Historic Preservation Board

Minutes – October 7, 2015

Opening Session

- Dena Wild, Chairperson, called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.
- Determination of a quorum. Pledge of Allegiance. Introduction of Board Members and staff.

Consideration of the September 2, 2015 Minutes

Jeffery Thompson moved to approve the Minutes of the September 2, 2015 meeting. Michael Arrington seconded the motion, which was voted upon and passed by unanimous voice vote (8-0).

Regular Agenda

1. Case No.: HPB2015-00149, 100 E. Central Blvd.

Applicant: Ryan Davis, 100 E. Central Blvd, LLC, Orlando, FL 32802

Owner: Robert J. Benson, Central Holding, LLC, 100 E. Central Blvd, Orlando, FL 32779

District: Downtown Historic District (Commission District 5)

The applicant is requesting a Major Certificate of Appropriateness to modify the corner entrance area, add additional openings enclosed with roll up glass doors on the west and north façade and add a bi-fold door system to north facade.

Recommended Action: Approval of the request subject to staff conditions of approval as follows:

1. All changes to this proposal shall be reviewed and approved by HPB Minor Review Committee prior to permitting.
2. Align bottom rail of proposed operable door systems with existing water table on west façade.
3. All glass in proposed doors, transoms and sidelights shall be non-reflective, clear and un-tinted.
4. Front entry door shall have a high bottom rail consistent with historic commercial entry doors.
5. Proposed plans, as submitted, contain a number of errors and final plans shall require additional review.
6. Recommend using a folding style door system on all three openings.

Richard Forbes, Historic Preservation Officer, introduced the proposal with a PowerPoint presentation with images of site maps, site photos, Sanborn map, proposed elevations, and historic photos of the building and the building’s namesake Dr. McEwan. Known as the McEwan Clinic, the building was constructed in 1911 as a two story building and the third floor was added in 1913. It is a contributing structure in the Downtown Historic
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District. The ground floor was altered in 1950 for commercial use. The north ground floor façade and the northern portion of the west facing ground floor have been altered the most significantly. The building underwent a substantial renovation in 1983 using Federal Tax Credits. Mr. Forbes explained this proposal and Staff Conditions.

Jeffery Thompson asked what the rollup doors will look like when they are opened. Mr. Forbes said it will be open and a track will be visible. He also explained there are some graphic inconsistencies in the plans. Mr. Thompson also inquired if the original brick is behind the current stucco near the entrance. Mr. Forbes stated that the brick was removed during the 1950 renovation and believes that any infill needed to complete this project will be stucco.

Ryan Davis, 2171 Poinsettia Dr., Longwood Fl, 32779, spoke as the applicant and owner of the first floor business. He prefers the rollup style door to get the glass out of the way while patrons are dancing or drinking alcohol. He stated that someone recently went through the current glass window. He also stated that he is agreeable to infilling with brick if the Board preferred the brick over stucco. Mr. Davis also cited examples of other Downtown establishments utilizing the rollup style door. He also explained the reason he did not want the bi-fold style doors is because they take up space and patrons could potentially run into them which could result in accidents or insurance issues.

Mark Lewis stated that the brick infill would be an enhancement and the Board agreed. Jeffery Thompson asked if the image presented with the "mock up" would be the look of the rollup doors; Mr. Davis confirmed and stated that he used these doors at the Harry Buffalo site. He explained that the doors would be a panel systems which can able him to replicate the look of multi-pane windows. Lucie Ghio asked about screening the track system of the rollup doors; Mr. Davis explained that they could "stack up" into the interior and would not be visible from the exterior.

The Board discussed how the rollup doors would look when they are down and stressed the importance that whether the doors are the bi-fold style or the rollup style that they look like a traditional window system when they are down. Mr. Forbes stated that the example Mr. Davis used on Wall Street was a repair shop and historically had a rollup style door where this building was historically a medical clinic and would not have had this style door. He also stated that the other example Mr. Davis used is a non-contributing structure and closed onto a knee wall. Sean Lackey asked if Mr. Forbes considered this an irreversible project. Mr. Forbes did not take that Historic Preservation standard into consideration because the original storefront and entrances were already altered and removed by previous businesses. Dena Wild asked if the awnings would be affected by the rollup doors; Mr. Forbes clarified that the doors would roll up into the building and the awning would not be affected.

Jeffery Thompson moved to APPROVE the Request subject to Staff Conditions and to allow the rollup style door and add Condition 7. All masonry elements remaining after the doors are installed shall be treated with brick. Mark Lewis SECONDED the Motion. The Motion was voted upon and PASSED by a Unanimous Voice Vote (8-0).

2. Case No.: HPB2015-00166, 121 Kennison Dr.

   Applicant: Richard Barrette, 924 Brentwood Dr., Apopka, FL 32717
   Owner: Vanessa Siefke, 121 Kennison Dr., Orlando, FL 32801
   District: Lake Lawsona Historic District (Commission District 4)

The applicant is requesting a Major Certificate of Appropriateness to construct an addition to the rear of the house, construct a 900 sq. ft. second floor addition, demolish the existing one story garage and construct a two story garage with apartment above.

   Recommended Action: Approval of the request subject to staff conditions of approval as follows:

1. All changes to this proposal shall be reviewed and approved by HPB Minor Review Committee prior to permitting.
2. Reduce size of upper story addition so as to move the mass of the proposed addition further to the rear in line with the east wall of the dining room bay.
3. Ganged windows shall have a minimum 8 inch wide intermediate jamb between them.
4. Provide additional windows on both floors of the north façade of the proposed house addition.
5. Provide additional windows or detail on the north façade of the proposed garage so that the façade is not blank.
6. Provide a pair of ganged windows on the street facing, west façade, second floor of the proposed garage.
7. Provide a carriage style garage door.
8. New windows shall match the existing in style, trim, material, installation and pattern.
9. Roof on addition, proposed garage and existing house shall match.
10. Recommend pulling the front door forward to be in line with existing plane of living room wall.
12. Waive the 180 day waiting period for the garage demolition (However, per Section 65.732, the applicant must receive a building permit for the new development prior to receiving a demolition permit.)

Richard Forbes, Historic Preservation Officer, introduced the proposal with a PowerPoint presentation with images of site maps, site photos, 1956 Sanborn map, map of living square footage and gross square footage of structures in the Lake Lawsona Historic District, existing site survey, existing site plan, proposed elevations, and proposed floor plans. The house is a one story bungalow which is a contributing structure with a one story garage in the Lake Lawsona Historic District. A second story addition to a one-story contributing structure is not typically recommended and Staff stated that the reason an approval is recommend is because there is no alternative due to a lack of room to expand to the rear. The small site only allows a five foot deep extension to the rear. Typically, only a one-story addition is recommended to a one-story structure. The garage will require a variance because the proposed two-story garage apartment will only be five feet from the rear lot line where fifteen is required. He stated that the 2-story garage apartment is proposed to be narrow and be minimally perceived from the street. Mr. Forbes is more concerned with the second story addition because it will have a large impact on the original architecture and overall massing. He proposed that the second floor addition be pushed back from the front façade to minimize the impact of the addition. He also stated that the inline addition, because it does not meet the side yard setback to the South, may need a Modification of Standards. Mr. Forbes reviewed Staff Conditions.

Jeffery Thompson asked about the setbacks of overhangs between structures. Mr. Forbes clarified that it is currently five feet “clear to the sky”. Jason Burton added that a new Land Development Code will require the walls of a main structure and a two-story accessory structure be 10 feet from wall to wall. Mr. Thompson stated that the proposed plans show that the overhangs are proposed to be four feet from one another, not meeting the current “five feet clear to the sky” standard. Mr. Thompson added that the Board should remain consistent to previous cases that they required this standard. Sean Lackey asked Mr. Forbes if his recommendation, that the roof and proposed garage materials shall match, include fascia and other roof details. Mr. Forbes clarified that his recommendation is only for the material, as the Applicant does not make it clear if the proposed 5V-crimped metal roof of the garage apartment is also to be added to the main structure. Mr. Lackey also asked if they can push their proposal of the second floor addition to the back without reducing the size of the second floor addition. Mr. Forbes stated they can not, because there is only 5 feet available to the rear for an addition, which they are using. Because there is only 5-feet, the bulk of the addition is proposed as a second story. Mr. Forbes reiterated that this is not preferred for a one-story structure. The Board also discussed opening the screen porch, which Mr. Forbes stated is not proposed in this application. The lot size, garage setback, front door, porch elements, cantilevering the second floor to the rear, and visual impact were also discussed. Mr. Thompson inquired about how many other two-story buildings are on this block face; using the 1956 Sanborn map, Mr. Forbes illustrated the 1, 1 ½, and two-story main structures on the block face.

Chairperson Dena Wild read two letters into the record:
- David Garstka, 122 S. Lawsona Blvd, Orlando, FL 32801, is a neighbor and supports the project
- John and Lynn Puder, 116 Kennison Drive, Orlando, FL 32801, is a neighbor and supports the project

Richard Barrette, 924 Brentwood Drive, Apopka, FL 32712, spoke as the applicant and architect of the project. He reviewed each of Staff’s conditions with his comments. He is in agreement with most of the comments. He stated that owner would like to eliminate the screen porch, which the Board supports though it is not proposed in this project. He also stated that he will be altering the plans by closing the rear balcony due to a neighbor’s request. He disagrees with Staff’s recommendation of pushing the second floor back. He also disagrees that pushing the second floor back over the gable peak of the “pop out” will enhance this architectural feature as he thinks it will diminish this feature. The Board discussed fascia sizes, the front elevation, garage apartment, and ceiling heights of the garage with the applicant.

Herbert Hill, 127 Kennison Drive, Orlando, FL 32801, is a neighbor. He is in favor of improvements to this site however he stated that the second story is too large. He is concerned that the large eaves may dump rainwater onto his property, as there is a narrow space between the subject house and his property. He also objects to the second story balcony currently proposed as it will look directly into his yard. He also stated that because his house will be mostly impacted by the addition, he is not in favor of any variances.

Vanessa Seifcak, 121 Kennison Drive, Orlando, FL 32801, is the owner of the property. She stated the reason for this addition is that her mother and her sister are moving in and they need the extra space. She can agree to enclose the rear balcony. The Board continued discussion of the proposal. There was an agreement that the massing created by the second story
addition will significantly change the architectural character of the house and not adhere to the historic development pattern of the block face. The Board also discussed flipping the addition so that the gable of the pop out will remain intact, ways to decrease the need for a variance, and pushing the massing to the rear of house. Because of the various options, the Board discussed recommending a Design Review Committee meeting to determine the best option.

Jeffery Thompson moved to DEFER the Request until the November meeting and to require the applicant meet with the Design Review Committee. Michael Arrington SECONDED the Motion. The Motion was voted upon and PASSED by a Unanimous Voice Vote (8-0).

Catherine Price left the meeting at 5:35

3. Case No.: HPB2015-000147, 28 N. Brown Avenue, Orlando, FL 32803

Applicant: Danny Gaughan, 10814 Arrowtree Blvd, Clermont, FL 34715
Owner: Eddy Workinger, 244 Blue Branch St, Eustis, FL 32736
District: Lake Lawsona Historic District (Commission District 4)

The applicant is requesting a Major Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish the existing non-contributing structure and construct a new 2566 square foot, two story Craftsman style residence with detached one story two car garage.

Recommended Action: Approval of the request subject to staff conditions of approval as follows:

1. All changes to this proposal shall be reviewed and approved by HPB Minor Review Committee prior to permitting.
2. Windows shall be similar in style to historic wood windows, have dimensional, exterior muntins and paired windows shall have a minimum 8 inch intermediate jamb between them.
3. Windows shall be inset the same and similar to historic properties on both the first and second floor.
4. Window trim shall be similar to contributing structures in the district.
5. Front façade and ground floor north façade windows shall be taller (5 feet) as shown on upper floor side elevations so as to have the correct proportion.
6. Align south façade second floor bedroom window with the living room window on the first floor.
7. Cement board siding shall be smooth finish so as to be similar to historic siding in the district.
8. Waive the 180 day waiting period for demolition (However, per Section 65.732, the applicant must receive a building permit for the new development prior to receiving a demolition permit.)

Richard Forbes, Historic Preservation Officer, introduced the case with a PowerPoint presentation that included a site map, site photos, Sanborn Map, existing and proposed site plan, and proposed elevation and plans. Mr. Forbes reviewed the case, which came before the Board last month and was deferred. The applicant has addressed issues discussed at the September HPB meeting and has reflected these changes in the revised plans.

Sean Lackey expressed concern that the 4:12 pitch may be too shallow for this style. Mr. Forbes stated that this pitch is fairly consistent for a Prairie style home with Craftsman details. He provided examples of other similar style homes with the 4:12 and 5:12 roof pitch. Mr. Forbes stated that anything steeper would be inappropriate. Mr. Lackey also inquired if there is frieze board proposed or if just the clapboard goes up to the top. This proposal does not include a frieze. Mr. Forbes indicated the various examples of exposed eaves and rafters, frieze boards, and structures without a frieze or soffit.

Danny Gaughan, 10814 Arrowtree Blvd, Clermont, FL 34715, is the applicant. He stated that he prefers 4-foot high windows on the second story on the front façade, as opposed to the recommended 5-foot high vertical orientation. Sean Lackey asked if the windows would appear inconsistent and awkward if they do not match the other second floor windows on the side façades. Mr. Lackey also questioned the windows on the first floor and stated that an 8-foot head height from the finished floor would provide a better visual impact as they would not be blocked by the front porch railings. Mr. Lackey also asked if the Applicant would consider adding a frieze board. The Applicant said he is open to a frieze board. The Board continued discussion on the roof pitch and windows.

Sean Lackey moved to APPROVE the Request subject to Staff Conditions with the additional Condition 9. Add a frieze to the
second floor of the main house. And Condition 10. All first floor windows be raised to eight feet to the top of the window from the finish floor. Jeffery Thompson SECONDED the Motion. The Motion was voted upon and PASSED by a Unanimous Voice Vote (7-0).

OTHER BUSINESS

- General Appearances: There were no general appearances.
- Richard Forbes reviewed the Minor Reviews issued for the month of September.
- Mr. Forbes reminded the Board that elections for Chair and Vice-Chair will be taking place next month.

ADJOURNMENT

Dena Wild, Chairperson, adjourned the meeting at 5:50 p.m.
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