HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD

MINUTES • JUNE 1, 2016

OPENING SESSION
- Jeffery Thompson, 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 MAY 4, 2016 MINUTES

Lucie Ghioto MOVED to approve the Minutes of the May 4, 2016 meeting. Mark Lewis SECONDED the motion, which was voted upon and PASSED by unanimous voice vote (5-0).

CONSENT AGENDA

1. Case No.: HPB2016-00088, 813 E. Livingston Street

   Applicant: Kelly Carr, KLC Designs, Inc., 2929 Alamo Dr., Orlando, FL 32805
   Owner: Tracy de la Feuilliez and Ted Gorman, 813 E. Livingston St., Orlando, FL 32803
   District: Lake Eola Historic District (Commission District 4)

   The applicant is requesting a Major Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a new rear porch with the roof to match existing shingles and cement board siding. All soffit and trim details to match existing.

   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. All materials shall generally match the existing house.

   Lucie Ghioto moved to APPROVE the Consent Agenda. Mark Lewis SECONDED the motion, which was voted upon and PASSED by unanimous voice vote (5-0).


   Revised 6/6/2016
REGULAR AGENDA

2. Case No.: HPB2016-00086, 123 W. Church Street

   Applicant: Gustavo Fonseca, 8865 Commodity Circle, Unit 13, Office 107, Orlando, FL 32819
   Owner: Richard Galilto, TSLF Church Street Retail, 30 Federal Street, Boston, MA 02110
   District: Downtown Historic District (Commission District 5)

The applicant is requesting a Major Certificate of Appropriateness to make alterations to the façade by installing columns similar to the neighboring property, replacing the existing awning; replacing the wainscot tile; adding operable doors and adding signage.

   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. Proposed doors shall have dimensional exterior muntins to simulate true divided lights.
   3. Final paint colors shall require additional Minor Review.
   4. Final tile selection shall require additional Minor Review.
   5. Proposed signage will require additional Minor Review.

Richard Forbes, Historic Preservation Officer, introduced the case with a PowerPoint presentation that included current site and historic images, Sanborn map images, and proposed floor plans, elevations, signage, and canopy options. Known as the Teele Building, this structure was built c.1920 and is a contributing structure in the Downtown Historic District. The original four bay storefront was altered over time to accommodate various tenants including major alterations in the 1970s, as part of the Church Street Station Complex. These alterations included installation of the wrought iron and metal canopy, which was removed in 2003 and replaced in 2008.

Dena Wild asked Staff why a non-functioning balustrade is proposed. Mr. Forbes clarified that the balustrade is decorative and designed to line up with neighboring properties. Chair Jeffery Thompson stated that a building of this height would not have had such a high balustrade. Mr. Thompson also commented about the transparency of the storefront windows and suggested mullions in the transom windows.

Michael Lingerfelt, 7896 St. Andrews Circle, Orlando, FL 32835, spoke as the architect on behalf of the applicant. He stated that the balustrade was proposed to add cohesiveness to the Church Street plaza area and that the depth of the canopy adds shade for the windows below. He is open to simplifying the pickets of the balustrade, however, the medallions are a part of the tenants' identity.

The Board continued discussions concerning the balustrade’s height obstructing the parapet detail, mullions in the transom windows, and signage. It was questioned if the medallions with a logo feature will count as signage, as architectural elements do not count towards signage. Because the medallions are new, they will count towards the allotted signage, however, because the structure is zoned in a Major Attraction Overlay, there is a higher allowance. The Board also discussed the fact that this structure has been altered from its original design and that the balustrade may be removed in the future. Mark Lewis supported the design as shown and does not think the balustrade obstructs the parapet.

Mark Lewis moved to APPROVE the request subject to Staff Conditions. Vilay Marajia SECONDED the Motion. The Motion was voted upon and PASSED by a 4-3 Voice Vote (Ghioto, Thompson, and Wild opposed).

3. Case No.: HPB2016-00093, 125 W. Church Street

   Applicant: G. Douglas Lanoce, TSLF Church Street Retail, LLC, 30 Federal Street, Boston, MA 02210
   Owner: G. Douglas Lanoce, TSLF Church Street Retail, LLC, 30 Federal Street, Boston, MA 02210
   District: Downtown Historic District (Commission District 5)

The applicant is requesting a Major Certificate of Appropriateness to renovate the façade by installing operable doors and redesigning the entrance bay with swinging French wood and aluminum clad doors with sidelights.
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. All new material and existing material to have finishes matching as closely as possible.
3. New door panels shall align with existing antique framing.
4. The bottom rail of the new entry doors and operable door panels shall be the same height as the existing entry door bottom rail.
5. Entry doors and operable door panels shall have a dimensional muntin pattern to be similar or compatible to the upper floor of the building.

Richard Forbes, Historic Preservation Officer, introduced the case with a PowerPoint presentation that included site images of the existing conditions, historic photographs, proposed elevations and floor plans, and images of the surrounding buildings. The structure was built in 1922 and is a contributing structure in the Downtown Historic District. It was renovated in the 1970s as part of the Church Street Station entertainment complex. The antique 19th century cast iron columns and railings were installed on the face of the building at that time. The storefront system which consists of antique stained glass transoms, carved wood columns, and plate glass, were also installed in the 1970s. In 2003 some of non-original railings were replaced and in 2008 the decorative railings were reintroduced.

Dena Wild asked Staff if the proposed windows will be operable; Mr. Forbes stated that they all will be bi-fold windows and that the entry doors will fold back.

Aranya Mom, 201 S. Orange Ave, Orlando, FL 32801, spoke as the applicant’s representative. He stated that the tenant, Ceviche, aims to improve safety, enhance their atmosphere, and define the patio area. They desire to include the plate glass look in the bi-fold doors, which is becoming more popular in the restaurant business. They are not in agreement with Condition 5. They commented that the current bars are transparent plate glass. They aimed to align the folding patterns of the doors with the muntins of the transom windows. He exhibited examples of other bi-fold doors.

The Board discussed the proposed plate glass windows and Staff’s Condition of muntins. Sean Lackey understands the applicant’s desire for the clean glass look and feels this building lost its historic design expression when it was stripped down in the 1970s and non-original details were added. Dena Wild agreed that some of the current architectural features were not original and likes the simplicity, as it nods to the original appearance. Jeffery Thompson agreed with Staff’s condition, as plain glass will look too modern. Lucie Ghiozzi stated that though these features are not original encouraging consistency with the neighboring buildings is important. The Board further discussed Condition 5 with the focus on the phrasing of “similar or compatible”. This yields various patterns and a compromise could be achieved.

Lucie Ghiozzi moved to APPROVE the request subject to Staff Conditions. Jeffery Thompson SECONDED the Motion. The Motion was voted upon and PASSED by a 5-2 Voice Vote (Lackey and Wild opposed).

4. Case No.: HPB2016-00087, 210 Annie Street

Applicant: David Stone, Phil Kean Design Group, 912 W. Fairbanks Ave., Winter Park, FL 32789
Owner: Tommy Barraza, PO Box 140882, Orlando, FL 32814
District: Lake Copeland Historic District (Commission District 4)

The applicant is requesting a Major Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a new 2-story single family residence consisting of 2298 living square footage.

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. Chimney feature shall be the same material as the house walls.
3. Add additional fenestration to the blank east wall of the second floor bedroom.
4. Change the three east side window shades to a single continuous shade.
5. Provide additional details to provide texture such as wider, larger parapet cap, additional window muntins, arched opening, scupper details. Review and approval by Minor Review Committee will be required.

6. Horizontal windows on the south side shall be altered to appear more vertical by either redesigning the façade or adding additional vertical divisions to these windows.

7. Windows shall the same inset on both the first and second floor and muntins shall be exterior and dimensional and simulate true divided light windows.

Richard Forbes, Historic Preservation Officer, introduced the case with a PowerPoint presentation that included current site photographs of the empty lot, site survey, and proposed elevations. The site has historically been vacant and a portion of the lot has been sold off, making the lot less than the required depth. The applicant met with the Design Review Committee on February 24, 2016 and presented three designs. The owner prefers a modern style and Staff has suggested the applicant use the architecture of Irving Gill (1870-1936) as a reference for a modern and simple interpretation of the Mediterranean or Spanish Colonial Style. Mr. Forbes showed images of the surrounding structures which includes a mix of styles from the 1920s to 1950s including Mediterranean Revival, Colonial Revival, Bungalow, and Prairie.

Sean Lackey asked Mr. Forbes if there are examples of flat roofs throughout the historic districts. Mr. Forbes stated there are some and that Staff recommends more texture such as a larger parapet cap. Dena Wild inquired if the Lake Copeland Historic District has standards for design. Mr. Forbes stated that the code follows the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for new construction. Evaluation of new construction styles are set in Section 62.706, which states that new construction may be influenced by, but not duplicate historic styles and that if a historic style influences new construction, that style must already exist or have existed in Orlando. There are some modern houses within the historic districts that share some of the attributes of Gill’s style. The Board expressed concerns about the compatibility of this modern style. Mr. Forbes stated that the style is just one of the elements taken into consideration when assessing compatibility.

David Stone, 912 Fairbanks Ave, Winter Park, 32789, spoke on behalf of the applicant, Phil Kean Design Group. He exhibited examples of Irving Gill’s designs. He is comfortable with Staff Conditions and provided updated elevations incorporating these conditions. Mr. Stone stated that the owner wanted a completely modern house and has been working with Staff and the Design Review Committee to find a modern interpretation of a historic style. The scuppers on the front elevation will be mostly decorative to avoid rain stains on the front of the house. The Board discussed maintenance concerns of a flat roof. The applicant agrees and stated that the owner will need to maintain regularly.

There were no other public speakers. The Board continued discussion on the appropriateness of the modern style. The Board agrees that additional details may alleviate the modern appearance. Michael Arrington stated that the windows have too modern of an appearance. He feels that the Board should be cautious as approval may set a precedence by allowing modern designs in the historic districts. The Board discussed the options of sending the case back to Design Review, the full HPB, or to Minor Review to determine the additional details.

Luci Ghiloto moved to APPROVE the request subject to Staff Conditions. Michael Arrington SECONDED the Motion. The Motion was voted upon and PASSED by a 6-1 Voice Vote (Lackey opposed).

Dena Wild asked the applicant to understand the Historic Preservation Board is charged with determining the appropriateness of new construction in the historic districts. She complimented the design but didn’t find it appropriate for a historic district.

5. Case No.: HPB2016-00099, 700 E. Colonial Drive

Applicant: Randy Rolfsen, PPG Architectural Finishes, INC., 400 Bertha Lamme Drive, Cranberry, PA 16066
Owner: Dr. Phillips Inc., P.O. Box 692709, Orlando, Fl 32869
District: Historic Landmark Sign (Commission District 4)

The applicant is requesting a Major Certificate of Appropriateness to alter the historic sign by adding new vinyl signage over a portion of the historic sign.

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. Existing sign shall not be painted or damaged under area of vinyl wrap.

Richard Forbes, Historic Preservation Officer, introduced the case with a PowerPoint presentation that included pictures of the
Landmark Sign and of the proposed alterations. Citrus Fruit Products, Inc. (now Dr. Phillips, Inc.) designed the building for tenant Porter Paints in 1954. It was designed by local architect, L. Alex Hatton in the International Style. The sign's overall structure and graphics are integral components of the overall design. The sign is the only known sign of its type in the City. The Porter Paints sign was designation a Landmark Sign in 1995. Mr. Forbes explained the difference between the Landmark and Landmark Sign ordinances. The Landmark Sign ordinance protects historic signs that no longer conform to the Land Development Code yet promote the City’s commercial history. Per the Code, alterations to Landmark Signs require a Certificate of Appropriateness; however the code does not prohibit the owner from removing the Landmark Sign. The alteration to this sign will change the look of the Landmark, however the vinyl wrap could be removed in the future, which is allowed by the standards of the Landmark Sign code. If the owner of the property removed the sign entirely, then no new signage would be allowed above the roof line.

The owner and applicant were not present and there were no public comments.

Chair Jeffery Thompson asked if the sign would retain its Landmark Sign status if it were altered. Mr. Forbes stated that it would because alterations, if approved, are allowed by the Landmark Sign Code. Mr. Forbes stated that the owner contacted Staff and expressed concern over the alterations and removal of the Landmark Sign status. Jeffery Thompson added that this case began in Minor Review and, as a committee member, felt that it was more appropriate for a full Board review. The Board's overall assessment of the design was unfavorable. The Board discussed several alternative designs including; only covering the Porter Paint text with the PPG blue logo or; not completely wrapping around the top of the sign; or removing the Porter Paints text and adding the PPG text, retaining the historic stripes. Mr. Forbes stated that he has made alternative design suggestions to the applicant and they were not inclined to change their design. There were concerns about the appearance straight on concerning the thin section of the panels having two colors. They discussed the possible removal of the sign from the Landmark Sign list. Dena Wild commented that the Porter Paints sign may have "lived its life" and if they applicant was going to cover it up then perhaps it would be better to remove it from the status altogether and disallow any future signage above the building roof line and simply let the pylon be an architectural element. The Board discussed the Applicant’s desire to have their new logo on the building. Despite Porter Paints has been on the building for over 60 years, Lucie Ghito feels that this is an important identifier of the building. The Landmark Signage does not count towards the businesses' allowable signage.

Dena Wild moved to DENY the request. Lucie Ghito SECONDED the motion. The Motion was voted upon and PASSED by an unanimous voice vote (7-0).

OTHER BUSINESS

- General Appearances: There were no General Appearances.
- Historic Preservation Officer, Richard Forbes reported on the May Minor Reviews (23 reviews)

ADJOURNMENT

Jeffery Thompson, Chairperson, adjourned the meeting at 6:00 p.m.

STAFF PRESENT

Kyle Shephard, Assistant City Attorney  
Jason Burton, City Planning  
Heather Bonds, Recording Secretary  
Richard Forbes, Historic Preservation Officer