

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE
MONDAY, MAY 3, 2004- 5:00 P.M.
CITY HALL
1st FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM
100 N. ANDREWS AVENUE
FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA**

Cumulative Attendance

<u>Board Members</u>	<u>Present/Absent</u>	<u>From January 2004</u>
Christopher Eck	P	4-1
Todd Fogel	P	4-1
Mary-Jane Graff	P	4-1
Margi Glavovic-Nothard, Chair	P	3-2
Rachel Bach	A	3-2
William Saunders, Vice-Chair	P	5-0
Carolyn Dandy	P	4-1
Tom Tatum	P	5-0
Barbara Walker	P	4-1
Clay Wieland	A	4-1

Staff Present

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

Guests Present

Gus Carbonell	Richard Lock	Patricia Moss
Julia Jones	Cathy Sweetapple	Jeff Suiter
John McDonald	Veronica Sazera	

Call to Order

Chair Margi Glavovic-Nothard called the meeting of the Historic Preservation Board to order at approximately 5:05 p.m. Roll call was taken with the following Board Members being present: Todd Fogel, Mary-Jane Graff, William Saunders, Tom Tatum, Barbara Walker and Margi Glavovic-Nothard.

Approval of Minutes –April 5, 2004 Meeting

Motion made by Mary-Jane Graff and seconded by William Saunders to approve the minutes of the April 5, 2004 meeting. Board unanimously approved.

ALL INDIVIDUALS WISHING TO SPEAK THIS EVENING WERE SWORN IN.

1. **Applicant:** Las Olas Riverfront Associates, L.P. Case No. 15-H-04
Location: 300 SW 1st Avenue
Request: Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration:
 - Two reverse channel signs with raised letters, burnt orange color for placement on east fascia of building and north fascia of building

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING

May 3, 2004

PAGE 2

Zoned: RAC-CC
Legal: (Refer to Project File)

James Cromar stated that this application was for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration to Art Bar located in the locally designated landmark structure of the Tibbets Building on the corner of SW 2nd Street and SW 1st Avenue at the Riverfront. He reminded the Board to consider the criteria for a Certificate of Appropriateness found in Section 47-24.11.

Merrilyn Rathbun, Consultant, stated that the applicant was asking for a COA for business identification signs to be attached to the east and north facades of the historically designated "Tibbets Building" at 300 SW 1st Avenue. This ca. 1925-26 building was designed as a bus terminal by Palm Beach architect, Marion Sims Wyeth. The building was conceived as a three-story Spanish Eclectic design with Beaux Arts details. After the 1926 hurricane, the design was cut back to one story and the ornamentation was simplified.

Ms. Rathbun further stated that the applicant was asking for signs comprised of individual flat, non-illuminated, reverse channel letters, burnt orange in color to be attached to the fascia. The letters would protrude two and one-quarter inches from the surface, which places these signs well within the requirements for flat (wall) signs (protrusion of no more than eighteen inches from the wall surface) as stated in Sec. 47-22 Sign requirements of the ULDR. She stated that the requested letters were a traditional serif font, which was appropriate for the historic building.

Carolyn Dandy entered the meeting at approximately 5:08 p.m.

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

Chair Margi Glavovic-Nothard asked for the applicant or their representative to make their presentation.

Mr. Cromar stated that the representative of the applicant was not yet present, but he had spoken with them last week and they intended to be at tonight's meeting.

Therefore, the Chair stated that the item would be deferred to the end of tonight's agenda giving the applicant or their representative time to arrive at the meeting.

2. Applicant:	<u>Patricia D. Moss</u>	<u>Case No. 8-H-04 (SB)</u>
Location:	1001 S.W. 4 Street	
Request:	Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demolition of single one-story building Certificate of Appropriateness for Relocation: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Relocation of two structures within the site Certificate of Appropriateness for New Construction: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• New construction of nine (9) townhouses• Request yard modifications – 15 ft. front, and 15 ft. rear.	
Zoned:	RML-25/Sailboat Bend Historic District Overlay	
Legal:	<u>Town of Fort Lauderdale</u> . Block A, Lot 14 Resubdivision of Block 7P.B. 1, P. 60	

James Cromar stated that the applicant was requesting Certificates of Appropriateness for demolition of one structure on the site, relocation of two structures within the site, and new construction of nine (9) townhouses on the site. He reminded the Board to consider the Material and Design Guidelines for the Sailboat Bend Historic District Section 47-17, and the criteria for a Certificate of Appropriateness as found in Section 47-24.11.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING

May 3, 2004

PAGE 3

Christopher Eck entered the meeting at approximately 5:10 p.m.

Merrilyn Rathbun, Consultant, stated that the applicant had brought a preliminary plan for this project to the Board for their review and comment in March 2004. The following was a quotation from the Consultant's comment for that review:

"The applicant proposes to build a townhouse project with nine (9) units on three lots (Block 107, Lots 1, 3 and 5, Waverly Place) at 1001 – 1009 SW 4th Street. There are three structures on the building site, two of which are historic and listed on the Florida Master Site File."

Ms. Rathbun continued stating that the house at 1009 SW 4th Street (Lot 5) is shown on the 1924 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map for the City of Fort Lauderdale. According to the Master Site File record, the house was built ca. 1918-1920 for Joseph Fritsch, the owner of a local garage. The Site File description of the building states:

“Architectural Description: This one-story wood frame apartment building is located at 1009 SW 4th Street. It is an example of Bungalow style architecture. The building has a rectangular plan and a gable roof. The exterior fabric is asbestos shingle and fenestration consists of double-hung sash windows with 1/1 lights. An entrance porch with a gable roof, square posts, and knee wall extends from the façade. Other notable architectural features include a continuous concrete block foundation.”

Ms. Rathbun further stated that the architect for the project had addressed a letter to the Board in which he stated that this house would be demolished to make room for a new development. Mr. Carbonell noted in his letter that a number of additions had been made to the historic structure and much of the original character of the building had been removed or obscured.

The house at 1001 SW 4th Street (Lot 3) is also shown on the 1924 Sanborn map. The description from the Master Site File follows:

“Architectural Description: This one-story wood frame residential building is located at 1001 S.W. 4th Street. It is an example of the Frame Vernacular style of architecture. The building features a hip roof with exposed rafter ends, an end porch with a hip roof, square posts, and knee wall. The house has been altered from its original appearance by the application of aluminum siding and metal awning windows.”

Ms. Rathbun further explained that this structure was probably built ca. 1925; the first resident listed in city directories was S.M. Leeper. The applicant planned to incorporate this building into the new project. A two-story addition would be constructed on the east elevation of the historic house that would then be attached to the new townhouse structure by a small addition, recessed from the front of the structure. The house was on a corner lot, and both the south and east facades faced the street and for historic preservation purposes were considered primary elevations.

Ms. Rathbun continued stating that the applicant had since made substantial changes in the plan. The residence at 1001 SW 4th Street would be moved to the SW corner of the building lot and restored. All new construction would be built to the west of this building, which would enable both primary facades, the south and east, to be seen from the street. The non-compliant first story of the apartment house at 1009 SW 4th Street would be demolished, and the second story would be moved to a newly built foundation and first floor at the east end of the northernmost building of the project. This restored building would be visible from SW 10th Avenue. The third story belvederes of the new townhouses had been reduced in size and their street side

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING

May 3, 2004

PAGE 4

elevations were narrower and not as noticeable from street level. Such changes were compatible with Section 47-24.11 of the ULDR and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Ms. Rathbun called the Board's attention to the criteria listed in Sections 47-24.11.

Ms. Rathbun further stated the applicant had requested approval of the following materials, including noted exceptions in Section 47-17.7. The applicant also requested approval for 16-foot wide garage doors, which would not be on a street side and which were not in compliance with the ULDR requirements.

Ms. Rathbun proceeded to call the Board's attention to Section 47-17.5 in reference to the applicant's request for front and rear yard modifications.

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

William Saunders disclosed that he had attended the Sailboat Bend Civic Association meetings during the presentation of this project, but had not participated in any of the discussions.

Todd Fogel disclosed that he had spoken with Sal Levy who was one of the principals regarding this project, but they had not actually discussed the application. He advised that he lived next door to the property in question.

Gus Carbonell, architect, stated that this project had been reviewed by the Sailboat Bend Civic Association on an informal basis, and various concerns had been raised. He advised that they had also appeared before this Historic Preservation Board, but due to certain issues raised, they had not completed the presentation, but they were now returning with a formal presentation and application. He explained that the site plan had been revised in order to accommodate various concerns that had been raised. He proceeded to show photographs of the site.

Mr. Carbonell explained that the project was located in the RML-25 zoning district, which permitted 25 units to the acre; if this were an apartment building, there could be a maximum of 15 apartments. He explained they were proposing fee simple townhouses and would be permitted to build 11, but they were only going to build 9 units to keep the density of 15 units per acre. He further stated that the adjacent properties were houses built in the 1960s and 1970s.

Mr. Carbonell explained the site contained three structures, and one was a non-contributing structure, labeled Building "C" in the back-up materials provided to the Board. He explained it was a small one-story apartment building that was to be demolished. He proceeded to show a drawing of the referenced building.

Mr. Carbonell continued, stating that there were two other structures on the site: the main one-story house and a small apartment on the top of a concrete foundation. He stated it appeared to be a two-story apartment building, but the floor was below grade and the headroom in some areas was approximately six (6) feet high.

Mr. Carbonell stated that they had taken the main home and relocated it to the east in order to emphasize that unit as the focal point of their project. He stated further that approximately 25% of the site was being devoted to that unit. He advised that they were planning an addition directly to the west that would consist of a garage on the ground floor and a foyer with an open yard area in the front facing the park, and a master bedroom on the second floor. He stated the existing historic home would then be visible from the rear (north), side (east) and front (south), and from most of the west side.

Mr. Carbonell stated that the second building proposed for demolition would be retained and made a focal point of the project. He stated the unit would be facing the street, and it would be rotated 180 degrees so the front

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING

May 3, 2004

PAGE 5

would be facing a light traffic street. He explained the five units would be fronting the alley. He explained that they would also maintain the existing trees, and there was one Oak tree of value in the center of the site that would have to be relocated. He stated a possible location was near the west property line or in the park across the street. He explained they had spoken with an arborist regarding this matter.

Mr. Carbonell explained that the units were two-story and they were requesting a yard modification on the alley (rear) side and on the street (front) side. He further stated they would be maintaining light, air and ventilation because most of the bulk for which they were requesting the modifications was being encroached by open porches. He stated they needed such modifications because they needed to hide the garages to an internal driveway.

Mr. Carbonell continued stating that 35% of the site was being maintained as a landscape area. He proceeded to show an elevation that faced the alleyway. He explained that the home, which was being relocated, was also being restored as much as possible to its original construction. He explained the porch was enclosed with aluminum awnings and windows, which were to be removed, and the porch would be reopened. He stated the roof would be re-roofed with metal, and all the new construction would consist of Hardi Plank siding. He explained they would paint the two historic structures a light oyster color so they would be distinct from the rest of the project. He stated the new construction would be compatible but would look different. He stated they wanted to maintain the original character of the homes.

Mr. Carbonell further stated the units would have bay windows facing the alley drawing attention to the upper floor, and planters with palm trees would line the driveways to minimize the impact of the two-story structure. He stated the buildings would have five units in the back and four units in the front. He explained there was quite a bit of roof movement and a belvedere was created that would be about 4 feet wide and high enough to enclose stairs. He explained there would be a sun deck on the roof surrounded on four sides with metal roofing. He stated that a drawing to scale of the relationship of this project to the adjacent property had been submitted to the board. He explained further that to the east were two one-story apartment buildings that were non-contributing. He explained there were also two-story homes surrounding the project and one at the end of the block.

Mr. Carbonell proceeded to show further renderings of the project. He explained they were not asking for a modification on the west side. He added that the Sailboat Bend Civic Association had taken a formal vote regarding the revised project, and 100% of the attending members were in favor of the project. He advised that they were to send a letter to the Board stating their recommendation.

Todd Fogel asked for further clarification of the relocation of the two-story structure. Mr. Carbonell proceeded to explain how they would rotate the house and relocate it. Todd Fogel asked whether the structures could be moved. Mr. Carbonell stated that they could be removed and repaired, and the home appeared to be in good to excellent shape. He stated that they probably would need to be re-sided and added that the existing home had asbestos siding that would have to be replaced.

William Saunders thanked Mr. Carbonell for listening to the Board's comments regarding the project, especially regarding the historic structures being identifiable from the new construction.

Christopher Eck stated that when the two historic structures were to be renovated, he asked if there would be a differentiation between the old and new siding. Mr. Carbonell confirmed and stated the siding on the existing homes was more of a period type, and Hardi Plank would be used on the remaining part of the development. He stated the color would also help to differentiate the buildings.

Barbara Walker asked what was the Code requirement regarding height for the district. Mr. Carbonell explained that Code permitted building heights up to 35 feet, which was basically a 3-story building, and they

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING

May 3, 2004

PAGE 6

were going to be much lower in height. Ms. Walker stated that comments had been made that the belvederes would be hidden from the street due to the trees, and she asked how tall were the existing trees. Mr. Carbonell explained that most were 35' to 40' in height. Ms. Walker further stated that on the drawings there was no indication regarding square footage of the belvederes. Mr. Carbonell replied they were approximately 4' wide by 16' long and would be in the center of the structure. Ms. Walker asked if the cricket shown in the front elevation of the belvedere going left was the roof behind. She added that the elevation she was referring to was marked as the north elevation A-5. Mr. Carbonell explained they attempted to put the belvedere away from the west property line. He stated that the portion Ms. Walker was referring to was a portion of the railing for the roof deck. Ms. Walker stated that going to the next belvedere and to the left it appeared as if there was a ridgeline on the roof. Mr. Carbonell explained further that it was not a ridge and was a gable end facing the house to the west and was actually a parapet wall serving as a railing above the roof.

Chair Margi Glavovic-Nothard proceeded to open the public hearing.

John McDonald stated that he lived to the north of the west end of this site and he had no objections to the project.

Veronica Sazera stated that she was very upset about this project and she felt that she was speaking way too late. She stated that seven years ago she had attempted to get permission to install a picket fence on her property, but had been denied. She stated that she had trusted that the neighborhood would not be sold out. She stated that 15 additional units to the neighborhood no matter how attractive were still 15 additional units. She suggested that the money from this project be invested in the units already existing in the neighborhood. She added that she had invested money in her property, and she felt that this Board would protect their neighborhood from such projects. She reiterated that empathy was lacking in this world. She stressed that she was very opposed to this project.

Chair Margi Glavovic-Nothard reiterated that no decision had yet been made by this Board regarding the project.

Richard Lock stated that he was here tonight to speak against the project on west Las Olas, but he felt this project fit into things also. He remarked that he had been involved since 1986 in putting together the historic district. He stated that he had compiled the necessary statistics to prove to the City Commission that they had buildings with historic merit. He added that Commissioner Moore had stated to him that he thought the community wanted to have the best use of the property, which would be high-rise condominiums. He reiterated that they were attempting to preserve the single-family neighborhood. Mr. Lock stated further that the footprint of the historic homes in Sailboat Bend was one that consisted of a single-family home between 700 sq. ft. and 1,000 sq. ft. sitting on a lot of about 50' x 100'. He stated that half to two-thirds of the lot was garden. He reiterated that the open space in Sailboat Bend was just as important as the small-scale homes. He advised that there was only one three-story home in the area, which was located at the corner of 7th Avenue and 2nd Court. He explained that the third story was an attic with gabled windows. He explained further that there were very few two-story buildings in the area, and those were five historic apartment buildings, which were built on one lot and were comprised of about 8 units.

Mr. Lock further stated that there were no concrete block homes in Sailboat Bend. He stated every home in the area was different and were vernacular and reflected their owners. He explained there were larger homes on the New River, but they were on larger lots and most were one-story homes. He stated if there were stucco homes in the Mediterranean style they were exclusively wood lathe covered by stucco. He stated the construction of the townhouses did not follow the footprint of Sailboat Bend. He stated the size and scale were not compatible. He remarked there was a beautiful canopy in the area. He remarked that the purpose of zero line setbacks was not to allow to build on the entire site, but to supply incentive to do something different. He stated the concept of this Board was that they "might" allow a project, but "did not have to allow it." He stated

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING

May 3, 2004

PAGE 7

that this project was incompatible with the area and would be changing the character of the neighborhood if permitted to be built.

Julia Jones stated she had been a resident of this City for 83 years and felt this project was not appropriate for the neighborhood. She reiterated that there should only be single-family homes in the neighborhood. She stressed that she was against this project.

Patricia Moss, owner of the subject property, stated that the property consisted of three lots that were 50' x 175'. She remarked that the site had been rental property from its beginning. She explained there had been a garage, a two-story with living units above, and at some point it had been turned into a living unit below with additional ones above. She stated that when she had purchased the property, there had been two units downstairs and one above. In the rear was the cement cottage, along with the house that had been the main residence for the owners. She added that the trees were placed around the property and there would not be a big difference once the new buildings were constructed. She felt this project would enhance the neighborhood. She felt the placing of the units facing the alley was a good idea and added that presently there were derelicts using the alley and things were being stolen. She stated that by putting windows and porches facing the alleyway, it would make it more attractive and also make for a safer environment reducing crime. She added that porches would be facing the other street, which was typical of older neighborhoods and encouraged pedestrian activity.

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.

Christopher Eck asked whether the house referred to as a one-story or a residence above an enclosed parking area had been raised or had it always been as such. Ms. Rathbun replied that the site did not provide specifics, but she thought the Sanborn Map had shown it as a two-story. She remarked that in referring to the structure as a two-story, they meant a raised single-story.

Chair Margi Glavovic-Nothard asked if the Board should consider everything regarding this application as a whole or were they to consider each item separately. James Cromar explained that the applicant had requested three separate certificates and the Board could take either one vote or several votes regarding the application.

Motion made by William Saunders and seconded by Christopher Eck to approve the application as presented.

Todd Fogel remarked that he was torn regarding this project. He stated it was a nice project and heard the neighbors' concerns. He stated that in looking at the streetscape, they did run an issue of approving the project, but he felt the neighborhood was far beyond the project and the damage had already been done. He stated it was not possible to stop building and the ordinance did not permit it, and homeowners could make their requests and presentations as long as they followed guidelines. The question of compatibility arose and he stated that it would create more ownership instead of rentals for the area. He added that if they continued to approve such projects, there would be no further need for this Board. He remarked that they had permitted houses to be demolished and relocated, and they had already changed the complexion of the neighborhood. He reiterated that the damage was done.

Mr. Fogel stated that streetscape wise the massing was not compatible, but visually each unit was compatible. He stated that to the east were two small duplexes and probably would be the next to go, and stated that at some point people stopped fighting City Hall because they could not win.

Barbara Walker stated that this project might meet the present Code, but she felt they were an Advisory Board and if they felt strongly about an issue, then they needed to make the City Commission aware of their feelings.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING

May 3, 2004

PAGE 8

She felt they should not take a defeatist attitude. She felt that in looking at the elevations of the streetscape, the project was a huge massive project. She stated it was an attractive project, but was not in keeping with the character of the historic district. She personally felt that at some point the property owners had to realize that they might not be able to get the ultimate value out of their property, and other issues were involved besides monetary ones.

Christopher Eck stated that he had been listening to residents of Sailboat Bend at almost every meeting, and things have gone back and forth regarding the permitting of structures and projects. He stated that when this project had first been presented, he had raised comments regarding the possibility of losing another historic home in the area. He agreed that since this issue was now running rampant throughout eastern Broward as to what was considered to be overdevelopment or compatible development, even in areas where greater density was permitted, this was a "thorny" issue that would continue. He added that in historic neighborhoods such as this one where the overwhelming character of the streetscape was single-family homes, one would question the greater density even where it was permitted. He stated his initial concern was the loss of historic fabric. He felt that even though it was an attractive development, they were heading towards overdevelopment in this area. He added that the character of the area was single-family homes. He felt something more compatible could be developed for the site that would be in keeping with the historic nature of the neighborhood with less units, and it could still be economically feasible. He felt it was less an issue of profit, but more of trying to retain what had given value to the neighborhood, which was the historic character of the surrounding area. He reiterated that the area was mostly single-family homes or smaller unit development. He felt this was becoming more of a problem in the area.

Tom Tatum stated that he had been working with this ordinance for six years, and he did not think it was the intent of such ordinance to turn this neighborhood into one of such structures. He stated that projects had been built, but he believed the intent of the ordinance was not to change the basic nature of the neighborhood from single-family dwellings to this.

William Saunders stated he was a resident of Sailboat Bend and remarked that many properties were in disrepair and things could be better. He added there were vagrants everywhere all the time in the neighborhood. He felt having more ownership in the area would help clean up the neighborhoods and such things would disappear. He stated he intended to live in Sailboat Bend for a long time or at least maintain a home in the area.

Gus Carbonell reminded the Board of the Shepherd Estate and how people thought the townhouses being built would not fit in. He stated that not only had this Estate been saved from demolition by neglect, but also the townhouses were an enhancement to the area. He reiterated that everyone kept referring to this neighborhood as single-family, but the zoning permitted 25 units per acre. He stated that this area was very mixed and the area was zoned multi-family. He felt this project would be an asset to the neighborhood. He reiterated that this project was not a rental project and were single-family dwellings attached. He emphasized it was not a group home.

Tom Tatum stated that Mr. Carbonell was correct in regard to the use of the word "single-family," and stated that the term was being misused and possibly they should use other terms in sense of scale, mass and open space. He stated the neighborhood was characterized essentially by low-rise structures. He stated there were plenty of multi-family uses in the area, but they could occur in buildings with less scale and mass than such projects that were beginning to proliferate the neighborhood.

Barbara Walker stated that the other issue was that by having three separate lots, they ended up with green space between the buildings, which contributed to the open space feeling of a neighborhood that was important. She stated that she had grown up in Victoria Park and it had been a great single-family neighborhood, but it was now losing its early charm.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING

May 3, 2004

PAGE 9

Christopher Eck stated that in using the term single-family in his dialogue, he had really was attempting to discuss the scale and mass of the project. He stated this project and neighborhood could not be compared to a historic neighborhood in a different city that had a different development history. To say one had to go elsewhere to have an historic neighborhood would be denigrating the historic status of Sailboat Bend itself to a degree by borrowing from another place.

Chair Margi Glavovic-Nothard stated she also was a resident in the neighborhood, along with being a designer. She stated that her responsibility was ultimately to the City ordinance in effect. In looking at the criteria for additional guidelines for new construction, she felt that for a project to seek exceptions to the provisions of the ULDR needed to be able to meet such criteria. She felt the biggest issue regarding this project was the relationship of the buildings to open space between adjoining buildings and they were to be visually compatible to the places they were visually related. She stated the park nearby was an open space and related to the buildings in the area and if the project took over the whole area, it would appear as a hermetically-sealed park and that was not the intention for the area. She felt the project was lacking open space, but there had been an inordinate effort to try and do this right and make everyone happy. Effort had also been made to preserve the existing buildings. She felt the project was still deficient in meeting some of the additional criteria mentioned in the guidelines for new construction. She felt it only met about 50% of such criteria.

Roll call showed: YEAS: Carolyn Dandy and William Saunders. NAYS: Christopher Eck, Mary-Jane Graff, Barbara Walker, Todd Fogel, Tom Tatum, and Margi Glavovic-Nothard. Motion failed 2-6.

- 3. Applicant:** City of Fort Lauderdale **Case No. 14-H-04**
Downtown Development Authority
- Location: Second Street Corridor Streetscape Improvements
- Request: Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration
- Second Street corridor streetscape improvements within the H-1 District
 - The north and south sides of SW 2nd Street between SW 3rd Avenue and the FEC Corridor
 - The east and west sides of SW 3rd Avenue within the H-1 District between Broward Boulevard and the New River
 - The east and west sides of SW 2nd Avenue within the H-1 District between Broward Boulevard and the New River
 - The north and south sides of SW 1st Street (North New River Drive West) between SW 3rd Avenue and SW 2nd Avenue
- Zoned: H-1
- Legal: (Refer to project file)

James Cromar stated that the applicant was requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration for portions of the proposed streetscape improvements within the H-1 district. He explained the area was from the FEC corridor to SW 3rd Avenue. He reminded the Board to consider the criteria listed in Section 47-16, along with the criteria in Section 47-24.11.C.

Merrilyn Rathbun, Consultant, stated that the applicant was asking for approval of streetscape improvements along SW 2nd Street and on streets within the H-1 District, including lighting, paving, landscaping and street furniture. The requested items needed to be compatible with the historic character of the H-1 district, the Florida State Historic Site/Old Fort Lauderdale Museum and Village (within the H-1 district), the adaptive reuse of the area, i.e. commercial and restaurant, as well as the nearby Riverwalk. The proposed alterations would not alter the exterior appearance of the historic buildings of the district and nearby areas.

Ms. Rathbun continued stating that this application included a detailed narrative of the project with a table

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING

May 3, 2004

PAGE 10

detailing the improvements to be made on each street. She stated that the requested materials were as follows:

- Sidewalk improvements, new curbing and width increased eight (8) to ten (10) feet
 - Red clay brick pavers
 - Red aggregate rock material
- Landscaping
 - New trees, including shade trees and Sabal Palms
 - New planters installed on sidewalk
 - Starburst tree grates, installed in sidewalk
- New paving on roads
- Lighting
 - Double globe period lighting for historic district
 - Signature lighting for financial district
- Street furniture
 - Metal benches and waste cans (as on Riverwalk)

Ms. Rathbun further stated that the requested materials were compatible with the historic streetscape of the H-1 District and nearby areas.

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

Cathy Sweetapple, Transportation Planner, stated she was representing the DDA, and stated that Jeff Suiter of EDSA who was one of the designers of the Second Street Corridor Streetscape improvement program, was also present this evening to answer any questions the Board might have in regard to this project.

Jeff Suiter, EDSA, stated that the DDA and the City were partners in this project. He stated that about three to three-and-a-half years ago, their firm got the request to come up with various types of prototype materials throughout the Downtown. He stated that some of the areas were in the historic district, and the majority of the project was in the new business district. He explained that the materials selected were to be compatible with the various areas. He explained further the historic district would have the period lights and clay bricks. He stated that the intent of the overall project that the DDA was hoping to accomplish throughout the entire Downtown was to become more pedestrian friendly and minimize the vehicular movements through the Downtown with the narrowing of lanes, and widening sidewalks where possible.

Mr. Suiter proceeded to show a sketch of SW 2nd Avenue.

Tom Tatum asked for some further clarification regarding the widening of the sidewalks and asked about the dimensions. Mr. Suiter replied that currently most of the sidewalks in the area were about four-and-a-half to five feet in width, and where possible they would widen them to at least eight feet. Mr. Tatum asked if 2nd Street would remain with two-way traffic. Mr. Suiter confirmed. Mr. Tatum further asked if parking would be eliminated. Mr. Suiter stated that currently parking was two lanes during the day, and parking was permitted on the side streets in the evenings. He stated such parking would remain and there would be clay brick pavers on the outside lanes and had been used in the crosswalks in the Downtown area, as well as at Riverfront. He explained that the two outside lanes would become paved areas with bollards. He explained further there was an agreement between the City and the Himmarshee Merchants Association that on certain evenings various streets could be closed down to vehicular activity. The bollards would be moved during the evening hours when the streets were to be closed.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING

May 3, 2004

PAGE 11

Tom Tatum stated that if they widened the sidewalks would there be additional tables, and how would the pedestrian traffic be served through this plan, rather than just having additional tables and chairs that prevent pedestrian passage. Mr. Suiter stated that currently the Association had an agreement with the City permitting café tables, and they were charged a certain fee. He advised that he was not aware of the logistic details of such agreement.

William Saunders stated that it appeared the parking on the block between SW 3rd Avenue and SW 2nd Avenue existing on both sides would be eliminated in order to accommodate the restaurants and bars with outside seating.

Ms. Sweetapple stated that part of Mr. Saunders' interpretation was correct in regard to certain times. Mr. Saunders asked what would happen with the pedestrians. Ms. Sweetapple stated that when the tables and chairs were in the ten-foot wide area of brick pavers on the roadway for dining, there would be additional room on the sidewalk for pedestrians. Mr. Saunders reiterated that additional tables would be added, and they would not just move the existing tables to another location. Ms. Sweetapple acknowledged that it was difficult to walk through the area, but it was part of the attraction of the area. She stated that the sidewalk between 2nd and 3rd Avenues was already about eight to ten feet wide, and would have a new red brick clay surface. It would not be widened, but the brick would extend into the street. She stated depending on the amount of the crowds, it was a victim of its own success.

Chair Margi Glavovic-Nothard clarified that they were not actually extending the sidewalk, and they were just going to change the material of the lanes. Ms. Sweetapple confirmed. Chair Margi Glavovic-Nothard clarified once again that the application was not to extend the sidewalk. Ms. Sweetapple confirmed.

Mr. Suiter explained that in that location the sidewalk was about twelve to fifteen feet wide, and announced that on Wednesdays the street was shut down completely and they would probably continue to do so. He advised that on Fridays and Saturdays there was an agreement with the City to shut down the outside lane of traffic. He stated this was an additional effort to try and protect the pedestrians standing and lingering in the street area. He stated it would be more of a strip to provide extra protection for the pedestrians.

William Saunders stated that was not an accurate statement, and explained there were only two traffic lanes on the block, one going east and one going west, and there was parking on either side of the road.

Ms. Sweetapple explained that the sidewalk which was being widened was located on the north/south cross streets on 2nd and 3rd Avenues. She stated that some of the widths presently made it difficult to maneuver due to the utility poles. She stated that there had been changes regarding the parking along 2nd Street, and she believed that parking was allowed during off-peak hours, but during peak hours the outside travel lanes were open.

Chair Margi Glavovic-Nothard asked if the green trees were making a distinction from the non-green trees on the plan and asked for some further clarification. Mr. Suiter explained that the trees being delineated due to this project were either existing trees or proposed trees, and the symbol was indicative of the type of tree. He added that the clear trees were located outside of the project. Chair Margi Glavovic-Nothard asked if they were increasing the canopy at this time. Mr. Suiter stated they were not removing any of the canopy and were only adding to it. Chair Margi Glavovic-Nothard asked if the 2nd Street project included the area east of SW 2nd Avenue where the Strand was being proposed at the southeast quadrant. Mr. Suiter confirmed and stated that the project began at Federal Highway and went west to SW 3rd Avenue. Chair Margi Glavovic-Nothard asked about the trees for the remaining portion of the project. Mr. Suiter stated they would add trees wherever possible based on the Code. He added they were also going to provide underground duct bank work for utilities. Chair Margi Glavovic-Nothard reiterated that she did not feel enough trees were being added to the streetscape to make it a more pedestrian environment.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING

May 3, 2004

PAGE 12

Chair Margi Glavovic-Nothard further stated that opposite the County Government Center, there appeared to be a lack of trees. Mr. Suiter stated that there were existing trees and were located within the open lot, but they had not been indicated on the plan.

Barbara Walker asked if they were proposing the same paver on the sidewalk as on the roadway. Mr. Suiter confirmed. Ms. Walker asked if there would be a clear enough definition in stepping off the curb and onto another level of roadway. Mr. Suiter replied that there would be a row of trees that were offset about three-and-a-half to four feet, and he did not think there would be a problem. Ms. Walker asked about the materials to be used for the intersections. Mr. Suiter replied it would be asphalt. He remarked that everything on the plan shown in gray would be a new overlay.

William Saunders asked if there were any plans where the streets intersected to have trash containers and benches installed. Mr. Suiter replied there were trash containers and benches throughout the area.

Chair Margi Glavovic-Nothard stated that a streetscape also encompassed various other components, and she was assuming that would be part of a bigger picture. Ms. Sweetapple stated that the back-up also included colored photographs and illustrations of examples. Mr. Suiter explained that the trash containers and benches were located at the intersections. He explained how the project had been labeled to the Board.

Ms. Walker further asked if the bollards were an integral part of the plan, and remarked that she was not in favor of them, and objected to how they would be used. James Cromar stated that business owners requesting outdoor dining permits either had them in place or would have to appear before this Board for a review of their request. He reminded them that a restaurant owner had approached the Board at a previous meeting in regard to changing his outdoor dining layout from four to six tables.

Mr. Suiter further stated that he was not well versed in regard to the dining permits and requirements. He stated that when the exterior lanes were shut down, currently orange cones were used as a protective barrier, but they did not actually protect the pedestrian. He stated the intent of the bollards were to create where the pedestrians were located and provide a safer area for them. He explained that the bollard was a steel structure that was a protective device that could deter a vehicle from striking a pedestrian. He advised they also had reflective tape on them meeting all code requirements.

Christopher Eck stated that the Board had not been provided with a visual description of the bollards that were to be used. He asked if they were similar to the ones used in New Orleans in the Quarter. He explained they were simple steel posts with a metal cap. Mr. Suiter stated that the bollards in question were decorative and they were trying to keep within the character of the light poles that were used, but on a smaller scale.

Tom Tatum asked if the brick on 2nd Avenue that wrapped around by Tarpon Bend was different than the sidewalk in front of the Historic Buildings at the Historical Society. Mr. Suiter confirmed. Mr. Tatum clarified there would be a demarcation where such buildings started. Mr. Suiter again confirmed.

Chair Margi Glavovic-Nothard asked if there was an intent for the future to continue the streetscape improvements through to Sailboat Bend. Mr. Suiter stated this was a demonstration project, and DDA had funds to spend on improvements in the Downtown area. He stated their intent 3-4 years ago was to make the area more pedestrian friendly. Based on the budget available, this was the portion of the project that would be done at this time. Chair Margi Glavovic-Nothard felt the area should connect to the museums and performing art center. She further stated that the public realm needed to receive a greater level of support and infrastructure in order to make this continue for pedestrians. She felt the sidewalks should be widened and she was concerned that this project would make things look nice, but would not provide better pedestrian access. Mr. Suiter reiterated that sidewalks were being widened in areas where possible.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING

May 3, 2004

PAGE 13

Ms. Sweetapple stated there were other sections on 2nd Street to the east where there were smaller sidewalks, and there was an effort to widen them to the financial district to attract individuals into the historic district on foot. She reiterated that this was the first step and they wanted a sign-off from this Board. She stated that part of this dealt with federal funding, and the City had requested such monies to help fund transit for the area and other improvements extending from the pedestrian improvements.

Chair Margi Glavovic-Nothard noted that retractable bollards could be an option and she felt that moving the bollards onto the sidewalks when not used created a strange edge that was not pedestrian friendly. Mr. Suiter stated that the existing light poles had offsets of two feet, and they had moved things closer to the travel lanes and widened the pedestrian spaces where they could.

Christopher Eck asked if the monies were transportation enhancement monies through the MPO, which had already been approved. Ms. Sweetapple stated they were seeking Federal dollars. She clarified that she was representing the DDA. She stated that this was above and beyond the MPO.

Chair Margi Glavovic-Nothard 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 Barbara Walker and seconded by Tom Tatum to accept the application as presented. Roll call showed: YEAS: Christopher Eck, Mary-Jane Graff, Barbara Walker, William Saunders, Todd Fogel, Tom Tatum, Carolyn Dandy, and Margi Glavovic-Nothard. NAYS: None. Motion carried 8-0.

- Applicant:** Las Olas Riverfront Associates, L.P. **Case No. 15-H-04**
Location: 300 SW 1st Avenue
Request: Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration:
 - Two reverse channel signs with raised letters, burnt orange color for placement on east fascia of building and north fascia of building**Zoned:** RAC-CC
Legal: (Refer to Project File)

Continued from earlier in the meeting.

James Cromar stated that neither the applicant nor their representative was present tonight.

Chair Margi Glavovic-Nothard asked if this item was to be deferred.

The Assistant City Attorney stated that the applicant should be present during the hearing, and the Board should defer the item. She explained that Mr. Cromar would contact the applicant and see what they desired.

The Board unanimously agreed to defer this item.

For the Good of the City

James Cromar stated that he had three items he wanted to bring forward. He stated there were two cases that had been stricken from tonight's agenda. One was The Strand at Riverfront, which was to come before the Board for a site plan review and comment. He stated that the design team had requested that the hearing be deferred until the Board's June meeting due to design changes. He further stated the other case which was to be on the agenda but had not come forward was the Corey Lenga Townhouses on the 800 Block of West Las Olas. He stated that portions of their package had not been received in time so that the item could be on this month's agenda.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING

May 3, 2004

PAGE 14

"Historic Preservation Week"

James Cromar announced that this week was "Historic Preservation Week," and stated that the Broward Trust for Historic Preservation was going to conduct a series of walking tours. Details could be provided if desired.

Length of Service for Board Members

James Cromar stated that this was also the last month of service for some of the Board Members.

Chair Margi Glavovic-Nothard announced that tonight was Tom Tatum's last meeting after six years of service. She thanked him for all his expertise and dedication to the Board. Tom Tatum stated it had been a pleasure serving on the Board and had the utmost respect for the individuals he had served with in such capacity.

Barbara Walker stated that she was also leaving the Board due to moving out of the country, and hoped when she returned that she would be able to once again serve on the board.

Update of Properties Located at 700-712 SW 2nd Court

The Assistant City Attorney stated that two hearings were held last week in regard to the properties located at 700-712 SW 2nd Court, and another one was scheduled for this week in order to impose fines on the properties.

She stated there was presently a fine running on the properties. She stated that the third hearing would be held provided the property owner did not appeal such hearings. She advised the City had to wait 90 days from the date the order was signed before commencing foreclosure proceedings.

William Saunders asked if the owner had attempted to take advantage of the Amnesty Program. The Assistant City Attorney stated that the owner could not take advantage of such program due to the fact that the properties were not in compliance. Mr. Saunders asked if they had given the directive for foreclosing on the properties if the owner did not make an appeal. The Assistant City Attorney stated she did not know if such a decision had yet been made in regard to those properties.

Todd Fogel asked what were the amount of the fines on the properties. The Assistant City Attorney revealed that there was presently a fine on 712 SW 2nd Court in the amount of \$103,600 that was accruing in the amount of \$50 per day. The fines on 700 SW 2nd Court totaled \$216,300 that was accruing in the amount of \$100 per day. She stated that this Thursday, staff would be asking the Special Master to impose a second fine on the property located at 712 SW 2nd Court in the amount of \$65,000 that would accrue at \$50 per day.

Todd Fogel asked if these fines were separate from the existing liens that had appeared or had they been "washed." The Assistant City Attorney replied there had not been any liens on the properties. Todd Fogel stated that when these properties came before this Board, there had been over \$1 Million in liens and asked what had happened to those liens. The Assistant City Attorney explained that she had spoken to this Board about the matter several times and stated that there had been errors in the recorded documents. She stated that the documents that had been recorded had not been liens and had not been perfected or recorded properly. Staff had not adhered to statutory requirements, and therefore, there were no liens. She advised they had taken the steps this past week to have fines imposed on the properties, but up until last Tuesday that had not yet been done.

Todd Fogel stated that when these properties went before the City Commission liens had been discussed in excess of \$1 Million. He asked if those figures were incorrect. The Assistant City Attorney stated that the property owner had offered to settle the outstanding code enforcement cases and make a payment to the City.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING

May 3, 2004

PAGE 15

At that time, the City Attorney's office had advised the Commission that if they proceeded they would end up with about \$400,000 of fines against the properties. The owner had offered less than that amount, and she did not think the figure of \$1 Million had ever been used in regard to these properties.

Todd Fogel asked what was going on with the property at 712 SW 2nd Court, and further asked if the house was to be demolished. The Assistant City Attorney stated that neither house could be torn down at this time because the City Commission had upheld this Board's denial of the owner's economic hardship request. Todd Fogel stated that lack of maintenance on the property and demolition by neglect had taken place during the proceedings. He reiterated that if one went to the site, one would see that the roof had entirely caved in and the house would be torn down due to the fault of the City. He stated that he had continuously raised this issue for the last year and a half. He advised that he had gone to the City Commission and to Commissioner Hutchinson and had shown them pictures, but yet nothing had been done. He stated that he had been told that the house would be torn down because the City had made a deal. The owner was to pay the fines and then would be permitted to demolish the property located at 712 SW 2nd Court. He stated if that was the case, it was disgusting. He stated that was why he had made the statement that he was very discouraged sitting on this Board. He reiterated they were volunteers, and the public stated they relied on this Board, who voted their conscience and gave of their time, but the City still made deals and allowed houses to be torn down.

James Cromar stated that the Assistant City Attorney had provided the Board with the latest available information regarding these properties.

South Side School

Chair Margi Glavovic-Nothard proceeded to congratulate the City on its acquisition of the South Side School.

Christopher Eck stated that it was his understanding that the City had acquired the school for about \$2.1 Million, and County Commissioner John Rodstrom had contributed out monies of his open space allocation fund. He further stated that there had been a Florida Communities Trust Grant of over \$2 Million provided to the City. He stated that he believed the documentation finalizing such purchase went through several weeks ago.

Chair Margi Glavovic-Nothard congratulated Christopher Eck on his work in regard to this matter. Christopher Eck stated that congratulations went to the City in regard to this item.

Approved Building Materials in Section 47-17 (SBHD)

James Cromar stated that Barbara Walker had raised some questions regarding the permitted building materials.

Barbara Walker stated that she had noticed in one project that they had introduced a new material on the front of a house that adjoined existing material without definition. She felt it would be a good practice to make a definition in such case. She felt such things were not aesthetically pleasing otherwise. She also stated that she realized Hardi Plank was an approved material for the historic district, but she would like the Board to rethink that matter. She stated she was not aware of the process involved, but urged them to do so. She did not feel that Hardi Plank was appropriate material to be used. She stated that builders preferred to use it because it was maintenance free, but she did not think it enhanced the district.

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

There being no further business to come before this Board, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 7:14 p.m.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING

May 3, 2004

PAGE 16

CHAIR

Margi Glavovic-Nothard

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.