

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE
MONDAY, JUNE 7, 2004- 5:00 P.M.
CITY HALL
1st FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM
100 N. ANDREWS AVENUE
FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA**

Cumulative Attendance

	<u>Present/Absent</u>	<u>From January, 2004</u>
<u>Board Members</u>		
Christopher Eck	P	5-1
Todd Fogel	P	5-1
Mary-Jane Graff	P	5-1
Margi Glavovic-Nothard, Chair	P	4-2
Rachel Bach	A	3-3
William Saunders, Vice-Chair	P	6-0
Carolyn Dandy	P	5-1
Clay Wieland	P	5-1

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

Amy Streelman	Pete Daltmer	Ken Hawkins
Jason Dynan	Justin Raby	Daryl Jolly
Lee Williams	Ed Cahn	Vincent Williams
Harry Cussen	Don Wilkin	Douette Pryce
Bill Carltock	Erik Bonilla	Sheelyn Reid
Dean Craig	Corey Lenga	Richard Loche

Call to Order

Chair Margi Glavovic-Nothard called the meeting of the Historic Preservation Board to order at approximately 5:07 p.m. Roll call was taken with the following Board Members being present: Carolyn Dandy, Todd Fogel, Mary-Jane Graff, William Saunders, Clay Wieland and Margi Glavovic-Nothard.

Christopher Eck entered the meeting at approximately 5:09 p.m.

Election of New Chair

James Cromar announced that the new terms for the Board Members were beginning and that the previous terms had ended on May 20, 2004.

Margi Glavovic-Nothard nominated Christopher Eck as Chair of the Historic Preservation Advisory Board. Seconded by Clay Wieland.

Motion made by William Saunders and seconded by Clay Wieland that Christopher Eck be elected Chair of the Historic Preservation Advisory Board. Board approved unanimously.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING

June 7, 2004

PAGE 2

Election of Vice-Chair

Chair Christopher Eck nominated Williams Saunders as Vice-Chair of the Historic Preservation Advisory Board. Seconded by Margi Glavovic-Nothard.

Motion made by Clay Wieland and seconded by Margi Glavovic-Nothard that Williams Saunders be elected Vice-Chair of the Historic Preservation Advisory Board. Board approved unanimously.

Approval of Minutes –May 3, 2004 Meeting

Motion made by William Saunders and seconded by Clay Wieland to approve the minutes of the May 3, 2004 meeting. Board unanimously approved.

All individuals wishing to speak regarding the cases on tonight's agenda were sworn in.

- | | | | |
|-----------|-------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| 1. | Applicant: | <u>Las Olas Riverfront Associates, L.P.</u> | <u>Case No. 15-H-04</u> |
| | Location: | 300 SW 1 st Avenue
Art Bar | |
| | Request: | Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration: <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ 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) | |

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 that this item had been deferred from the May 3, 2004 agenda since a representative of the applicant had not been present. He stated that the Board needed 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 a 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.

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

Erik Bonilla, GM Signs, stated that he wanted to show a sample of what the letters on the sign would look like to the Board.

Chair Christopher Eck proceeded to open the public hearing. There being no individuals who wished to speak

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING

June 7, 2004

PAGE 3

on this item, the public hearing was closed and discussion was brought back to the Board.

Clay Wieland asked if there would be lighting on the signs. Mr. Bonilba explained there would be no illumination.

William Saunders remarked that there were some wooden signs on the site, and he believed there had been overhead lighting for such signs, and asked if that was to stay. Mr. Bonilba replied that it would stay and provide some illumination to the sign.

Motion made by Margi Glavovic-Nothard and seconded by Williams Saunders to approve the application as submitted. Roll call showed: YEAS: Carolyn Dandy, Clay Wieland, Mary-Jane Graff, William Saunders, Todd Fogel, Margi Glavovic-Nothard, and Christopher Eck. NAYS: None. Motion carried 7-0.

2. **Applicant:** **LBJ Investments (Jay Adams)** **Case No. 28-H-03**
Progresso Plaza
Location: 901 Progresso Drive
Request: Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration
- Repair and restore railings
 - Replace existing barrel tile roof with visually similar material
 - Repair stucco finish and restore archways on first-floor archway and within window openings as in original design
 - Restore wood flooring on second floor walkway
- Zoned: B-2
Legal: An unnumbered block lying south of Block 214
P.B. 2, P. 18(D)

James Cromar announced that the representative of the applicant had not yet arrived, and asked if this matter could be heard later in the evening. Board unanimously approved.

3. **Applicant:** **Corey Lengq** **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 buildings
- Certificate of Appropriateness for New Construction:
- Townhouses, Two (2) Stories with six (6) 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'
- 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 applicant was requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition for four structures at the site, along with a Certificate of Appropriateness for New Construction of six townhouses with a request for yard modifications. He stated that the Board had seen this application previously, and the item had been continued from a previous meeting. He reminded the Board to consider the Material and Design Guidelines for the Sailboat Bend Historic District, Section 47-17, and the criteria in Section 47-24.11.C.

Merrilyn Rathbun, Consultant, stated that the applicant was requesting 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. None of those

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING

June 7, 2004

PAGE 4

buildings were shown on the City Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps before 1953, and were not considered to have historic significance in the historic district as they had not been built in the period of significance for the SBHD, i.e. 1913 to 1940. She further stated that the applicant had stated that this demolition was necessary for the project. Ms. Rathbun proceeded to read the criteria from Section 47-24.11.C.

Ms. Rathbun further stated that the applicant required a COA for New Construction of a two-story, six-unit townhouse project. The townhouses would be built on 3 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 3-story West Las Olas Villas. Immediately across the street from the proposed project site was the historically significant, ca. 1914-1918, Dichtenmueller House. She stated that it was an excellent example of a Craftsman bungalow. The Dichtenmuellers were important pioneer merchants in the City. In the same block (21), Lot 19 was the site of the Francis Abreu designed Oliver House, ca 1926. The house was individually designated historic by the City when it was moved to the location from Smoker Park. The applicant had modified his original plan and reduced the height of the Townhomes from three stories to two stories. The six units were in two separate buildings on either side of the combined lots which allowed for a large amount of open space between the buildings. The design would considerably lessen any adverse impact on the nearby historic houses and would be better integrated with the historic streetscape of West Las Olas Boulevard.

Ms. Rathbun proceeded to read criteria Section 47-24.11, along with the criteria in the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation pertaining to the building site. She stated that the landscape surrounding a historic building and contained within an individual parcel of land was considered the building site. The site, including its associated features, contributed to the overall character of the historic property. She added that it was recommended that alterations or additions for the new use be of a design for new exterior additions to historic buildings or adjacent new construction which was compatible with the historic character of the site and which preserved the historic relationship between the building or buildings and the landscape. It was not recommended to introduce new construction onto the building site which was visually incompatible in terms of size, scale, design, materials, color or texture which would destroy historic relationships on the site or which would damage or destroy important landscape features. She added that the size and scale of the new design was compatible with the historic neighborhood.

Ms. Rathbun continued stating that the applicant had requested the following materials which met the Materials and Design Guidelines of the SBHD, and proceeded to read Section 47-17.7. She added that the garage doors were to be eight feet wide. She stated that the project required a principal structure yard setback to fifteen feet front, and fifteen feet rear, five foot left side setback from ten feet and five foot right side setback from ten feet. She then proceeded to read Section 47-17.5, application for yard and minimum distance separation reduction. She continued stating that reduction of yards would be permitted as follows:

- “1. RML-25 zoning Principal residential structures: Front yard: fifteen (15) feet, side yard: five (5) feet, rear yard: fifteen (15) feet.”

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

Kenneth Hawkins, architect, stated that they had been before this Board previously, and were now returning after addressing comments provided by the community and this Board. He stated the site currently was comprised of four structures with seven units. He continued, stating that they were requesting to demolish those structures, and build a new development comprised of six units. He advised that they were attempting to preserve the trees at the site, and showed to the Board a site plan and pictures of the trees at the site.

Mr. Hawkins stated that the items which had changed since their last presentation were as follows: He explained they had reduced the number of units down to six from seven, and there had been a wrought iron

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING

June 7, 2004

PAGE 5

fence wrapping around the property which had been removed. He added that due to massing concerns, they had reduced the buildings from three-stories to two-stories, and had reduced the building lot coverage. He added they were still requesting some yard modifications that he would explain further. He stated they were now providing a one-car garage instead of two-car garages, but were maintaining the two parking spaces per unit with one space in a surface lot. He proceeded to show the area on the site plan.

Mr. Hawkins continued stating that they had increased the landscaping at the site and had changed the look of the building. In regard to the yard modifications, he stated they had agreed to a trade-off with the community because they had desired front porches. He explained that porches had been added facing West Las Olas. He added that the main structure was setback 25 feet, but the porches encroached into the setback. He stated that they also added porches on the eastern portion of the property, and the main structures were set back ten feet from the property line. On the west, he stated they were requesting a yard modification up to 5 feet, 11 inches due to attempting to preserve the old Oak tree. He added they also were requesting a rear yard modification of up to 15 feet.

Mr. Hawkins further stated that they broke up the massing, and reiterated how the building had been reduced to two stories. He added they had brought in architectural elements that would make the project more compatible with the single-family homes in the area. He explained they were using Hardi-Plank, stucco and paint. He added that on the western portion of the project, they had tried to isolate the unit and not have a continuous wall. He stated they were going to use metal roofs on two of the units with clay tiles. He continued stating that they had worked with the community and attempted to address their concerns. He proceeded to urge the Board to approve this application.

Chair Christopher Eck proceeded to open the public hearing.

Don Wilkin stated that he was now the liaison to this Board from the Sailboat Bend Civic Association, replacing Nolan Haan. He advised that in May their Association had met and discussed this project. He announced that reducing the structures to two stories had been a major issue. He stated the Association had voted in favor of this project since various changes were made. He further stated that the goal was to take a long façade and break it up with different features. He felt they needed to do some more rearranging. He stated he had suggested that the garage to the west be flipped so a porch could be added facing the street, but there had been a problem due to an attempt to save the Oak tree. He stated that some of the goals were consistent with the Design Development Review Committee, which had been organized in the neighborhood during the last couple of months in an attempt to make recommendations to developers as to what could and could not be submitted. He stated that this project was presented before the formation of that committee. He reiterated that the community was in favor of this project.

William Saunders stated that prior to the neighborhood submitting their written approval regarding this project, the residents had suggested some items that could make the project more acceptable. He stated that from what he could see, it appeared the developer had taken some of the suggestions from the community and commended them for doing so.

Todd Fogel asked if there was an issue regarding the design since more than one style had been incorporated into the project. He felt it was mimicking what already existed in a neighborhood in order to accomplish an effect, instead of keeping the building more consistent.

Margi Glavovic-Nothard stated that the scale issues had been handled well, along with the side relationships. In terms of changing the style with each unit, she felt it would require more than a material change, and that it appeared disjointed. She believed there was a lack of cohesive presence on the street. She stated that her goal was always to see whether a project met the guidelines for new construction. Therefore, in terms of the criteria "a" through "h," it appeared most of such criteria had been met. Aesthetically, she stated that she was

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING

June 7, 2004

PAGE 6

concerned about the appearance.

Kenneth Hawkins stated that their intent on mixing the styles was due to feedback from some immediate neighbors, where they tried to use the architectural styles in order to break up the massing visually. He further stated that they were going for more of an eclectic look.

Margi Glavovic-Nothard further stated that she felt the facades could be stronger, if the style was more consistent. She did not think the bulk of the project was so massive that it would have been overwhelming on the street. She felt the styles being used could work consistently without being overwhelming or massive in keeping with the neighboring buildings, the solid to void relationship, and the opening to mass ratio.

Margi Glavovic-Nothard continued stating that the goal was to retain the cars on the inside which had probably driven a lot of the developer's decisions. Mr. Hawkins confirmed. Ms. Nothard asked if any consideration could be given to putting windows in garages. Mr. Hawkins stated that in the initial design there had been little openings in the garage, but they had chosen more decorative moldings instead. Ms. Nothard stated that she continued to lament the loss of the 1950s buildings in the neighborhood. She added that she hoped the Civic Association would support projects that protected the mix in the community.

Chair Christopher Eck asked if the applicant wanted to attempt to address some of the additional concerns mentioned this evening. Mr. Hawkins stated that the developers wanted to pursue what was actually being presented this evening.

Motion made by William Saunders to approve the application as presented based upon the consultant's report.

Todd Fogel stated that he wanted to commend the developers for returning before this Board. He added that he also wanted to comment them for staying with two-story structures without pop-ups which massed the project. He stated that he was glad they had broken up the building and removed the fencing. He also thanked them for their patience and work with the neighborhood. He remarked that this was the wave of what the neighborhoods were seeing.

Todd Fogel proceeded to second the motion made by William Saunders.

Roll call showed: YEAS: Clay Wieland, Mary-Jane Graff, William Saunders, Todd Fogel, Margi Glavovic-Nothard, Carolyn Dandy, and Christopher Eck. NAYS: None. Motion carried (7-0).

2.	Applicant:	<u>LBJ Investments (Jay Adams)</u>	<u>Case No. 28-H-03</u>
		Progresso Plaza	
	Location:	901 Progresso Drive	
	Request:	Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Repair and restore railings• Replace existing barrel tile roof with visually similar material• Repair stucco finish and restore archways on first-floor archway and within window openings as in original design• Restore wood flooring on second floor walkway	
	Zoned:	B-2	
	Legal:	An unnumbered block lying south of Block 214 P.B. 2, P. 18(D)	

Continued from page 3.

James Cromar announced that the applicant was now present. He further stated that the applicant was seeking

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING

June 7, 2004

PAGE 7

to restore this site to its historic appearance. He referred the Board to the criteria in Section 47-24.11.

Merrilyn Rathbun, Consultant, stated that Progresso Plaza, a 1926 Mediterranean Revival building was declared an historic site by the City of Fort Lauderdale in 2003. The following is a quotation from the consultant's memo recommending designation that was presented to the Board in September, 2003:

"The building is a fine example of the Spanish Eclectic style (a subset of Mediterranean Revival). The architect is unknown; it has been suggested that Addison Mizner was the designer, but there is no evidence that Mizner ever worked in Broward County. The work resembles that of local architect, Francis Abreu, who worked in the area at this time; there is no documentation on Abreu's involvement in this project. The architect knew his business; he gave careful attention to all the elevation, even the sides and back.

"The building has been restored to its 1920's appearance. It is sited on a triangular lot. The design is symmetrical with a central tower at the apex of the triangle with two wings along the legs of the triangle. There is an open patio area between the wings. The most distinctive detail is the double galleries facing the patio area. The lower gallery features heavy masonry columns; the upper gallery has wooden balusters and rail* and thick wooden posts with support brackets at the roofline. Most of the storefronts on the first floor have been restored to their 1920's appearance with plate glass and transom windows. One or two storefronts remain to be, and will be, restored. On the second floor, the original apartments have been converted to office suites; the owners have carefully restored the rustic wooden lintels over the office entrances.

"The owners have included extensive documentation, which includes the narrative prepared for the building listing on the Florida Master Site File. This documentation includes an excellent discussion of the Mediterranean Revival Style. Progresso Plaza is an extremely important historic resource for the City of Fort Lauderdale. The Board should recommend historic designated for this property."

Ms. Rathbun continued to state that the applicant had come before the Board to request a COA for alterations to restore the building to its historic appearance; he had also included a narrative detailing the planned alterations.

Ms. Rathbun further stated that the openings of the first floor arcaded porch were originally flattened arches. At some point in the building's history the arches were squared. The applicant proposed to restore those arches. Mr. Adams' researched the building with the historical society and found photographs from the 1920's showing detail. She also stated that the applicant intended to repair damaged banisters on the second floor gallery. The baluster was too low to meet today's code requirements; the applicant had some ideas for accommodating the code. He proposed to add wire cables above the baluster to meet today's height requirement. This was done on the New River Inn, a National Register property. Otherwise, he had suggested placing clear plastic sheets to code height behind the baluster. Another handrail could be installed above the existing handrail. Any of those solutions would be appropriate.

Ms. Rathbun also stated that Mr. Adams intends to replace the modern tile flooring of the second floor gallery with 4" wood plank, which was more appropriate to the period. The Spanish tile roofing would be replaced with handmade or tiles similar to the old Cuban barrel tile. The applicant was also going to do a paint test and

* The 1920's balusters and rail do not meet modern code height requirements. The owner has added a modern wrought iron extension to the top of the rail. Wrought iron, historically, would not have been used on a building of this style.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING

June 7, 2004

PAGE 8

repaint the building appropriately. New stucco was specified for the front façade and Mr. Adams stated that he intended to have the stucco medallions and column capitals replaced. She proceeded to refer the Board to criteria Section 47-24.11.

Ms. Rathbun read into the record 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.
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.
5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.
6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires 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 stated that the applicant's plans meet the above requirements.

Ms. Rathbun continued stating that this Board could approve the application as presented, approve it with modifications, or deny the application.

Individuals wishing to speak on this item were sworn in.

Jay Adams stated that this building was ideal when built in the 1920's and they just wanted to bring it back exactly the way it had been. He stated there were code, fire and handicap issues, but he wanted to bring it back the way it had been. He reiterated that he wanted to do a replica of the picture they had of the building in the 1920s.

Clay Wieland asked about the wire, and asked what other alternatives there were besides the wire and glass panels. Mr. Adams stated that as they got further into the project, they would probably discover other issues. He felt the wires were the best choice and were not visible. He reiterated that he was going to remove the banister piece-by-piece. He explained if they labeled things as “repair,” then they would not have to change things. He stated the wood used had been Cypress.

William Saunders asked if the banister was to remain as is, since it was a designated historic building, did they have to comply with Code. Mr. Adams replied that he believed the life safety issue overrode historic issues.

James Cromar advised that Mr. Adams had several discussions with the City's building official and the structural engineer. He added there were provisions within the FBC that permitted allowances for historic structures. In this regard, he explained they were looking to meet the basic safety needs with the rail being high enough, but still retaining the historic integrities. Mr. Adams replied that the Code was to be sensitive to the issues.

Margi Glavovic-Nothard stated that she felt this had more to deal with than just aesthetics because what was being proposed had the least impact on the existing structure. She felt it was a good solution. Mr. Adams remarked that he was open to any suggestions. He further stated that he had a good track record with other buildings in bringing them back to what they had been.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING

June 7, 2004

PAGE 9

Chair Christopher Eck 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 Margi Glavovic-Nothard and seconded by William Saunders to approve the application as presented.

Margi Glavovic-Nothard stated that it was always helpful to cite the criteria, and she wanted to reiterate that criteria 1, 2, 5 and 6 were met in regard to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for rehabilitation. She further stated that they did not have a picture of the long-term project because when renovations began things did happen, and she felt it might be prudent to have a set of drawings which could anticipate such things. She felt that possibly certain areas might have to be modernized and to the extent that would occur, they might be fabricating historical features and that should not be done, according to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. She reiterated they needed to distinguish what was old from what was new.

Mr. Adams stated that sometimes craftsmen had to redo the structure, and there were some good ones available. Ms. Nothard reiterated that in the end they did not want the project to be a replication. She added that she had not been inside the building, and therefore, did not know what actually existed and did not know if there would be any refabrication done in order to bring the building back to what it had been. She stated it was not automatic that it had to be what it had been because they still needed to distinguish the old from the new in order to celebrate the historical property.

James Cromar stated that in their discussions they had attempted to avoid a situation where every time something new came up, Mr. Adams would have to come back before this Board. Therefore, they attempted to cover a lot of items under this application. He added they were going to do some other things down the road, such as changing windows and doors, and then the Board would have to review the proposal. Ms. Nothard stated that drawings would be needed at that point since replacements would be taking place. Mr. Cromar stated this was to be restoration of what was in place, and if new items were to be brought into the picture, then the matter would have to be discussed with this Board. Ms. Nothard stated that the building inspector would not have anything to look at in order to compare the stucco for the building and verify the old from the new. There appeared to only be one photograph available showing such things. She stated normally there were a set of drawings for such things. Mr. Adams replied that possibly later on he could hire another architect to do a more detailed rendering. He stated that the photograph depicting the building in the 1920s was exactly how it looked, and he felt the photograph was very detailed. He reiterated that he wanted to do exactly what the photograph showed.

Mr. Adams further stated that they were looking at this project as repair work, and if some things were to be changed, then an engineer would have to do some drawings. Ms. Nothard stated that Mr. Adams was asking for "good faith" in the process, but in this case she felt drawings would help to ensure that the contractor would perform the project as expected. She further stated that she did not want to set such precedence and felt they were also trying to protect Mr. Adams and the project.

Chair Christopher Eck asked if Mr. Adams was going to take this application for a Federal tax credit, and added he would probably have to produce drawings for the State. Mr. Adams confirmed, but stated that was a nightmare and had gone through the process for other buildings previously. He added there were no tax credits because of alternative minimum tax, and extra time and monies were being spent in the process to obtain nothing. He stated he probably would do it anyway.

Chair Christopher Eck explained when there was an application for the tax credit, it had to be reviewed by the Historical Preservation Division in Tallahassee for the State, and also required photographs and drawings of the building. Mr. Adams stated that they had to do an extensive detailed book, both for the exterior and interior of

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING

June 7, 2004

PAGE 10

the building. Chair Christopher Eck stated that if such an application was submitted to the State, could Mr. Adams provide the same information to this Board. Mr. Adams agreed.

Todd Fogel stated that he did not question the good faith of the applicant and had seen what he had done with previous buildings, but precedence would be set. He explained that normally the Board approved applications with drawings because things could change during rehabilitation. He asked if they could include in the motion that due to the lack of drawings, the Board was using a photograph as a guide for the structure.

Margi Glavovic-Nothard reiterated that the motion referred back to the consultant's report.

The Assistant City Attorney stated that the ordinance for the COA for alterations, new construction or relocation read in Section 47-24.11.C.3.a.i as follows:

"The applicant must make the application to the department and shall include the following information: drawings, plans, or specifications of sufficient detail to show the proposed exterior alterations, additions, changes, or new construction as are reasonably required for decisions to be made by the Historic Preservation Board and the Department."

The Assistant City Attorney further stated that suggestions were also given as to what could be included in the plans. She explained that if the Board felt that the drawings submitted did not supply sufficient detail regarding the changes, then they should not approve the application. She advised the Board could ask the applicant to return with additional information, or the Board could proceed with the material being provided at this time.

James Cromar confirmed that the drawing shown to the Board had been the one submitted and reviewed by the City, along with the photograph. He added that zoning and landscaping had reviewed the drawing.

Margi Glavovic-Nothard asked if drawings had to be submitted when the applicant applied for a permit. Mr. Adams stated that this was actually repair work and they were not sure as of this time what had to be submitted to the City.

Motion made by Margi Glavovic-Nothard and seconded by William Saunders to approve the application as presented.

Ms. Nothard made the following changes in the motion:

Motion made by Margi Glavovic-Nothard and seconded by William Saunders to approve the application as presented, and that the repair and restoration of the railings, replacement of the existing barreled tile roof with visually similar material, the repair of stucco finish in the restoration of the archways on the first floor and within the window openings as shown in the original design (See Fig. 1 – 1926 photograph), and restore the wood flooring on the second floor walkway as per the description of repairs Items 1-8 which were to meet the original building construction elevations and intentions.

Todd Fogel stated that he wanted to make an addendum to the motion in that if drawings were required during the process that they become part of this record as long as they reflected the motion, and were not different. If the drawings were different, then the applicant would have to reappear before this Board.

Ms. Nothard restated the motion as follows:

Motion made by Margi Glavovic-Nothard and seconded by William Saunders to approve the application as presented, and that the repair and restoration of the railings, replacement of the existing barreled tile roof with visually similar material, the repair of stucco finish in the restoration of the archways on the first floor and within

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING

June 7, 2004

PAGE 11

the window openings as shown in the original design (See Fig. 1 – 1926 photograph), and restore the wood flooring on the second floor walkway as per the description of repairs Items 1-8 which were to meet the original building construction elevations and intentions. Also, if drawings were required during the process that deviated from this motion, then the applicant would have to return before this Board for approval.

Ms. Nothard asked how the permitting process would consider a COA in this matter. Mr. Adams replied that he did not think drawings were needed for the arches because it was not a structural matter. He added if they were required, then he would do so.

The Assistant City Attorney stated that if the Board found the drawings and photographs being presented this evening to be sufficient, then they could decide to issue the COA. If further alterations were needed, the applicant would have to return before the Board. If a Building Official required drawings for the arches, then the request would go through Mr. Cromar who could inform the individuals that the drawings matched the photograph. She stated she was not sure if the building official at this time had been provided with sufficient information to know whether a permit was necessary since he had not seen any drawings as of this point in time either.

Todd Fogel stated that he would withdraw his amendment to the motion.

The motion would read as follows:

Motion made by Margi Glavovic-Nothard and seconded by William Saunders to approve the application as presented, and that the repair and restoration of the railings, replacement of the existing barreled tile roof with visually similar material, the repair of stucco finish in the restoration of the archways on the first floor and within the window openings as shown in the original design (See Fig. 1 – 1926 photograph), and restore the wood flooring on the second floor walkway as per the description of repairs Items 1-8 which were to meet the original building construction elevations and intentions.

Roll call showed: YEAS: Mary-Jane Graff, William Saunders, Todd Fogel, Margi Glavovic-Nothard, Carolyn Dandy, Clay Wieland, and Christopher Eck. NAYS: None. Motion carried (7-0).

Presentation of revisions to the 200 Brickell proposal and its potential impact on the neighboring Bryan Building, 220 S.W. 1st Avenue

Arline A. Sterling, TR

DRC Case No. 103-R-03/77-R-04

Legal: Town of Fort Lauderdale, Block 26. Lots 1, 2, 3, 4,
North 25 feet of Lot 5, and Lot 24.

P.B. "B", P. 40 (D).

Zoned: RAC-CC

Location: 200 Brickell (218 SW 1 Ave)

Request: Site Plan Review and Comments from HPB on revisions to site plan

- Revisions to south façade for drive-through banking facility and retail space
- 2nd-level walkway connecting to McCrory's Building.

James Cromar stated that the applicant had originally presented this project at the Board's December 1, 2003 meeting. The applicant was now returning with an amended site plan, including revisions to the south façade for a drive-through bank facility, along with a second-level walkway connecting to the McCrory's Building. He stated that in accordance with Policy 11.2 of the City of Fort Lauderdale's Comprehensive Plan, the applicant had identified the location, extent, status and proposed impact to historic or archaeological resources. He

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING

June 7, 2004

PAGE 12

added that in accordance with Policy 11.3 of the City of Fort Lauderdale's Comprehensive Plan, the applicant had to report all proposed impacts on historic resources to this Board. He stated that a supplemental report would be given from the Historical Society's Consultant, and then Amy Streelman of Janus Research would present an analysis of the applicant's findings.

Merrilyn Rathbun, Consultant, stated that the applicant had brought his plans to the HPB for review and comment on December 1, 2003. The applicant had since made revisions to such plans. She stated that the following was from her report in December, 2003 to this Board:

"The two-story Bryan Building, otherwise known as the Shepherd Building, at 220-230 Brickell Avenue was built in 1913 by pioneer developer Tom Bryan. It is an excellent example of an early 20th century commercial building with storefronts and offices. Brickell Avenue was the site of Fort Lauderdale's first business district; it pre-dates Andrews Avenue as the town's first main street. Most of this early commercial district was destroyed by fires in 1912 and 1913; the Bryan Building was built as a new beginning for the downtown. The building was nominated to the National Register of Historic Places in 1997.

"The Bryan Building is noted for its brick construction. Brick was not locally manufactured; it was a luxury material unlike the commonly used (at that time) hollow concrete block. The building is a corner structure and is located at Brickell Avenue and Wall Street (now known as West Las Olas Boulevard). The first floor corner entrance is chamfered. Immediately to the north is the two-story, modern style, Sterling Building at 200 Brickell Avenue, which wraps around the Bryan Building on the north side and east rear elevations.

"Although the new building will have street level storefronts, the first six floors, and that portion of the building that wraps the historic resource, will be the parking facility. The upper six floors will house offices. The central portion of the new building is a projecting pavilion, which finishes in a tower and cupola above the twelfth floor housing the building mechanicals."

Ms. Rathbun continued, stating that in the parking garage portion of the new building, which wrapped the historic building and faced West Las Olas Boulevard (Wall Street), the applicant originally intended to put two storefronts (cafes). Now, the applicant intended to replace the storefront closest to the historic building with a drive-through banking facility. The bank patrons would enter (drive-through) an existing fourteen foot alleyway and exit on West Las Olas Boulevard. The design would be integrated with the previously existing design for the storefronts.

Ms. Rathbun explained that the applicant proposed to build a second floor walkway from the existing McCrory's building on the east across the alleyway to the new garage building which would give pedestrian access to office and retail space in the historic McCrory's Building. Ms. Rathbun proceeded to read the criteria in Section 47-24.11.C. She stated that The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation were as follows:

- "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.
- "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

June 7, 2004

PAGE 13

Ms. Rathbun further stated that the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for Rehabilitation recommended that designing new additions in a manner that made clear what was historic and what was new. They should consider the attached exterior addition both in terms of the new use and the appearance of other buildings in the historic district or neighborhood. Design for the new work may be contemporary or may reference design motifs from the historic building. In either case, it should always be clearly differentiated from the historic building and be compatible in terms of mass, materials, relationship of solids to voids, and color. Designing additional stories, when required for the new use are to be set back from the wall plane, and are to be inconspicuous as possible when viewed from the street. It did not recommend designing a new addition so that its size and scale in relation to the historic building was out of proportion, thus diminishing the historic character.

Nor should it duplicate the exact form, material, style and detailing of the historic building in the new addition so that the new work appears to be part of the historic building. It should not imitate a historic style or period of architecture in new additions, especially for contemporary uses such as drive-in banks or garages. Nor, should it design and construct new additions that would result in the diminution or loss of the historic character of the resources, including its design, materials, workmanship, location or setting.

Ms. Rathbun advised that this information was being provided to the Board for their review and comment.

Amy Streelman, Janus Research, stated that they were to review the report prepared by Anthony Abbate, and then make their assessment of effects the project would have on the resources. She stated the project had initially been reviewed in December 2003, and two changes were now taking place. She stated they were only dealing with the changes and not the overall development.

Ms. Streelman advised the two changes would consist of the pedestrian walkway, and the drive-through bank teller and ATM's on the south elevation of 200 Brickell Avenue. She stated that in April 2004, Anthony Abbate produced his report, and they concurred with those findings. She explained that the item which had been excluded involved discussion regarding the McCrory's Building. She advised that had been incorporated into their discussion of impacts.

Ms. Streelman further stated that the consultant had given a thorough description of the Bryan Building. She added that the McCrory's Building was located on Andrews Avenue which had been built in 1936. She stated it had been surveyed last year as part of the City's comprehensive resources survey, and it had been determined that it could potentially be eligible for listing by the City. She further stated that several items needed to be discussed regarding impacts to the two historic resources. She stated that the pedestrian bridge would go across the alleyway and link the east side of 200 Brickell to the west rear side of the McCrory's Building. She stated it would go into the new parking garage and would be of a simple design. She advised there would be no glass enclosures or air conditioning. She proceeded to show the site plan. She further stated that it would not effect the Bryan Building, but it would directly impact the McCrory's Building. She advised it would be attached to the rear elevation, and not the primary elevation. She stated that the architects committed there would be no structural damage to the building. She further stated it would not be an adverse impact and would not effect the McCrory's Building's eligibility for listing.

Ms. Streelman further stated that she had evaluated the south elevation. She stated that there was to be a storefront bay closest to the Bryan Building, but there would now be a drive-through bank teller accessed through the alleyway and exit out onto Las Olas. She stated there would also be ATMs as well. She remarked that the bays would remain the same size as the storefront next to it, and awnings would be similar. She stated that there would also be landscaping. In looking at impacts to the Bryan Building, she stated that this was not the most appropriate use, but there would be an open space instead of a storefront. In the evenings, a decorative security gate would be in place. She stated that despite the inappropriate use, it would not be that egregious of an effect where the Bryan Building would no longer be eligible for the National Register of Historic places, and it would be more of an indirect impact. She stated this change would not effect the McCrory's Building at all.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING

June 7, 2004

PAGE 14

Margi Glavovic-Nothard stated that one of the issues included in The Secretary of the Interior's Standards were to not only look at the building, but also its environment. She stated it appeared that an environment that was intended for pedestrians would be adversely impacted. She stated further that they were measuring impact in terms of the ability to designate the McCrory's Building. She stated that aside from that, the impact on the pedestrian environment, which contributed to the qualities of the McCrory's Building, appeared to be greatly impacted. She stated that the bridge would further remove pedestrians from the ground level, and they would be enhancing a more vehicular environment.

Ms. Streelman stated that the City's ordinance did not establish formal criteria of effects, and that was why they used the criteria established by the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. She agreed that the walkway did not encourage pedestrian activity on the ground level, but pavers would be maintained on the sidewalk. She did not think that would be an adverse effect. She stated that she was measuring adverse effect in terms of the building and its eligibility.

Ms. Nothard asked if there was a context where such significance would be evaluated in the evaluation of designation when there were two buildings close to each other, and a walking connection between them would become more desired. Ms. Streelman stated that had been the commercial core of the City, but unfortunately there had been additions and alterations to the area, and therefore, there were only a few historic buildings remaining in the area. She stated the alley was remaining. She added that this was not a designated historic district and the setting was looked at to a point and assessments then made.

Ms. Nothard further stated that this was one of the few areas where pedestrians could still walk and she did not know why individuals had to drive to the bank. She asked if there was going to be retail/restaurant at the site.

Pete Daltmer, Architecture 6400, stated they were the in-house architects for the Stiles Corporation. He further stated that the bank had not committed to a particular bay, and were looking more at the area located off the lobby. He proceeded to show the site plan. He also stated that ATM's would be provided for pedestrian use along the sidewalk. He stated that the drive-through would be open only during normal banking hours. He advised it would be secured during the nighttime hours. He continued stating that the pedestrian bridge was to connect the McCrory's Building to the covered garage and the office tower. He added that the owner wanted covered parking accessibility. He also stated that the structure itself would be independent from the McCrory's Building and would have its own supports. He advised they would only be butting up against the building. He stated there would be two drive-through lanes, one of which would be used for the ATM machine.

Mr. Daltmer stated that the design intent was to keep within the original design, especially regarding the awnings and the consistent look that had originally been presented. He further stated that the pedestrian feel along the sidewalk area would be preserved with brick pavers and landscaping. He advised there would be a curb cut, but it would be a lowered curb that would drop down for car use.

William Saunders asked if the predominant street would be SW 1st Avenue. Mr. Daltmer stated that at the corner of 1st Avenue and 2nd Street, there was Art Bar and Riverfront was directly across the way. He stated the alleyway was presently being used one-way and they were maintaining the southward movement, and would be widening it by three feet due to a requirement of the Code. He added they were also removing the utilities and putting them underground which would free-up vehicular access.

Margi Glavovic-Nothard stated that in the previous presentation, she had objected to the denigration of 2nd Street because she felt it was an important connection to the entertainment district, but now it appeared the footprint of the building had become smaller, but the car footprint was increasing. She objected to the drive-through bank and wished there were more amenities in the area to reinforce the pedestrian environment. Mr. Daltmer further stated that there was a demand for drive-through banking in the area.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING

June 7, 2004

PAGE 15

Chair Christopher Eck stated that what he liked about the pedestrian bridge was that the area on Andrews was underutilized, and this would probably utilize the historic building to a greater degree and draw in traffic. He agreed that whatever could be done to encourage pedestrian traffic on the street should be done and would be a bonus to the neighborhood.

William Saunders stated that he was glad this building was moving forward and felt it was a good addition to the downtown

For the Good of the City

James Cromar stated that he had included materials in the Board's back-up regarding a conceptual design discussion. He stated that based on previous discussions, it was best for such discussions to come before the Board as formal applications. Therefore, it would not place the Board in a position to make comments that would provide an applicant guidance that would not be subject to change.

700-712 SW 2nd Court

William Saunders asked for an update regarding the property at 700 and 712 SW 2nd Court.

The Assistant City Attorney stated that Chapter 162 of the Florida Statutes required that the City give the property owner an opportunity to challenge the City's assertion that the property was not in compliance by the date ordered by the Code Enforcement Board. Hearings were held in April and May and there had been three outstanding cases presented for a Special Master Hearing. She stated that fines had been imposed and the total of the fines was around \$400,000. It was her understanding that the owner was attempting to challenge such determination. She stated that she did not know if the property owner had filed an appeal, which had to be done within 30 days. She explained that the Statute provided that the City had to wait 90 days from the date of the Order, and then the City could commence foreclosure proceedings.

William Saunders asked if there was an opportunity in the interim to have the chain link fences removed which were inappropriate for the area, and if the property could be cleaned up of debris and vegetation. The Assistant City Attorney stated that she was not sure of the fence situation, and in regard to the vegetation a complaint could be made to Community Inspections. Chair Christopher Eck replied that the fence was probably there to prevent nuisance claims regarding health and safety issues.

Todd Fogel asked what was the City doing to prevent further deterioration of the property located at 712 SW 2nd Court. He reiterated the City lost another building because nothing had been done to prevent further deterioration. He stated they lost the building due to the fault of the City and no one else. He reiterated that he was not finding fault with staff regarding this issue, but stated that it was an extremely frustrating situation.

Chair Christopher Eck stated that since the presentation made to the Board in December, 2003, he had discovered there were actual guidelines regarding the development of the Riverfront district passed through ordinance in about 1986. He asked if such documents could be provided to the Board.

James Cromar stated that a project would be placed on the Board's next agenda which addressed a project at the Riverfront. He stated it was his understanding that the guidelines applied specifically to such properties. He advised that a project was coming before this Board that was a condominium project for the area in which the movie theaters now existed.

Margi Glavovic-Nothard stated that the Master Plan and Urban Design Guidelines were critical, and one of her criticisms of the project had been predicated on the idea of curb cuts and pedestrian environments.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING

June 7, 2004

PAGE 16

James Cromar stated that he would provide some further background to the Board on the projects being presented. He stated there was also a design review team which looked at projects for the Downtown area within the context of the new Master Plan. He added that a traffic analysis would also be done regarding the drive-through bank.

City Commission items

Todd Fogel asked if any applications that the Board had denied were due to go before the City Commission. James Cromar stated that on the June 15, 2004 City Commission agenda, the Moss property would be presented for a hearing to determine if the project should proceed for another hearing or not. The Assistant City Attorney explained that such hearing was whether the criteria for proceeding with an appeal had been met. She stated they would be determining whether this Board's decision had been based on competent substantial evidence or if there had been a lack of due process. She stated further that because part of the application had been for demolition for other structures on the site, there would have to be notice to the neighboring property owners. She stated if the Commission decided on June 15, 2004, that the criteria for an appeal had been met, they would then schedule a new hearing to be held within 30-60 days.

James Cromar further stated that the soonest that could be done would be the July 20, 2004 Commission hearing. He stated that sometimes the Commission in the past had referred such hearings back to this Board.

James Cromar continued stating that the other item on the Commission's June 15th agenda was the final Abreu property designation. He stated that the Commission had denied designation for two of the properties in March.

Chair Christopher Eck stated that Miami Beach in addressing properties being demolished or neglected within a historic district passed an ordinance stating if such an historical structure was demolished, then the structure replacing it must be developed in similar style, materials, and scale. He suggested that this City investigate this ordinance further.

Motion made by William Saunders and seconded by Margi Glavovic-Nothard to adjourn the meeting.

There being no further business to come before this Board, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 7:09 p.m.

CHAIR

Christopher Eck

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.