



**CITY OF WINTER PARK
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD**

9:00 a.m.
November 11, 2015
Commission Chambers
401 Park Avenue South

MINUTES

1. Call to order. The meeting was called to order at 9:05 a.m.

Present: Chairman Bill Segal, Vice-Chair Phil Wood, Rebecca Talbert, Genean McKinnon, Laura Armstrong and Phil Wood. Absent: Candace Chemtob Louise Sprimont and Phil Kean. Staff: Senior Planner Lindsey Hayes and Recording Secretary Lisa Smith.

2. Approval of Minutes.

Motion made by Rebecca Talbert, seconded by Laura Armstrong to approve the August 12 and 19, 2015 and September 9 and 15, 2015, as amended. Motion carried unanimously.

Public comments on any business not appearing under action.

No one wished to speak. Public comment was closed.

3. Action Item.

COR 15-007 Request by John M. Brennan, Jr. For a Certificate of Review to demolish the existing single car garage and add a freestanding two car garage with a second floor accessory dwelling unit at the rear of his property located at 814 Antonette Avenue. A variance is requested for a ten foot rear setback. Contributing historic resource listed in the College Quarter Historic District. Zoned R-1AA. Parcel ID #07-22-30-1490-01-100.

Senior Planner Lindsey Hayes presented the staff report. She used a power point presentation to give the history of the request and to present the current conditions. She reviewed the details of the Certificate of Review Request. She explained that the house located at 814 Antonette Avenue is a contributing resource in the College Quarter Historic District. She explained that the applicant is requesting a certificate of review to demolish the existing single car garage and add a freestanding two car garage with a 572 square foot unit on the second floor. The application was originally on the August 12 HPB agenda but was tabled at the owner's request. The application has been revised to increase setbacks, and to reduce windows that would overlook adjacent properties. She discussed the code requirements with regard to garage apartments and accessory dwelling units, setbacks, and floor area ratio. A variance is requested for a rear setback of ten feet in lieu of 35 feet to a two story dwelling. The required third parking space is provided.

The proposal meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation nine and ten (*Section 58-469(1)*):

(9) New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

The single car garage to be demolished does not add to the historic character of the property. The new construction is freestanding and does not impact the historic house. There are other examples of two story accessory buildings behind one story main houses in the immediate area, so that size and scale of development is not unusual or detrimental. The architecture of accessory buildings does not have to mimic historic architecture, but needs to be compatible as is the proposed structure. Typically, accessory buildings are simpler than the main building.

(10) New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall 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 freestanding structure could be removed without impacting the historic main house.

To repeat, all new or reactivated accessory dwelling units require a third separately accessible parking space behind the front setback. The two required parking spaces for the main house are within the new garage and the third space is adjacent to the structure in the 12 foot side setback. When an accessory dwelling unit is added or reactivated, the guest or tenant is required to park on site in a separately accessible parking space. On street parking is very limited in the city's historic areas and the applicant is aware that the use of an accessory dwelling unit is contingent upon the guest or tenant parking on site as required.

Staff has met with the neighbor to the south at 818 Antonette Avenue. Ms. Bosserman had concerns about the two story structure previously proposed five feet from the side of her property. The revised application moves the new structure 12-feet from the side setback. Mr. Miller, the owner of 767 French Avenue adjacent to the rear of the property, had concerns about the five-foot rear setback previously proposed. The revised application requests a ten-foot rear setback. She stated that staff has received nine comments from neighbors pertaining to the architecture. In response to those concerns, the applicant has revised rear and side elevations to reduce the size of windows and to raise them order to address privacy concerns. Staff recommended approval subject to the following conditions:

1. demolition of the existing single car garage;
2. construction of a two car garage with a second floor accessory dwelling unit; and
3. Granting a variance to allow a ten foot rear setback to the new two story structure.

Ms. Hayes responded to Board member questions and concerns.

Jay Brennan, the applicant, provided the Board members with background details of his project. He explained that the proposed dwelling unit will not be rented out, but will be used as living space for his son. He stated that he agrees with the staff report and thanked Ms. Hayes for a thorough and fair review. He said that they have tried to comply with city requirements and address the concerns of neighbors.

Holly Hill, 817 Antonette Avenue, expressed concerned about the style of the garage apartment. She requested that the roof be changed aesthetically to be in line with front part of the house. She said that she feels that if this change is made, it will be increase property values.

Tom Kuntz, 1568 Holts Grove Circle, spoke in support of the request. He explained that his daughter lives on Antonette Avenue and feels that what the applicant is proposing to build is very consistent with what has been done with other properties in the College Quarter District . He noted that the home his daughter purchased went through the same process with the previous owners.

Elizabeth Bosserman, 818 Antonette Avenue, stated that she opposes the request due to proposed building's height, massing, screening, scale, design and encroachment. She did not feel that the proposal is consistent with the College Quarter design guidelines. Ms. Bosserman presented a petition with 20 signatures in opposition to the request.

Margie Bridges, 767 Antonette Avenue, addressed the Board from the perspective of being in a historic district and adhering to the guidelines established by the district. She touched upon some of the guidelines of the district specifically mass, scale and architecture. She suggested that the applicant consider turning the garage apartment to allow for side entry to allow for better traffic circulation within the property.

Stephen Coutant, 905 Lakeview Drive, the proposal is not in keeping with the original intent of Article III concerning garage apartments. He agreed with the previous comments concerning height and massing of the proposed structure. He did not feel that it compliments the primary structure.

The applicant was allowed to rebut. Mr. Brennan stated that in response to concerns raised by Mrs. Bridges there is a turnaround plan to allow for better traffic circulation within the lot. In response to Ms. Bosserman's concerns, they have revised the plan to have deeper setbacks and landscaping. He responded to Board member questions and concerns.

Ms. Bosserman restated her concerns. She stated there is no room for screening and feels that the one-story option works better. Further, she said that there is no room for anything to grow and if it does grow, it will take a long time to mature. No one else wished to speak. Public Hearing closed.

The Chairman opened the Board discussion. Ms. Talbert stated that she took Ms. Bosserman up on her invitation and visited her backyard and drove the neighborhood. She said that she is concerned with impervious coverage and does not feel that the site plan or the impervious calculations accurately reflect the existing conditions. She is more comfortable with the one-story option. She said that she would love to approve the request, but this neighborhood went thru the district creation process and bound themselves to the design guidelines. She stated that she would be in favor of some concessions on setbacks and the impervious if the applicant can make a one-story option work.

Mr. Wood feels that this request if approved can be precedent setting for the College Quarter neighborhood. He stated that he is concerned with the setbacks. He detailed his concerns with regard to balancing living in the district versus private property rights. He said that he feels that if approved, the design of the garage and apartment should match that of the original home and that the pitch roof is out of character with the surrounding neighborhood and needs to be lowered.

Mrs. Armstrong agreed with Mr. Wood. She stated that she would like to see the proposed structure match the look of the original house.

Mr. Brennan responded to Board member concerns regarding the roof. He explained that there is a flat roof on the original house and it leaks and currently requires costly repairs. He said that the roof style proposed was easier to maintain and repair and it was at the suggestion of the project architect.

Motion made by Mrs. McKinnon, seconded by Mrs. Armstrong to approve the request subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Demolition of the existing single car garage;**
- 2. Construction of a two car garage with a second floor accessory dwelling unit;**
- 3. Granting a variance to allow a ten foot rear setback to the new two story structure; and.**
- 4. That the applicant return with a landscape plan and elevations for a flat roof that mimics the original home's architecture.**

An amendment to the motion was offered by Ms. Talbert, seconded by Mrs. Armstrong that the impervious lot coverage not to exceed 50%. Mr. Brennan stated that he is not prepared to respond to the impervious coverage concerns at today's meeting. The amendment failed due to the required number of votes. The original motion carried with a vote of 5-1. Ms. Talbert voted against the motion.

Chairman Segal recessed the meeting at 10:40 a.m. and reconvened the meeting at 10:45 a.m.

COR 15-008 Request by Angela and William Weatherford for a Certificate of Review for alterations to their property at 1583 Highland Road, Winter Park, Florida including enclosing a rear screened porch, replacing east and north facing windows, replacing the existing entry door, replacing a rear door, replacing the rear deck pergola with a partially roofed pergola. Non-contributing historic resource in the Virginia Heights East Historic District. Parcel No. 07-22-30-8908-14-120. Zoned R-1AA.

Senior Planner Lindsey Hayes presented the staff report. She used a power point presentation to give the history of the request and to present the current conditions. She reviewed the details of the Certificate of Review Request. Ms. Hayes reviewed the guidelines with regard to a non-contributing home requests a certificate of review, the primary consideration for the HPB is to ensure that the proposal does not conflict with the essential historic character, scale and massing within the district. The applicants are proposing a number of improvements to the property. The most visible is replacing the double front door with a single Craftsman style door with sidelights. A rear screened porch recessed under the roof is proposed to be enclosed to create a bathroom for the master bedroom. North and east side windows are proposed for replacement. The windows to be replaced are not the original, and the replacement style is compatible with both the property and the surrounding homes. The existing French door onto the rear deck will be replaced, and the wood pergola replaced with a 10 by 15 foot shade structure. She said that the proposal meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation three and nine (*Section 58-469(1)*):

(3) Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.

The owners are incorporating Craftsman style but with modern materials that do not pretend to be original to the property.

(9) New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

The historic façade of the original house is already covered with newer construction. The enclosure of the rear screened porch has no impact to the district, and the replacement windows and doors, and shade structure are compatible with the historic district environment.

Staff recommended approval of the certificate of review. Ms. Hayes responded to Board member questions and concerns.

Mr. Bill Weatherford, 1583 Highland Road, was present to address concerns of the Board. No one wished to speak in support of or in opposition to the request. Public Hearing closed.

Motion made by Ms. Talbert, seconded by Mrs. Armstrong to approve the request as recommended by staff. Motion carried unanimously with a 5-0 vote.

COR 15-009 Request by Gregory Engelman for a Certificate of Review for additions and alterations to his property located at 863 North Park Avenue, Winter Park, Florida including replacing the existing non-original section with a two story 4,363 square foot garage and living area addition and a 576 square foot cabana with a ten foot setback and a 280 square foot open porch. A variance is requested to allow the 856 square foot cabana and open porch under roof to exceed the allowed 500 square feet with a ten foot rear setback. Individually designated historic landmark. Parcel No. 06-22-30-5772-00-460. Zoned R-1AA.

Senior Planner Lindsey Hayes presented the staff report. She used a power point presentation to give the history of the request and to present the current conditions. She reviewed the details of the Certificate of Review Request. The applicants are requesting a certificate of review to demolish the enclosed garage, flat roofed carport and room to add a one and two story wing that will include an enclosed two car garage and living space. The applicants are also requesting approval of a rear yard pool cabana with 576 square feet of enclosed space and an open porch of 280 square feet in lieu of the allowed 500 square feet under roof. The new addition preserves the original body of the house, and the irregular massing and details of the addition continues the historic architectural pattern. The floor area ratio and impervious surface coverage are within the allowed maximum.

The historic preservation ordinance regulations act as an overlay to existing zoning designations. The intent of the HPB is to preserve the exterior historic characteristics of the property or district while properties are renovated or expanded for contemporary use. The guidelines for review are the Secretary of the Interiors' Standards for Rehabilitation. The proposal meets the following applicable standards:

2) The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be retained.

The enclosed former garage and flat roofed addition are not character defining elements and their demolition in preparation for the new addition preserves the original body of the property.

9) New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

The new addition is placed on a secondary side elevation and does not destroy the original body of the house. It is differentiated by a change in wall and roof lines. The repetition of fenestration type, irregular massing and even the arch detail is inspired by the historic architecture but does not compete with it. The façade of the new addition does not overpower the original body of the house. The freestanding cabana is located in the southwest corner of the rear yard. Although not visible to the public, the cabana's style and trio of arches along the open loggia are compatible with the historic property.

10) New additions and adjacent new construction shall 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.

She said that should a future owner desire, the addition and cabana could be removed without damaging the historic body of the house. Staff recommended approval of the request subject to the following conditions:

1. demolition of the enclosed single car garage, carport and room; and
2. one and two story new wing; and
3. cabana with a variance to allow a total of 856 square feet under roof, and
4. Semi-circular driveway.

Ms. Hayes responded to Board member questions and concerns.

Mr. Steve Feller, Architect, represented the applicant. He stated that the property is a supporter of historic preservation. He provided details of the applicant's proposal. He explained that they are attempting to stay within the original architecture and continue with the present scale so as not to overpower the existing residence. He responded to Board member questions and concerns.

No one wished to speak in favor of or in opposition to the request. Public Hearing closed.

The Board members were in support of the request. Ms. Talbert disclosed that she met with Mr. Feller prior to today's meeting and they informally reviewed the various designs that this has gone through prior to coming before the board today.

Motion made by Ms. Talbert, seconded by Mrs. Armstrong to approve the request. Motion carried unanimously with a 5-0 vote.

4. New Business.

1. The Board members requested that staff provide as soon as made available a list of all of the amendments that the City Commission made to the Historic Preservation Ordinance.
 2. Ms. Hayes offered to set-up for the Board members a walking tour of both the College Quarter and Virginia Heights historic districts. The Board members were agreeable to that.
5. Adjournment. There was no further business. The meeting adjourned at 11:15 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa M. Smith,
Recording Secretary