

CITY OF DELRAY BEACH

DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

100 N.W. 1ST AVENUE • DELRAY BEACH • FLORIDA 33444 • (561) 243-7040



HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEMORANDUM 330 NE 1 st Avenue				
December 1, 2021	2021-199	Certificate of Appropriateness		
DEQUEST				

REQUEST

The item before the Board is consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness (2021-199) request for additions and exterior modifications to a contributing 2-story single-family residence located at **330 NE 1st Avenue, Old School Square Historic District**.

GENERAL DATA

Agent: Dan Sloan, AIA

Owner: Steven and Laura Derrickson

Location: 330 NE 1st Avenue **PCN:** 12-43-46-16-01-065-0210 **Property Size:** 0.23 Acres

Zoning: OSSHAD

Historic District: Old School Square Historic District

LUM Designation: HMU (Historic Mixed Use)

Adjacent Zoning:

- OSSHAD (North)
- OSSHAD (West)
- OSSHAD (South)
- OSSHAD (East)

Existing Land Use: Residential Proposed Land Use: Residential



BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND UPDATED PROPOSAL

At its meeting of October 6, 2021, the Board reviewed COA 2021-199 for new additions and exterior modifications to the existing contributing 2-story single-family residence. Specifically, the request included the following:

- Restoration of the original 2-story porch on the front façade of the main existing structure;
- A new 252 square foot addition to the north side of the existing main structure;
- A new 632 square foot addition to the south side of the existing main structure;
- Removal of the existing shed from the southwest corner of the property;
- Construction of a new 766 square foot, 2-story, 2 car garage with a gym/office space on the 2nd floor;
- Construction of a new 307 square foot addition to the existing 1-story structure located on the northwest side rear of the property;
- Repaving of existing 2 back-out parking spaces on the front southeast side of the property;
- Construction of new driveway along the north/south alley in the rear of the property adjacent to the proposed garage;

Project Planners:	Review Dates:		Attachments:
Katherina Paliwoda, Planner, PaliwodaK@mydelraybeach.com	HPB: December 1, 2021	1.	Plans
Michelle Hewett, Assistant Planner, HewettM@mydelraybeach.com		2.	Photographs
		3.	Material selections
		4.	History and Justification Statements

- Installation of a 5V Crimp metal roof in "Natural Silver" to all existing structures and new additions; and.
- Construction of a new open air summer kitchen and in-ground spa to the rear of the existing main structure.

At its meeting of October 6, 2021, the Board reviewed the proposal and expressed concerns with the application meeting the historic LDR's, Secretary of the Interior's Standards, and Delray Beach Historic Preservation Design Guidelines. The Board continued the request to a date uncertain with the following concerns:

- The massing of the 2nd story addition;
- The appearance of front façade with additions;
- Use of a 5v crimp metal roof material;
- The proposed bronze window frame color;
- The style of exterior doors in relation to the existing doors; and,
- The style of proposed porch railing design.

The applicant revised the proposal and resubmitted the request on November 2, 2021. The proposed changes are outlined below:

- Existing parking spaces in front of the property to be removed.
- A new ribbon striped driveway is proposed to the front northeast side of the property.
- Roof material is now proposed to be standing seam.
- Exterior doors have been revised from the modern style 5-light French door style to 10-light French door design.
- Proposed 2-story front porch design has been revised to a vertical picket style.
- Aluminum windows frames to be white.

The COA request is now before the board.

REVIEW AND ANALYSIS

<u>Parking:</u> Parking areas shall strive to contribute to the historic nature of the properties/districts in which they are located by use of creative design and landscape elements to buffer parking areas from adjacent historic structures. At a minimum, the following criteria shall be considered:

- a. Locate parking adjacent to the building or in the rear.
- b. Screen parking that can be viewed from a public right-of-way with fencing, landscaping, or a combination of the two.
- c. Utilize existing alleys to provide vehicular access to sites.
- d. Construct new curb cuts and street side driveways only in areas where they are appropriate or existed historically.
- e. Use appropriate materials for driveways.
- f. Driveway type and design should convey the historic character of the district and the property.

The subject property has an existing 2-car parking area located on the front of the site along NE 1st Avenue and the original proposal included the repaving of the area with brick pavers.

As there is proposed parking in the rear of the property via a new 2½-car garage, there was previous concern as the proposal involves a major improvement to the subject property, altering more than 25% of the existing floor area of the building & all appurtenances, and as new parking is being provided in the rear of the property, consideration should be given to the removal of the parking spaces in the front of the property to ensure the requirements of this code section are met.

The applicant has revised the proposal to remove the existing 2-car parking area in the front of the property. In addition, the existing asphalt driveway located on the north side of the property is proposed to be replaced with a ribbon strip driveway. The driveway includes space for two tandem guest spots, which was created to be the equivalent of two 10' x 16' compact stalls.

Pursuant to LDR Section 4.5.1(E)(4) – Alterations: in considering proposals for alterations to the exterior of historic buildings and structures and in applying development and preservation standards, the documented, original design of the building may be considered, among other factors.

As noted in the previous staff report the original 1st and 2nd floor front porches on this structure were enclosed in 1958. The design of the proposal includes restoration of said porches. However, there was concern with the previous design as the restored front porches included a modern style railing rather than a historic vertical picket railing. It was also noted in the previous report that although there were no building permits or documentation available to determine the style of the original porch railing, given the simple and understated style of the structure it is likely that the porch railings were vertical pickets.

The applicant has taken the direction of the board and revised the railing style to now consist of a more appropriate vertical railing style. The new design ensures that simplistic architectural style and integrity of the historic structure is retained through the restoration of the front porches.

SECRETARY OF THE INTERIORS STANDARDS

Standards 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, & 10 are still applicable to the request.

With the original request there was concern regarding **Standard 3** as the decorative style of the porch railing did not match the architectural style of the historic structure. The previous design represented a **change that created a false sense of historical development by adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings.** A condition of approval was included that the design of the proposed porch railings be revised to include a vertical picket. The applicant has revised the proposed porch railings to include a vertical picket design to the railings of the 2-story front porch. This ensures that the restored porch is consistent with the architectural design the structure and doesn't introduce any conjectural features that may harm the historic integrity of the contributing structure nor the Old School Square Historic District. Therefore, the requirements of this standard can now been met.

Regarding **Standards 2 and 5** as the roof material in the original request proposed a change from the existing asphalt shingle roof to 5-v crimp metal roof was a concern as it **represented a change of distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property, which shall be preserved. The board expressed concern with the proposed 5-v crimp material as this type of metal has not been deemed compatible for use on historic structures within the city's historic districts. In addition, the request for a metal roof material was previously denied by HPB for this property. The applicant has also revised this part of the request to now use a standing seam metal roof instead of the 5-v metal crimp roof. It is noted that the most appropriate replacement options roof styles for this structure would be either the use of 3-dimensional asphalt shingles or aluminum shingles**

Regarding Standard 9 & 10, the original proposal included additions to the north and south side of the main structure. Both additions were proposed behind the front wall plane of the main residence, so as not to compete with the existing historic façade. All additions to the site have also been proposed in such a way, that if removed in the future, it would not harm the historic integrity of the existing main structure or accessory structures. The board expressed concern with the additions as although they were placed behind the main structure, the overall massing as a result of the additions was significantly

larger when viewed from the public right of way. The direction given by the board was to address the massing and work to reposition the additions on site in a way so that they didn't significantly alter the massing of the front façade. The revised plans for this request still include additions to the north and south side of the main structure. When compared to the original proposal it appears that the proposed first floor plan of the main structure shows that the south side addition will be decreased from the original proposed 23'- 10" to 22', which would be a 1'-1" modification to the size of the addition. Standards 9 & 10 require that 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.

VISUAL COMPATIBILITY STANDARDS

Regarding Front Facade Proportion and Rhythm of Entrance and/or Porch Projections, the board expressed concerns about the design style of the 2-story front porch that was to be restored to the front façade of the residence. As previously noted, this concern was addressed as the request now includes a vertical picket style of aluminum railings. This design is simplistic and gives a more accurate detail of what a 2-story front porch on a Masonry Vernacular would look like. Therefore, the revised porch design can be considered visually compatible.

Regarding **Relationship of Materials, Texture, and Color** as previously noted, the applicant has revised the request from proposing the use of a 5-v crimp metal roof material and is now using a standing seam metal roof in Natural Silver Galvalume, which is a more appropriate metal roof style for use within historic districts. It is also important to note that given the option of a more compatible roof for the structure, the use of metal shingles would help retain the defining characteristic of the original roof style as the structure was originally constructed with asphalt shingles. Therefore, as a condition of approval that the roof material be replaced with 3-dimensional asphalt shingles or a suitable alternative roofing material such as aluminum shingles.

With respect to **Proportion of Openings (Windows and Doors)** and **Rhythm of Solids to Voids**, the board expressed concerns with the original proposal of the aluminum single-hung window frames to be black frames. As the structure exists with white frame windows, a change in the window color would be considered an inappropriate alteration to the structure. The applicant has taken the direction of the board and has revised the request to include white frame windows.

There was also concern regarding the style of the exterior doors as 5-light "Ladderback" French doors were originally proposed. As this door style is prominently seen on a Midcentury Modern or Spanish architectural style, such door style would not typically be appropriate for use on a Masonry Vernacular residence. The door design has also been revised to 10-light French doors with the same proposed door color to be Benjamin Moore - Hale Navy (HC-154) with proposed awning fabric to be red (6006-Dubonnet Tweed). Therefore, the doors can now be considered visually compatible.

With respect to **Additions**, as previously noted, there is still concern regarding the proposed additions to the main structure, as the overall massing of the structure when viewed from the public right of way is still significantly larger than the original front façade and may not be considered compatible with the historic streetscape. It has been noted that there was a slight revision of 1'-1" to minimize the size of the south side addition. However, this modification does not significantly change the massing of the overall proposed structure. It is noted that the north and south additions to the main structure are still placed behind the front wall plane of the main structure, yet there is still conflict as the additions give the impression of a larger front façade, competing with the main structure. Because of this massing, the additions may not be considered secondary and subordinate.

As previous noted in the original staff report for this request, this structure is a contributing resource within the Old School Square Historic District. It is imperative that the historic integrity of the structure be kept intact. The Board will need to make a determination that the improvements represent an appropriate modification to the historic structure and will contribute to the historic integrity of the Individually Listed to the Local Register of Historic Places.

OPTIONAL BOARD MOTIONS FOR ACTION ITEMS

- Move to continue with direction.
- B. Approve Certificate of Appropriateness (2021-199) for the property located at 330 NE 1st Avenue, Old School Square Historic District, by finding that the request and approval thereof is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and meets the criteria set forth in the Land Development Regulations.
- C. Approve Certificate of Appropriateness (2021-199) for the property located at 330 NE 1st Avenue, Old School Square Historic District by finding that the request and approval thereof is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and meets the criteria set forth in the Land Development Regulations, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1. That the roof material be replaced with 3-dimensional asphalt shingles or a suitable alternative roofing material such as aluminum shingles;

Site Plan Technical Items:

- 1. Include setbacks for all structures on site plan.
- 2. Provide setbacks and measurements within the site data table in feet & inches measurements to match dimensions provided on site plan (i.e., 13'2" rather than 13.10') on plan sheet A1.02.
- 3. That existing and proposed height measurements be corrected in the site data table on plan sheet A1.02 and confirmed for accuracy on all elevation plan sheets (existing height appears to be 21'6" and proposed height appears to be 22'4" on elevation plan sheets).
- 4. That the proposed setbacks for the in-ground spa be indicated on the site data table on plan sheet A1.02
- 5. That total square foot calculations (including A/C and non-A/C square feet) be provided in the site data table on plan sheet A1.02.
- 6. That open space calculations be provided in the site data table on plan sheet A1.02 to document that a minimum of 25% is proposed.
- 7. Revise door schedule to show change in the 5-light French doors to the revised 10-light French doors.
- 8. Revise the change in south setback, measurements, and square footage for the revised south side addition on all applicable plan sheets and data table.
- 9. Include illustration of existing asphalt driveway on the front north of the property.
- D. Deny Certificate of Appropriateness (2021-199) for the property located at **330 NE 1st Avenue**, **Old School Square Historic District**, by finding that the request is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan and does not meet the criteria set forth in the Land Development Regulations.

PUBLIC AND COURTESY NOTICES					
\underline{X} Courtesy Notices were not required for this property.	\underline{X} Public notice mailers are not applicable to this application.				
	\underline{X} Agenda was posted on (11/23/21), 5 working days prior to meeting.				