMBER FROM THE SAME MANUFACTURER, WITHOUT STAFF APPROVAL. (HPB19-034)

23. **519 W PATTERSON ST (Contributing Building)** - Installation of 58 linear feet of 4 ft. tall chain link fence to connect with existing chain link fence on the east side of the subject property.

Subject to the following conditions: (HPB19-035)
24. 319 S LAKE AV (Contributing Building) - Installation of a new 10 ft. wide concrete driveway on the south side of subject property, with a double-car width parking area at the rear of the house. Subject to the following conditions: (HPB19-036)

25. 1017 LEXINGTON ST (Non-Contributing Building) - Remove non-original barrel-tile overhang on the front wall of the house and replace with a shed/slant canvas awning. Subject to the following conditions: (HPB19-037)

26. 113 W HANCOCK ST (Non-Contributing Building) - Subject building is a duplex. Convert two window openings to doorways (one in each unit) and install Plastpro solid fiberglass doors (FL#17347.12) Subject to the following conditions: (HPB19-038)
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
STAFF REPORT
February 28, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>HPB18-224</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>New Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Address</td>
<td>625 E. Lime Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic District; FMSF#</td>
<td>East Lake Morton Historic District; N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner/Applicant</td>
<td>Baylis Consulting, Inc./ The Lunz Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning; Context District; SPI; Future Land Use</td>
<td>O-1 (Low Impact Office District); Urban Neighborhood; Garden District SPI Sub-District 2; Residential High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Use</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent Properties</td>
<td>Office, Residential, Institutional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Approvals</td>
<td>11/2001 (2001-74) Demolition of a non-historic accessory building; 11/2018 (HPB18-224) Demolition of the existing building on site and staff approval of the construction of a 4-story apartment building (contingent on adoption of Garden District SPI amendment, which was altered)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REQUEST

The Applicants request Final Approval for the construction of a new four-story residential apartment building and associated parking area on the subject property.

SUMMARY OF BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The subject property consists of a vacant parcel, approximately 0.74 acres in area, located at the southwestern corner of East Lime Street and South Indiana Avenue. Pursuant to Ordinance No. 5625 adopted in 2017, design review for new construction and demolition within the Garden District SPI was assigned to staff. This project was initially submitted for staff review in November 2018. Approval was granted for the demolition of the circa 1956 one-story masonry building located on this property, as the criteria for approval were adequately satisfied. Demolition of this building was completed in January 2019. Conditional approval for the initial design of the apartment building, which was proposed to be 54 feet, six inches tall, was also granted by staff, contingent upon the approval of proposed changes to the Garden District SPI that would increase the maximum height for multi-family residential uses within certain areas.

As approved by the City Commission on January 7, 2019, Ordinance No. 5756 amended the Garden District SPI to reestablish design review for demolition and new construction to the Historic Preservation Board’s Design Review Committee (DRC), and provided a 60-feet height bonus for buildings in certain Sub-Districts of the Garden District. The subject property, however, was removed from consideration for the 60-feet height bonus following opposition from adjacent residential property owners. As a compromise, City Commission approved multi-family uses in O-1 zoning to be built to a maximum height of 40 feet, instead of 36 feet, to be consistent with the rest of East Lime Street, which was excluded from the height bonus. In response to this change, the Applicants have reduced the building height to 40 feet, retaining the same number of dwelling units, while also making changes to the design and materials of the building. Due to this revision and the change in design review authority under the amended SPI ordinance, the project is now subject to review by the DRC.

The proposed four-story building consists of 40 units, with a total floor area of 41,300 square feet. The maximum height of the building is 40 feet, measured from the finished ground floor to the top of the cornice parapet. The
The design of this building is contemporary stylistically, with horizontal massing featuring a combination of cladding materials, colors, modern fenestration, and a stepped cornice parapet. A public entrance into the building is provided on the E. Lime Street elevation and a secondary, private entrance is located on the west elevation for access from the parking lot; both entrances feature a metal canopy. As an outdoor amenity, each of the ground floor units will have a private patio, and all upper floor units will have a Juliet balcony.

Materials proposed for this project include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Cladding</td>
<td>Ground floor: Stucco on block construction. Second through fourth floor: Wood frame construction with painted HardiePlank lap siding, Select Cedarmill finish, with a 6-inch exposure.</td>
<td>Dark Gray TBD Sail Cloth (light yellow-tan) and Light Mist (light gray)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trim</td>
<td>Hardie smooth trim, corner boards, banding</td>
<td>Artic White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows and Doors</td>
<td>Material and type to be determined</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balconies, Entry Canopies</td>
<td>Aluminum or steel</td>
<td>Black semi-gloss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof</td>
<td>Membrane roofing behind a parapet wall</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The site plan shows an internal parking lot on the west and south sides of the subject property containing 36 spaces. An additional six on-street parking spaces are to be created on the east side of the subject property along Indiana Avenue. The building setback dimensions indicated on the site plan appear to meet the requirements of the property’s O-1/Urban Neighborhood Context District zoning district, and the overall building height of 40 feet is permitted in this zoning district, as well as in Sub-District 2 of the Garden District SPI. The site is proposed to be enclosed with a 6-foot tall black decorative metal fence on the west and south sides, and a 4-foot black decorative metal fence on the north and east sides.

**APPLICABLE GUIDELINES:**

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

The following Design Guidelines apply to this project:

Chapter 4, New Construction Guidelines, pages 4-1 to 4-9.

- Proportion – the scale and massing of the new building, including its fenestration, roof height and shape, and elevation should be consistent with surrounding contributing buildings.
- Orientation of new buildings should be toward the primary road and building setbacks should reflect traditional siting dimensions.
- Materials should respect adjacent historic buildings.
- Details and ornamentation should reflect those of surrounding buildings.
- Window material, style, size, and trim should be consistent with historic windows and include dimensional mullions and exterior muntins, if applicable.
- Doors should be of an appropriate design reflective of the architectural style of the building.
- Roof design and details should reflect those of surrounding buildings.
- Colors should complement surrounding buildings.

The following Garden District Regulations apply to this project:
1. Intent
   • To provide incentive and mechanism for quality infill development.
   • To remove regulatory impediments.
   • To allow a variety of building forms that are sympathetic to the character of the area and that incorporate good urban design.
   • To preserve the historic fabric and assure architectural compatibility of new construction.

2. Sub-District 2 Principle Uses Permitted By Right
   • Multiple-family residential buildings

3. The subject property is located in the area of Sub-District 2 not eligible for a height bonus.

ANALYSIS:
In evaluating this project with the applicable Design Guidelines and Garden District SPI regulations, staff finds that the design as submitted meets their intent for the following reasons:

• Siting and Orientation: The building is sited appropriately with the north and east building facades lining E. Lime Street and Indiana Avenue, and provides a street edge compatible with adjacent buildings. Orientation of the building is established on the East Lime Street elevation, which features a recessed and covered public entrance from the street and sidewalk. Parking for this property is placed appropriately to the rear and side of the building. The proposed fence height and material is acceptable, but the final design and placement will be reviewed through a separate fence permit.

• Massing and Scale: Along with the full-height building recess on the north elevation wall, shallow wall projections are present on the other three elevations that feature a different color from the adjacent walls and successfully break up the horizontal planes of the design. Floor-to-ceiling heights within the building are compatible with residential buildings in the District, and the fenestration appears to be of a compatible scale with adjacent buildings. The articulated massing and scale of building elements is compatible with buildings within the East Lake Morton Historic District, and similar to the Grace Manor assisted living facility across the street. Additionally, the balconies provide further articulation and visual interest.

• Design: The style of this building reflects a modern frame vernacular aesthetic. The ground floor is appropriately distinguished from the upper floors by its stucco cladding and prominent horizontal banding. The facades are separated into components by the use of decorative trim, banding, and paint color. The cornice is simply designed and provides a visual terminus to the verticality of this four-story structure. Finally, the materials and paint color palette as proposed are consistent with the Design Guidelines.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:
Staff recommends Final Approval of the request with the following conditions, to be reviewed by staff prior to permitting: 1) submittal of the material(s) and type(s) of windows and doors to be used in the building; 2) windows must be recessed a minimum of two inches from the exterior wall surface; 3) if muntins/grids are used on windows, they must be dimensional and affixed to the exterior of the glass; and 4) the texture of stucco to be used on the ground floor of the building should be compatible to stucco textures found within the East Lake Morton Historic District.

Report prepared by: Emily M. Foster, Senior Planner, Historic Preservation Liaison to the Historic Preservation Board
Application for Certificate of Review

MAJOR REVIEW

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD

PROPERTY OWNER INFORMATION

NAME: Baylis Consulting, Inc.
MAILING ADDRESS: 53 Lake Morton Drive, Lakeland, FL 33801
EMAIL ADDRESS: 
TELEPHONE NUMBER: 

APPLICANT/AGENT INFORMATION

NAME: The Lunz Group
MAILING ADDRESS: 58 Lake Morton Drive, Lakeland, FL 33801
EMAIL ADDRESS: permits@lunz.com
TELEPHONE NUMBER: 863.682.1882

PROPERTY ADDRESS: 625 E Lime Street, Lakeland, FL 33801

PROJECT TYPE (check all that apply):
- New Construction
- Addition
- Major Rehabilitation/Restoration
- Minor Exterior Alteration
- Demolition
- Relocation
- Accessory Buildings (larger than 300 SF)
- Other

RETROACTIVE REQUEST: [ ] YES  [ ] NO

CODE ENFORCEMENT ACTION: [ ] YES  [ ] NO

HISTORIC DISTRICT:
- [ ] BEACON HILL
- [ ] DIXIELAND
- [ ] EAST LAKE MORTON
- [ ] LAKE HUNTER TERRACE
- [ ] MUNN PARK
- [ ] SOUTH LAKE MORTON

CURRENT USE:
- [ ] RESIDENTIAL
- [ ] COMMERCIAL
- [ ] OTHER

DESIGN PROFESSIONAL/CONTRACTOR/CONSULTANT:
Bradley T. Lunz, The Lunz Group

FOR STAFF USE ONLY

Date Received: 01/19/19
HPB/DRC Meeting Date: 02/26/19
Project # HPB: 01-234
Contributing: [ ] Yes  [ ] No
FMSF#: [ ] Vacant

Zoning: [ ] Residential
Context District: UNH
Future Land Use: [ ] R

Conceptual Review: [ ] Yes; HPB/DRC Final Review Meeting Date: 

APPLICATION FEE: $170.00
(Fee applies if project exceeds $10,000)

Fee Received: [ ] Yes  [ ] No
Payment Type: [ ] Prepayment  [ ] Postpayment

0.74 acre
Project Description
Describe the scope of your project here, along with all relevant details. If the scope of work will involve more than one project on the subject property, please list each project separately. Please attach additional sheets if more space is needed to describe your project.

EXISTING CONDITIONS AND MATERIALS:
The existing building was a commercial one-story concrete building with on-grade parking that has recently been demolished per City of Lakeland building permit. The current existing conditions is a cleared vacant lot.

PROPOSED PROJECT:
The project is a 4-story multi-family apartment building on the corner of Lime Street and Indiana Avenue. The proposed building is composed of 40 units totaling 41,300 square feet with a total building height of 40'-0". The parking includes 36 gated spaces and 6 on-street spaces.

PROPOSED MATERIALS (SEE PAGE 4 FOR TYPES OF MATERIALS NEEDED FOR EACH BUILDING COMPONENT):
See attached narrative.

CERTIFICATION AND AUTHORIZATION
I certify that the information contained in this application is true and correct to the best of my knowledge at the time of submission. I understand that this application will not be accepted and deemed complete until all supporting and/or requested information has been supplied. I understand that this application may require a site visit to the subject property by City of Lakeland staff. I understand that this application is required to be heard at a public meeting of the Lakeland Historic Preservation Board and its Design Review Committee. Either I or my authorized representative will be in attendance at this meeting. I understand that the issuance of a Certificate of Review does not relieve the responsibility of obtaining a building permit and following all other applicable codes and requirements of the City of Lakeland, Polk County, State of Florida.

In consideration for review of this application by the Historic Preservation Board/Design Review Committee for a proposed change to a property within one of Lakeland's Historic Districts, the applicant and owner agree to allow access to the property by City of Lakeland staff for inspection purposes during the review process, during the time that work is performed, and upon completion of the project.

Owner/Applicant Signature
02/07/19
Date
February 7, 2019

City of Lakeland
Historic Preservation Board
228 S. Massachusetts Ave.
Lakeland, FL 33801

Re: 625 E Lime Street
Application for Certificate of Review - Major

Mrs. Foster:

Please accept this narrative on the proposed building materials for Lake Morton Apartments. The following information is also included on the attached Application for Certificate Review for final approval. The project is a 4-story multi-family apartment building on the corner of Lime Street and Indiana Avenue. The proposed building is composed of 40 units totaling 41,300 square feet with a total building height of 40'-0". The parking includes 36 gated spaces and 6 on-street spaces.

Proposed materials are as follows:

1. First floor construction is to be stucco on block. The floors above are to be wood construction with HardiePlank Lap Siding. The selected finish is Select Cedarmill in Sail Cloth (variance of yellow and tan) and Light Mist (light gray) with accents and trim in Smooth Artic White. The plank overall width is 7.25” with 6” of the board that is visible/exposed.

2. Semi-gloss black metal balconies are to be placed at the living room of each unit on floors 2-4. These balconies are to protrude 36” from the face of the building and are 80” in width. For the first floor, concrete pads are located at the living room porch door and window assembly.

3. The current design intent for the property fence is a 6’ high black metal fence similar to the balconies along property lines on the west and south. A 4’ high black metal fence similar to the balconies will be installed along Lime Street and Indiana Avenue.

4. Majority of the window sizes are approximately 6’-4” wide by 4’-10” high. The living room door and window assembly totals 6’-0” x 7’-2”, but is comprised of one 3’-0” x 7’-2” glass door and 3’-0” x 7’-2” window.

Pursuant to a follow up conversation, staff has requested that additional attention to the following topics:

1. Use a different compatible material at the base of the building instead of the lap siding (ex. cast stone or brick) to create a more substantial visual transition from building base/foundation to upper floors.

Response: This was accomplished by using stucco on block for the first-floor construction and continuing with Hardie siding on wood construction for the remaining floors.
2. Break up the horizontal plane of the façade by address recesses (ex. integrated porches, recessed doorways) and projections (ex. architectural bump-outs, bay windows, banding, rigid awnings).

Response: Horizontal and vertical banding has been utilized across every elevation. Various architectural bump-outs have also been utilized to increase the variations along the façade and break-up the mass.

3. Separate the façade into recessing and projecting sections such that the building appears as a collection of individual buildings instead of a monolithic building.

Response: See response above. In addition to this, changes of material (stucco vs siding) occur on the first floor to the other floors, as well as a change in material color and finish for the horizontal and vertical banding and architectural bump-outs.

4. Vary the roofline, (ex. stepped or other decorative parapet, gables, dormers, pronounced cornice).

Response: The roofline will appear to vary from the view at the street due to the architectural bump-outs. Physically altering the roofline would add to the overall height of the building as well as negatively affect the effectiveness of the current roof design.

5. Provide architectural ornamentation compatible to the scale of the building that references traditional features of the historic district (banding, brackets, decorative casing/trim, etc).

Response: See responses #2 and #3 above. In addition to the banding and bump-outs, decorative porches accent the unit living spaces. The parapet cornice is also decorative with variations of protrusions.

6. Provide a formal, pronounced public entry at the Lime/Indiana corner.

Response: To maximize the efficiency of the floor plan, the pronounced public entry fronts on Lime Street. The entry is easily recognized and addresses the Land Development Code (LDC section 3.4.5 G #3 / Ord. No. 5455, 07-21-14).

7. Provide a rooftop terrace as an amenity/open space.

Response: A rooftop terrace was explored in the conceptual design phase and is not feasible.

Sincerely,

Bradley T. Lunz, NCARB, AIA, LEED AP, GGP
View Lime Street and Parking Entrance

LAKE MORTON APARTMENTS / LAKELAND, FLORIDA / 02.07.19
## REQUEST

The Applicants request Final Approval for the construction of a new 99-unit residential apartment complex consisting of two three-story buildings and associated off-street parking lots on the subject properties.

## SUMMARY OF BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The subject property consists of four vacant parcels located northwest and northeast of the intersection of East Lime Street and South Lake Avenue, and consist of 0.46 acres (140’ X 140’) at 325 S. Lake Avenue (western parcel), and 0.88 acres (approximately 180’ X 200’) for the remaining parcels (eastern parcels).

The architectural elevations and site plan for this request have been modified since Conceptual Approval was granted in January to address conditions given by the Committee and staff. Two three-story buildings are still proposed; the western building will have a total floor area of approximately 26,470 square feet with 39 units and the eastern building will have a total floor area of approximately 39,830 square feet with 60 units. Each building will have two entrances into an interior corridor; the E. Lime Street frontage will feature the primary, public entrance, and rear of each building will have a private entrance from the adjacent parking lot. The private surface parking lots on the north side of each building contain a total of 81 spaces. Since this project received conceptual approval, the number of units has increased by nine and the number of parking spaces has decreased by 14; this is due to the reconfiguring of space as a result of adding a public entrance to each building, as well as extending the east elevation of the western building along the S. Lake Avenue frontage.

On the ground floor of each building, about half of the units will have a porch approximately six feet deep by nine feet wide with a decorative metal railing. The Juliet-style balconies have been removed from all facades. The windows on each building are to be either casement or single-hung sash windows. Each building will have an approximate building height of 36 feet measured from the finished ground floor to the cornice drip edge of the roof. The height of the entry and stair element on the building is 40 feet.

### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>HPB19-006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>New Multi-Family Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Address</td>
<td>322, 324, &amp; 325 S. Lake Avenue and 810 E. Lime Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic District; FMSF#</td>
<td>East Lake Morton Historic District; N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner/Applicant</td>
<td>Lake Lime LLC / Mr. Steve Boyington and Ms. Erica Craig, WMB-ROI, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning; Context District; SPI; Future Land Use</td>
<td>MF-22; Urban Neighborhood; Garden District SPI; Residential High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Use</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent Properties</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Approvals</td>
<td>3/17/2006 (2006-060) New Construction of an 8-Unit Multi-Family Building; This project was not realized due to the economic downturn beginning in 2007. 7/27/2017 (HPB17-114) Demolition and New Construction of a Single-Family House; Rehabilitation of existing house was determined infeasible and house was demolished in 2017; plan for new single-family house did not materialize. 1/24/2019 (HPB19-006) Conceptual approval granted for the new construction of two 3-story apartment buildings with several conditions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The design of the proposed apartment buildings has been changed and features a contemporary aesthetic that displays a combination of cladding styles and finish colors, a vertically-oriented fenestration pattern, and stylized tower entrance features. The roof features a cornice with a wide overhang and continuous frieze band underneath.

According to the Applicant, the materials are subject to change pending budget pricing and approval of the property owner. Materials that are being considered for this project include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Cladding</td>
<td>Wood frame construction with painted Hardie board siding and trim; Precast concrete panels with painted/textured finish; or CMU walls with painted stucco or Hardie siding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows and Doors</td>
<td>Vinyl or Aluminum with low-E glazing in Bronze/Dark Chocolate color.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decorative Railings</td>
<td>Powder coated aluminum or steel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof</td>
<td>Membrane roofing behind a parapet wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colors</td>
<td>As submitted; a variety of Sherwin Williams neutral colors were chosen to blend with the neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The site plan as submitted shows setback dimensions for each building that mostly meet the requirements of the property’s MF-22/Urban Neighborhood Context District zoning district. However, an Administrative Adjustment or a variance will be needed for the building setbacks along S. Lake Avenue, which are required to be a minimum of 10 feet. The site plan continues to show a rain garden feature along three sides of both buildings.

**APPLICABLE GUIDELINES:**

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

The following Design Guidelines apply to this project:
Chapter 4, New Construction Guidelines, pages 4-1 to 4-9.

- Proportion – the scale and massing of the new building, including its fenestration, roof height and shape, and elevation should be consistent with surrounding contributing buildings.
- Orientation of new buildings should be toward the primary road and building setbacks should reflect traditional siting dimensions.
- Materials should respect adjacent historic buildings.
- Details and ornamentation should reflect those of surrounding buildings.
- Window material, style, size, and trim should be consistent with historic windows and include dimensional mullions and exterior muntins, if applicable.
- Doors should be of an appropriate design reflective of the architectural style of the building.
- Roof design and details should reflect those of surrounding buildings.
- Colors should complement surrounding buildings.

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

2. Sub-District 4 Principle Uses Permitted By Right
   • Multiple-family residential buildings

3. The subject property is located in the area of Sub-District 4 not eligible for a height bonus.

ANALYSIS:

Staff finds that the Applicants have met the conditions provided with Conceptual Approval of this project, which were recommended in keeping with the Design Guidelines. In evaluating this project with the applicable Design Guidelines and Garden District Regulations, staff finds:

1. Building Bulk/Massing:
   • The horizontal massing of the buildings has been articulated by recesses and projections along this plane; the porches, entry features, central block recess, and material texture and color works in concert to avoid a monolithic appearance.
   • The western building has been extended along S. Lake Avenue and continues the building pattern and street rhythm of the district and helps to hide the surface parking lot on the interior of the site. On the eastern side of S. Lake Avenue, a dumpster enclosure with a proposed decorative wall finish and landscaping is proposed that may help to continue the street wall.

2. Entrance Feature: A distinct public entrance tower feature was provided for both buildings along the E. Lime Street frontage and establishes compatible and clear orientation toward the primary street, as well as creates a pedestrian connection between the building and sidewalk.

3. Design Elements:
   • The ground floor has been distinguished from the upper floors along the building façade through the use of material texture and contrasting paint, as well as louvered overhangs at the ground floor porches. This provides a distinct foundation for the building and provides a visual break in the vertical plane of the façade.
   • Juliet balconies have been removed.
   • The gable and rounded parapet details have been replaced by a level, horizontal cornice with a wide overhang/soffit.

4. Materials: The proposed materials are consistent with the Design Guidelines; precast concrete panels are compatible for use as long as a finish material or veneer is provided, such as brick, stone, or stucco, and in conjunction with using two or more such finishes.

5. Regarding the note included on page two of the Certificate of Review (Major Review) Application for this project concerning colors, materials, and design details being subject to change pending budget pricing and owner approval, any change to the design details, colors, or materials of this project following final approval by the Design Review Committee (DRC) is subject to subsequent design review of that change by the DRC.

As stated during Conceptual Review, although the DRC is not tasked with making decisions related to conformance with zoning requirements, staff evaluated the project with the Land Development Code (LDC), Article 3, Urban Form Standards, and made the following findings for the information of the Applicant and the DRC members:
1. A ‘Type A Buffer’ will be required for screening parking areas from adjacent property with a single-family residential use. A frontage buffer will also be required where off-street parking is shown as located immediately adjacent to a public street.

2. Concept Plan Review by the Development Review Team is necessary for this project, as well as dimensioned drawings of the project to ensure compliance with LDC and engineering standards.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

As the project is consistent with the intent of the Design Guidelines, staff recommends Final Approval of the request with the following conditions, to be reviewed by staff prior to permitting:

1. Windows must have exterior mounted grids/muntins if a simulated divided-lite appearance is used, and must be recessed from the surface of the exterior wall by a minimum of two inches; and

2. Any signage for the project will require a Sign Permit Application and separate design review by staff.

Report prepared by:   Emily M. Foster, Senior Planner, Historic Preservation Liaison to the Historic Preservation Board
Application for Certificate of Review
MAJOR REVIEW
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD

PROPERTY OWNER INFORMATION
NAME: Lake Lime LLC
MAILING ADDRESS: 100 S KENTUCKY AVE STE 290, Lakeland, FL 33801
EMAIL ADDRESS: mclark@resbroadway.com
TELEPHONE NUMBER: (863) 683-3425

APPLICANT/AGENT INFORMATION
NAME: Steven Boyington
MAILING ADDRESS: 110 S Kentucky Ave, Lakeland, FL 33801
EMAIL ADDRESS: stevenboyington@wmb-roi.com
TELEPHONE NUMBER: 863-687-3573

SAME AS ABOVE ☐

PROPERTY ADDRESS: 322/324/325 S Lake Ave & 810 E Lime St

PROJECT TYPE (check all that apply):
☐ New Construction  ☑ Demolition
☐ Addition  ☑ Relocation
☐ Major Rehabilitation/Restoration  ☑ Accessory Buildings (larger than 300 SF)
☐ Minor Exterior Alteration  ☐ Other

RETROACTIVE REQUEST: ☐ YES ☐ NO
code enforcement action: ☐ YES ☐ NO

HISTORIC DISTRICT: ☐ BEACON HILL  ☐ BILTMORE-CUMBERLAND
☐ DIXIELAND  ☑ EAST LAKE MORTON
☐ LAKE HUNTER TERRACE  ☐ MUNN PARK
☐ SOUTH LAKE MORTON

CURRENT USE: ☑ RESIDENTIAL  ☐ COMMERCIAL
☐ OTHER

DESIGN PROFESSIONAL/CONTRACTOR/CONSULTANT:
WMB-ROI, Inc.

FOR STAFF USE ONLY

Date Received: __________________________ HPB/DRC Meeting Date: __________________________
Project # HPB: ________________________ Contributing: ☐ Yes ☐ No FMSF#: __________________________
Zoning: ______________________________ Context District: __________________________ Future Land Use: __________________________
Conceptual Review: ☐ Yes; HPB/DRC Final Review Meeting Date: __________________________ ☐ No

APPLICATION FEE: 170.00
(Fee applies if project cost exceeds $10,000)
Fee Received: ☐ Yes ☐ No
Payment Type: __________________________
Project Description
Describe the scope of your project here, along with all relevant details. If the scope of work will involve more than one project on the subject property, please list each project separately. Please attach additional sheets if more space is needed to describe your project.

EXISTING CONDITIONS AND MATERIALS:
Vacant lots with grass, shrubs, and trees.


PROPOSED PROJECT:
99 unit residential complex consisting of 2 buildings. The western building will be approx. 26,470 SF with 39 units, and eastern building will be approx. 39,830 SF with 60 units total. Each building will have three floors and building height of approximately 40 feet. The parking lot will be located behind the buildings (on northside) and will contain about 81 parking spaces total. Each building will have 2 entry doors into the shared interior corridor. The Entry doors to the building will have full lite glazing. On the ground floor about half of the units will each have a small porch which are about 6’ deep x 6’ long with a decorative railing. The windows are to be casement or single hung windows. The roof will be low slope roof with a “haint” blue soffit extension with a continuous frieze band.

PROPOSED MATERIALS (SEE PAGE 4 FOR TYPES OF MATERIALS NEEDED FOR EACH BUILDING COMPONENT):
Building structure and cladding will be one of the following systems (pending pricing and completion of design):
- Wood frame construction with painted Hardie board siding and trim (as shown in renderings)
- Precast concrete panels with painted/textured finish
- CMU walls with painted stucco or Hardie siding
The roofing will be membrane roofing hidden behind parapet wall. The windows and doors may be vinyl or aluminum with clear low-e glazing. Decorative railings with be powder coated aluminum or steel railings.

NOTE: ALL COLORS, MATERIALS, AND DESIGN DETAILS ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE PENDING BUDGET PRICING AND FINAL APPROVAL OF OWNER.

CERTIFICATION AND AUTHORIZATION
I certify that the information contained in this application is true and correct to the best of my knowledge at the time of submission. I understand that this application will not be accepted and deemed complete until all supporting and/or requested information has been supplied. I understand that this application may require a site visit to the subject property by City of Lakeland staff. I understand that this application is required to be heard by a public meeting of the Lakeland Historic Preservation Board and its Design Review Committee. Either I or my authorized representative will be in attendance at this meeting. I understand that the issuance of a Certificate of Review does not relieve the responsibility of obtaining a building permit and following all other applicable codes and requirements of the City of Lakeland, Polk County, State of Florida.

In consideration for review of this application by the Historic Preservation Board/Design Review Committee for a proposed change to a property within one of Lakeland’s Historic Districts, the applicant and owner agree to allow access to the property by City of Lakeland staff for inspection purposes during the review process, during the time that work is performed, and upon completion of the project.

Owner/Applicant Signature

01/03/2019

Date
Color Scheme

Soffit Color
SW 9063 Porch Ceiling
View Details

Field Color
SW 7511 Bungalow Beige
View Details

Trim + Accent Color
SW 7102 White Flour
View Details

Base Color 1
SW 6243 Distance
Interior / Exterior
Locator Number: 224-C6
View Details

Base Color 2 (Stucco)
SW 7674 Peppercorn
View Details

Hardie Artisan Panel Accent Wall Colors

View Details

View Details

View Details

Casement or Single Hung (TBD) - Window Color: Bronze/Dark Chocolate

Note: 28"x72" Casement w/ 28"x24" Fixed divided transom window above is shown in the renderings and elevations

If Single hung windows are chosen, the sash will add another division in the operable portion of the window
PERSPECTIVE RENDERING
At the intersection of Lake Ave. and Lime St. looking northeast
LAKE & LIME APARTMENTS
Lakeland, FL 33801

WMB-ROI
110 South Kentucky Avenue
Lakeland, Florida 33801
P: 863.687.3573
www.WMB-ROI.com
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
STAFF REPORT
February 28, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>HPB19-022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Minor Exterior Alteration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address; Historic Name</td>
<td>723 Success Avenue, “William and Mary Zimmerman House”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic District; FMSF#</td>
<td>South Lake Morton Historic District; #SLM 8-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner/Applicant</td>
<td>Duke and Chris Chadwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning; Context District; Future Land Use</td>
<td>RA-4; Urban Neighborhood; Residential Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Use</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent Properties</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REQUEST

The Applicants request approval to enclose two window openings on the north side wall of the house on the subject property, and relocate the removed windows to the rear wall.

SUMMARY OF BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The subject property, located at the northwest corner of Success Avenue and Riggins Street, consists of 0.17 acre (50’ x 150’). On the lot is a single-family house in the Bungalow architectural style that was built in 1933 and considered a contributing building in the South Lake Morton Historic District. A detached garage, built in 2015, is located to the rear of the lot.

The Applicants are requesting approval to enclose two window openings, as shown on the wall photos and floor plan submitted with the application, in order to accommodate an interior renovation to their kitchen to include a new range exhaust hood on the north elevation wall. This opening is proposed to be enclosed with typical wood frame construction and sided in custom cypress siding with an 8-inch exposure that will match the profile and dimension of the original siding. The removed pair of windows are then proposed to be relocated to a new window opening on the rear, west facing wall, which is part of a rear addition built in 1994 and not original to the house. The relocated windows will be trimmed to match their original appearance.

In December, staff approved the Applicants’ plans to enclose a 38.25 SF (4.5’ X 8.5’) setback entrance area on the rear wall that is part of the 1994 building addition. Relocation of the rear entry door, a new window opening, and the enclosure of an octagonal window on the rear elevation was also approved as part of this enclosure request. The new window opening proposed in the rear wall is intended to receive the relocated original windows from the north wall.

APPLICABLE GUIDELINES:

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

The following Standards apply to this project:

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

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

The following Design Guidelines apply to this project:

Exterior Walls/Features
- Use the wall finish most acceptable for the architectural style.
- Avoid using new material that is inappropriate or was unavailable when the building was originally constructed, such as imitation cast stone, imitation brick siding, or brick veneer.
- Replace significant architectural trim features such as cornices, shutters, brackets, and railings with the same type features.

Not Recommended/Not Acceptable:
- Removal or concealing of any original wall surface with a material inappropriate to the style.
- 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.
- One alternative for wood is Fiber cement, a mixture of Portland cement, cellulose or wood fiber material, sand, and other components. It can be formed into a variety of siding patterns, have a smooth or embossed face, or be textured for a cedar look. A special curing process leaves the final product with a low-moisture content, making it resistant to warping and conducive to paint application. These products may be used as a replacement material or for new construction. See Appendix 1; Replacement Siding Guidelines.

Windows
- Windows should reflect the architectural style of the building.
- Existing windows contributing to the building’s character should be retained.
- Window should be kept in the same proportion as originally provided. Window head heights should be consistent throughout the building.

Not Recommended/Not Acceptable:
- Modification that alters the character of the building.
- Removal of window details.
- Reducing window size.
- Addition of out-of-scale features.
- Windowpane patterns that are not the same as the original.
ANALYSIS:

Staff finds the request to be consistent with the intent of the Standards and Design Guidelines, as the original set of windows will be reused on the rear elevation. In addition, given the number of windows on the north side elevation, as well as the asymmetrical grouping and heights, enclosing the pair of windows as requested will not result in an unbalanced fenestration pattern on this wall. Furthermore, this wall is not highly visible as it is a secondary wall and does not face a street frontage. Staff finds that the request will not alter the overall architectural character of the building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the request as submitted.

Report prepared by:  Emily M. Foster, Senior Planner, Historic Preservation Liaison to the Historic Preservation Board
This Certificate of Review grants approval for the project described below which was found to be consistent with the Design Guidelines: A Guide to the Exterior Design of Buildings.

Enclose the 4’-6” X 8’-6” setback entrance area on the rear elevation of the house. The existing rear elevation features a 12’ X 20’ porch that was added in 1994, altering the rear elevation of this home. The enclosure will feature the same 8” reveal Hardie lap siding that exists on the rear elevation, as well as Hardie trim and corner boards matching the house, and will be painted to match the existing color of the home. In addition to the enclosure, a hexagonal window in the rear elevation will be removed, and a new Craftsman wood entry door will be installed to replace the door to be removed in the enclosed area. Double-hung sash windows in a 3-over-1 lite configuration that were salvaged from the 1994 renovation of the subject house will be reused in new openings on the rear elevation.

After reviewing the request, staff determined on 12/6/18 that this request could be administratively approved instead of subject to DRC approval for the following reasons: the requested enclosure is small (38.25 SF) and located on a secondary façade, the siding, salvaged windows, and new door are consistent with the Design Guidelines, and the rear elevation of the subject house has already been altered from its original configuration.

Subject to the following Conditions of Approval:

Work related to this Project is to be performed in accordance with this approval. Any revisions or deviations from the plan must be approved by the Design Review Committee or Community Development staff. The Chief Building Official of the Building Inspection Division, under the authority of the City of Lakeland, Florida (City of Lakeland Land Development Code, Article 11, Section 6.4) will inspect the project for conformance with the approved plan and Community Development staff will inspect the project for conformance with this Certificate of Review. Receipt of a Certificate of Review serves as a prerequisite for obtaining a building permit from the Building Inspection Division. Any modification to the project must receive an additional or amended Certificate of Review. This Certificate of Review does not constitute approval for the Project by other City of Lakeland Departments and additional approvals may be necessary from other Departments prior to beginning work on this Project.

Signed:
Application for Certificate of Review

MAJOR REVIEW
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

RECEIVED
NOV 29 2018

PROPERTY OWNER INFORMATION

NAME: Arthur and Chris Chadwell
MAILING ADDRESS: 723 Success Ave.
EMAIL ADDRESS: dukechadwell@gmail.com
TELEPHONE NUMBER: 863-670-0278

APPLICATION/AGENT INFORMATION

☐ SAME AS ABOVE

NAME:
MAILING ADDRESS:
EMAIL ADDRESS:
TELEPHONE NUMBER:

PROPERTY ADDRESS: 723 Success Ave.

PROJECT TYPE (check all that apply):

☐ New Construction
☐ Addition
☐ Major Rehabilitation/Restoration
☐ Minor Exterior Alteration
☐ Demolition
☐ Relocation
☐ Accessory Buildings (larger than 300 SF)
☐ Other

RETROACTIVE REQUEST: ☐ YES ☐ NO

CODE ENFORCEMENT ACTION: ☐ YES ☐ NO

HISTORIC DISTRICT:

☐ BEACON HILL
☐ DIXELAND
☐ LAKE HUNTER TERRACE
☐ SOUTH LAKE MORTON
☐ BILTMORE-CUMBERLAND
☐ EAST LAKE MORTON
☐ MUNN PARK
☐ OTHER

CURRENT USE:

☐ RESIDENTIAL ☐ COMMERCIAL
☐ OTHER

DESIGN PROFESSIONAL/CONTRACTOR/CONSULTANT:
Duke and Chris Chadwell (third time remodeling)

APPLICATION FEE: 170.00

Date Received: 11/29/18
Project # HPB 18-239
Contributing: ☐ Yes ☐ No
FMSF# SLM 8-15
Zoning: RA-4 Context District: UNH Future Land Use: RM
Conceptual Review: ☐ Yes; HPB/DRC Final Review Meeting Date: ☐ Yes ☐ No

FOR STAFF USE ONLY

0.17ac 50x
1936 - Win Zimmerman House
Project Description
Describe the scope of your project here, along with all relevant details. If the scope of work will involve more than one project on the subject property, please list each project separately. Please attach additional sheets if more space is needed to describe your project.

EXISTING CONDITIONS AND MATERIALS:
We currently have a 12 ft x 20 ft back porch that has a 4ft 6" x 8ft 6" set back entrance. The porch was added in 1994 when we remodeled and added on to our existing house. Our existing house has (8" reveal) cypress siding and three pane top window over one pane bottom double hung sash wooden windows. In 1994 we installed Hardie Board (8" reveal) that matches the cypress siding.

PROPOSED PROJECT:
We plan to enclose the 4ft 6" x 8ft 6" set back entrance. We will remove an octagon window and install a Craftsman wood door matching our Craftsman wood entrance door. We saved a few sets of the original double hung sash windows from our 1994 remodel and we will install two sets of two windows on either side of the new entrance door. The exterior trim will be matched to the existing windows and doors. We did this during our 1994 remodel and again in 2015 when we built a garage with 12ft x 20ft porch.

PROPOSED MATERIALS (SEE PAGE 4 FOR TYPES OF MATERIALS NEEDED FOR EACH BUILDING COMPONENT):
Install original double sash windows from earlier remodel in 1994. We will match exterior trim as we did in prior remodels and new construction of the garage & porch. We will match our existing Craftsman wood front door for the new back entrance. The walls will be Hardie Board (8" reveal) matching the existing HB that replicates the cypress siding on the original house.

CERTIFICATION AND AUTHORIZATION
I certify that the information contained in this application is true and correct to the best of my knowledge at the time of submission. I understand that this application will not be accepted and deemed complete until all supporting and/or requested information has been supplied. I understand that this application may require a site visit to the subject property by City of Lakeland staff. I understand that this application is required to be heard at a public meeting of the Lakeland Historic Preservation Board and its Design Review Committee. Either I or my authorized representative will be in attendance at this meeting. I understand that the issuance of a Certificate of Review does not relieve the responsibility of obtaining a building permit and following all other applicable codes and requirements of the City of Lakeland, Polk County, State of Florida.

In consideration for review of this application by Historic Preservation Board/Design Review Committee for a proposed change to a property within one of Lakeland's Historic Districts, the applicant and owner agree to allow access to the property by City of Lakeland staff for inspection purposes during the review process, during the time that work is performed, and upon completion of the project.

Owner/Applicant Signature

11-29-2018
Date
### REQUEST

The Applicant requests approval to replace all of the wooden casement windows in the subject building with vinyl single-hung sash windows with a simulated divided lite appearance.

### SUMMARY OF BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The subject property, consisting of 0.45 acres, is located at the southwest corner of East Palmetto Street and Winfree Avenue. On this property are two two-story apartment buildings built circa 1926. Both buildings are frame structures clad in stucco with a parapet roof, and feature elements of the Mediterranean Revival style. Both buildings have been altered over time, and the rear or “south” building now features a mansard roof treatment, vinyl siding, and Tudor-style faux half-timbering. For purposes of this request, window replacements are being considered for only the building located on the northern portion of the property, which fronts E. Palmetto Street (the “north” building).

Property research indicates that the original building on this property was a two-story L-shaped house of frame construction, built circa 1915. It is believed that the north building was built over the structure of this house in 1926, as well as the construction of an eastern wing and the south building. In 1980, the eastern wing was demolished; it is believed that a portion of the rear of the north building was also demolished at this time and poorly repaired.

Staff has been in contact with the Applicant and Design Professionals since November 2016 concerning this property, and several administrative Certificates of Review for repair work have been issued. Over the past year, the Applicant has undertaken a major rehabilitation to this building after discovering several structural deficiencies, which has led to the removal of all stucco on the building, the shoring and rebuilding of the rear wall, and the removal of the front porch and balcony feature.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>HPB19-032</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address; Historic Name</td>
<td>915 E. Palmetto Street; Palm Terrace Apartments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested Action</td>
<td>Major Exterior Alteration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner/Applicant</td>
<td>Mr. Andrew Boccia, Central Florida Income Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Professional</td>
<td>Mr. Chris Bajsa, CMTG Properties and Mr. Patrick Duggan,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic District; FMS#</td>
<td>South Lake Morton Historic District; SLM #18-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning; Context District; Future Land Use</td>
<td>RA-4 (Single Family Residential); Urban Neighborhood; Residential Medium</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>1/16/2015 (HPB15-016) Replace 1 window, back (south) building; 8/30/2017 (HPB17-159) Repair rear wall and stair of north building; 5/15/18 (HPB18-106) Maintenance, repairs, repainting of south building; 7/31/18 (HPB18-150) Exploratory demolition and major repairs; 1/10/19 (HPB19-008) Replacement windows for north building matching type and lite configuration of original windows.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The north building features 47 sets of wooden casement windows with 4-lite, 6-lite, and 10-lite configurations. After determining that the original wooden casement windows were too deteriorated to repair, the Applicant received permission from staff to replace the windows with Andersen A-Series vinyl-clad composite casement windows with dimensional muntins and lite configurations similar to the original windows. The quoted cost for these windows was $102,478. The Applicant has stated that his budget for windows is $15,000, and that the quote for replacement casement windows is unreasonable. Therefore, he is requesting to use Andersen Silver Line 50-Series single-hung sash windows with a six-over-six and eight-over-eight light configuration, which have been quoted at $9,796.

Staff has discussed this request with the Applicant and explained that using a different type of window with a lite configuration that does not match the original windows is in conflict with the Design Guidelines, and is unable to support administrative approval. Information concerning other window restoration and replacement options was provided to the Applicant in order to source less costly and historically appropriate replacement windows, but the Applicant has been unable to find compatible windows so far.

APPLICABLE GUIDELINES:

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

The following Standards apply to this project:

Standard No. 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.

The following Design Guidelines apply to this project:

Chapter 5: Rehabilitation of Contributing Buildings
Windows

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

ANALYSIS:

Typically, window replacement requires staff-level review and approval, as long as the replacement windows meet the Standards and Design Guidelines. Since the request is not consistent with the Standards and Design Guidelines with regard to window type and pane configuration requirements, the Applicant asked that it be referred to the Committee for review and approval.

Original windows are character-defining features of a historic building, and the installation of replacement windows can adversely affect the architectural integrity of a building. The architectural style of this building is Mediterranean Revival, which is expressed in part by the narrow divided lite configuration of its original casement windows. In cases of severe deterioration, which appears to be present in the wood windows of the subject building, replacement windows are able to be used as long as they are consistent the design guidelines; this includes matching the window type and window pane configuration of the original windows, as well as having an adequate recess for the window profile and reveal. The replacement windows requested by the Applicant do not match the window type and will not have a divided lite appearance matching the original windows, and therefore the request is inconsistent with both the Standards and Design Guidelines.

The Applicant has discussed the possibility of using replacement casement windows only on the front façade and using narrow single- or double-hung replacement windows with a divided lite configuration matching the original casement windows on the side elevations, which staff would consider but this proposal has not been researched yet by the Applicant and his Design Professionals.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Due to inconsistency with the Standards and Design Guidelines, staff recommends denial of the request as submitted.

The administrative Certificate of Review (HPB19-008) issued by staff for replacement casement windows matching the original windows is still valid.

Report prepared by: Emily Foster, Senior Planner, Historic Preservation Liaison to the Historic Preservation Board
Application for Certificate of Review

MAJOR REVIEW

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD

PROPERTY OWNER INFORMATION

NAME: Central Florida Income Fund
MAILING ADDRESS: 1021 Florida Ave S #3, Lakeland, FL 33803
EMAIL ADDRESS: Andrew@CentralFloridaIncomeFund.com
TELEPHONE NUMBER: 8633978663

APPLICANT/AGENT INFORMATION
NAME: Andrew Boccia
MAILING ADDRESS: 1021 Florida Ave S #3, Lakeland, FL 33803
EMAIL ADDRESS: Andrew@CentralFloridaIncomeFund.com
TELEPHONE NUMBER: 8633978663

PROPERTY ADDRESS: 915 E Palmetto St, Lakeland, FL 33801

PROJECT TYPE (check all that apply):
- New Construction
- Addition
- Major Rehabilitation/Restoration
- Minor Exterior Alteration
- Demolition
- Relocation
- Accessory Buildings (larger than 300 SF)
- Other

RETROACTIVE REQUEST: Yes No
CODE ENFORCEMENT ACTION: Yes No

HISTORIC DISTRICT:
- Beacon Hill
- Dixieland
- Lake Hunter Terrace
- Munn Park
- South Lake Morton

CURRENT USE: Residential Commercial Other

DESIGN PROFESSIONAL/CONTRACTOR/CONSULTANT:
CMTG Construction

FOR STAFF USE ONLY

Date Received: 1/30/19
HPB/DRC Meeting Date: 2/28/19
Project #: HPB 19-032
Contributing: Yes No
FMSFP SLU 10-29
Zoning: RA-4
Conceptual Review: Yes; HPB/DRC Final Review Meeting Date:
Context District: UNH
Future Land Use: RUN
Payment Type: N/A 40K
APPLICATION FEE: 170.00
 Fee Based on Project Cost
 Fee for FMSFP: $0
 Fee for HPB/DRC: $0
 Fee for SLU: $0
Project Description
Describe the scope of your project here, along with all relevant details. If the scope of work will involve more than one project on the subject property, please list each project separately. Please attach additional sheets if more space is needed to describe your project.

EXISTING CONDITIONS AND MATERIALS:
Major Restoration is underway and is overall going well.

All city/county inspectors have been satisfied with the progress and workmanship of this project.

PROPOSED PROJECT:
We are proposing that Historical guidelines on specifically the windows, be waived for this project.

The existing windows cannot be repaired.

An adequate replacement cannot be found for a commercially reasonable cost.

All other elements of the exterior of the building remain up to or exceeding historical guidelines.

PROPOSED MATERIALS (SEE PAGE 4 FOR TYPES OF MATERIALS NEEDED FOR EACH BUILDING COMPONENT):
Our budget for new windows (materials only) is $15,000.

The closest matching “AS-IS” window we could find was $102,478.

The best available, and commercially reasonable, product, is the American Craftsman 50 series SH vinyl window priced out at $9,796.15.

CERTIFICATION AND AUTHORIZATION
I certify that the information contained in this application is true and correct to the best of my knowledge at the time of submission. I understand that this application will not be accepted and deemed complete until all supporting and/or requested information has been supplied. I understand that this application may require a site visit to the subject property by City of Lakeland staff. I understand that this application is required to be heard at a public meeting of the Lakeland Historic Preservation Board and its Design Review Committee. Either I or my authorized representative will be in attendance at this meeting. I understand that the issuance of a Certificate of Review does not relieve the responsibility of obtaining a building permit and following all other applicable codes and requirements of the City of Lakeland, Polk County, State of Florida.

In consideration for review of this application by the Historic Preservation Board/Design Review Committee for a proposed change to a property within one of Lakeland’s Historic Districts, the applicant and owner agree to allow access to the property by City of Lakeland staff for inspection purposes during the review process, during the time that work is performed, and upon completion of the project.

Owner/Applicant Signature

Date
**QUOTE**

**STORE:** 6371 WINTER HAVEN 2000 8TH STREET NW WINTER HAVEN, FL 33881

**PHONE:** (863) 293-6574

**SALESPERSON:** LM95A6

**REVIEWER:**

**SOLD TO**

**NAME:** CMTG USE THIS

**CHRIS BASJA**

**PHONE 1**

(561) 358-9626

**ADDRESS:**

3903 INDUSTRY BLVD

**CITY:** LAKELAND

**STATE:** FL

**ZIP:** 33811

**SOLD TO**

**COMPANY NAME:**

**CMTG USE THIS**

**JOB DESCRIPTION:** 915 E Palmetto St. Series A Window Quote

**PHONE 2**

**STATE:**

**FL**

**ZIP:** 33811

**COUNTRY:** POLK

---

**MERCHANDISE AND SERVICE SUMMARY**

**TO:** CUSTOMER

**S/O - MERCHANDISE TO BE SHIPPED:**

**S/O ANDERSEN LOGISTICS**

**REF # S01**

**ESTIMATED ARRIVAL DATE:** 03/13/2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #</th>
<th>SKU</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UM</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>TAX</th>
<th>PRICE EACH</th>
<th>EXTENSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S0101</td>
<td>1001-796-635</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>A SERIES / A SERIES S/O AW A-S LONG LEAD TIME / Line 1 on quote 23380699</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$13,005.84</td>
<td>$13,005.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0102</td>
<td>1001-796-635</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>A SERIES / A SERIES S/O AW A-S LONG LEAD TIME / Line 2 on quote 23380699</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$1,366.98</td>
<td>$1,366.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0103</td>
<td>1001-796-635</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>A SERIES / A SERIES S/O AW A-S LONG LEAD TIME / Line 3 on quote 23380699</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$1,773.04</td>
<td>$1,773.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0104</td>
<td>1001-796-635</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>A SERIES / A SERIES S/O AW A-S LONG LEAD TIME / Line 4 on quote 23380699</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$19,239.02</td>
<td>$19,239.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0105</td>
<td>1001-796-635</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>A SERIES / A SERIES S/O AW A-S LONG LEAD TIME / Line 5 on quote 23380699</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$14,519.79</td>
<td>$14,519.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0106</td>
<td>1001-796-635</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>A SERIES / A SERIES S/O AW A-S LONG LEAD TIME / Line 6 on quote 23380699</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$3,279.99</td>
<td>$3,279.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0107</td>
<td>1001-796-635</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>A SERIES / A SERIES S/O AW A-S LONG LEAD TIME / Line 7 on quote 23380699</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$3,279.99</td>
<td>$3,279.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0108</td>
<td>1001-796-635</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>A SERIES / A SERIES S/O AW A-S LONG LEAD TIME / Line 8 on quote 23380699</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$14,519.79</td>
<td>$14,519.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

***CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE***
**VENDOR DIRECT SHIP #1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S0109</th>
<th>1001-796-635</th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>A SERIES / A SERIES S/O AW A-S LONG LEAD TIME / Line 9 quote</th>
<th>A Y</th>
<th>$19,239.02</th>
<th>$19,239.02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S0110</td>
<td>1001-796-635</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>A SERIES / A SERIES S/O AW A-S LONG LEAD TIME / Line 10 Quote</td>
<td>A Y</td>
<td>$1,773.04</td>
<td>$1,773.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0111</td>
<td>1001-796-635</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>A SERIES / A SERIES S/O AW A-S LONG LEAD TIME / Line 11 quote</td>
<td>A Y</td>
<td>$3,777.41</td>
<td>$3,777.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VENDOR - SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS:** WILL DELIVER DIRECT TO CUSTOMER AT 915 E. PALMETTO, LAKELAND, FL.

**VENDOR WILL SHIP MDSE TO:** CHRIS BASJA

**ADDRESS:** 915 E. Palmetto St.  
**CITY:** LAKELAND  
**STATE:** FL  
**ZIP:** 33801  
**COUNTY:** POLK  
**SALES TAX RATE:** 7.0  
**MERCHANDISE TOTAL:** $95,773.91

**PHONE:** (561) 358-9626  
**ALTERNATE PHONE:**  
**PAGER:**

**TOTAL CHARGES OF ALL MERCHANDISE & SERVICES**

| ORDER TOTAL | $95,773.91 |
| SALES TAX | $6,704.18 |
| TOTAL | $102,478.09 |
| BALANCE DUE | $102,478.09 |

*The Home Depot reserves the right to limit / deny returns. Please see the return policy sign in stores for details.*

END OF ORDER No. H6371-67798
**CUSTOMER PICKUP #1**

**MERCHANDISE AND SERVICE SUMMARY**

We reserve the right to limit the quantities of merchandise sold to customers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #</th>
<th>SKU</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UM</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>TAX</th>
<th>PRICE EACH</th>
<th>EXTENSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S0101</td>
<td>0000-243-260</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>NA / 50 SERIES BLOCK SINGLE-HUNG - 2111B,C EQ / 50 SERIES BLOCK SINGLE-HUNG - 2111B,C (#1)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>$205.62</td>
<td>$822.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0102</td>
<td>0000-243-260</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>NA / 50 SERIES BLOCK SINGLE-HUNG - 2111B,C EQ / 50 SERIES BLOCK SINGLE-HUNG - 2111B,CATT TO (#1)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$173.66</td>
<td>$694.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0103</td>
<td>0000-243-260</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>NA / 50 SERIES BLOCK SINGLE-HUNG - 2111B,C EQ / 50 SERIES BLOCK SINGLE-HUNG - 2111B,C (#2)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$248.78</td>
<td>$1,990.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0104</td>
<td>0000-243-260</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>NA / 50 SERIES BLOCK SINGLE-HUNG - 2111B,C EQ / 50 SERIES BLOCK SINGLE-HUNG - 2111B,CATT TO (#2)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$192.61</td>
<td>$1,540.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0106</td>
<td>0000-243-260</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>NA / 50 SERIES BLOCK SINGLE-HUNG - 2111B,C EQ / 50 SERIES BLOCK SINGLE-HUNG - 2111B,CATT TO (#3)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$195.20</td>
<td>$780.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0107</td>
<td>0000-243-260</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>NA / 50 SERIES BLOCK SINGLE-HUNG - 2111B,C EQ / 50 SERIES BLOCK SINGLE-HUNG - 2111B,CATT TO (#3)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$195.20</td>
<td>$780.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0108</td>
<td>0000-243-260</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>NA / 50 SERIES BLOCK SINGLE-HUNG - 2111B,C EQ / 50 SERIES BLOCK SINGLE-HUNG - 2111B,C (#4)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$176.59</td>
<td>$706.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE ***

**FOR WILL CALL**
MERCHANDISE PICK-UP
PROCEED TO WILL CALL OR SERVICE DESK AREA
(Pro Customers, Proceed To The Pro Desk)
### CUSTOMER PICKUP #1

**REF #W10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total with Sales Tax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S0109</td>
<td>0000-243-260</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$152.24</td>
<td>$608.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCHEDULED PICKUP DATE:** Will be scheduled upon arrival of all S/O Merchandise

**MERCHANDISE TOTAL:** $9,155.28

**TOTAL CHARGES OF ALL MERCHANDISE & SERVICES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORDER TOTAL</td>
<td>$9,155.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALES TAX</td>
<td>$640.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$9,796.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALANCE DUE</td>
<td>$9,796.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policy Id (PI):**

A: 90 DAYS DEFAULT POLICY;

‘The Home Depot reserves the right to limit / deny returns. Please see the return policy sign in stores for details.’

**END OF CUSTOMER PICKUP - REF #W10**

---

**WILL CALL**

Will Call items will be held in the store for 7 days. For Will Call merchandise pick up, proceed to Will Call/Service Desk area (Pro Customers, proceed to the Pro Desk).

**Returns:** A 15% restocking fee applies to the return of regular special orders, i.e., special orders merchandise that is not custom made. Special orders that are custom uniquely designed or fitted to accommodate the requirements of a particular space or environment (some examples are cabinetry, countertops, floor and wall coverings, and window treatments) are non-returnable. Exceptions: Cancellations made by midnight on the third business day after the date of Your purchase; merchandise incorrectly ordered by Home Depot or by Professional; or merchandise damaged beyond repair in delivery or by Professional. Unless otherwise specified in this Agreement, all returns must be made within Home Depot’s posted time frame.

---

**TERMS AND CONDITIONS**
Front (North)

Order this: 4 - 92 1/2" w x 35 1/2" T

47 sets/pairs

Rough

92 1/2" w x 35 1/2" T
915 Palmetto
Lakeland FL

East

Future Phase
Rough Opening
No windows

1 - 9" x 61/2 " T
2 - 9 1/2 " w x 42 " T
4 - 9 " w x 61/2 T
2 - 11 1/2 w x 61/2 T
2 - 5 1/2 w x 35 1/2 T

Order these sizes

36 casements
18 sets/pairs + new opening
Emily,

Would you support something like this?

Closing up and down but with the grid pattern so that it looks comparable to the old windows which were there.

Andrew Boccia
Fund Manager/ Officer
Central Florida Income Fund, LLC
(863) 397-8663 (mobile)

Referrals are appreciated!
Accredited investors are welcome to invest.
SEC Form D
Initial casement window proposed and administratively approved - cost deemed unreasonable
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
STAFF REPORT
February 28, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>HPB19-002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address; Historic Name</td>
<td>116-118 W. Park Street; “Robert Cole House”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic District; FMSF#</td>
<td>Dixieland; #DL 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner/Applicant</td>
<td>Mr. Gregory Fancelli, Lester Grossman LLC / Mr. Albert Moore, Albert C. Moore Construction LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning; Context District; SPI; Future Land Use</td>
<td>RA-4; Urban Neighborhood; Dixieland SPI; Residential Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Use</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent Properties</td>
<td>Residential and Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Approvals</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REQUEST

The Applicants request approval to demolish the existing house on the subject property in order to undertake a larger redevelopment project involving residential infill and alley enhancements.

SUMMARY OF BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The subject property is an interior urban lot consisting of 0.17 acres and measures 50’ wide by 145’ deep. A one-story Frame Vernacular house constructed circa 1950 is located on the subject property and is considered to be a contributing building in the Dixieland Historic District. This house has a side-gabled roof and gabled front stoop, aluminum and wood windows, and aluminum siding. This house has been altered over its history, including the replacement siding, replacement windows and doors, the enclosure of the eaves, and the enclosure and alteration of its front porch. This house is simple in style and features little architectural ornamentation. The house is currently unoccupied, but was rented as a duplex residence previously.

The home was purchased in 2017 by the current owner. Based on Mr. Moore’s assessment as a licensed building contractor, the property has been poorly maintained over its history and has damage to its walls and windows, as well as rotten flooring. The cost to repair the house was estimated at $187,685; as the Polk County Property Appraiser’s Just Market Value of the property is $92,686, the Applicants feel that rehabilitation of the structure is unreasonable. Mr. Moore has estimated the cost to demolish the house at $9,000, which will likely take a week to complete. Any salvageable building materials will be saved for reuse in other building projects.

This property is part of a larger redevelopment project Mr. Fancelli has proposed, which involves the properties immediately west of the north-south alley that is located one block west of S. Florida Avenue, and between W. Park and W. Hancock Streets. The project proposes building four two-story apartment buildings containing 23 units and adjacent off-street parking, as well as angled parking on the alley. Additionally, an improved surface material is proposed for the alley and the installation of public art pieces along the alley is proposed. A second phase of this project involves the redevelopment of the Dixieland Mall parking area for similar multi-family use.
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.e.4(c) Demolition within redevelopment areas is generally discouraged and shall be reviewed with regards to:

i. 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.

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

iii. The future proposed utilization of the site in relation to specific or proposed plans. When specific plans are not available for the site, the proposed plans may include formally established redevelopment plans or those plans submitted by the applicant that comply and are compatible with the district and meet the intent of the adopted redevelopment plan. The demolition review process will take into consideration a ranking of properties in redevelopment areas based on architectural significance and integrity as identified by the HPB.

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS:

Staff finds the subject house to be a simple frame vernacular structure, which has undergone numerous changes over its history that have adversely affected its architectural integrity, such as the loss of its original doors and windows, enclosure of the eave, significant alteration to the front porch, and the addition of aluminum siding (the original wood siding is underneath the aluminum siding, but is in poor condition). Additionally, this house has no known associations with persons or events important in Lakeland’s history. While its age and architectural style qualify it as a contributing structure within the Dixieland Historic District, this house would not be eligible for an individual listing on the National Register of Historic Places based on its architectural merits alone. Given its deteriorated and altered condition, its contribution to the architectural character of Dixieland is minimal.

While economic factors are not a part of the demolition considerations, the Applicant has substantiated the poor structural condition of the building and provided an estimate to rehabilitate the structure that more than doubles the current value of the property.

Finally, the subject property is located immediately adjacent to the Dixieland CRA Commercial Corridor, a designated redevelopment area, in which the ability to demolish a building is permitted more flexibility given the replacement structure is compatible and adds value to the District. Many of the properties along the alley west of the subject property are parking lots, and buildings that exist on these lots are often significantly altered, in poor condition, or noncontributing to the District. In fact, the DRC recently approved the demolition of the house located at 115 W. Park Street, across the street from the subject property, for many of the same reasons given for demolition of the subject building.

From an urban planning perspective, a transitional zone is appropriate between the commercial properties along S. Florida Avenue and the historic residential neighborhood to the west, and helps to define an edge to the residential core of the neighborhood. However, tearing down a building and leaving the property undeveloped for a long period of time is not appropriate, as vacant lots diminish the character and integrity of Historic Districts. Staff recognizes that many of the properties immediately adjacent to the north-south alley west of South Florida
Avenue in the Dixieland Historic District have been converted into parking lots for the businesses along this roadway. The Applicants have presented a conceptual plan for a sensitive transition of this area into the Dixieland neighborhood, as well as have assembled several properties, including all parcels where apartments are proposed.

A well-designed redevelopment plan for these properties that is compatible with the historic fabric of the District and does not adversely affect neighboring properties can be supported by the City’s Planning staff. The Applicants have presented a cohesive conceptual plan, but further details will be needed for the project, such as elevation drawings, a dimensioned site plan, and an exterior materials list in order to receive design review approval from the DRC. Additionally, the project will also require additional reviews by City staff and potentially the Planning and Zoning Board and City Commission.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

As the request satisfies the demolition considerations, staff recommends approval of the demolition as requested.

Final approval of the new multi-family buildings as proposed in concept is subject to a separate Certificate of Review application submittal and design review by the DRC.

Report prepared by: Emily M. Foster, Senior Planner, Historic Preservation Liaison to the Historic Preservation Board
Application for Certificate of Review

MAJOR REVIEW

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD

PROPERTY OWNER INFORMATION
NAME: Lester Grossman, LLC
MAILING ADDRESS: 2000 East Edgewood Lakeland 33803
EMAIL ADDRESS: sharon.wheeler@liman.com
TELEPHONE NUMBER: 863-668-7533

APPLICANT/AGENT INFORMATION
NAME: Albert H. Moore Construction, LLC
MAILING ADDRESS: 5055 Fairfax East Lakeland 33813
EMAIL ADDRESS: AHmoore@401.com
TELEPHONE NUMBER: 863-640-9440

PROJECT INFORMATION
PROPERTY ADDRESS: 118-118 Park St
PROJECT TYPE (check all that apply):
- New Construction
- Addition
- Major Rehabilitation/Restoration
- Minor Exterior Alteration
- Demolition
- Relocation
- Accessory Buildings (larger than 300 SF)

RETROACTIVE REQUEST: □ YES □ NO
CODE ENFORCEMENT ACTION: □ YES □ NO

HISTORIC DISTRICT:
- BEACON HILL
- DIXIELAND
- EAST LAKE MORTON
- SOUTH LAKE MORTON
- MUNN PARK
- LAKE HUNTER TERRACE
- BILTMORE-CUMBERLAND

CURRENT USE:
- Residential
- Commercial
- Other

DESIGN PROFESSIONAL/CONTRACTOR/CONSULTANT:
Albert H. Moore - Contractor

FOR STAFF USE ONLY
Date Received: 11/21/19
HPB/DRC Meeting Date: 1/24/19
Project # HPB 19-002 Contributing: □ Yes □ No FMSF# DL# 99
Zoning: RA-4 Context District: UNH Future Land Use: Rm
Conceptual Review: □ Yes; HPB/DRC Final Review Meeting Date: □ Yes □ No

APPLICATION FEE: 170.00
(Fee applies if project cost exceeds $10,000)
Fee Received: □ Yes □ No
Payment Type: □ Check □ Cash

C-1940
Project Description
Describe the scope of your project here, along with all relevant details. If the scope of work will involve more than one project on the subject property, please list each project separately. Please attach additional sheets if more space is needed to describe your project.

EXISTING CONDITIONS AND MATERIALS:
1) This building was a bungalow — very low rent — aluminum siding.
   During the demo we will save as much as possible existing windows and wall materials.

PROPOSED PROJECT:
2) The existing property has been poorly maintained, low rent housing — with damage to exterior walls and windows — old floor rotted — As a builder the costs of repairs are unknown — the plumbing and electric are too old to repair
4) Future use of property unknown at this time.

PROPOSED MATERIALS (SEE PAGE 4 FOR TYPES OF MATERIALS NEEDED FOR EACH BUILDING COMPONENT):

Demolition costs are $9,000.00 would take about a week.

CERTIFICATION AND AUTHORIZATION
I certify that the information contained in this application is true and correct to the best of my knowledge at the time of submission. I understand that this application will not be accepted and deemed complete until all supporting and/or requested information has been supplied. I understand that this application may require a site visit to the subject property by City of Lakeland staff. I understand that this application is required to be heard a public meeting of the Lakeland Historic Preservation Board and its Design Review Committee. Either I or my authorized representative will be in attendance at this meeting. I understand that the issuance of a Certificate of Review does not relieve the responsibility of obtaining a building permit and following all other applicable codes and requirements of the City of Lakeland, Polk County, State of Florida.

In consideration for review of this application by the Historic Preservation Board/Design Review Committee for a proposed change to a property within one of Lakeland’s Historic Districts, the applicant and owner agree to allow access to the property by City of Lakeland staff for inspection purposes during the review process, during the time that work is performed, and upon completion of the project.

Owner/Applicant Signature

Date

Dec 30, 2018
Bid to remodel existing duplex

This existing unit had aluminum siding, we had it removed. The exterior has wood siding with extensive damage. The windows are a mixture of old wood casements and aluminum awning. Asbestos was found on the flooring and windows frames. Each unit has one bedroom, one bath, living room and a kitchen. The floors are a mixture of tile and carpet covering old wood flooring.

Costs of repairs:
Frame and install exterior walls with new wood siding.
Install new windows and exterior doors approved by the city.
Repairs to the interior walls that are a mixture of drywall and plaster.
New flooring.
New kitchen with appliances.
New bathroom with tub and shower.
Electric.
Plumbing.
Air conditioning.
Facia and soffit with roof repairs.
plans and engineering.
Permit fees.
Insurance and profit.

Total Costs $187,685.00

THANK YOU
Dixieland Residential Infill Concept
Dixieland Residential Infill Before
Dixieland Residential Infill Concept
Dixieland Residential Infill Before
Dixieland Residential Infill Concept