July 25, 2024

Historic Preservation Board

Re: 236 N Dixie Boulevard - Gannon Residence Certificate of Appropriateness Application

Dear Sir or Madam,

The homeowner seeks to add an addition to the single family home located at 236 N Dixie Boulevard. The existing home is a one-story home originally constructed in 1925 and is a well preserved example of the Mission style architecture of the time. We underline that the proposed modifications are only sought after to bring the property to a state of utility and allow efficient contemporary use of the property without diminishing but rather continuing the historical prominent features of the residence. Within the enclosed application and supporting documents, we will layout our basis for issuance of the Certificate of Appropriateness for the addition to this historic home.

The house is within the Del-Ida Historic District, which is one of Delray's first planned developments platted in 1923. The home was originally built by Dorothy and James Lutzinger in 1925. Mr. Lutzinger put in a wood framed screen porch addition to home in 1961. Of the prominent Delray Beach architectural styles, this residence is one of the few remaining well-preserved examples of Mission Style Architecture within this district, featuring a front façade with minimal detailing, a textured stucco exterior, and a flat roof hidden behind a parapet with an elevated curved corner detail. With these characteristics in consideration, we offer our position on the following key elements of our proposed home:

Front Façade

In keeping with the Land Development Regulations (LDR) for contributing historic properties, namely LDR 4.5.1(E)(7)(b), we highlight that we are not modifying the front façade or proposing any modifications to the structure on the front building plane. This is of material importance as the original contributing structure will not be affected in any way by the proposed addition. The proposed two-story addition on the rear is not visible from eye level looking at the front elevation as illustrated in the attached renderings.

Addition

The proposed two-story addition has been designed in the rear of the property to reduce any impact of the new addition from the streetscape. While the original house, constructed in 1925, was only a onestory structure, by making the addition be two stories, we reduced the impact of the addition on the overall site. The current use of the rear yard includes extensive gardens that the owner did not want to impact. Although never practical, the addition could be removed in its entirety and the original structure would remain.

Demolition of Contributing Structure

Part of our proposed plan includes removing an existing enclosed patio on the rear of the house. This patio was not part of the original structure built in 1925 and was built as a screen patio in 1961 and was later enclosed as living space. While this addition could be considered a contributing portion of the structure simply because of the date of construction, it is our opinion that this portion of the existing home, located in the rear of the property and not visible from the street, does not provide any significant value to the overall Mission Style of the original home.

We are proposing to take the porch located directly behind and attached to the main structure down completely and allow the new two-story addition to encompass this area. Our records search indicate that the porch was permitted to be constructed as an addition to the original structure as a screened porch in 1961 and later the residents enclosed the porch. In our research, we did not find the addition as part of a permit package to the City of Delray Beach. As the original structure in a well-preserved example of the prominent Mission Style architecture of the time, and the porch was constructed much later as a screen patio and does not enhance the architectural style of the original home, we feel the demolition of this enclosed porch does not detract from the historic nature of the original structure. This area is approximately 330 square feet and is not a particularly good example of the Mission Style Architecture or the original home.

The reasons for removing the structure are numerous but since this structure was originally built as screen patio, it was not designed or intended to be enclosed habitable space, it would not be structurally feasible to construct a second-floor addition without literally removing the structure and the foundations. Based on the above information, we feel it is appropriate to permit the demolition of this area as it does not have any significant detail adding to the historic value of the original structure.

Garage

On the rear of the property is a small, detached garage structure built as part of the original home in 1925 and in not affected by the proposed addition.

Site

Over the driveway on the side of the home, is a trellis structure that was built and permitted by the current owner in 2013. The rear of the property contains a series of gardens and miscellaneous trellis structures and a 6'-0" high wood fence along three sides. The proposed addition will remove one of the trellis structures immediately adjacent to the enclosed porch. Our research didn't find any relevant building permits and this structure has no contributing historic value to the home, and was used to grow plants and vines as part of the various gardens in the rear yard.

Roof Shapes and Material(s)

The original portion of the historic home has a flat roof hidden behind a parapet with curved corner detailing that is one of the significant characteristics of Mission style architecture. The proposed design includes a flat roof to minimize the height of the new two-story addition and maintain the historic characteristic flat roof design of the original structure. We have included the same curved parapet detailing in the new addition as on the original structure.

Visual Compatibility Standards: LDR's 4.5.1(E)(7)(a-m)

Below is a description of how the proposed addition is in compliance with the visual compatibility standards in LDR 4.5.1(E)(7)(a-m). Please note that this application includes a waiver request for relief as it relates to 4.5.1(E)(7)(m)6.

- a. The height of the proposed addition does not exceed the building height plane (BHP) or come near surpassing the BHP as the proposed addition. The second-floor addition has been designed to be at the rear of the existing structure, the closest point of the new addition is more than 66 feet away from the front property line. See submitted elevations for illustrated BHP. See attached renderings of the proposed addition taken from eye level from the street. This perspective illustrates that the proposed addition is not visible from the street view.
- b. The addition is considered a multi-story structure. The maximum height from finished floor elevation to finished floor elevation shall not exceed 12-0". The Proposed second story elevation does not exceed the 12' limit but is actually being proposed at approximately 10'-6" to keep the second floor limited in overall height.
- c. As described in the section above regarding the front façade we are not proposing any modifications to the existing structure. The proposed addition is located at the rear of the existing structure.
- d. Proportion of openings (windows and doors) is being accomplished in the following ways:
 - 1. Rear and side facades of the proposed structure are keeping the same window style and in fact the same manufacturer as the windows on the existing home. Product to be white and similar style in painted aluminum to match the existing windows.
 - 2. The addition side and rear facades are utilizing the window sizes or proportions of the original window sizes to create the openings in the addition. We are using the same size pattern of muntins (or styles) as the original house. In the rear of the property, we are proposing glass french doors that match existing doors on the side of the existing home.
- e. Rhythm of buildings on the street is being maintained as we are not proposing structural modifications to the front façade. In addition, we are maintaining the Mission style of the original design in the proposed addition.
- f. Rhythm of entrance and / or porch projections are not modified within our proposal therefore we believe we meet the historic intent.
- g. Relationship of materials, texture, and color will be visually compatible to the Del-Ida Park Historic District as we are proposing to match the existing textured stucco walls and the color of the

addition is the match the existing house color. In brief summary, we offer the following for exterior façade colors and have samples in the submittal:

- 1. Walls: Light Blue, to match existing color.
- 2. Roof: Flat built-up roof hidden behind a parapet, same as existing.
- 3. Windows: White frames with muntins similar to existing. Glass to be non-reflective type hurricane impact with Low-E coating for energy conservation.
- h. Roof Shape will be a flat roof that is not visible. Flat roof is utilized to reduce overall height and maintain the same historic characteristics of the original home.
- i. Walls of continuity are not subject to any non-conformance in our submission. The walls are being proposed to meet the LDR's under 4.3.4, 4.5.1(C)(3)(a)(1), and 4.6.5. Front yard and side sections of the front yard do not have any proposed walls, fences, or landscape masses.
- j. With respects to the scale of the building, there are no proposed modifications to the front of the existing home therefore section 1 would not apply, and the total depth of the home with the proposed addition is not more than 50% of the lot depth so section 2 does not apply.
- k. The directional expression of the front elevation is not being compromised from the original design intent of 1925.
- I. The architectural style of the historic house is Mission, and the scope of the addition is being framed as such to follow this style. Techniques to achieve this include but are not limited to uniform stucco finish to match the existing, window sizes in line with those on the original structure with similar muntin pattern, hiding the flat roof behind a parapet and incorporating the same raised corner parapet detail.
- m. With respects to the addition, the visual compatibility is achieved in response to subparts 1 through 5: (Note that this application include a Waiver relief from subpart 6)
 - 1. The addition has been designed to be located completely in the rear of the historic building.
 - 2. As noted in the previous subpart, the addition is not located in the established front wall plane rather located towards the rear of the property.
 - 3. Nothing within our proposal for this project destroys or obscures the original structure. The only demolition proposed occurs on subsequent additions to the property after the original structure was built and are located in the rear home with little historical significance. The porch was originally permitted as screened and was later enclosed with which we have not found being permitted.
 - 4. The addition meets the full intent of subpart 4 in the most literal way as if it was as simple as removing a current code designed structure the existing roof and walls would remain as constructed from 1925. The new addition is proposed to have its own foundation that is separate from the historic home so as not to add any additional load to the historic structure and allow the addition to be completely removed without any damage to the original historic home.
 - 5. As outlined above the addition is not introducing a new architectural style but rather the addition allows a flow through or around the house in scale, design, and proportion. As noted in subpart I (Architectural Style) the proposed addition is a continuation of the

historic pattern and detailing of the contributing structure.

6. This application includes a waiver to this provision. While the property is large enough for a single-story addition, this property has been meticulously improved with various gardens, trees and other landscape material. We felt it was appropriate to maintain as much of the green space as possible, and believe that a two story addition to the historic one story home, while it may be larger in massing, is still appropriate in order to be able to preserve the extensive trees and landscaping that make the rear of the property a virtual oasis of green. Please see the attached Waiver justification for additional information.

To close, we hope the Historic Preservation Board will approve the Certificate of Appropriateness along with our Waiver application, to allow the owner the opportunity to enjoy this property, now and well into the future. As our intent is aligned with yours, we believe this residence can be an exemplary historic preservation project maintaining the core historic principles.

Sincerely,

Kermit C. White, AIA Agent for the Owner Principal Architect Principal Design & Development Group, LLC

July 25, 2024

Historic Preservation Board

Re: 236 N Dixie Boulevard - Gannon Residence Certificate of Appropriateness Application

Dear Sir or Madam,

The homeowner seeks to add an addition to the single family home located at 236 N Dixie Boulevard. The existing home is a one-story home originally constructed in 1925 and is a well preserved example of the Mission style architecture of the time. Little has done to modify the original structure. Most of windows have been replaced over time with new impact resistant windows. The proposed modifications are only sought after to bring the property to a state of utility and allow efficient contemporary use of the property without diminishing but rather continuing the historical prominent features of the residence. Within the enclosed application and supporting documents, we will layout our basis for issuance of the Certificate of Appropriateness for the addition to this historic home.

The house is located within the Del-Ida Historic District, which is one of Delray's first planned developments platted in 1923. The home was originally built by Dorothy and James Lutzinger in 1925. Mr. Lutzinger put in a wood framed screen porch addition to home in 1961. Of the prominent Delray Beach architectural styles, this residence is one of the few remaining well-preserved examples of Mission Style Architecture within this district, featuring a front façade with minimal detailing, a textured stucco exterior, and a flat roof hidden behind a parapet with an elevated curved corner detail. With these characteristics in consideration, we offer our position on the following key elements of our proposed home:

Front Façade

In keeping with the Land Development Regulations (LDR) for contributing historic properties, namely LDR 4.5.1(E)(7)(b), we highlight that we are not modifying the front façade or proposing any modifications to the structure on the front building plane. This is of material importance as the original contributing structure will not be affected in any way by the proposed addition. The proposed two-story addition on the rear is not visible from eye level looking at the front elevation as illustrated in the attached renderings.

Addition

The proposed two-story addition has been designed in the rear of the property to reduce any impact of the new addition from the streetscape. While the original house, constructed in 1925, was only a onestory structure, by making the addition be two stories, we reduced the impact of the addition on the overall site. The current use of the rear yard includes extensive gardens that the owner did not want to impact. Although never practical, the addition could be removed in its entirety and the original structure would remain.

Demolition of Contributing Structure

Part of our proposed plan includes removing an existing enclosed patio on the rear of the house. This patio was not part of the original structure built in 1925 and was built as a screen patio in 1961 and was later enclosed as living space. While this addition could be considered a contributing portion of the structure simply because of the date of construction, it is our opinion that this portion of the existing home, located in the rear of the property and not visible from the street, does not provide any significant value to the overall Mission Style of the original home.

We are proposing to take the porch located directly behind and attached to the main structure down completely and allow the new two-story addition to encompass this area. Our records search indicate that the porch was permitted to be constructed as an addition to the original structure as a screened porch in 1961 and later the residents enclosed the porch. In our research, we did not find the addition as part of a permit package to the City of Delray Beach. As the original structure in a well-preserved example of the prominent Mission Style architecture of the time, and the porch was constructed much later as a screen patio and does not enhance the architectural style of the original home, we feel the demolition of this enclosed porch does not detract from the historic nature of the original structure. This area is approximately 330 square feet and is not a particularly good example of the Mission Style Architecture or the original home. The 330 square foot porch represents less than 18% of the total historic structure,

The reasons for removing the structure are numerous but since this structure was originally built as screen patio, it was not designed or intended to be enclosed habitable space, it would not be structurally feasible to construct a second-floor addition without literally removing the structure and the foundations. Based on the above information, we feel it is appropriate to permit the demolition of this area as it does not have any significant detail adding to the historic value of the original structure.

Garage

On the rear of the property is a small, detached garage structure built as part of the original home in 1925 and in not affected by the proposed addition.

Site

Over the driveway on the side of the home, is a trellis structure that was built and permitted by the current owner in 2013. The rear of the property contains a series of gardens and miscellaneous trellis structures and a 6'-0" high wood fence along three sides. The proposed addition will remove one of the trellis structures immediately adjacent to the enclosed porch. Our research didn't find any relevant building permits and this structure has no contributing historic value to the home, and was used to grow plants and vines as part of the various gardens in the rear yard.

Roof Shapes and Material(s)

The original portion of the historic home has a flat roof hidden behind a parapet with curved corner detailing that is one of the significant characteristics of Mission style architecture. The proposed design includes a flat roof to minimize the height of the new two-story addition and maintain the historic characteristic flat roof design of the original structure. We have included the same curved parapet detailing in the new addition as on the original structure.

Visual Compatibility Standards: LDR's 4.5.1(E)(7)(a-m)

Below is a description of how the proposed addition is in compliance with the visual compatibility standards in LDR 4.5.1(E)(7)(a-m). Please note that this application includes a waiver request for relief as it relates to 4.5.1(E)(7)(m)6.

- a. The height of the proposed addition does not exceed the building height plane (BHP) or come near surpassing the BHP as the proposed addition. The second-floor addition has been designed to be at the rear of the existing structure, the closest point of the new addition is more than 66 feet away from the front property line. See submitted elevations for illustrated BHP. See attached renderings of the proposed addition taken from eye level from the street. This perspective illustrates that the proposed addition is not visible from the street view.
- b. The addition is considered a multi-story structure. The maximum height from finished floor elevation to finished floor elevation shall not exceed 12-0". The Proposed second story elevation does not exceed the 12' limit but is actually being proposed at approximately 10'-6" to keep the second floor limited in overall height.
- c. As described in the section above regarding the front façade we are not proposing any modifications to the existing structure. The proposed addition is located at the rear of the existing structure.
- d. Proportion of openings (windows and doors) is being accomplished in the following ways:
 - 1. Rear and side facades of the proposed structure are keeping the same window style and in fact the same manufacturer as the windows on the existing home. Product to be white and similar style in painted aluminum to match the existing windows.
 - 2. The addition side and rear facades are utilizing the window sizes or proportions of the original window sizes to create the openings in the addition. We are using the same size pattern of muntins (or styles) as the original house. In the rear of the property, we are proposing glass french doors that match existing doors on the side of the existing home.
- e. Rhythm of buildings on the street is being maintained as we are not proposing structural modifications to the front façade. In addition, we are maintaining the Mission style of the original design in the proposed addition.
- f. Rhythm of entrance and / or porch projections are not modified within our proposal therefore we believe we meet the historic intent.
- g. Relationship of materials, texture, and color will be visually compatible to the Del-Ida Park Historic Page | 3

District as we are proposing to match the existing textured stucco walls and the color of the addition is the match the existing house color. In brief summary, we offer the following for exterior façade colors and have samples in the submittal:

- 1. Walls: Light Blue, to match existing color.
- 2. Roof: Flat built-up roof hidden behind a parapet, same as existing.
- 3. Windows: White frames with muntins similar to existing. Glass to be non-reflective type hurricane impact with Low-E coating for energy conservation.
- h. Roof Shape will be a flat roof that is not visible. Flat roof is utilized to reduce overall height and maintain the same historic characteristics of the original home.
- i. Walls of continuity are not subject to any non-conformance in our submission. The walls are being proposed to meet the LDR's under 4.3.4, 4.5.1(C)(3)(a)(1), and 4.6.5. Front yard and side sections of the front yard do not have any proposed walls, fences, or landscape masses.
- j. With respects to the scale of the building, there are no proposed modifications to the front of the existing home therefore section 1 would not apply, and the total depth of the home with the proposed addition is not more than 50% of the lot depth so section 2 does not apply.
- k. The directional expression of the front elevation is not being compromised from the original design intent of 1925.
- I. The architectural style of the historic house is Mission, and the scope of the addition is being framed as such to follow this style. Techniques to achieve this include but are not limited to uniform stucco finish to match the existing, window sizes in line with those on the original structure with similar muntin pattern, hiding the flat roof behind a parapet and incorporating the same raised corner parapet detail.
- m. With respects to the addition, the visual compatibility is achieved in response to subparts 1 through5: (Note that this application include a Waiver relief from subpart 6)
 - 1. The addition has been designed to be located completely in the rear of the historic building.
 - 2. As noted in the previous subpart, the addition is not located in the established front wall plane rather located towards the rear of the property.
 - 3. Nothing within our proposal for this project destroys or obscures the original structure. The only demolition proposed occurs on subsequent additions to the property after the original structure was built and are located in the rear home with little historical significance. The porch was originally permitted as screened and was later enclosed with which we have not found being permitted.
 - 4. The addition meets the full intent of subpart 4 in the most literal way as if it was as simple as removing a current code designed structure the existing roof and walls would remain as constructed from 1925. The new addition is proposed to have its own foundation that is separate from the historic home so as not to add any additional load to the historic structure and allow the addition to be completely removed without any damage to the original historic home.
 - 5. As outlined above the addition is not introducing a new architectural style but rather the addition allows a flow through or around the house in scale, design, and proportion. As

noted in subpart I (Architectural Style) the proposed addition is a continuation of the historic pattern and detailing of the contributing structure.

6. This application includes a waiver to this provision. While the property is large enough for a single-story addition, this property has been meticulously improved with various gardens, trees and other landscape material. We felt it was appropriate to maintain as much of the green space as possible, and believe that a two story addition to the historic one story home, while it may be larger in massing, is still appropriate in order to be able to preserve the extensive trees and landscaping that make the rear of the property a virtual oasis of green. Please see the attached Waiver justification for additional information.

Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation

- 1. A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.
 - The property was originally built as a single family home and has continued to be so, and will be after the proposed renovation.
- 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 avoided.
 - The original built structure of the home is unaffected by this proposed renovation. The addition is not visible from the street elevation. (See attached color elevations). The front Façade is not affected by the proposed renovations, and the new two story renovation incorporates the same exterior stucco material, matching windows, flat roof, and signature curved parapet detail.
- 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.
 - As mentioned above the original structure of the house is unaffected by the proposed renovation, and the proposed addition follows the same materials, style and characteristics of the original Mission style home.
- 4. Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.
 - The original house has had very little changes to the structure over time and will be preserved in this renovation.
- 5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.
 - Both the interior and exterior of the original stucco remain unaffected by the renovation.
- 6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in

design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

- The original historic structure has been well preserved and maintained over time and doesn't require any significant restoration or replacement of any of the historic elements.
- 7. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.
 - As mentioned, the original historic structure is to be unaffected by this renovation.
- 8. Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.
 - There are no proposed changes to the original structure and the original home will be protected and preserved.
- 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 proposed addition is compatible with the architectural style and features of the original historic home. Our application includes a waiver to the compatible massing per the Visual Compatibility standards. (See above) The existing home is a simple one story structure to be preserved, and the proposed two story addition is located on the rear of the property, behind the original structure and is not visible from the street.
- 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 new two story addition will be totally structurally independent of the original historic structure and could be completely without causing any significant damage to the original home.

To close, we hope the Historic Preservation Board will approve the Certificate of Appropriateness along with our Waiver application, to allow the owner the opportunity to enjoy this property, now and well into the future. As our intent is aligned with yours, we believe this residence can be an exemplary historic preservation project maintaining the core historic principles.

Sincerely,

Kermit C. White, AIA Agent for the Owner Principal Architect Principal Design & Development Group, LLC