



DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

BUILDING | HISTORIC PRESERVATION | PLANNING & ZONING
100 NW 1ST AVENUE, DELRAY BEACH, FLORIDA 33444
(561) 243-7040

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD STAFF REPORT

18 NE 7th Street

Meeting	File No.	Application Type
December 16, 2020	2020-208	Certificate of Appropriateness & Variance

REQUEST

The item before the Board is in consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness & Variance (2020-208) request associated with the construction of a one-story addition and exterior alterations to an existing non-contributing residence on the property located at **18 NE 7th Street, Del-Ida Park Historic District**.

GENERAL DATA

Agent: Steve Siebert Architecture
Owner: Eric and Rosita Gilbert
Location: 18 NE 7th Street
PCN: 12-43-46-09-29-002-0191
Property Size: 0.21 Acres
Zoning: R-1-AA - Single-Family Residential
LUM Designation: LD (Low Density)
Historic District: Del-Ida Park Historic District
Adjacent Zoning:

- R-1-AA - Single-Family Residential (North)
- R-1-AA - Single-Family Residential (West)
- R-1-AA - Single-Family Residential (South)
- R-1-AA - Single-Family Residential (East)

Existing Land Use: Residential
Proposed Land Use: Residential



BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The subject 0.21-acre property is located on the south side of NE 7th Street between N. Swinton Avenue and NE 2nd Avenue. The property is located within the Locally Registered Del-Ida Park Historic District and consists of the west 25' of Lot 19 & and all of 20, Block 2, Del Ida Park. The property contains a one-story, Ranch style, non-contributing single-family, residence, which was built in 1969.

The subject Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) and Variance requests are as follows:

- Construction of a one-story, 943 square foot addition in the rear of the existing structure;
- Enclosure of the existing two-car carport to allow for a two-car garage;
- Construction of a new front porch addition;
- Variance to allow the front porch to encroach 3' – 10 ½" into the required 30' front setback; and,
- Construction of a new swimming pool and associated deck in the rear of the property.

The COA is now before the board.

Project Planners:

Katherina Paliwoda, Planner, PaliwodaK@mydelraybeach.com
Michelle Hoyland, Principal Planner HoylandM@mydelraybeach.com

Review Dates:

HPB: December 16, 2020

Attachments:

1. Plans
2. Justification Statements
3. Photographs
4. Material selections

REVIEW AND ANALYSIS

Pursuant to Land Development Regulation (LDR) Section 2.4.6(H)(5), prior to approval, a finding must be made that any Certificate of Appropriateness which is to be approved is consistent with Historic Preservation purposes pursuant to Objective 1.4 of the Historic Preservation Element of the Comprehensive Plan and specifically with provisions of Section 4.5.1, the Delray Beach Historic Preservation Design Guidelines, and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.

Pursuant to Land Development Regulation (LDR) Section 2.4.5(I)(5), Architectural (appearance) elevations, the Site Plan Review and Appearance Board or the Historic Preservation Board, as appropriate, may approve subject to conditions or deny architectural elevations or plans for a change in the exterior color of a building or structure, or for any exterior feature which requires a building permit.

ZONING AND USE REVIEW

Pursuant to LDR Section 4.4.3(F)(1) - Single-Family Residential (R-1-AA) Development Standards:

Pursuant to LDR Section 4.3.4(K) - Development Standards: properties located within the R-1-AA zoning district shall be developed according to the requirements noted in the chart below. Provided the variance is approved, the proposal can be found to be in compliance with the applicable requirements; therefore, positive findings can be made.

Development Standards	Required	Existing	Proposed
Open Space (Minimum, Non-Vehicular)	25%	67.1%	46.7%
Setbacks (Minimum): Front (North)	30'	30.29'	30.29' (principal) 26.1' (porch)*
Side Interior (East)	10'	6.95'	6.95' (principal)
Side Interior (West)	10'	6.88'	6.88' (principal) 10.3' (accessory)
Rear (South)	10'	51.23'	19' (addition)
Height (Maximum)	35' Max.	10'2"	12'-2" (addition)

*Variance requested

Pursuant to LDR Section 4.6.15(G) Swimming Pool - Yard encroachment. Swimming pools, the tops of which are no higher than grade level, may extend into the rear, interior or street side setback areas but no closer than ten feet to any property line. Swimming pools shall not extend into the front setback area noted in Section 4.3.4(K).

A swimming pool is proposed in the rear of the property and will meet the requirements of this code section.

LDR SECTION 4.5.1

HISTORIC PRESERVATION: DESIGNATED DISTRICTS, SITES, AND BUILDINGS

Pursuant to LDR Section 4.5.1(E), Development Standards, all new development or exterior improvements on individually designated historic properties and/or properties located within historic districts shall, comply with the goals, objectives, and policies of the Comprehensive Plan, the Delray Beach Historic Preservation Design Guidelines, the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, and the Development Standards of this Section

Pursuant to LDR Section 4.5.1(E)(2)(c)(4) – Major Development.

The subject application is considered “Major Development” as it involves “modification of more than 25% of a non-contributing structure within the R-1-AA zoning district.”

Pursuant to LDR Section 4.5.1(E)(3) – Buildings, Structures, Appurtenances and Parking: Buildings, structures, appurtenances and parking shall only be moved, reconstructed, altered, or maintained, in accordance with this chapter, in a manner that will preserve the historical and architectural character of the building, structure, site, or district:

Appurtenances: Appurtenances include, but are not limited to, stone walls, fences, light fixtures, steps, paving, sidewalks, signs, and accessory structures.

Fences and Walls: The provisions of Section 4.6.5 shall apply, except as modified below:

- a. Chain-link fences are discouraged. When permitted, chain-link fences shall be clad in a green or black vinyl and only used in rear yards where they are not visible from a public right of way, even when screened by a hedge or other landscaping.
- b. Swimming pool fences shall be designed in a manner that integrates the layout with the lot and structures without exhibiting a utilitarian or stand-alone appearance.
- c. Fences and walls over four feet (4') shall not be allowed in front or side street setbacks.
- d. Non-historic and/or synthetic materials are discouraged, particularly when visible from a public right of way.
- e. Decorative landscape features, including but not limited to, arbors, pergolas, and trellises shall not exceed a height of eight feet (8') within the front or side street setbacks.

The proposal includes the construction of a swimming pool in the rear southwest corner of the property. There is an existing 4' chain link fence that currently exists on the sides and rear of the property line, which is not visible from an adjacent right-of-way.

Garages and Carports:

- a. Garages and carports are encouraged to be oriented so that they may be accessed from the side or rear and out of view from a public right of way.
- b. The orientation of garages and carports shall be consistent with the historic development pattern of structures of a similar architectural style within the district.
- c. The enclosure of carports is discouraged. When permitted, the enclosure of the carport should maintain the original details, associated with the carport, such as decorative posts, columns, roof planes, and other features.
- d. Garage doors shall be designed to be compatible with the architectural style of the principal structure and should include individual openings for vehicles rather than two car expanses of doors. Metal two car garage doors are discouraged; however, if options are limited and metal is proposed, the doors must include additional architectural detailing appropriate to the building.

The subject proposal includes enclosure of the front facing carport to allow for a 2-car garage. The front facing carport is an existing non-conformity to the property and is an architectural feature seen on traditional Ranch architectural style structures. There is one supporting column at the northwest corner of the carport, which is to be enclosed into the design of the new garage. The proposed metal garage doors are designed as individual openings with raised panels rather than a two-car expanse of doors. The proposal can be said to be appropriate with the overall visual compatibility of the historic streetscape, as many other residences with the historic district also have front facing garages.

Parking: 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 proposal complies with the requirements of this subject regulation, as there is an existing carport and driveway that complies with residential parking. As previously noted, the proposal includes the enclosure of the existing carport to be used as a new two-car garage. The garage will be front facing of the street and is accessible by an existing brick paver driveway path. The single point of access for the new two-car garage will be from the north side of the subject property.

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.

The subject request is the for the construction of an addition to the rear of the existing structure, modification of the façade with construction of a new front porch and enclosure of the carport for a two-car garage. The structure has been considered with respect to improvements.

Pursuant to LDR Section 4.5.1(E)(5) - Standards and Guidelines: a historic site, building, structure, improvement, or appurtenance within a historic district shall only be altered, restored, preserved, repaired, relocated, demolished, or otherwise changed in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, and the Delray Beach Historic Preservation Design Guidelines, as amended from time to time.

Standard 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.

Standard 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.

Standard 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.

Standard 4

Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.

Standard 5

Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.

Standard 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.

Standard 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.

Standard 8

Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.

Standard 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.

Standard 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.

First, it is noted that the subject property is currently classified as a non-contributing structure within the Del-Ida Historic District. However, with the Historic Resource Survey that is in process, the property has been recommended to be reclassified as contributing. Based upon this recommendation, modifications to or demolition of structures that are considered a future historic resource is a great concern as such action would represent a loss of future historic integrity to the historic district.

Standard 1, 2, 3, 5, 9, & 10 are applicable. The proposal includes the construction of one-story addition to the rear of existing one-story residence, construction of a new front porch addition, and enclosure of the existing carport. The proposed roof of the new front porch encroaches into the front setback for which a variance has been requested. In addition, there is also a swimming pool and wooden deck to be added to the rear of the property.

With respect to Standard 1, the existing structure will maintain its original use of a single-family residence; thus, there is no change to the use of the structure.

With respect to Standards 2 & 3, there is concern regarding the façade change as the subject request proposes to change the architectural style from Ranch style to Minimal Traditional style. The proposal includes modifications to the existing structure that will alter the front façade resulting in an alteration of the structure's historic character. Further, the changes create a false sense of historical development through the addition of a new front porch that is designed in a style different than the original Ranch style. This addition of a conjectural feature and architectural element modifies a future historic resource.

While the structure is a non-contributing structure it is slated to be reclassified as a contributing structure. The proposed changes would remove the structure from being considered a contributing structure, resulting in a loss of historic fabric to the Del-Ida Park Historic District.

With respect to Standard 5, there is concern that the proposal does not meet this Standard, which requires that **existing distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques that characterize the property as a Ranch style structure be preserved**. While it is understood that today this structure is a non-contributing resource, it has been identified to be reclassified as a contributing structure with the Historic Resource Survey that is in process. The proposed request involves changing the façade of the structure to incorporate elements of the Minimal Traditional or even Bungalow style, resulting in elimination of features that characterize the property. The Delray Beach Historic Preservation Design Guidelines note the following regarding architectural styles:

Delray Beach Historic Preservation Design Guidelines

SECTION IV. PREVALENT STYLES OF ARCHITECTURE

INTRODUCTION

Cities and towns across America are characterized by the types and design of the buildings constructed for each place. Climate and environment, traditions, available building materials, newly developed technology and current fashion heavily influence the choice and types for regional designs.

In Delray Beach, building forms were largely a result of environmental concerns. For example, to protect residents from storms and animals, foundations were raised off the ground. Because of the durability and ready availability of Dade County Pine, many homes were built with wood frame construction. Roof overhangs and porches provided relief from the rain and sun, and gable ends allowed the space for ventilation.

The city of Delray Beach has a number of recognizable architectural styles that define its character and create its identity. As time progresses, so do the designs for both residential and commercial buildings. One of the ways that progress may be defined is through the identification of the most popular building types during the period.

ABOUT ARCHITECTURAL STYLE

There are two principal components that must be considered together when defining an architectural style. The first is the form the building takes, beginning with its plan shape (the outline of its footprint) and structural character. Form is comprised of the interrelationship between proportion, scale, height, depth and width.

Decoration or ornamentation is the second component that gives definition to any particular architectural style, and is usually non-structural in nature. Materials that have been crafted, tooled or formed beyond the need for structure or enclosure are considered to be ornamentation. Typical examples are bargeboards, attic vents, railings, cast concrete shields and medallions, chimney caps and metal grilles.

Delray Beach has a wealth of architectural styles that span decades. The most common types are described in the following pages.

With respect to Standard 9 & 10, the subject proposal includes construction of a new front porch addition and alteration of the front facade. There is concern with this alteration as **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.** Further, Standard 10 states that **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 proposal alters the materials that characterize the property, and the new work is not compatible with the architectural features of the existing structure. The new front porch addition and alteration of the front façade are not designed in a manner that if removed in the future that the essential form and integrity of the structure would be unimpaired.

The requirements of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation are applied to properties within historic districts, both contributing and non-contributing. As presented, the proposal does not meet these requirements.

Pursuant to LDR Section 4.5.1(E)(7) - Visual Compatibility Standards: new construction and all improvements to both contributing and noncontributing buildings, structures and appurtenances thereto within a designated historic district or on an individually designated property shall be visually compatible. In addition to the Zoning District Regulations, the Historic Preservation Board shall apply the visual compatibility standards provided for in this Section with regard to height, width, mass, scale, façade, openings, rhythm, material, color, texture, roof shape, direction, and other criteria set forth elsewhere in Section 4.5.1. Visual compatibility for minor and major development as referenced in Section 4.5.1(E)(2) shall be determined by utilizing criteria contained in (a)-(m) below.

- a. **Height:** The height of proposed buildings or modifications shall be visually compatible in comparison or relation to the height of existing structures and buildings in a historic district for all major and minor development. For major development, visual compatibility with respect to the height of residential structures, as defined by 4.5.1(E)(2)(a), shall also be determined through application of the Building Height Plane.
- b. **Front Facade Proportion:** The front facade of each building or structure shall be visually compatible with and be in direct relationship to the width of the building and to the height of the front elevation of other existing structures and buildings within the subject historic district.
- c. **Proportion of Openings (Windows and Doors):** The openings of any building within a historic district shall be visually compatible with the openings exemplified by prevailing historic architectural styles of similar buildings within the district. The relationship of the width of windows and doors to the height of windows and doors among buildings shall be visually compatible within the subject historic district.
- d. **Rhythm of Solids to Voids:** The relationship of solids to voids of a building or structure shall be visually compatible with existing historic buildings or structures within the subject historic district for all development, with particular attention paid to the front facades.
- e. **Rhythm of Buildings on Streets:** The relationship of buildings to open space between them and adjoining buildings shall be visually compatible with the relationship between existing historic buildings or structures within the subject historic district.
- f. **Rhythm of Entrance and/or Porch Projections:** The relationship of entrances and porch projections to the sidewalks of a building shall be visually compatible with existing architectural styles of entrances and porch projections on existing historic buildings and structures within the subject historic district for all development.
- g. **Relationship of Materials, Texture, and Color:** The relationship of materials, texture, and color of the facade of a building and/or hardscaping shall be visually compatible with the predominant materials used in the historic buildings and structures within the subject historic district.
- h. **Roof Shapes:** The roof shape, including type and slope, of a building or structure shall be visually compatible with the roof shape of existing historic buildings or structures within the subject historic district. The roof shape shall be consistent with the architectural style of the building.
- i. **Walls of Continuity:** Walls, fences, evergreen landscape masses, or building facades, shall form cohesive walls of enclosure along a street to ensure visual compatibility with historic buildings or structures within the subject historic district and the structure to which it is visually related.
- j. **Scale of a Building:** The size of a building and the building mass in relation to open spaces, windows, door openings, balconies, porches, and lot size shall be visually compatible with the building size and mass of historic buildings and structures within a historic district for

all development. To determine whether the scale of a building is appropriate, the following shall apply for major development only:

- a. For buildings wider than sixty percent (60%) of the lot width, a portion of the front façade must be setback a minimum of seven (7) additional feet from the front setback line:
- b. For buildings deeper than fifty percent (50%) of the lot depth, a portion of each side façade, which is greater than one story high, must be setback a minimum of five (5) additional feet from the side setback line:
- k. **Directional Expression of Front Elevation:** A building shall be visually compatible with the buildings, structures, and sites within a historic district for all development with regard to its directional character, whether vertical or horizontal.
- l. **Architectural Style:** All major and minor development shall consist of only one (1) architectural style per structure or property and not introduce elements definitive of another style.
- m. **Additions to individually designated properties and contributing structures in all historic districts:** Visual compatibility shall be accomplished as follows:
 1. Additions shall be located to the rear or least public side of a building and be as inconspicuous as possible.
 2. Additions or accessory structures shall not be located in front of the established front wall plane of a historic building.
 3. Characteristic features of the original building shall not be destroyed or obscured.
 4. Additions shall be designed and constructed so that the basic form and character of the historic building will remain intact if the addition is ever removed.
 5. Additions shall not introduce a new architectural style, mimic too closely the style of the existing building nor replicate the original design but shall be coherent in design with the existing building.
 6. Additions shall be secondary and subordinate to the main mass of the historic building and shall not overwhelm the original building.

With regards to **Architectural style**. The LDRs state that **all major and minor development shall consist of only one architectural style per structure or property and not introduce elements definitive of another style.**

The existing style of the structure is Ranch and the architect has proposed changing the style to Minimal Traditional.

Delray Beach Historic Preservation Design Guidelines

Ranch (1935–1975)

General Characteristics:



- Plan shape: irregular
- Building material: frame; masonry
- Exterior surface treatment: wood cladding; stucco
- Roof type: low-pitched hip or gable
- Height: one story
- Window type: awning; fixed; jalousie
- Other:
 - Attached one- or two-bay garage carport on front façade
 - Horizontal design emphasis
 - Concrete tile or shingle roof covering

The Ranch style originated in the mid-1930s and gained popularity in the 1940s, eventually becoming the dominant style throughout the country during the 50s and 60s. The popularity of “rambling” Ranch houses were made possible by the country’s increasing dependence on the automobile. As the

automobile replaced streetcars and buses as the principal means of personal transportation in the decades following World War II, compact houses could be replaced by sprawling designs on much larger lots. Never before had it been possible to be so lavish with land, and the rambling form of the Ranch style home emphasized this by maximizing façade width, and in some instances were increased by built-in garages. Although, according to the Delray Beach Historic Preservation Guidelines, along with Ranch style, Minimal Traditional is also one of the prominent architectural styles used throughout the district.

Delray Beach Historic Preservation Design Guidelines

Minimal Traditional (1935–1950)



General Characteristics:

- Plan shape: symmetrical
- Building material: frame; masonry
- Exterior surface treatment: clapboard; stucco; sometimes with a partial facing of stone/rock/brick
- Roof type: low-pitched gable
- Height: one story
- Window type: wood frame sash; metal fixed; awning
- Other
 - Front-facing gable
 - Garage bay attached to the residence
 - Eaves are close, no overhangs
 - Roof material: shingles; concrete tile
 - Details: Vents in gable end; shutters; cornerboards.

The Minimal Traditional style was a style that was designed to be simple, economical, and able to be mass produced. Such houses had little ornamentation and were an economical form of construction that gained popularity during the Great Depression and World War II as they were able to be constructed quickly, providing housing for many veterans returning from the war. The lack of architectural ornamentation was deliberate in that it decreased the time and cost of production and oftentimes these types of homes “kit homes”. Their small size equaled affordability.

There is major concern with changing a Ranch style structure to a “Minimal Traditional” style.

- First, the sheer size of the existing Ranch structures façade does not equate to the Minimal Traditional style, as a Minimal Traditional structure would not have a sprawling façade.
- Second, the two new low opposing gables on the front façade including the new front porch addition are not characteristic in the Minimal Traditional style. The new gable introduce exposed beams that are more stylistic of the Bungalow style.
- Additionally, and most importantly, elimination of the Ranch style on this non-contributor, (which qualifies to be reclassified as a contributing structure), will exclude the structure from being part of the historic fabric of the Del-Ida Park Historic District. While the investment being made to upgrade the home is a positive for the district, the fabric of the district is being altered. If a similar structure were proposed as new construction in the district, HPB would need to consider if the style is appropriate for the district and if it would contribute to the longevity of the district. There would be hope that the new structure would be looked at in 50 years as a potential contributing structure. Alteration of the subject structures’ façade makes the building vulnerable to demolition in the future. The homeowners and architect have an opportunity to make modifications to the structure that fit in with the Ranch style, ensuring the structure can be classified as a contributing with the Historic Resource Survey that is in process.
- Finally, modification of the style of the structure does not meet the requirements of this code section as the proposal **introduces elements definitive of another style**. Blending of two different styles, and the alteration of an original architectural style to be converted into a

completely different style is not an appropriate nor authentic method of preservation or rehabilitation. Should the request be approved, the structure will be of a style that is not definable and obvious that it was modified from its original style.

Therefore, the introduction of a new architectural style to this Ranch style structure is not an appropriate alteration of a potential contributing structure located within a historic district.

Proportion of Openings (Windows and Doors): The openings of any building within a historic district shall be visually compatible with the openings exemplified by prevailing historic architectural styles of similar buildings within the district. The relationship of the width of windows and doors to the height of windows and doors among buildings shall be visually compatible within the subject historic district.

Proposed windows will be white aluminum framed. The existing façade includes the use of awning style windows to be replaced with single hung, casement, and horizontal sliders. It is noted that according to the Delray Beach Historic Preservation Guidelines, horizontal sliding windows are not permitted within an historic district without approval from the Historic Preservation Board.

While the proposed window modifications on the front façade are compatible with openings exemplified by other historic styles within the Del-Ida Park Historic District. However, they are not compatible with the existing style (or proposed style) of the structure. The existing Ranch style structure has windows on the front façade that are slightly off-set from center of the front opposing gable roof. This is a design feature that would have been typical of a mid-century Ranch style home. The proposal alters these windows to double-hung windows, which are stylistic of a Minimal Traditional style home, but their offset placement is not characteristic of the simple Minimal Traditional style. Windows on a façade of a Minimal Traditional style structure that had an opposing gable would have been centered on the gable. Further, the relocation of the original front door represents a modification of the structure that eliminates the Ranch style of the structure. The proposal does not meet the intent of this code requirement.

Directional Expression of Front Elevation: A building shall be visually compatible with the buildings, structures, and sites within a historic district for all development with regard to its directional character, whether vertical or horizontal.

An open-air carport on the west side of the structure is proposed to be enclosed as a two-car garage. Carports and garages are typically seen on Ranch style structures. As the carport faces the public right-of-way, the orientation of the two-car garage is appropriate to the setting of the structure's original character, as well as the overall historic streetscape as front facing garages exist throughout the district. The proposed front porch addition with its opposing gable roof and beam style of design is not indicative of the directional character of structures within the district.

With respect to the **Rhythm of entrance and porch projections**, the existing front door which is located on the north side facing wall is being reoriented to the front. As the Ranch and Minimal Traditional styles were known for their asymmetrical designs, it is normal to see a front entry off centered. Although front facing entrances are not uncommon with these styles, **the cutting of new entrances on a primary façade is not a recommended** practice of historic preservation.

The proposal also includes modification of the front façade by adding a new front porch addition with a gable roof that includes beam detailing. There is an existing recessed front porch that exists within the roofline of the façade. This porch is proposed to be modified to bring the porch forward of the existing façade. Further, a variance has been requested to allow this porch to encroach into the required front setback. A matching roof design is also proposed to replace the existing façade facing gable. As noted below, the **Secretary of the Interiors Guidelines for Rehabilitation** states that it is not recommended

to remove or substantially change entrances and porches, which are important in defining the overall historic character of the building so that, as a result, the character is diminished. It is important to note that both Ranch and Minimal Traditional architectural styles focused on the simplicity of design but in different ways. Typical porches seen on each were both modest and lacked any ornamentation. The existing entrance and porch are being modified which significantly alters the existing Ranch style character of the structure. The guidelines listed below are a tool that both preservationists and design professionals can refer to for guidance. The recommended approach is that architectural features be preserved rather than altered to ensure the defining characteristics of a building are not diminished. The proposed entrance and porch alteration is not considered an appropriate alteration to the structure nor a potential contributing structure.

Pursuant to “The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, & Reconstructing Historic Buildings” (Guidelines) – Entrances and Porches:

ENTRANCES AND PORCHES

RECOMMENDED

Identifying, retaining, and preserving entrances and porches and their functional and decorative features that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building. The materials themselves (including masonry, wood, and metal) are significant, as are their features, such as doors, transoms, pilasters, columns, balustrades, stairs, roofs, and projecting canopies.

NOT RECOMMENDED

Removing or substantially changing entrances and porches which are important in defining the overall historic character of the building so that, as a result, the character is diminished.

Cutting new entrances on a primary façade.

Altering utilitarian or service entrances so they compete visually with the historic primary entrance; increasing their size so that they appear significantly more important; or adding decorative details that cannot be documented to the building or are incompatible with the building’s historic character.

Regarding the visual compatibility requirement for the **Relationship of Materials, Texture, and Color**, There is brick surrounding a portion of the front façade under the existing covered porch that is proposed to be removed. The brick is an original defining feature of the structure. A stucco finish exists on the remaining portion of the structure. The one-story addition in the rear is to be constructed of concrete block with painted stucco to match the existing structure. There is an existing patio to the rear of the residence that is being removed to accommodate the new addition. The proposed colors of the residence will be light cream walls with light blue accents to match the existing structure. All doors, window frames, fascia, and columns to be white.

Regarding the visual compatibility requirement for **Roofs: The roof shape, including type and slope, of a building or structure shall be visually compatible with the roof shape of existing historic buildings or structures within the subject historic district. The roof shape shall be consistent with the architectural style of the building** - the request includes the construction of a one-story addition to be added to the rear of the existing residence, a redesigned front facing gable roof, and a front porch addition with an opposing front facing gable. The roof of the rear addition is proposed two feet higher than the existing structure.

It is noted that low pitched roofs are features typically seen on both Ranch and Minimal Traditional style structures. The new front gables also introduce a beam detail that is more indicative of the Bungalow or Craftsman Cottage style. There is concern with the new roof elements as they introduce conjectural

features which are not an appropriate practice of historic preservation. The main concern is with the new front porch as this element modifies the existing Ranch architectural style of the structure, to what the architect is describing as Minimal Traditional. This element is not typically seen in the Minimal Traditional architectural style.

The proposal also includes a new standing seam metal roof to replace the existing asphalt shingle roof. According to building permit records, when originally constructed in 1969 the structure had a cement tile roof. Building permit records indicate that the cement tile roof was replaced in 1988 with cement tile and was later changed to an asphalt shingle roof. The asphalt shingle roof was widely utilized in the mid-2000's during the economic downturn as homeowners sought out affordable roofing options and asphalt shingle roofs began to replace cement tile roofs throughout the area at an alarming rate. The concern with the use of asphalt shingle material on a concrete block Ranch style structure is that it appears lighter than the existing construction. Although, it is a material that is documented as being utilized in such structures. The cement tile roof material has a prominence to it, as it appeared appropriate for block structures with large roof expanses. While there has been much debate over the use of metal roofing within the 5 Delray Beach historic districts, it is a material that is documented as being utilized on appropriate structures in Delray Beach, both in standing seam and shingle styles.

Ideally, utilizing a cement tile roof in the proposal would return historic integrity to the structure, but the board could consider approving the standing seam metal roof. Should the metal roof be approved, it would need to be in a mill finish.

Pursuant to “The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, & Reconstructing Historic Buildings” (Guidelines) – Roofs:

ROOFS	
RECOMMENDED	NOT RECOMMENDED
<p><i>Identifying, retaining, and preserving</i> roofs and their functional and decorative features that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building. The form of the roof (gable, hipped, gambrel, flat, or mansard) is significant, as are its decorative and functional features (such as cupolas, cresting, parapets, monitors, chimneys, weather vanes, dormers, ridge tiles, and snow guards), roofing material (such as slate, wood, clay tile, metal, roll roofing, or asphalt shingles), and size, color, and patterning.</p>	<p>Removing or substantially changing roofs which are important in defining the overall historic character of the building so that, as a result, the character is diminished.</p> <p>Removing a major portion of the historic roof or roofing material that is repairable, then rebuilding it with new material to achieve a more uniform or “improved” appearance.</p> <p>Changing the configuration or shape of a roof by adding highly visible new features (such as dormer windows, vents, skylights, or a penthouse).</p> <p>Stripping the roof of sound historic material, such as slate, clay tile, wood, or metal.</p>

Finally, if the subject property is reclassified as a contributing resource, the proposed improvements would not be compatible with any of the requirements of the below code section – **Additions to contributing structures**. However, as the structure is a non-contributor as it exists today, these standards are not applied. They are provided below as a reference.

- m. **Additions to individually designated properties and contributing structures in all historic districts: Visual compatibility shall be accomplished as follows:**
1. **Additions shall be located to the rear or least public side of a building and be as inconspicuous as possible.**
 2. **Additions or accessory structures shall not be located in front of the established front wall plane of a historic building.**
 3. **Characteristic features of the original building shall not be destroyed or obscured.**
 4. **Additions shall be designed and constructed so that the basic form and character of the historic building will remain intact if the addition is ever removed.**
 5. **Additions shall not introduce a new architectural style, mimic too closely the style of the existing building nor replicate the original design but shall be coherent in design with the existing building.**
 6. **Additions shall be secondary and subordinate to the main mass of the historic building and shall not overwhelm the original building.**

Overall, the proposal is not consistent with the requirements of this code section.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Pursuant to the Historic Preservation Element (HPE), Objective 1.4, Historic Preservation Planning: Implement appropriate and compatible design and planning strategies for historic sites and properties within historic districts.

The objective shall be met through continued adherence to the City's Historic Preservation Ordinance and, where applicable, to architectural design guidelines through the following policies:

HPE Policy 1.4.1

Continue to require that the Historic Preservation Board make findings that any land use or development application for a historic structure, site or within a historic district, is consistent with the provisions of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, the Land Development Regulations, and Delray Beach Historic Preservation Design Guidelines.

The development proposal involves the construction of a front porch addition, a one-story addition to the rear of the existing one-story residence, and enclosure of the existing carport to a two-car garage. A swimming pool is proposed to the rear of the property. The Historic Preservation Board is required to make findings that the proposal is consistent with the requirements noted above.

As documented in this report the proposal is not consistent with the provisions of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, the LDRs, nor the Delray Beach Historic Preservation Design Guidelines. With respect to the adjacent land uses, the single-family residence is in an area surrounded by single-family residential uses.

VARIANCE ANALYSIS

The applicant has requested a variance to the setback requirements, which is summarized below:

Pursuant to Section 4.4.3(K), required side setbacks within the R-1-AA District are 10'.

A variance to allow a porch to encroach 3'- 10 ½" into the front setback.

Pursuant to LDR Section 2.2.6(D), the Historic Preservation Board (HPB) shall act on all variance requests within an historic district, or on a historic site, which otherwise would be acted upon by the Board of Adjustment.

Pursuant to LDR Section 2.4.7(A)(6) - Alternative Findings of the Historic Preservation Board: The Board may be guided by the following to make findings as an alternative to the variance standard criteria:

(a) That a variance is necessary to maintain the historic character of property and demonstrating that the granting of the variance would not be contrary to the public interest, safety, or welfare.

Staff Analysis

The variance is not necessary to maintain the historic character of the property, in fact, the variance will facilitate modification of the historic character of the front façade. The request is not anticipated to be contrary to the public interest, safety, or welfare.

(b) That special conditions and circumstances exist, because of the historic setting, location, nature, or character of the land, structure, appurtenance, sign, or building involved, which are not applicable to other lands, structures, appurtenances, signs, or buildings in the same zoning district, which have not been designated as historic sites or a historic district nor listed on the Local Register of Historic Places.

Staff Analysis

The structure as it exists today conforms to the front setback requirements. There are no special conditions nor circumstances which exist. The proposal involves construction of a new front porch feature which will encroach into the required front setback.

(c) That literal interpretation of the provisions of existing ordinances would alter the historic character of the historic district, or historic site to such an extent that it would not be feasible to preserve the historic character of the historic district or historic site.

Staff Analysis

The proposal involves construction of a new front porch that will alter the existing character of the structure. It is feasible to preserve the historic character of the site and district through improvements that do not alter the façade; thus, literal interpretation of the existing ordinances could be adhered to.

(d) That the variance requested will not significantly diminish the historic character of a historic site or of a historic district.

Staff Analysis

The requested variance is anticipated to significantly diminish the historic character of the historic site and the historic district in that it represents a modification of the front façade of the structure and will change the architectural style of the structure from Ranch to another style.

(e) That the requested variance is necessary to accommodate an appropriate adaptive reuse of a historic building, structure, or site.

Staff Analysis

The requested variance would allow for the modernization of the site, but as a recessed front porch already exists it is difficult to demonstrate that the variance is necessary to accommodate an appropriate adaptive reuse of the structure. Ample space exists in the rear of the property, which can accommodate a new addition.

The property owner has submitted justification statements for the request (attached).

Note: As required by the LDRs, a notice regarding the subject variance request was sent to those property owners located within a 500' radius of the subject property.

OPTIONAL BOARD MOTIONS FOR ACTION ITEMS

- A. Move to continue with direction
- B. Approve Certificate of Appropriateness and Variance (2020-208), requests for the property located at **18 NE 7th Street, Del-Ida Park 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 and Variance (2020-208), requests for the property located at **18 NE 7th Street, Del-Ida Park 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:

Site Plan Technical Items:

- D. Deny Certificate of Appropriateness and Variance (2020-208), requests for the property located at **18 NE 7th Street, Del-Ida Park 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

☒ Courtesy Notices were provided to the following, at least 5 working days prior to the meeting:

Del-Ida Park Neighborhood Association

☒ Public notice mailers were sent to all properties within a 500' radius of the subject property on (12/3/20)

☒ Agenda was posted on (12/9/20), 5 working days prior to meeting.