



Historic Preservation Board Regular Meeting Minutes

April 9, 2025 at 9:00 AM

City Hall Commission Chambers
401 S. Park Avenue

Present

John Skolfield, Kelsey Wolfe, Lee Rambeau, Kim Burst Wood, Aimee Spencer, Wade Miller

Absent

Fay Pappas

Staff Present

Director of Planning and Zoning Allison McGillis, Planner II Nicholas Lewis, Administrative Coordinator Mary Bush

1. Call to Order

Chairman Miller called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m.

2. Consent Agenda

- a. Approve the minutes of the March 12, 2025 regular meeting.

Motion made by John Skolfield, seconded by Kelsey Wolfe, to approve the March 12, 2025 meeting minutes.

The motion carried unanimously by a 5-0 vote. (N. Lee Rambeau was not present for approval of the minutes. Fay Pappas was absent from the meeting.)

3. Public Comments (for items not on the agenda): Three minutes allowed for each speaker

No one from the public wished to speak. The public hearing was closed.

4. Public Hearings (Public participation and comment on these matters must be in person.)

- a. HDA 25-02 Request by Wieck Gilson Denis to individually designate their home at 1303 Canterbury Road, built in 1951, zoned R-1A, as a historic resource.

Mrs. McGillis provided a summary of the item. She noted that the property is situated in the Orwin Manor neighborhood and was constructed in 1951. She described the home as a representative example of mid-century modern architecture, citing its low-pitched roof, horizontal lines, and restrained ornamentation as key characteristics. She also

pointed out the unique round brick fenestration and corner bank windows as defining features of the home's design. She then emphasized that the home's designation would help preserve the original scale and character of homes from the 1950s within the neighborhood.

Staff recommendation was for approval.

The Board expressed recognition of the architectural and historical significance of the property and their overall support for the designation. The consensus among the Board was that the home appropriately fits the criteria for historic designation and represents an important architectural period worthy of preservation.

No one from the public wished to speak. The public hearing was closed.

Motion made by Wade Miller, seconded by Aimee Spencer, to individually designate the home at 1303 Canterbury Road, built in 1951, zoned R-1A, as a historic resource.

The motion carried by a 5-0 vote. (N. Lee Rambeau was not present for voting on the item. Fay Pappas was absent from the meeting.)

- b. COR 25-01 Request by Barefoot Brothers Construction to demolish the existing one-story home at 747 McIntyre Avenue (zoned R-2), which is a 'contributing' structure within the College Quarter Historic District in order to subdivide the property into two 52-foot-wide lots and build two single-family homes, one on each of the newly created lots.

Mrs. McGillis provided a summary of the item. She noted that the 107-foot-wide lot would be split into two 52-foot-wide lots, with an additional three feet being added to the adjacent property at 767 McIntyre Avenue to slightly enlarge its side yard. The two proposed single-family homes would meet all zoning and design guidelines applicable to the R-2 zoning district and the College Quarter neighborhood. She added that they both appear as a one-story in the front and then larger in the rear, with an addition in the back with rear entry garages. While Mrs. McGillis acknowledged the proposed homes were very similar in appearance, she clarified that the current hearing was limited to the demolition and lot split, not approval of the new home designs.

Staff recommendation was for approval, with the following condition:

- that the new homes come back to the Board for a separate certificate of review approval.

The applicant, Ron Scarpa, at 767 McIntyre Avenue, Winter Park, FL 32789 addressed

the Board. He emphasized the efforts made to inform and consult with nearby property owners, noting that several adjacent and nearby neighbors were in favor of the demolition and redevelopment plan, including those immediately to the north and south of the property. Mr. Scarpa also stressed the design team's efforts to incorporate feedback from the previous meeting and requested guidance from the Board on how to further differentiate the two new homes for the next review.

The Board expressed general support for the demolition and lot split, citing several reasons. The Board also noted that the existing home did not merit preservation, indicating that it was poorly built, with additions and a low, slab-on-grade structure that is vulnerable to flooding. The Board appreciated the applicant's communication with the community and commended his track record of constructing attractive, historically respectful homes. However, they emphasized the need for the new homes to feature clearly distinct designs—not just mirrored versions with minor variations.

The applicant's architect, Gary Hancock proposed making one of the homes a two-story Spanish Colonial-style house with traditional elements such as arches and a tile roof, while maintaining modest proportions and low overall height. He indicated that he would want to make the ceiling heights 9 feet 4 inches on the first floor and 8 feet 4 inches on the second floor while keeping the total building height under 30 feet. Board members were receptive to this idea, indicating they would support such variation and style, as long as it preserved the character and scale of the neighborhood.

The Board heard public comment from the following resident who was in favor of the request:

Margie Bridges at 767 Antonette Avenue, Winter Park, FL 32789.

No one else wished to speak. The public hearing was closed.

In conclusion, the Board voiced approval for the demolition and lot split, subject to the applicant returning for a full review and approval of the architectural designs of the proposed homes. There was broad consensus that more architectural differentiation was needed, and the Board expressed interest in seeing distinct styles, such as the proposed Spanish Colonial, to ensure the new homes contribute positively to the historic character of the district.

Motion made by John Skolfield, seconded by N. Lee Rambeau to demolish the existing one-story home at 747 McIntyre Avenue (zoned R-2), which is a 'contributing' structure within the College Quarter Historic District in order to subdivide the property into two 52-foot-wide lots and build two single-family homes, one on each of the newly created lots, with the following

condition:

- **that the new homes come back to the Board for a separate certificate of review approval.**

The motion carried by a 6-0 vote. (Fay Pappas was absent from the meeting.)

- c. COR 25-02 Request by Marty Sullivan and Maura Smith to amend the Certificate of Review granted in April 2023 for 901 Georgia Avenue, zoned R-1A, to build a 737-square foot addition to the existing detached garage for an accessory dwelling unit, inclusive of setback variances in the rear of the lot.

Mrs. McGillis provided a summary of the item. She noted that the request was to amend the certificate of approval granted in April 2023 for an accessory dwelling unit (ADU) at 901 Georgia Avenue. The amendment involved a change in the layout of the planned addition to the existing detached garage, with modifications that slightly altered the size and configuration of the ADU. Notably, the newly proposed depth of the addition expands the required setback variance from 22 feet to 32 feet. Although the porch area was reduced, the total square footage of the ADU increased from 672 to 737 square feet due to the extended length of the addition. Mrs. McGillis noted that in the original plans there was a parking space proposed along the rear property line with a walkway to the ADU, which has been removed and replaced with a dry retention pond. She then noted that although the applicant's new rear neighbors expressed a preference that the ADU not be used as a rental unit, the applicant emphasized they did not wish to impose such a limitation, even though they had no plans to rent it. She also clarified that the architectural elements and design remained consistent with the previously approved plan, aside from minor adjustments like window sizes and the addition of a copper roof over the ADU entrance.

Staff recommendation was for approval.

The Board heard public comment from the following residents:

In favor of the request:

Margie Bridges at 767 Antonette Avenue, Winter Park, FL 32789.

Opposed to the request:

Gigi Papa at 1440 Hibiscus Avenue, Winter Park, FL 32789; and Donna Leuck at 635 Dunblane Drive, Winter Park, FL 32789.

No one else wished to speak. The public hearing was closed.

Board discussion then ensued, which addressed broader community concerns surrounding ADUs, especially in relation to short-term rentals. It was emphasized that short-term rentals (30 days or less) are not allowed under Winter Park regulations and that such violations are subject to code enforcement, regardless of whether the unit is a primary residence or an ADU. Board members affirmed that R-2 zoning allows for ADUs, and enforcement mechanisms and increased property taxes from improvements like ADUs help offset any associated administrative burden. The discussion also briefly touched on perceptions of conflict of interest due to the applicant being a City Commissioner. Board member N. Lee Rambeau, who had been appointed by the Commissioner, voluntarily recused herself from the vote to avoid any ethical concerns. Other Board members expressed that the applicant's identity held no bearing on their decision-making, as the focus was solely on the structure and its historical and architectural context. In closing, the Board strongly voiced ongoing support for ADUs and their historical aspects, while noting their added benefit as a tool for promoting housing diversity and affordability within Winter Park.

Motion made by Aimee Spencer, seconded by John Skolfield to amend the Certificate of Review granted in April 2023 for 901 Georgia Avenue, zoned R-1A, to build a 737-square foot addition to the existing detached garage for an accessory dwelling unit, inclusive of setback variances in the rear of the lot.

The motion carried by a 5-0 vote. (N. Lee Rambeau recused herself from voting on the item. Fay Pappas was absent from the meeting.)

- d. Request of the City of Winter Park for: An Ordinance amending Article VIII Historic Preservation of Chapter 58 of the Land Development code concerning the process and procedures for Certificates of Review subject to the public notice and public hearing process, penalties for unauthorized demolitions or significant alterations to historic structures.

Mrs. McGillis provided a detailed update on the proposed revisions to the Historic Preservation Ordinance. She explained that after the Historic Preservation Board previously recommended changes to the ordinance, the matter was brought before the City Commission. However, the City Commission tabled the item, requesting broader public input through a community meeting, which was held on February 20, 2025. Based on the feedback gathered during that community meeting, staff developed two revised versions of the ordinance to address concerns, particularly around the clarity of the language and the severity of penalties for unauthorized alterations or demolitions of historic structures.

Version one responds to concerns about punitive measures by removing the monetary

contribution penalty for violations. However, it still retains the authority to revoke variances previously granted to a property and to require property owners to reconstruct any structures that were altered or demolished without proper approval, restoring them to their original appearance. In contrast, version two keeps all three enforcement tools: revocation of variances, mandatory reconstruction, and the monetary contribution penalty. The financial penalty remains in the same form as previously approved by the Board, capped at 30% of the structure's assessed value according to the Orange County Property Appraiser.

Despite the difference in penalties, both versions of the ordinance share several key provisions aimed at improving process efficiency and transparency. Both versions streamline the application and review process by allowing minor requests to undergo a combined preliminary and final review in a single hearing, reducing the number of public hearings from three to two. The intent is to simplify the process while still ensuring thorough oversight. For larger or more complex projects, a separate preliminary and final review process remains available. Both versions also require that final construction plans undergo a follow-up review to confirm consistency with what was approved by the Historic Preservation Board. If any discrepancies are found, the applicant must return to the Board for re-approval.

The ordinance revisions also include efforts to clarify the submission requirements for a certificate of review. Applicants must now provide more complete documentation in their initial submissions—for example, explicitly identifying materials like wood siding—so that the Board can make informed decisions without needing a third round of review. Additional clarifications were made regarding minor changes that do not require Board approval, such as replacing a front door with a new door of the same design. These changes can be approved administratively by staff unless the alteration involves a more significant design shift or broader changes to the structure.

Another clarification added to both versions addresses the replacement of demolished non-contributing structures in historic districts. The revised ordinance stipulates that any new construction must be compatible with and reflect the architectural style of the surrounding district, thereby maintaining the historic character of the neighborhood.

Lastly, Mrs. McGillis noted that there was a third option available: to take no action and retain the ordinance in its current form.

The Board then discussed challenges, solutions, and strategies for improving the process for historic preservation projects. A key issue discussed was the need for clear communication to homeowners and builders that any deviations from the certificate of review (COR) would result in the revocation of variances and potentially require the return of a structure to its original state. To ensure transparency, it was suggested that this warning be included in the application and building permit packets. This approach would help avoid subjective or reactive decisions at board meetings and make the rules understood upfront, to help prevent individuals from attempting to bypass regulations with financial penalties. The Board and staff also discussed the problematic practice of receiving incomplete or unclear plans, referred to as "napkin sketches," and the goal of

moving away from such informal submissions was emphasized. The Board proposed requiring complete working drawings to be submitted for review to ensure compliance with the design guidelines. Both version one and version two of the updated ordinance aim to structure this more clearly, with version one emphasizing revocation of variances in extreme cases, while version two focuses on penalties that allow for correction without requiring the loss of variances.

The Board heard public comment from the following residents:

In favor of the request:

Suzanne Brandon at 318 Vitoria Avenue, Winter Park, FL 32789.

Did not confirm their favor of or opposition to the request:

Betsy Owens at 656 Park Avenue, Winter Park, FL 32789; Ron Scarpa at 767 McIntyre Avenue, Winter Park, FL 32789; Rhett Delaney at 1331 Aloma Avenue, Winter Park, FL 32789; Sally Flynn at 1400 Highland Road, Winter Park, FL 32789; Charles Clayton at 940 Old England Avenue, Winter Park, FL 32789.

No one else wished to speak. The public hearing was closed.

A significant portion of the meeting was dedicated to discussing the severity of penalties for non-compliance, especially regarding financial penalties. Discussion also ensued regarding suggestions from the public that included using a monetary penalty as an alternative to revoking variances to expedite the process and avoid long, costly litigation. It also included a suggestion to base the penalty on the future value of the property, as appraised, rather than the assessed value, to better match the scale of the project and its potential benefits.

Mrs. McGillis clarified that deviations from the certificate of review fall under the Board's purview, not the purview of Code Enforcement. A certificate of review violation is handled differently than a code violation. Discussion then ensued about whether the Board could play a larger role in enforcing compliance with the COR outside of code violations. To improve documentation and communication, Mrs. McGillis noted that, similar to other boards, the department would begin issuing to the applicant a clear letter after approval outlining the conditions and requirements attached to the COR approval, including a statement that any deviations from what was approved would require returning to the Board for approval during construction.

The Board ultimately favored including the consequences of violating the certificate of review in both the application packet and building permit packet to ensure transparency and make the information standard practice. Additionally, the importance of requiring fully developed, feasible plans to prevent the submission of incomplete or unworkable proposals was emphasized. The Board also agreed to adopt a clearer documentation process with approval letters that detail conditions and potential requirements for changes in the building permit review process. This approach aims to ensure that homeowners and builders fully understand their responsibilities and the potential consequences of non-compliance.

Motion made by Aimee Spencer, seconded by John Skolfield, to approve Version 1 (no monetary contributions as a potential penalty) of an Ordinance amending Article VIII Historic Preservation of Chapter 58 of the Land Development code concerning the process and procedures for Certificates of Review subject to the public notice and public hearing process, penalties for unauthorized demolitions or significant alterations to historic structures.

The motion carried by a 5-1 vote. (In Favor: Kelsey Wolfe, John Skolfield, Kim Burstwood, Aimee Spencer, and Wade Miller. Opposed: N. Lee Rambeau. Fay Pappas was absent from the meeting.)

5. Action Items

6. Non-Action Items

7. Staff Updates

8. Board Comments

The Board expressed gratitude to Wade Miller and Aimee Spencer for their years of service on the Board, as they had been termed out and would no longer be on the Board after April. Aimee Spencer and Wade Miller expressed their pleasure with serving on the Board and working with the other Board members and staff.

The Board also acknowledged that resident Margie Bridges had been appointed to the Board and expressed that they were pleased to have someone that resides in one of the city's historic districts and homes on the Board.

9. Upcoming Agenda Items

10. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 11:10 a.m.

Minutes approved by the Board on May 14, 2025.

ATTEST:

/s/ Mary Bush, Recording Secretary

FORM 8B MEMORANDUM OF VOTING CONFLICT FOR COUNTY, MUNICIPAL, AND OTHER LOCAL PUBLIC OFFICERS

LAST NAME—FIRST NAME—MIDDLE NAME <i>Kambeau, N. Lee</i>		NAME OF BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY, OR COMMITTEE <i>Historic Preservation Board</i>	
MAILING ADDRESS <i>1359 Chapman Circle</i>		THE BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY OR COMMITTEE ON WHICH I SERVE IS A UNIT OF:	
CITY <i>Winter Park</i>	COUNTY <i>Orange</i>	☒ CITY ☐ COUNTY ☐ OTHER LOCAL AGENCY	
DATE ON WHICH VOTE OCCURRED <i>April 9, 2025</i>		NAME OF POLITICAL SUBDIVISION: <i>N/A</i>	
		MY POSITION IS: ☐ ELECTIVE ☒ APPOINTIVE	

WHO MUST FILE FORM 8B

This form is for use by any person serving at the county, city, or other local level of government on an appointed or elected board, council, commission, authority, or committee. It applies to members of advisory and non-advisory bodies who are presented with a voting conflict of interest under Section 112.3143, Florida Statutes.

Your responsibilities under the law when faced with voting on a measure in which you have a conflict of interest will vary greatly depending on whether you hold an elective or appointive position. For this reason, please pay close attention to the instructions on this form before completing and filing the form.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 112.3143, FLORIDA STATUTES

A person holding elective or appointive county, municipal, or other local public office **MUST ABSTAIN** from voting on a measure which would inure to his or her special private gain or loss. Each elected or appointed local officer also **MUST ABSTAIN** from knowingly voting on a measure which would inure to the special gain or loss of a principal (other than a government agency) by whom he or she is retained (including the parent, subsidiary, or sibling organization of a principal by which he or she is retained); to the special private gain or loss of a relative; or to the special private gain or loss of a business associate. Commissioners of community redevelopment agencies (CRAs) under Sec. 163.356 or 163.357, F.S., and officers of independent special tax districts elected on a one-acre, one-vote basis are not prohibited from voting in that capacity.

For purposes of this law, a "relative" includes only the officer's father, mother, son, daughter, husband, wife, brother, sister, father-in-law, mother-in-law, son-in-law, and daughter-in-law. A "business associate" means any person or entity engaged in or carrying on a business enterprise with the officer as a partner, joint venturer, coowner of property, or corporate shareholder (where the shares of the corporation are not listed on any national or regional stock exchange).

ELECTED OFFICERS:

In addition to abstaining from voting in the situations described above, you must disclose the conflict:

PRIOR TO THE VOTE BEING TAKEN by publicly stating to the assembly the nature of your interest in the measure on which you are abstaining from voting; and

WITHIN 15 DAYS AFTER THE VOTE OCCURS by completing and filing this form with the person responsible for recording the minutes of the meeting, who should incorporate the form in the minutes.

APPOINTED OFFICERS:

Although you must abstain from voting in the situations described above, you are not prohibited by Section 112.3143 from otherwise participating in these matters. However, you must disclose the nature of the conflict before making any attempt to influence the decision, whether orally or in writing and whether made by you or at your direction.

IF YOU INTEND TO MAKE ANY ATTEMPT TO INFLUENCE THE DECISION PRIOR TO THE MEETING AT WHICH THE VOTE WILL BE TAKEN:

- You must complete and file this form (before making any attempt to influence the decision) with the person responsible for recording the minutes of the meeting, who will incorporate the form in the minutes. (Continued on page 2)

APPOINTED OFFICERS (continued)

- A copy of the form must be provided immediately to the other members of the agency.
- The form must be read publicly at the next meeting after the form is filed.

IF YOU MAKE NO ATTEMPT TO INFLUENCE THE DECISION EXCEPT BY DISCUSSION AT THE MEETING:

- You must disclose orally the nature of your conflict in the measure before participating.
- You must complete the form and file it within 15 days after the vote occurs with the person responsible for recording the minutes of the meeting, who must incorporate the form in the minutes. A copy of the form must be provided immediately to the other members of the agency, and the form must be read publicly at the next meeting after the form is filed.

DISCLOSURE OF LOCAL OFFICER'S INTEREST

I, N Lee Rambear, hereby disclose that on April 9, 20 25:

(a) A measure came or will come before my agency which (check one or more)

- ☐ inured to my special private gain or loss; ☒ the commissioner who appointed me.
- ☐ inured to the special gain or loss of my business associate, _____;
- ☐ inured to the special gain or loss of my relative, _____;
- ☐ inured to the special gain or loss of _____, by whom I am retained; or
- ☐ inured to the special gain or loss of _____, which is the parent subsidiary, or sibling organization or subsidiary of a principal which has retained me.

(b) The measure before my agency and the nature of my conflicting interest in the measure is as follows:

I was appointed to the Board by Commissioner Marty Sullivan.

If disclosure of specific information would violate confidentiality or privilege pursuant to law or rules governing attorneys, a public officer, who is also an attorney, may comply with the disclosure requirements of this section by disclosing the nature of the interest in such a way as to provide the public with notice of the conflict.

May 14, 2025
Date Filed

N Lee Rambear
Signature

NOTICE: UNDER PROVISIONS OF FLORIDA STATUTES §112.317, A FAILURE TO MAKE ANY REQUIRED DISCLOSURE CONSTITUTES GROUNDS FOR AND MAY BE PUNISHED BY ONE OR MORE OF THE FOLLOWING: IMPEACHMENT, REMOVAL OR SUSPENSION FROM OFFICE OR EMPLOYMENT, DEMOTION, REDUCTION IN SALARY, REPRIMAND, OR A CIVIL PENALTY NOT TO EXCEED \$10,000.