

**CITY OF HOLLYWOOD, FLORIDA
DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
DIVISION OF PLANNING AND URBAN DESIGN**

DATE: July 9, 2024 **FILE:** 24-CV-33

TO: Historic Preservation Board

VIA: Anand Balram, Planning Manager

FROM: Joseph A. Colón, Planner II

SUBJECT: Certificate of Appropriateness for Design and Variance seeking relief from Article 4, Section 4.1.C of the Zoning and Land Development Regulations to maintain a legally nonconforming side yard setback for an addition to a single-family home in the Lakes Area Historic Multiple Resource Listing District.

APPLICANT'S REQUEST

Certificate of Appropriateness for Design: for façade alterations to a single-family home located at 1519 Madison Street within the Lakes Area Historic Multiple Resource Listing District.

Variance: To request relief from **Article 4, Section 4.1.C** to extend a house along the established building line within a legally non-conforming side yard setback of 5'4" whereas 7'6" is required.

STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION

Certificate of Appropriateness for Design: **Approved, With Conditions:**

1. Revise the building design for cohesive architectural character with contributing building elements, including awnings, and/or architectural treatments such as paint and faux treatments, scoring, construction joints.
2. Decrease the roof height and/or pitch to align with the neighborhood's architectural style.

Variance: **Approved.**

BACKGROUND

The existing one-story home was constructed in 1949, based on Broward County records, on an approximately 0.22-acre lot located at 1519 Madison Street. A building permit search does not reveal how the original home was constructed; therefore, the staff will rely on submitted existing plans as a basis which shows that the house was built on two lots with one garage access through the alley. The house

was originally built with three bedrooms, two bathrooms, living room, dining rooms, and a kitchen. This house has not had major alterations as shown by the permit history since 2000.

The current façade of the structure does not exhibit unique architectural styles or elements recognized in the Historic District guidelines. The existing structure exhibits some elements of “Post War Modern Ranch Style” architectural characteristics. The Design Guidelines for Historic Properties states that *Post War Modern homes were erected in mass to house a wave of new residents*. This style popular with builders, was relatively inexpensive and used simple materials with none of the traditional detailing.

REQUEST

The Applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for Design for exterior renovations and an addition facing the rear yard to an existing single-family home. The applicant’s renovations include new windows and doors, elevating the finished floor height of the structure by approximately 2 feet and 4 inches per FEMA requirements., and a new driveway in the rear yard to the alley. The renovations will increase the main structure’s height from 11 ft. 2 in. to 22 ft. 9 in. while reducing the structure’s fenestration from 29% (144 ft.² / 494 ft.² front existing elevation façade) to 17% (127 ft.² / 741 ft.² front proposed elevation façade) on the Madison Street front façade. The entrance location is proposed to remain in its existing location accessed by a new 4-step porch that opens to a newly renovated interior floor plan including 4 bedrooms and 4 bathrooms.

The proposed 422 square feet addition within the rear yard will include a new bathroom, walk-in-closet, and a 207 square foot covered lanai. Overall, the proposed exterior renovations will change the existing architectural unity and offers architectural and site elements that enhance the facade of the home.

BOARD REVIEW

Certificate of Appropriateness

Pursuant to **Article 5, Section 5.5.E.** and **Section 5.5.F.1.**, a certificate of appropriateness is required for alterations and physical modifications to buildings within a historic district. The Historic Preservation Board (HPB) is further guided by the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and the City of Hollywood’s *Design Guidelines for Historic Properties and Districts*. These documents offer design controls for materials, scale, massing, and location for all properties within the district.

Variance

Pursuant to **Article 4, Section 4.1.C.**, lists the interior side yard requirement as follows: “*The sum of the side yard setbacks shall be at least 25% of the lot width, but not to exceed 50 ft. with no side yard less than 7.5 ft.*” The subject site is 70 ft. in width, which when applying the subject regulation, results in aggregate requirement of 17.5 ft., which can be distributed in whichever manner as long as the additional requirement of minimum of 7.5 ft. for each side yard is met. However the existing site maintains a 5 ft. setback in the west interior side yard and a 5 ft. and 4 in. setback in the east interior side yard, which therefore establishes the property’s nonconformity as per **Article 3, Section 3.12.E**. Due to the aforementioned nonconforming status, the variance is ineligible for administrative approval and is being brought before the HPB for a determination pursuant to **Article 5, Section 5.5.J**.

SITE BACKGROUND

Applicant/Owner: Brian Abraham
Address/Location: 1519 Madison Street
Size of Property: 9,555 square feet (0.22 acres)
Present Zoning: Single-Family Residential (RS-6)
Lakes Area Multiple Resource Listing District (HMPRLD-1)

Present Land Use: Low Residential (LRES)
Present Use of Land: Single Family
Year Built: 1949 (Broward County Property Appraiser)

ADJACENT ZONING

North: Single-Family Residential District (RS-6)
Lakes Area Multiple Resource Listing District (HMPRLD-1)
South: Single-Family Residential District (RS-6)
Lakes Area Multiple Resource Listing District (HMPRLD-1)
East: Single-Family Residential District (RS-6)
Lakes Area Multiple Resource Listing District (HMPRLD-1)
West: Single-Family Residential District (RS-6)
Lakes Area Multiple Resource Listing District (HMPRLD-1)

CONSISTENCY WITH THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Within the Comprehensive Plan, the primary goal of the Land Use Element is to *promote a distribution of land uses that will enhance and improve the residential, business, resort and natural communities while allowing the land owners to maximize the use of their property.*

The proposal does not contemplate a change in land use. The proposed design is compatible with the adjacent properties and surrounding area. Furthermore, through the proposed exterior improvements the City is accomplishing the desired reinvestment in the Lakes Area Historic Multiple Resource Listing District.

CONSISTENCY WITH THE CITY-WIDE MASTER PLAN

The City-Wide Master Plan (CWMP) places a priority on protecting, preserving and enhancing residential neighborhoods. It addresses the need for strict design controls to maintain the individual character of each neighborhood. The proposed improvements are sensitive to the character of the Historic Lakes Section through its design which is similar to existing structures in the surrounding neighborhood.

Policy 2.46: *Preserve stable neighborhoods and encourage rehabilitation initiatives that will revitalize and promote stability of neighborhoods.*

Policy CW.15: *Place a priority on protecting, preserving and enhancing residential neighborhoods.*

The CWMP also states *the single-family character of the area should be preserved and enhanced through strict zoning code enforcement, traffic calming and streetscape improvements.* The project may have an impact on the current streetscape, both in positive and negative directions.

CONSISTENCY WITH THE HOLLYWOOD LAKES NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN

The Hollywood Lakes Neighborhood Plan seeks to maintain and preserve the character and integrity of the existing residential community by protecting historical areas. It also seeks to eliminate the encroachment of negative residential uses.

The existing one-story home was constructed in 1949 and it does not represent any distinct historic architectural features, and it is not a prime example of any specific Period of Significance as indicated by the Design Guidelines for Historic Properties and Districts. The most evident period the existing structure exhibits is that of the “Post War Modern Ranch Style” architectural characteristics as described by *The Design Guidelines for Historic Properties*. Therefore, the proposed improvements will not adversely affect the integrity of the Historic District.

APPLICABLE CRITERIA

Analysis of criteria and finding for Certificate of Appropriateness of Design as stated in the City of Hollywood’s Zoning and Land Development Regulations, Article 5.

CRITERION: INTEGRITY OF LOCATION

ANALYSIS: One of the Basic Principles of the Design Guidelines recommends *to repair rather than replace, always try first to repair deteriorated features.* The intent of the Applicant is to completely renovate the existing structure, installing new doors, windows, doors, and driveway, elevating the building, and adding an addition facing the rear yard maintaining the insufficient interior side yard setback. The staff does not find that the proposed renovations constitute a full replacement. The items replaced are not repairable and in it of itself does not hold historic significance nor do those elements individually contribute to the house’s overall historic significance. Therefore, while there are significant proposed renovations, the staff does not find the proposal to be in conflict with the intent of the criterion.

FINDING: **Consistent.**

CRITERION: DESIGN

ANALYSIS: The Historic District Design Guidelines recommends alterations and rehabilitation to retain building features and landscape. The proposed alterations, as described above, in total do affect the main character of the house; in addition, there are existing awnings

over the windows that are being removed with no plan for contemporary or complimenting alternatives to replace them. The staff recognizes that the house is not a prime example of any specific Period of Significance, but the most evident period the existing structure exhibits is that of the "Post War Modern Ranch Style". However, the applicant's renovations do not propose any actualization of the Modern Ranch style, a contemporary style that is complimentary to the Historic District, or a sensible fusion of the two. The renovations and site alterations include desirable enhancements and while not deleterious in it of itself, as proposed these do not directly work to create a cohesive and better-defined architectural style in light of the district's historical context. Accordingly, staff has provided conditions to recommendation that would allow the applicant to improve the proposed design to have more consistency with the historical district standards, namely altering the roof pitch and including contributing elements such as awnings.

FINDING: **Consistent.**

CRITERION: SETTING

ANALYSIS: The Historic District Design Guidelines states that *a setting is the relationship of buildings within the Historic District and the surrounding site and neighborhood...the landscape features around a building are often important aspects of its character and the district in which it is located.* The proposed façade renovations, building expansion, and new driveway demonstrate the compatibility between the existing home and site internally, as the proposed redevelopment plan. However, the proposed redevelopment and addition would constitute a 25% increase to the overall building size from the existing size (620 ft.² / 2,415 ft.²), resulting in a total size of 20% of the proposed building (3,004 ft.²) which the staff considers a minor expansion and does not materially alter the character or setting of the house as it is in the rear. Additionally, the 11.9% reduction in building fenestration and lack of retaining distinctive features that distinguish a district or installing new ones are either conditions that are additionally minor or can be improved upon further consultation with staff. In regard to the 103% increase in a building height and roof style, a key element that would otherwise contribute to the property's historic nature, the staff finds that the proposal could disrupt the aforementioned relationship and the compatibility of the home within the Lakes Historic District and surrounding homes, but is a conditionable factor that can be ameliorated. Lastly, a contributing reason for the elevating of the building are FEMA requirements, which staff recognizes as affecting the setting of all properties in this area and it is condition outside the applicant's control.

FINDING: **Consistent.**

CRITERION: MATERIALS

ANALYSIS: Design Guidelines state materials are an important part of the fabric of any historic district or property and help to maintain the historic character of the place. Furthermore, materials are compatible in quality, color, texture, finish, and dimension to those that are

in the historic district should be used. The applicant proposes to maintain the concrete tile roofing and smooth masonry façade finish; the only change is the color, from a light, cream yellow to white. The proposal includes installing two-pane windows similar to exists (though the staff does not know the material of existing or proposed trims) and similar garage door design. Barring working out the details, the proposed improvements utilize a neutral color palette and natural elements that enhance and maintain the character of the place.

FINDING: **Consistent.**

CRITERION: WORKMANSHIP

ANALYSIS: The Design Guidelines recommend consideration of significant materials before undergoing rehabilitation of a historic structure or property. Materials of the improvements are consistent with the existing structure and are sensitive in design and nature to the home and adjacent properties. The design of the proposed exterior renovations for the single-family home is consistent with current workmanship styles and methods.

FINDING: **Consistent.**

CRITERION: ASSOCIATION

ANALYSIS: Design Guidelines recommend maintaining *consistent spacing and setbacks ... Within the context of historic preservation, elements of design such as massing, scale and rhythm reflect architectural style as well as the richness of the historic district.* The proposal meets the ZLDRs applicable requirements, and despite the requested variance maintains the existing non-conforming side yard setback. The proposed alterations, exclusive of the new roof height, does not substantially change the scale and massing of the house with regards to the adjacent neighborhood. Staff notes the proposed roof design does create an inconsistency with neighboring properties exists and should been designed to have a more complete strategy, as further outlined in the recommended conditions of approval. This project affects the streetscape elements by improving the landscape and site elements but hasn't demonstrated the positive impacts of the building design for the existing residence and the neighbors, though the design of the proposed structure could be further ameliorated to meet the intent of this criterion.

FINDING: **Consistent.**

Analysis of criteria and finding for Variances as stated in the City of Hollywood's Zoning and Land Development Regulations, Article 5.

VARIANCE: To request relief from **Article 4, Section 4.1.C** to extend a house along the established building line within a legally non-conforming side yard setback of 5'4" whereas 7'6" is required.

CRITERION 1: *That the requested Variance maintains the basic intent and purpose of the subject regulations, particularly as it affects the stability and appearance of the city.*

ANALYSIS: The *Zoning District Intents & Purposes* as listed **Article 4, Section 4.1** for the R-6 District is as follows: "These districts are designed to protect the character of the single-family neighborhoods." The applicant is proposing to renovate the existing single-family structure on the subject site and maintain the use of the low-density residential use. Article 4, Section 4.1.C. lists the interior side yard requirement as follows: "*The sum of the side yard setbacks shall be at least 25% of the lot width, but not to exceed 50 ft. with no side yard less than 7.5 ft.*" The subject site is 70 ft. in width, which when applying the subject regulation, results in aggregate requirement of 17.5 ft., which is 8.25 ft. for each interior side yard lot line and a minimum of 7.5 ft.; however, the existing site maintains a 5 ft. setback in the West interior side yard and a 5 ft. and 4 in. setback in the East interior side yard, which therefore sets the standard as per **Article 3, Section 3.12**. Therefore the applicant meets this criterion as it relates to zoning. As it relates to the *Design Guidelines for Historic Properties and Districts*, in the section above, the staff finds that the proposal is consistent with these guidelines.

FINDING: **Consistent.**

CRITERION 2: *That the requested Variance is otherwise compatible with the surrounding land uses and would not be detrimental to the community.*

ANALYSIS: The requested variance will permit a new addition to a renovated structure to maintain the established insufficient setback from the main structure. The subject site is surrounded by single-family residential on all sides except the front frontage, which faces Jefferson Park. The proposed addition would constitute a 25% increase to the overall building size from the existing size (620 ft.² / 2,415 ft.²), resulting in a total size of 20% of the proposed building (3,004 ft.²). This addition will be overall subservient to the overall proposed building design, particularly in tandem with the newly installed roof and since the existing building already maintains the proposed insufficient side yard setback. These are conditions and uses that readily exist in the neighborhood, and the staff finds the requested variance is compatible with the surrounding land uses and would not be detrimental to the community.

FINDING: **Consistent.**

CRITERION 3: *That the requested Variance is consistent with and in furtherance of the Goals, Objectives, and Policies of the adopted Comprehensive Plan, as amended from time to time, the applicable Neighborhood Plan and all other similar plans adopted by the city.*

ANALYSIS: The requested variance would allow the Applicant to enhance the property and structure. This would promote the Comprehensive Plan Section VI., Objective 4 policy to “ Promote improved architectural and streetscape design standards, code enforcement, economic development, neighborhood planning, and public information dissemination to maintain and enhance neighborhoods, businesses, and tourist areas.” An auxiliary effect of granting the variance would in effect enhance the historic neighborhood and with proper scaling, materiality, and historic preservation guidance.

FINDING: **Consistent.**

CRITERION 4: *That the need for the requested Variance is not economically based or self-imposed.*

FINDING: The requested variance is initiated by the applicant’s stated intent to redevelop the property to improve the property. The applicant can continue with the renovation to meet these aforementioned standards without adding the addition that extends the insufficient interior side lot line deficiency. However, a large portion of the reason is to raise the structure to meet FEMA and base flood elevation standards, which is not solely economically based or self-imposed. Additionally, the insufficient interior side yard setback is not established by the addition, as the applicant is within the appropriate buildable area boundaries, but by the existing structure since the applicant’s application is ineligible for an administrative variance due to also being reviewed for a Certificate of Appropriateness. Therefore, staff acknowledges that there are other contributing factors fueling the need for the requested Variance beyond just economically based or self-imposed factors.

FINDING: **Consistent.**

CRITERION 5: *That the Variance is necessary to comply with State or Federal Law and is the minimum Variance necessary to comply with the applicable law.*

FINDING: The applicant has not conveyed any applicable law the proposed addition will help them comply with. Conversely, the staff is not aware of any law that would satisfy this criterion. Therefore at this time, this criterion is non-applicable to this waiver request.

FINDING: **NON-Applicable.**

ATTACHMENTS

ATTACHMENT A: Application Package
ATTACHMENT B: Aerial Photograph