

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 2004 - 5:00 P.M.
CITY HALL
1st FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM
100 N. ANDREWS AVENUE
FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA**

**Cumulative Attendance
Present/Absent From January, 2004**

Board Members

Christopher Eck	A	1-1
Todd Fogel	P	2-0
Mary-Jane Graff	P	2-0
Margi Glavovic-Nothard, Chair	A	1-1
Rachel Bach	P	2-0
William Saunders, Vice-Chair	P	2-0
Carolyn Dandy	P	2-0
Tom Tatum	P	2-0
Barbara Walker	A	1-1
Clay Wieland	P	2-0

Staff Present

James Cromar, Planner, Staff Liaison to HPB
Shayne Regnery, Office Supervisor
Merrilyn Rathbun, Ft. Lauderdale Historical Society, Consultant to HPB
Assistant City Attorney
Margaret A. D'Alessio, Recording Secretary

Guests Present

Mark Sanders	Elliott Turner	Dr. Kilkin
Ken Hawkins	Molly Hughes	Mary Hughes
Michelle Graf	Matthew Graf	Pat Hinde
Nolan Haan	Margarita Trotogott	Brett McClure
Therese Roberts	Gayle Brammer	Nicholas Nelson
Kaylen Lewis	Patricia Moss	Judy Dixon
Edward Baker	Brent Williams	John Mazerelle
Marni Canavan	Robert Carricato	Justin Raby
Patrick De Vosioli	Jim Rothgeb	Scott Strawbridge
Dick Winer	Randall Swenson	Charles Willard
Henry Cussen	Walter Oliva	Gustavo Carbonell
Saul Levy	David Parker	Daryl Jolly
Hannah Corwin	Connie Weissbach	Rich Lundin
Bill Carhock	Corey Lenga	Deborah Krueger
John Kleinedler	Tom Jackson	Sara Carter
Mary Jackson	Julia Jones	

Call to Order

Vice Chair William Saunders called the meeting of the Historic Preservation Board to order at approximately 5:08 p.m. Roll call was taken with the following Board Members being present: Rachel Bach, Carolyn Dandy,

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING

February 2, 2004

PAGE 2

Todd Fogel, Mary-Jane Graff, Williams Saunders, Tom Tatum, and Clay Wieland.

All individuals wishing to speak in regard to the cases listed on the agenda were sworn in.

Vice Chair William Saunders proceeded to explain the procedure used by this Board during their meetings.

Approval of Minutes

Motion made by Todd Fogel and seconded by Tom Tatum to approve the minutes of the January 5, 2004 meeting. Board unanimously approved.

- | | | | |
|-----------|-------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| 1. | Applicant: | <u>Gregory W. Parker</u> | <u>Case No. 1-H-04</u> |
| | Location: | 1711 NE 7 Street | |
| | Request: | Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration:
▪ Addition of a dining room and powder room | |
| | Zoned: | RCS - 15 | |
| | Legal: | Victoria Courts, Court 2, The South two (2) feet of Lot 10, and all of Lot 11 together with easterly one-half of that vacated and abandoned "walk" lying immediately West of and adjacent to the South two (2) feet of Lot 10 and all of Lot 11.
P.B. 9, P. 49 | |

James Cromar stated that this application was for a Certificate of Appropriateness, and reminded the Board of the criteria they should consider when making their decision.

Merrilyn Rathbun, Consultant, stated that the applicant was asking to put an addition on the west side of a historically designated property. The house at 1711 NE 7 Street was part of the Victoria Courts complex and was a collection of one-story vernacular cottages, built ca. 1928 by Victoria Park developer Alfred Kuhn, and designed historic by the City in 1996. Victoria Courts was Fort Lauderdale's first multiple property designation.

Ms. Rathbun explained that the house under consideration was a one-story wood frame structure with a T-shape footprint and a cross gable roof. It featured pressed metal shingle roofing, stucco wall cladding, knee-braces at the gable ends and a hooded brick chimney. The house had an enclosed porch on the south elevation, and main entry was through the porch.

Ms. Rathbun further stated that the west elevation of the house was a secondary façade and the placing of the new addition at the position was appropriate, however, a small gable hood with shaped barge board and knee braces located at a side entrance would be lost. This type of detail was characteristic of Victoria Courts.

Ms. Rathbun proceeded to remind the Board to consider the criteria in ULDR Section 47-24.11 in making their determination. She then quoted the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation as follows:

- "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.

- "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."

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING

February 2, 2004

PAGE 3

Ms. Rathbun went on to explain that the Secretary of the Interior recommended that in constructing a new addition there be the least possible loss of historic materials and so that character-defining features are not obscured, damaged or destroyed. It was not recommended attaching a new addition so that the character-defining features of the historic building are obscured, damaged, or destroyed. They also recommended locating the attached exterior addition at the rear or on an inconspicuous side of a historic building, and limiting its size and scale in relationship to the historic building.

Ms. Rathbun explained that the roofline of the new addition was somewhat higher than that of the older structure, which would serve to distinguish the new addition from the historic house, and which was appropriate under the Secretary of the Interior Standards.

Ms. Rathbun advised that this Board could approve the application, approve the application with modifications, or deny the application.

Gregory Parker, owner, stated the house was very small and lacked a dining room, which the addition addresses, and they intended to keep the architecture within the character of the home and the neighborhood.

Vice Chair William Saunders proceeded to open the public hearing.

Susan Jordan introduced herself as a neighbor to the east who had applied for historic designation of the Victoria Court houses. She stated that she wanted the character of the eight Victoria Court houses to stay the same as when built in 1928. She realized they were very small and appreciated the fact that the owner needed more room, but reiterated that the integrity of the house should not be endangered. She further stated the homes were built of Dade County Pine and this was the only designated subdivision of houses within the City. She also stated that she did not want to see anything rising above the existing rooflines.

Scott Strawbridge, Preservation Contractor and Consultant, stated that they had been hired a year ago to assist the Parkers with the design process for their house. He pointed out that this structure was a masonry structure and not a Dade County Pine structure as the others. He stated they looked at the siting of this addition to the western portion of the house, which was the least visible elevation from the neighborhood. He felt they preserved the curb appeal aspects of the house and the addition would not detract from the original structure. He stated the addition would enhance their ability to enjoy the home.

Vice Chair William Saunders asked what percentage would the addition add on to the existing structure. Mr. Strawbridge stated that the addition would add about 20% to the structure.

Amy Parker, owner, stated that Ms. Jordan lived west of their house. She further stated that the addition would not be visible from the street and would be located in the rear of the house.

There being no other individuals who wished to speak on this matter, the public hearing was closed and discussion was brought back to the Board.

Tom Tatum asked how much higher would the roof on the addition be from the existing structure. Ms. Rathbun stated it was only slightly higher.

Todd Fogel stated that the drawing showed large modern windows for the structure that were not listed on the permissible chart. Mr. Strawbridge stated that in regard to the west elevation, there had been an omission in the plans, and they were supposed to be French grills that would be aesthetically keeping within the rest of the house. He stated the data provided was generic, showing the types of products contemplated for use, but emphasized that French pane windows would be used and the owners would be happy to stipulate such

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING

February 2, 2004

PAGE 4

products to be used.

Motion made by Tom Tatum and seconded by Clay Wieland to approve the application for Case No. 1-H-04 as presented, along with the stipulation that French grills would be used for the doors and windows. Roll call showed: YEAS: Carolyn Dandy, Clay Wieland, Mary-Jane Graff, Rachel Bach, Todd Fogel, Tom Tatum, and William Saunders. NAYS: None. Motion carried 7-0.

- 2. Applicant:** Richard S. Lundin **Case No. 33-H-02 (SB)**
Location: 444 S.W. 12 Avenue
Request: Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration:
▪ Installation of hip roof
▪ Air conditioning unit on concrete slab on grade
Zoned: RS-8/Sailboat Bend Historic District Overlay
Legal: Waverly Place, Block 102, all that part of the west one-half (W ½) of Lot 5 and Lots 6 and 7.
P.B. 2, P. 19(D)

James Cromar announced that this was a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration, and proceeded to remind the Board of the criteria to be considered in making their determination.

Merrilyn Rathbun, Consultant, stated that the applicant was requesting a COA for the installation of a gable-on-hip (hip roof with gablet) roof on the main structure of the property located at 444 SW 12th Avenue. The roofing materials met the SBHD Materials and Design Guidelines as stated in Section 47-17.7.

Ms. Rathbun continued stating that the gable end of the gablet, which surmounts the proposed hip roof, was covered in fish scale shingles. A small arched, pre-fabricated, louver would be centered on the gable end. The original structure had a flat roof and the inconspicuous chimney would be replaced with a tall flagstone finished chimney. By adding these traditional details, the applicant was attempting to convert a mid-century modern building to a neo-vernacular style structure. She advised the Board that they needed to consider whether the addition would be compatible with the SBHD overall. She referred the Board to ULDR Section 47-24.11 to assist in making their determination.

Ms. Rathbun then proceeded to quote from the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation as follows:

- "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.
- "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."

Ms. Rathbun further stated that the shingles, although not listed in the application, did meet the SBHD Material and Design Guidelines of Section 47-17.7. She further stated that the house and accessory structure was built for Mrs. Judith Stokes in 1959, which was well out of the SBHD period of significance. Although a significant Fort Lauderdale architect, Donald Macneir, had designed the house, and another significant architect, William Bigoney, had designed later additions, there was no protection for the house or any other architecturally or historically significant house built outside of the SBHD period significance under the historic district ordinance.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING

February 2, 2004

PAGE 5

Ms. Rathbun advised that this Board could approve the application, approve it with modifications, or deny the application.

Rich Lundin, owner, stated that the house did not fall within the historic guidelines and several years ago he had received permission to demolish the structure, but he had decided to just deal with what he had. He stated he was going with the hip roof because he could not put central air in the structure due to there not being anywhere for ventilation. He added that his architect had done a lot of work in SBHD and was very familiar with the guidelines for the district.

Vice Chair William Saunders proceeded to open the public hearing. There being no individuals who wished to speak on this matter, the public hearing was closed and discussion was brought back to the Board.

Todd Fogel stated that the house did not have significance according to the SBHD, but he felt it was unique and significant. He felt it was a shame to change the complexion of the house, but realized the owner's desire to install central air.

Motion made by Tom Tatum and seconded by Rachel Bach to approve the application as presented. Roll call showed: YEAS: Clay Wieland, Mary-Jane Graff, Rachel Bach, Todd Fogel, Tom Tatum, Carolyn Dandy and William Saunders. NAYS: None. Motion carried. 7-0.

- 3. Applicant:** P. Giorgio Ceciarelli Case No. 05-H-04
(Solo Trattoria)
- Location: 208 SW 2nd Street
- Request: Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration:
▪ Revised layout of sidewalk café (6 tables)
- Zoned: H-1
- Legal: Town of Fort Lauderdale, the East 0.30 feet of Lots 1, 2 and 3, less the North 20.00 feet and the South 15.00 feet, Block "C" and the West 25.00 feet of Lots 17, 18, and 19, less the North 20.00 feet and the South 15.00 feet, Block "C"
P.B. B, P. 40 (D)

James Cromar stated the applicant was requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration in order to revise the layout of the sidewalk café, requesting to increase the tables from four to six. He further reminded the Board of the criteria they were to review in making their determination.

Merrilyn Rathbun, Consultant, stated the applicant was asking to increase the number of tables from four to six in front of his store. She stated that sidewalk cafes were a modern use in the district and had not existed in the 1920s. She further stated that the Historic Preservation Board and the City had previously approved this modern use as an adaptive reuse in the H-1 District. She proceeded to refer the Board to Section 47-24.11 in making their decision. Ms. Rathbun then proceeded to quote from The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation as follows:

- "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.
- "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."

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING

February 2, 2004

PAGE 6

Ms. Rathbun stated that the applicant's choice of street furniture was compatible with the historic district under the permitted use. She advised the Board they could approve the application, approve it with modifications, or deny the application.

Walter Oliva, owner, stated that he wanted to increase the tables from four to six.

Vice Chair William Saunders proceeded to open the public hearing. There being no individuals who wished to speak on this matter, the public hearing was closed and discussion was brought back to the Board.

Vice Chair William Saunders stated that he felt the outdoor dining situation was getting overboard, but the City permitted it.

Motion by Clay Wieland and seconded by Rachel Bach to approve the application as submitted. Roll call showed: YEAS: Mary-Jane Graf, Rachel Bach, Todd Fogel, Tom Tatum, Carolyn Dandy, Clay Wieland and William Saunders. NAYS: None. Motion carried 7-0.

- | | | | |
|-----------|-------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| 4. | Applicant: | <u>Fort Lauderdale Woman's Club</u> | <u>Case No. 7-H-04</u> |
| | Location: | 15 S.E. 1 Street | |
| | Request: | Historic Designation | |
| | Zoned: | RAC-CC | |
| | Legal: | <u>Stranahan's Subdivision</u> , Block D, The West 135 feet of the South 100 feet of Lots 13 to 18, inclusive, Block 14 of the <u>Town of Fort Lauderdale</u> , less right-of-way.
P.B. 3, P. 10(D) | |

James Cromar stated the Fort Lauderdale Woman's Club was seeking historic designation, and advised the Board to consider the criteria in Section 47-24.11.C.

Merrilyn Rathbun, Consultant, stated that the applicant was requesting historic designation for the organization's clubhouse building. A complete historic narrative had been provided with the application. She proceeded to refer the Board to the criteria in Section 47-24.11.

Ms. Rathbun stated that the clubhouse was built in 1916 and designed by Miami architect August Geiger, who was one of South Florida's most notable architects. Geiger had worked in a number of different styles, but was most noted for his introduction of the Mediterranean Revival style to South Florida, which he had used in his design for the Miami Hospital Building ("The Alamo") in 1915. Geiger's work was not a strict interpretation of the style, but he used various Spanish elements such as stucco ornamentation and arched loggias, both of which could be seen in his design for the Woman's Club (illustration was shown). The Woman's Club was the first architect-designed project in the City of Fort Lauderdale. She stated that Geiger had been the official architect for the School Board of Dade County and in 1918 had designed the Old Davie School, which was named to the National Register of Historic Places.

Ms. Rathbun continued stating that in 1949 the clubhouse had been remodeled and an addition had been constructed that resulted in the loss of much of the historic character of the Geiger design. The applicant claimed that the entire roof of the original structure was preserved below the roof of the addition. The applicant further stated that the Club would restore the building to its late 1940s appearance.

Ms. Rathbun proceeded to refer the Board to Section 47-24.11. She then quoted from The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation as follows:

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING

February 2, 2004

PAGE 7

- "6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration required 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."

Ms. Rathbun then proceeded to refer the Board to the criteria in Section 47-24.11.B.6. She stated that the Woman's Club was founded in 1911, and in 1912 had been affiliated with the National Federation of Woman's Clubs. The clubs provided an important venue for civic activism for women in the days before they received the vote. The narrative provided by the applicant detailed a number of the civic projects undertaken by the club.

Ms. Rathbun stated that in 1916, Mr. and Mrs. Frank Stranahan donated land in downtown Fort Lauderdale for the construction of the clubhouse. As detailed in the narrative, Ivy Stranahan was a long-time member of the club. She stated that other prominent pioneer Fort Lauderdale women were Mrs. Louella Snyder, Mrs. E. R. Heimberger, Mrs. Frances Tenbrook, Mrs. R.S. Dye, Mrs. A. J. (Annie) Beck, and Mrs. Frank Oliver.

Ms. Rathbun advised the Board that they could approve the application, approve it with modifications, or deny the application.

Pat Hinde, past President of the Woman's Club, stated that they had also founded the first library, fire department, and girl scout troop, and presently were working to bring the building back into the 1940s and 1950s range.

Scott Strawbridge stated that patience was everything. He stated that there had been some objections in the past to the 1950s modifications that had been made to the building, and he had advised the club at that time that they were about 2 years away from that construction being 50 years old. He stated that the Geiger component section of the building was underlying of the remodeling that had been done, and it was the Club's intention to reveal that portion and move the entrance back onto to Andrews Avenue, and restore the front porch. He advised that he had the original drawings, but at the same time the 1950s addition provided a vital function of square footage that the Club required to capture any revenue stream possible. He stated it was going to be a hybrid project and they were going to attempt to "meld the best of both worlds." He stated that one of the first steps to be taken was to posture the Club to seek grant funding from the State.

Vice Chair William Saunders proceeded to open the public hearing. There being no individuals who wished to speak on this matter, the public hearing was closed and discussion was brought back to the Board.

Motion made by Clay Wieland and seconded by Rachel Bach to approve the application as presented. Roll call showed: YEAS: Rachel Bach, Todd Fogel, Tom Tatum, Carolyn Dandy, Clay Wieland, Mary-Jane Graff and William Saunders. NAYS: None. Motion carried 7-0.

- 5. Applicant:** Cory Lenga Case No. 02-H-04(SB)
Location: 807-809, 813-815, 817 & 819 W. Las Olas Blvd.
Request: Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition:
 - Four (4) one-story buildingsCertificate of Appropriateness for New Construction:
 - Townhouses, three (3) stories with seven (7) units
 - Request for yard modifications:
 - Front yard reduction from 25' to 15'
 - Rear yard reduction from 20' to 15'
 - Side yard (east and west) reductions from 10' to 5'

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING

February 2, 2004

PAGE 8

Zoned: RML-25/Sailboat Bend Historic District Overlay
Legal: Block 1 of Bryan Subdivision Blocks 21 & 22, Lots 24, 26 and 28
P.B. 1, P. 29

James Cromar stated that the owner was seeking Certificates of Appropriateness for demolition and new construction, along with requests for yard modifications. He referred the Board to the criteria in Section 47-24.11, along with the criteria for the SBHD.

Merrilyn Rathbun, Consultant, stated that the applicant was asking for a COA for demolition of six (6) units in four (4) CBS buildings on lots 24, 26 and 28, Block 21 of Bryan Subdivision in the SBHD. She stated that none of those buildings were shown on the City Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps before 1953 and were not considered to have historic significance in the historic district since they had not been built in the period significance for the SBHD, i.e. 1913 to 1940. She stated that the applicant stated that the demolition was necessary for the project. She then proceeded to refer the Board to Section 47-24.11.C.

Ms. Rathbun continued, stating that the applicant requested a COA for new construction of a three-story, seven-unit townhouse project. The townhouses were to be built on three lots in the middle of Block 21 on the north side of West Las Olas Boulevard. To the south side of West Las Olas and one lot to the east of the location of the proposed project is the three-story West Las Olas Villas. Immediately across the street from the proposed project site was the historically significant, ca. 1914-1918 Dichtenmueller House, which was an excellent example of a Craftsman bungalow. The Dichtenmuellers were important pioneer merchants in the City. She stated that in the same block (21), Lot 19 was the site of the Francis Abreu designed Oliver House, ca. 1926. The City gave historic designation to that house individually in conjunction with its move to the location from Smoker Park. Both Oliver House (two-story) and the Dichtenmueller House (one-story) could be adversely impacted by the two large three-story projects in the immediate vicinity, as would the nearby one-story Himmarshee Apartments. These two large projects would produce a hemmed-in effect on the historic structures. (An illustration of the site was shown).

Ms. Rathbun referred the Board to Section 47-24.11 and quote from The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation as follows:

"Building Site – The landscape surrounding a historic building and contained within an individual parcel of land is considered the building site. The site, including its associated features, contributed to the overall character of the historic property."

Ms. Rathbun stated that it was recommended that in designing new exterior additions to historic buildings or adjacent new construction that it be compatible with the historic character of the site, and preserves the historic relationship between the building or buildings and the landscape. It was not recommended that they introduce new construction onto the building site that was visually incompatible in terms of size, scale, design, materials, color and texture that would destroy the historic relationships on the site, or damage or destroy important landscape features.

Ms. Rathbun further stated that the applicant had requested materials that met the Materials and Design Guidelines of the SBHD in Section 47-17.7. She stated that the project required a yard setback to 15 feet in the front, and 15 feet in the rear, with 5 feet on the left side and 5 feet on the right side. She then referred the Board to the criteria in Section 47-15.5. She stated that the Board could approve the application, approve it with modifications, or deny the application.

Kenneth Hawkins, architect, stated that the applicant was requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition, as well as for new construction. He stated that currently on the site there were four one-story duplexes that were located within the acceptable setback areas. He proceeded to explain a drawing of the

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING

February 2, 2004

PAGE 9

site. He further stated that the existing building in the rear had been built in the 1960s. He stated that the neighbors at the time had permitted the encroachment of the roof. He stated the applicant was seeking to construct seven townhouses, which were permitted by Code. He explained they were going to preserve two oak trees, along with maintaining a pine tree on the west side of the site. He then proceeded to show photographs of the houses that were to be demolished, along with photographs of the trees that were to be preserved.

Mr. Hawkins continued stating that they wanted to create an internal courtyard which would take parking off the street, but to do so they had to request the setbacks in order to preserve the trees. He proceeded to then show photographs of the historical elements to be considered for the new structure. He added they were attempting to maintain decorative ornamental metal on the buildings. He added that some structures in the SBHD had two stories and showed photographs of such buildings in the area.

Mr. Hawkins then proceeded to show a rendering of the proposed development, along with the internal courtyard. He explained that they were going to create internal drains that would collect the water from the courtyards and the rooftops, along with the creation of swales along the perimeter of the site and a trench drain. He stated that according to Code, the townhouses had to be attached. He explained that the second floor would have balconies and there would be a stepback on the third floor with terraces. He then proceeded to show the front elevation of the stepbacks.

Todd Fogel stated that from the plans, it appeared there was metal gating across the front of the property and asked how far that extended. Mr. Hawkins replied that part of the DRC requirement was to have the iron fence along the front creating an entrance gate for vehicular access terminating at the east/west end of the property. He stated they were required to maintain a five-foot easement around the property, so there would be a series of gates permitting service to the areas. He added there would also be a pedestrian entrance leading to the sidewalks in two locations per DRC requirements. He stated that the fencing would create a series of private backyards. He proceeded to explain on the rendering how far the fencing would run.

Todd Fogel asked what was the length of the building from east to west. Mr. Hawkins replied it was 139 feet.

Vice Chair William Saunders asked if there was any other vegetation of significance on the site that was protected by the City. Mr. Hawkins replied there was not. Vice Chair William Saunders asked how the trees were going to be protected during construction. Mr. Hawkins stated the arborist was present this evening and would answer any questions the Board might have. He stated the building was setback about 16 feet from the trees.

Scott McClure, landscape architect and certified arborist, stated that the trees during demolition a tree protection barrier would encompass the tree and protect the root zone and trunk from damage. He added there was no other significant vegetation on the site other than the three trees that were to be preserved.

Vice Chair William Saunders stated there were currently six units on the property at this time. Mr. Hawkins confirmed and stated some were duplexes. Vice Chair William Saunders asked if they were requesting seven units for the site, along with yard reductions, and asked if the design would be reconfigured back to six units would they have to seek the setbacks. Mr. Hawkins stated that the configuration of the site had been done in the proposed manner in order to maintain the three trees and meet the DRC requirements.

Vice Chair William Saunders stated that the Civic Association and residents had declined fences along the street line in the past, along with electronic gates, and asked if there was anything that could be done to remove such fencing. Mr. Hawkins stated that part of the DRC requirement, due to police comments, required that electronic security be provided. He advised that the police had recommended a Hambro system. He stated the owner would be willing to give that up if the Board desired, but they also wanted to maintain some

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING

February 2, 2004

PAGE 10

sort of security for the units.

Tom Tatum asked how many bedrooms there would be in the units. Mr. Hawkins replied there would be two bedrooms with a den on the third floor.

Vice Chair William Saunders proceeded to open the public hearing.

Chuck Willard, SBB resident, stated that he was also speaking on behalf of individuals who had worked in the past to save the SBHD. He further stated that people should be allowed to build whatever they wanted as long as they met the requirements of the Code. He felt an easement should be granted if reasonable. He felt this project would create a "tunnel effect" for the neighborhood. He stated that in driving through the neighborhood, he had counted 68 combinations of buildings that could be torn down to make way for townhomes such as the ones being proposed. He added there were 22 such buildings on Las Olas and it would turn into a "canyon." He stated that was not what they had in mind when they had formed the master plan for the neighborhood and received their historic designation. He proceeded to show photographs of the units which had recently been built in the area that were compatible.

Robert Carricato stated that he was not opposed to the demolition, but he was opposed to the variances being requested. He stated that he was also concerned about the trees and the parking.

Jim Rothgeb stated that this project was not compatible with the area, and he did not feel there was anything unique about the project to request special consideration for setbacks. He felt it was not unreasonable to ask people to build within the pre-determined codes. He did not feel this Board should have to deal with changing the Code. He felt that would be up to the City Commission to address.

Julia Jones (not sworn in) stated she would state the truth as she saw it. She stated that she was opposed to this project because it was too big for the area and was not compatible. She added that she did not want any more big construction on Las Olas Boulevard from the River to the West Side School. She stated that she would prefer only single-family homes for the area. She reiterated that she did not want to see any more big development.

Debbie Krueger stated she was not a resident of SBB but was soon to be a first-time homebuyer in the City and wanted to purchase a home in that area some time in the future because it was intrinsically charming due to its historic quality. She also stated that she would prefer single-family homes for the area. She stated she was from Massachusetts and added that Florida had little history, and they should not take away the little history that they had. She reiterated that she was against the proposed project.

Dave Parker, resident of SBHD, stated that he was concerned about three things. The first thing was the height of the buildings, the second concern was about the variances being requested, and the third item of concern was parking.

John Mazerelle, resident of SBHD, stated that he had foreseen such construction for the area. He added that he had recently done work on his property and had not asked for any special modifications. He believed everyone should follow the same Codes that were in effect. He added that the Lennar project would have a tremendous impact on the area. He stated this was a historic district and these projects were way too big for the area. He felt that by having the area designated that they were to maintain the character and flavor of the neighborhood, and that was not presently happening. He felt that three stories were not appropriate for the area. He stated they needed to maintain the quality of life in the area and added that their green space was disappearing. He reiterated that with the new Dunkin Donut store they had lost 46 trees in the area. He stated the builder had promised to save them, but had not done so.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING

February 2, 2004

PAGE 11

Bill Carhock stated that he was concerned about the preservation of the trees. He added that he was not in favor of the setbacks being requested because it would put this project very close to his property.

Nina Trotogott, 230 SW 13th Avenue, stated that she lived across from the Lennar project. She stated that she was a new member of the SBHD and was honored to be a part of the area. She stated that saving the integrity and history of the area was more than saving trees; it was an ambiance. She believed that three stories were not appropriate for the area. She reiterated that she was not against demolition or rebuilding as long as it followed the requirements of the Code. She did not want to see the area lose its historic flavor.

Dick Winer, SBHD resident, stated that this project needed to be on a larger piece of property. He stated the building was a nice design but not for the proposed site.

John Kleinedler, President of Sailboat Bend Civic Association, stated that the developer had not presented this project to the Association as of this time, but was scheduled to do so in March. He stated that the setbacks were a "hot issue" for the neighborhood. Last November, he stated the Association had passed a resolution in opposition of variances and a letter had been sent stating such to the City Commission.

Rich Lundin stated that he had appeared before this Board about eight years ago seeking to demolish his house. He proceeded to show a photograph of the house he had planned to build on his property at that time. He stated he had to appear before the Board three times due to questions arising regarding the type of structure he was proposing and whether it was compatible with the area or not. He advised that an architect had quit during a meeting because of all the discussion taking place, and his response at the time had been that the area was run down and filled with duplexes with absentee landlords. He felt the area had changed a lot since that time and he was in favor of demolition of the structures that were not being maintained. He stated that the developers came into these neighborhoods and proposed structures that were not compatible with the area. He stated further that he did not understand why the Board had approved past three-story structures for the area. He believed that this Board needed to review how they were approving structures for this neighborhood.

Nolan Haan, owner of Oliver House, stated that his property would be greatly impacted by this project due to the shadows that would be cast onto his property. He proceeded to show a photograph of a cottage in the area with a three-story building next to it. He stated that the large building overwhelmed the cottage and he felt it was a total desecration of its value. He stated he did not understand how this Board had ever approved such a project. He stated that the buildings were supposed to be compatible with the adjacent buildings in the area. He stated further that he thought elevations of the area were to be provided when a project was being proposed. He added that such monolithic buildings were destroying the character of the neighborhood. He proceeded to show photographs of buildings that had been granted setbacks and the impacts on the adjacent structures.

Mr. Haan reiterated that trees were being removed and the character of the neighborhood was being destroyed. He thought by giving setbacks, they were supposed to make the structure more pedestrian friendly, but it was not happening. He stated at one of their Association meetings, they had discussed the idea of permitting one setback variance, but this project was asking for four variances. He stated that building was being expanded to inhabit all of the available green space. He proceeded to show a photograph of the canopy of the tree that was to be preserved. He stated the visible branches were about 75 feet and he wanted the developer to provide a drawing or photograph of the tree from the side with the buildings in place to see how the vertical line of the building would affect the canopy of the tree. He felt they would not be able to maintain the canopy. He felt 90% of the tree would have to be removed in order to make room for the walls of the proposed buildings.

Daryl Jolly stated he owned the house one lot over from this proposed project. He further stated that the

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING

February 2, 2004

PAGE 12

developers needed to stay within the guidelines of the SBHD. He stated that he had made renovations to his property, but had stayed within the guidelines for the area. He added that he was also concerned about parking. He then stated that this project would shadow the area and impact the properties. He added that they were not showing the elevations that would affect his property and asked if that could be shown. He remarked there would be no windows facing his property. He stated that he was opposed to the project.

Matthew Graf, past renter in SBHD and potential homeowner in SBHD, stated that there were no two properties the same in the area. He felt that development would be good for the community and would rid the area of some of the eyesores. He felt they could design a project that looked historical.

Molly Hughes, resident of SBHD, stated that she was going to state her concerns and if they were valid questions, she hoped the Board would raise them with the applicant. She stated that her questions revolved around two issues: compatibility and impacts. She asked where there were other three story structures in the area, and further asked where there were other gated communities in the neighborhood. She stated that the Commission had been adamant to prevent that in the past. She also asked what Code compliance contradictions existed in regard to this project. She asked what percentage of the tree canopy was going to be removed in order to construct this project. She also asked if the applicant was going to replace the trees that were to be removed. She also asked if demolition was to be contingent upon project approval or could the project demolish the buildings without obtaining some sort of approval.

Kenneth Hawkins stated that he wanted to clarify five points. He stated the first issue pertained to the number of units to be placed on the site. He explained that according to Code, the site was 0.4 acres, which could contain ten units, but they were only proposing seven units. The next issue pertained to parking. He stated there was no parking permitted on the south side of Las Olas, but street parking was permitted on the north side. He continued stating that the current layout of the parking consisted of nine spaces for the six units, and they were proposing seven units with 14 parking spaces within the property. He also stated there would be four guests parking spaces on the street. The third item he wanted to address was that the project was too big for the site, and the presence of other three story projects in the area. He stated that examples had been given to the Board of other three-story structures in the area that had garages facing the street. He stated further they did not think that was desirable and had created the inner courtyard-parking concept instead. He added that according to Code, a height of 35 feet was permitted for the area. He reiterated that if the community did not approve what the Code permitted, then they should seek to have the Code changed.

Mr. Hawkins further stated that the fourth item of concern pertained to the preservation of the trees. He stated they had consulted with an arborist and had provided his report to the Board that addressed the pruning of the trees. The fifth item of concern pertained to shadowing. He stated that currently on the site properties were shadowed and reminded everyone of the large trees adding to the shadowing.

Todd Fogel asked if a tree canopy and a building created the same type of shadow. Mr. Hawkins replied they did not. He added they had been working with Dave Gennaro regarding the trees. He stated they wanted to retain the trees, but if the neighborhood did not want that, they could be removed.

There being no other individuals who wished to speak on this matter, the public hearing was closed and discussion was brought back to the Board.

Vice Chair William Saunders asked when the current zoning had been overlaid in the SBHD. James Cromar replied that the zoning Code had been revised in 1997.

Rachel Bach thanked the people for coming to the meeting because she felt it was difficult sometimes for Board members to decide what the neighborhood considered compatible. She agreed that the project was not compatible with the SBHD due to its height and not oriented towards the roadway.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING

February 2, 2004

PAGE 13

Todd Fogel also thanked the neighborhood for attending tonight's meeting. He stated that comments had been made regarding ridding the neighborhood of eyesores, but creating more of an eyesore that was incompatible with an area was not the direction they should take. He added there were no other three-story structures of this size and massing in the area. He stated the north/south elevation ran 83 feet and an east/west elevation of 139 feet of solid wall. He asked if the photograph could be shown again of the black and white house. He stated that when they reviewed setbacks and yard reductions the Code stated: "Reducing required yards is compatible with yards or abutting properties across the street or yards proposed to be reduced." He stated if this were next door, this would not be compatible to reducing a side yard to 5 feet. He stated that in the photograph shown there was balance between open space and the structure. The proposed application did not show that type of balance. It appeared to be overflowing and reduced the setbacks all the way around.

Mr. Fogel stated that a non-resident of SBHD who had given testimony stated that she was so touched by the integrity and ambiance of the area, and this project would lose that feeling. He stated that Code permitted three-stories where it was compatible with adjacent properties. He stated the three-story that existed was not of the same size or massing of the proposed project. He stated the historic overlaid protected this area. He reiterated that a neighborhood was beyond brick and mortar and was a feel of a neighborhood. He stated that some other townhome projects had been built in the area, but the neighborhood had to wake up and come to the meetings and voice their concerns. He reiterated that this was the first time this Board had seen the neighborhood out in force regarding a project.

Mr. Fogel continued stating that a tree canopy provided a filtered shadow where a solid building provided a solid shadow.

Tom Tatum stated that he had two concerns. He added that the developer had done a good job in an effort to come up with a good project, but it was the wrong project for this property. He stated they had been struggling with the character of the neighborhood for a long time and stated that such character was not defined by 35-foot high buildings. He did not think that when there was so much mass that yard reductions should be given. He did not think that tall walls should be placed next to a single-story house. He added that he did not know what could be done to save this project and address everyone's concerns because it was too big for the site. He reiterated that he was opposed to the project.

Mary-Jane Graff stated that she was also against this project and felt it was incompatible with the feel of the neighborhood. She felt it was a well done project, but did not belong in this neighborhood.

Clay Wieland thanked everyone for attending tonight's meeting. He reiterated that it was important for the residents to come out and voice their concerns. He stated the Board went by the Code, but needed to hear from the neighborhood. He stated this was a beautiful design, but was too large for the neighborhood.

Mr. Hawkins stated they were scheduled to meet with the neighborhood association next month, and asked if they could continue to do so. Therefore, they were asking to defer this matter to a later date.

Todd Fogel asked if they planned to revise the project because if they did not intend to do so, then the Board should proceed and vote at tonight's meeting. He stated that meeting with the neighborhood would only delay matters because they knew what the outcome might be. Mr. Hawkins stated that they were willing to redesign the project.

Vice Chair William Saunders stated that since the applicant was willing to meet with the Association and address their concerns, he suggested that this matter be deferred for 60 days.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING

February 2, 2004

PAGE 14

The Assistant City Attorney stated that the Board could entertain the applicant's request to continue this case until April.

Motion made by Tom Tatum and seconded by Mary-Jane Graff to continue this case until April 5, 2004 to allow the applicant to redesign the project.

Todd Fogel stated that when developers were proposing such projects, it should be known that this Board requested to see how it would look in regard to the landscaping of the street.

Roll call showed: YEAS: Todd Fogel, Tom Tatum, Carolyn Dandy, Clay Wieland, Mary-Jane Graff, Rachel Bach and William Saunders. NAYS: None. Motion carried 7-0.

"For the Good of the City"

Vice Chair William Saunders stated that Daryl Jolly wanted to make a presentation to the Board at tonight's meeting.

Kennedy Homes

James Cromar stated that a matter arose last week that staff wanted to run by the Board and get their perspective. He stated they had received an application regarding the roofing of porches for the Kennedy Homes in the SBHD. He continued, stating that if the materials to be used were in the SBHD guidelines, staff could run a 15-day administrative approval. In this case, there was a question of definition of one of the listed material. He stated that Mr. Thurmond was going to present a sample of material he wanted to use. Mr. Cromar stated this was not a formal review, but that staff wanted a sense from the Board if they could review this application as an administrative approval, or did this matter have to be placed on the Board's agenda.

Dewey Thurmond, representing the Fort Lauderdale Housing Authority, stated the Kennedy Homes had roofing shingles on them. He stated that the pitch of the roof was adequate except for the porches which had a 2/12 pitch and as a result the under structure was rotting. He stated they were proposing a modified roofing material for the porches that would be the same color and texture as the existing shingles but would be flat. He advised there were 45 buildings on the site and all porches would be encompassed in the repairs.

Vice Chair William Saunders asked if the material to be used was acceptable to the City. James Cromar stated that the material and design guidelines mentioned asphalt shingles. He explained this was the same material, but in one large sheet rather than small shingles.

Todd Fogel asked if they were going to send in an application for administrative approval to the Board. Mr. Thurmond stated they were going to do whatever was necessary.

The Board agreed to review the case as a 15-day administrative approval. Mr. Cromar remarked that staff would report back to the Board regarding this matter.

SBHD Resident Presentation

James Cromar introduced Mr. Daryl Jolly and stated that he had explained to Mr. Jolly that the Board had asked that no one use the presentation to lobby the Board. The presentations were to be educational, last no more than 5-10 minutes and that no specific references were to be made regarding specific cases.

Daryl Jolly, SBHD resident, stated that he apologized that more residents had not attended the HPB meetings previously. He stated that one problem was communication, and he hoped there could be a better description

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING

February 2, 2004

PAGE 15

provided to the residents of what was being proposed to the Board.

Vice Chair William Saunders stated that the Board did not get a lot of advance knowledge regarding what was going on. He reiterated that agendas were provided on the City's website.

James Cromar stated that staff finalized the agendas about three to seven days before the meeting. He stated that as a result of past discussions, staff had initiated a new procedure that the administrative assistant for this Board would forward the HPB agendas to the presidents of the civic and neighborhood associations where projects were being proposed.

Vice Chair William Saunders stated that possibly associations could monitor the agendas on the website and have different individuals doing it and then advising the residents.

Mr. Jolly stated that more time was needed in order to obtain information from the City regarding the projects.

Todd Fogel asked if the public had the right to come to the City and ask for information regarding the agendas, and could they obtain copies of pertinent information for their neighborhoods. Mr. Cromar replied that staff had a sense of what was going to be on the agenda about three weeks before the meeting, but items had to go through a review process. Things were not necessarily definite until about one week before the meeting. He added that there was a new procedure being used through Planning and Zoning whereby citizens could come to the City and review any plans being proposed. He stated that they could request copies only of approved plans that had already gone through the review process.

Todd Fogel stated there was nothing stopping the public from contacting the person involved in a project and reviewing the plans. He felt the Association was very effective in getting the word out regarding tonight's meeting and commended them on their work. He felt they should not just rely on the Association's newsletter.

Chuck Willard asked the Board to drive through the area so they could get a sense of what SBHD consisted of. He stated that he had a video that had been made about 15 years ago that showed the homes in the area that helped them get their designation. He suggested that the video be looked at.

Motion made by Tom Fogel and seconded by Tom Tatum to adjourn the meeting.

There being no further business to come before this Board, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 7:27 p.m.

VICE CHAIRMAN

William Saunders

ATTEST:

Margaret D'Alessio
Recording Secretary

A mechanical recording is made of the foregoing proceedings, of which these minutes are part, and is on file in the Historic Preservation Offices for a period of two (2) years.