

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
City of Fort Lauderdale
Monday, January 3, 2005- 5:00 P.M.
City Hall
First Floor Conference Room
100 North Andrews Avenue
Fort Lauderdale, Florida

| <u>Board Members</u> | <u>Present / Absent</u> | <u>From January 2005</u> |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| Christopher Eck, Chair | A | 0-1 |
| Todd Fogel | P | 1-0 |
| Mary-Jane Graff | P | 1-0 |
| Bill Howard | P | 1-0 |
| Daryl Jolly | P | 1-0 |
| Margi Glavovic-Nothard | P | 1-0 |
| William Saunders, Vice Chair (5:50) | P | 1-0 |
| Carolyn Dandy | P | 1-0 |
| Tom Welch | P | 1-0 |
| Clay Wieland | P | 1-0 |
| Edith Colden | P | 1-0 |

Staff Present

James Cromar, Planner, Staff Liaison to HPB
Merrilyn Rathbun, Fort Lauderdale Historical Society, Consultant to HPB
Marc LaFerrier, Planning and Zoning Director
Assistant City Attorney
Jamie Opperlee, Recording Secretary

Guests Present

| | |
|--------------------|-------------------------|
| Brad Fitzgerald | Cara Cameron |
| Ed Cohen | Burnadette Norris-Weeks |
| Lee Williams | Ron Mastriana |
| Patrick de Vosjoli | Robert Allica |

Call to Order

Ms. Glavovic-Nothard called the meeting of the Historic Preservation Board to order at approximately 5:08 p.m. Roll call was taken with the following Board Members being present: Ms. Dandy, Mr. Wieland, Ms. Graff, Mr. Jolly, Mr. Fogel, Ms. Glavovic-Nothard, Mr. Welch, Mr. Howard, and Ms. Colden.

Approval of Minutes November 15, 2004 Meeting

Motion made by Ms. Graff, and seconded by Mr. Welch to approve the minutes of the November 15, 2004 meeting. In a voice vote, the motion was approved unanimously.

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

I. Cases

- 1. Applicant: Burnadette Norris-Weeks Case No. 22-H-04**
Location: 401 NW 7th Avenue
Request: Historic Designation
Zoned: B-2
Legal: North Lauderdale. Block 19, Lots 23 and 24. P.B. 1, P. 48.
Less road right-of-way.

Mr. Cromar noted that the correct owner's name was Right Perspective Development Group.

Ms. Rathbun stated that after an historical survey of the Near Northwest Redevelopment area was commissioned by the city 1979-1980, a report on the inventoried sites was submitted to the Florida State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) in 1981. She said that SHPO stated that none of the structures of the surveyed areas were of archeological or historic significance eligible for listing on the National Register for Historic Places. Ms. Rathbun said that according to the applicant, the building was built ca. 1959 or 1960, which is out of the generally accepted 50-year determination of historical significance. She stated that the Board may choose to designate the property if they think the building is of sufficient historic interest pursuant to Section 47-24.11. Ms. Rathbun said that criterion a. was most applicable to this application: "Its value as a significant reminder of the cultural or archeological heritage of the city, state, or nation."

Ms. Rathbun continued, stating that the store is located at the center of Fort Lauderdale's historic African-American community and the builder was Nathaniel Spann. She stated that the notable architectural feature is the chamfered corner, which was often found in the architecture of the West Indies. She added that the chamfered corner was often used in Spanish Eclectic commercial buildings of 1920s Fort Lauderdale

Ms. Burnadette Norris-Weeks felt the building had significant architectural character. She stated that Mrs. Elizabeth Hill, wife of the owner of the hotel that was once located across the street, had informed Ms. Norris-Weeks that the building was constructed in the early- to mid-1950s. Ms. Norris-Weeks said that she thought the building met the following criteria for designation:

- a. Its value as a significant reminder of the cultural or archeological heritage of the city, state, or nation;
- c. Its identification with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the development of the city, state, or nation, that person being Mrs. Hill;
- e. Its value as a building recognized for the quality of its architecture, and sufficient elements showing its architectural significance;
- f. Its distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style valuable for the study of a period, method of construction, or use of indigenous materials.

Ms. Norris-Weeks confirmed that the building had not been occupied for some time and she wished to convert it into a law office for herself and a partner. She said that some architectural

changes would be required to meet current code, and she described some possible cosmetic changes to the façade.

Ms. Glavovic-Nothard proceeded to open the public hearing. There being no individuals who wished to speak on this item, Ms. Glavovic-Nothard closed the public hearing and brought the discussion back to the Board.

Ms. Colden said she approved of the plan. She said that she thought Ms. Norris-Weeks's use of the building would help to deter crime in the area.

Ms. Graff was not sure the building, after cosmetic and code alterations, would meet the criteria for historic designation. Mr. Howard noted that if the building were given historic designation, any changes would need to be approved by the HPB.

Mr. Fogel felt the designation would help prevent the building from being turned into another townhouse but did not know if the building met the criteria. He said he would have liked to have seen some plans for the refurbishing. Mr. Wieland clarified that Ms. Norris-Weeks's primary objective was to gain historic designation for the building. Ms. Glavovic-Nothard agreed that the proper procedure was to get the historic designation first and refurbish the building later on.

Motion made by Mr. Welch, and seconded by Mr. Fogel to approve the application as presented. Roll call vote showed: Yeas: Ms. Dandy, Ms. Colden, Mr. Wieland, Mr. Fogel, Ms. Glavovic-Nothard, Mr. Jolly, Mr. Welch, and Mr. Howard. Nays: Ms. Graff. Motion passed 8-1.

2. Applicant: Lee & Susie Williams Case No. 4-H-04 (SB)/37-H-97
Location: 1117 SW 1st Street
Request: Certificate of Appropriateness for New Construction:
▪ Eleven (11) three-story townhouse units.
Zoned: RMM – 25 / Sailboat Bend Historic District Overlay
Legal: Waverly Place. Block 24, Lot 6 less the East 5.00 feet and Lots 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14 and the South half of the vacated alley lying North of and adjacent to said lots 6-14.
P.B. 2, P. 19

Mr. Cromar explained that the applicant had previously requested and received a Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition and approval for a multi-family dwelling at the site.

Ms. Rathbun stated that the applicant was requesting approval for an eleven-unit (three buildings), three-story townhouse development in the Sailboat Bend Historic District. She said there were currently three one-story structures on the property. She added that the applicants had requested the following yard set backs: fifteen (15) feet in the front and rear, five feet (5) on the east side, ten (10) feet on the west side. Ms. Rathbun said that the HPB may authorize a reduction in yard size and distance separation if criteria cited in Section 47-15.5 were met.

Ms. Rathbun continued, stating that the doors specified for the project included sliders, which would be located on the rear (street side) of the buildings. She said that the SBHD Materials

and Design Guidelines specified sliders on rear and side elevations only. Ms. Rathbun said that although the sliders were on the rear of the townhouse structure, they would face the street.

Mr. Lee Williams, property owner, stated that he originally planned to create apartments in the building but had then opted for townhouses. He said that he and Mr. Cohen had appeared six times at the Sailboat Bend Civic Association meetings and had obtained their approval. Mr. Williams noted that the sliders would be located at the rear of the building and explained that they were preferable to French doors because they could be fitted with screen doors and alarm components.

Ms. Glavovic-Nothard proceeded to open the public hearing. There being no individuals who wished to speak on this item, Ms. Glavovic-Nothard closed the public hearing and brought the discussion back to the Board.

Mr. Jolly stated that he had met with Mr. Williams on several occasions when he appeared at the Sailboat Bend Civic Association meetings. Mr. Jolly said he had also met with Mr. Williams regarding this project in his capacity as Chairman of the Sailboat Bend Developers' Committee, which had approved Mr. Williams's proposal as well.

At 5:50 P.M. Mr. Saunders arrived.

Mr. Fogel said he was concerned about the sliders for aesthetic reasons. He said that he thought that the eastern elevation was all balconies and doors and resembled a hotel.

Mr. Saunders stated that he had attended the Sailboat Bend meetings when Mr. Williams had presented the project as well and felt this project would help start the rehabilitation of this area.

Motion made by Mr. Saunders, and seconded by Mr. Jolly to approve the application as presented. Roll call vote showed: Yeas: Ms. Dandy, Ms. Colden, Mr. Wieland, Ms. Graff, Ms. Glavovic-Nothard, Mr. Jolly, Mr. Welch, Mr. Saunders, and Mr. Howard. Nays: Mr. Fogel. Motion passed 9-1.

Mr. Fogel asked if the Board should have a landscape plan included in the documentation for consideration. Mr. Cromar stated that this was not required for single-family dwellings. Mr. Fogel told Mr. Williams he would like to see a more complete view including landscaping. The Assistant City Attorney agreed to find out if the HPB could require a landscape plan to be included in the future.

Mr. Fogel asked if any other members had any issue with the sliders and asked them to consider if the design should be approved as submitted or if a change in door style should be requested. He said he was concerned about setting the precedent of allowing sliders that were not approved by the code. Mr. Jolly asked Mr. Saunders if his motion could be amended to specifically request that the doors in the rear of the building at least appear more like French doors than sliders. Mr. Saunders stated that he was not present for the discussion of the doors and was therefore not willing to add an amendment to his motion.

- 3. Applicant: 709 SW 4th Court LLC Case No. 10-H-04 (SB)**
Sailboat Landing
Location: 709 SW 4th Court
Request: Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration:
▪ Renovation of existing residential two-story building as part of townhouse project.
Certificate of appropriateness for New Construction:
▪ Seven (7) three-story townhouse units
Zoned: RML-25 / Sailboat Bend Historic District Overlay
Legal: Bryan Subdivision. Block 33, Lot 24 and 26.
P.B. 1. P. 29 (D).

Mr. Cromar stated that this was a townhouse project for which Certificates of Appropriateness for Alteration and New Construction were being sought.

Ms. Rathbun stated that the Mission Style structure was built ca. 1926-28 as the Shackelford Apartments. She stated that the building was shown as a concrete structure on the 1928 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map and it was listed on the 1985 City of Fort Lauderdale Historic Survey. Ms. Rathbun continued, stating that the building was two stories with a flat roof and parapet with merlons at the corners. She said the design is typical of the Mission style of South Florida

Ms. Rathbun added that the applicants had requested the following yard setback modifications: fifteen (15) feet in the front and rear and five (5) feet east and west sides. She cited Section 47-15.5 B, "Reduction of yards may be permitted as follows: ML-25 zoning district. Principal residential structures: Front yard: fifteen (15) feet, side yard: five (5) feet, rear yard: fifteen (15) feet."

Ms. Rathbun stated that the applicant planned to construct a new three-story building to the west of the historic structure. She said that the old apartment building will remain but a third story would be added and the front of the building would be bumped out. She added that the design for the new street facing elevation bore no resemblance to the historic façade.

Ms. Rathbun specified several portions of the United States Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings and pointed out many ways in which the new building's design conflicted with these guidelines.

Mr. Ron Mastriana, representing the applicant, stated that he and his client had appeared before the HPB earlier in the year and were told to proceed through DRC review first and then return to the HPB. He asked what the proper procedure was.

Mr. Cromar asked if Mr. Mastriana's to clarify if his intent had been to submit a plan for comment or for a formal vote on a Certificate of Appropriateness. Mr. Mastriana answered that they had requested the Board's input at design time but had been denied it a year ago. He continued, stating that over the course of the year, he had met with City staff and homeowners associations and then gone through the DRC process.

Mr. Robert Allica, the project architect, explained that the engineering reports indicated the building was unsound so they intended to gut the interior of the building. He said that the third floor would be distinguished from the existing historical building using a horizontal architectural band. Mr. Mastriana remarked that Mr. Allica had gone through the previous building permit files to try to determine the original structure and then conferred with City staff.

Mr. Saunders proceeded to open the public hearing. There being no individuals who wished to speak on this item, Mr. Saunders closed the public hearing and brought the discussion back to the Board.

Mr. Jolly stated that he did not like the idea because the structure would be lost, encased in a new structure. He said that he thought three story buildings were not desirable in that neighborhood. Mr. Fogel liked the different appearance of the project but disliked the "bumping out" the building as the front façade would be lost. He added that he thought the Board should have window and door specs with the application.

Mr. Mastriana stated that the developer, Peter Addison, had agreed to maintain the front façade even if it meant losing some units on the first level. Mr. Welch said he would like to see the original façade restored and, if possible, the third floor recessed to separate it from the original façade.

Ms. Glavovic-Nothard asked Mr. Jolly if this met the development requirements for the Sailboat Bend Civic Association. Mr. Jolly stated that it did not. He added that the first problem was with the yard reductions; these were allowed under certain circumstances but this project met none of them.

Ms. Glavovic-Nothard said that she did not like the fact that the new design removed the uniqueness of the old building. She cited the portion of the United States Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings pertaining to new additions: "New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property." She said she was concerned with protecting more than just the one façade as well. She added that she also wanted to see specifications for the windows and doors.

Mr. Howard agreed with the comments made by other Board members and stressed the importance of the front façade and setback issues; Ms. Graff concurred. Mr. Fogel confirmed the ramifications on the interior floor plan of maintaining the original facade with Mr. Mastriana. Mr. Saunders felt the Sailboat Bend Overlay requirements in the City Code allowed the Board to approve reduced setbacks if there was an accommodation for porches and/or back-load garages. He said that these garages did not back onto the street but were interior and they therefore met that criterion.

Mr. Jolly said that he was concerned that if the second building were brought out 15 feet, it would block the view of the first building's façade until one was almost past it. Mr. Mastriana said that the planned landscaping would block the façade as much as the extended second building. He said that they could return next month to show what the new façade would look like on the existing structure. Mr. Mastriana added that if the first building would lose units in order

to keep the facade, they should be permitted to bring the second building out the additional 15 feet to make up the loss. Mr. Jolly quoted from Section 47-17.5.A regarding reduction of yard and minimum distance requirements and stated that this project conflicted with the requirements.

Motion made by Ms. Glavovic-Nothard, and seconded by Mr. Welch to approve the application with the provision that the existing building design be reviewed at a future meeting, including specifications for the doors and windows. Roll call vote showed: Yeas: Ms. Dandy, Ms. Graff, Mr. Saunders, Ms. Colden, Mr. Wieland, Ms. Glavovic-Nothard, Mr. Welch, and Mr. Howard. Nays: Mr. Jolly and Mr. Fogel. Motion passed 8-2.

Mr. Jolly asked for an amendment on the motion that the setback on the second building be addressed for the reasons he cited earlier. Ms. Glavovic-Nothard asked if Mr. Jolly thought that the loss of the additional 15 feet on the first building to preserve the first facade was worth allowing the additional 15 feet on the second building. Mr. Jolly said that he did not agree that that the original idea to bump out to the first building should have been allowed either, so losing that 15 feet was not really giving up anything.

- 4. Applicant: Brad Fitzgerald Case No. 25-H-04 (SB)**
Camp Canine
Location: 808 W Broward Boulevard
Request: Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition
▪ Demolition of vacant, two-story structure on site.
Zoned: B-1 / Sailboat Bend Historic District Overlay
Legal: Kelly-Oliver's Subdivision of lots 3 and 4, Block 20 of Town of Fort Lauderdale. Block 20, Lot 9, less the North 15 feet and Lot 10, together with the vacated 10 foot wide alley between Lots 9 and 10.
P.B. "B", P. 40.

Mr. Cromar explained that the applicant was requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition of a vacant two-story structure on the side of the business.

Ms. Rathbun said that Mr. Fitzgerald was requesting a COA for Demolition for a building at 808 West Broward Boulevard. The building was shown on a paste-over on the 1963 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map indicating that the building was built well out of the period of significance for the SBHD.

Mr. Brad Fitzgerald, owner, explained that this second structure had been rendered unsafe by a previous owner's interior renovation. He said that he intended to put sod on the lot and the neighborhood association had asked that he also install a fence along Broward Boulevard to discourage pedestrians from cutting through the lot.

Mr. Saunders proceeded to open the public hearing. There being no individuals who wished to speak on this item, Mr. Saunders closed the public hearing and brought the discussion back to the Board.

Mr. Saunders confirmed that the neighborhood association had requested the fencing and confirmed with Mr. Fitzgerald that landscaping would be used to disguise the fence. Ms. Glavovic-Nothard suggested that the fence and landscaping be set back from Broward Boulevard a bit for aesthetic reasons. Mr. Cromar stated that the application before the Board this evening was only for the COA for Demolition.

Motion made by Mr. Wieland, and seconded by Mr. Welch to approve the application as presented. Roll call vote showed: Yeas: Ms. Dandy, Ms. Graff, Mr. Saunders, Ms. Colden, Mr. Wieland, Ms. Glavovic-Nothard, Mr. Welch, Mr. Howard, Mr. Jolly and Mr. Fogel. Nays: None. Motion passed 10-0.

- 5. Applicant: 111 Properties Inc. Case No. 2-H-05**
Location: 111 SW 3rd Avenue
Request: Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration:
▪ Installation of 18-foot length of 6-foot high chain-link fence. (after the fact)
Zoned: H-1
Legal: Town of Fort Lauderdale. Block 17, Lots 8, 9,10,16,17 and North 18 feet of Lot 15, less the East 50 feet of said Lot 15.
P.B. "B." P.40.

Mr. Cromar explained that the applicant was requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration for the installation of a 6-foot high chain link fence.

Ms. Rathbun said that the applicant was requesting approval of a section of a chain link fence that surrounded a legal parking lot. She said that only a small portion of the chain link fence protruded into the historic district (H-1 Historic District). She noted that the applicant stated the fence was needed for the security of the lot.

Ms. Cara Cameron, a principal in 111 Properties, explained that the fence enclosed legal parking areas. She said the fence was installed to delineate the legal parking areas from some other non-legal lots. Mr. Saunders confirmed the location of the lot with Ms. Cameron.

Motion made by Ms. Glavovic-Nothard, and seconded by Mr. Fogel to approve the application as presented. Roll call vote showed: Yeas: Ms. Dandy, Ms. Graff, Mr. Saunders, Ms. Colden, Mr. Wieland, Ms. Glavovic-Nothard, Mr. Welch, Mr. Howard, Mr. Jolly and Mr. Fogel. Nays: None. Motion passed 10-0.

II. Other Business

Mr. Cromar introduced newly appointed Board member Edith Colden. He said that Commissioner Moore appointed Ms. Colden. He added that she was an educator and librarian.

III. For the Good of the City

2005 Calendar

Mr. Cromar stated that there were a few instances in 2005 when the Board's usual meeting date of the first Monday of each month would not work. He discussed potential dates with the Board and they agreed upon the following dates: July 18, September 19, and October 17. The Board decided to wait to decide on a January 2006 meeting date.

Update on 700 and 712 Southwest 2nd Court

The Assistant City Attorney stated that the property owner was served with the city's foreclosure suit on December 17 and their answer was due this Thursday or Friday. Mr. Jolly asked about the request from the Sailboat Bend Civic Association that the City secure the interior of the structures. The Assistant City Attorney stated that her office had advised the City Manager's office that this would be unwise to do while litigation was pending.

Update on Fort Lauderdale Beach Hotel

Ms. Glavovic-Nothard said she was concerned with the amount of demolition that had taken place at the site without the owner's ever appearing before the Board for any further reviews. She said that she thought the process had not proceeded as it should have for this project.

Mr. Howard said he thought that the Board had the impression that when they voted "yes" to approve the COA for Alteration for the building, they were endorsing the agreement between the owner and Broward Trust, and that the Board would have the opportunity to review changes to the old building interior. He said that he thought that some representatives who appeared before the Board presented projects in ways crafted to get them passed by the Board, knowing that their presentation did not represent the entire project honestly.

Mr. Saunders noted that a third party, the Broward Trust for Historic Preservation, intervened and negotiated with the developers, removing the HPB from the loop. Ms. Glavovic-Nothard noted that the third party was present for the presentation. She asked City staff to explain the current status of the project and explain if the process had failed and what that meant vis-à-vis the responsibility of the HPB to the public interest.

Mr. Cromar explained that the reviews of this plan revision had gone through the City processes. He said that this situation had developed because only part of the property was historically designated. Mr. Cromar said that City staff thought the site plan would come back before the HPB through the DRC process, but at a later date, staff was directed to see if the plan would meet the Administrative Review criteria. He said that the plan met the criteria for Administrative Review, which exempted it from another review by the HPB.

Ms. Glavovic-Nothard said that she thought the designated portion did include some of the interior. Mr. Howard and Ms. Graff agreed that they understood some of the interior had been included in the designation.

Mr. Cromar noted that certain conditions were applied as part of the mediated settlement that were not necessarily in accordance with what historic preservationists would like them to be in terms of the Secretary of the Interior's guidelines. He pointed out that one result of the mediated settlement was that the developer was required to have historic preservation experts on staff. Mr. Saunders stated that it was a fact of life that when the HPB made a recommendation to the City Commission and the Mayor, it was always their prerogative to accept or reject it.

Mr. Fogel said he was dismayed with the bad precedent that might be set by their approval of plans lacking window and door specifications. He noted that one of this evening's applicants had previously presented one plan and then built another in Sailboat Bend. He said he was insulted that he brought up a specific request for input and received no response. Mr. Fogel stated he voted against both projects because he did not know exactly what he was voting on, not because he disliked the projects. He said he also wished to see changes indicated in the plans. Ms. Glavovic-Nothard asked staff to look into requiring a landscape plan.

Mr. Marc LaFerrier, Planning and Zoning Director, agreed to prepare a checklist of the information required for HPB presentations so the presentations would be consistent.

There being no further business to come before this Board, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 7:55 p.m.

CHAIRMAN

Christopher Eck

ATTEST:

Jamie Opperlee, 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. |
|--|