

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
City of Fort Lauderdale
Monday, March 7, 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	P	2-1
Todd Fogel	P	3-0
Mary-Jane Graff	P	2-1
Bill Howard	P	3-0
Daryl Jolly	A	2-1
Margi Nothard	A	2-1
William Saunders, Vice Chair	P	3-0
Carolyn Dandy	P	3-0
Tom Welch	P	3-0
Clay Wieland	A	1-2
Edith Colden	A	1-2

Staff Present

James Cromar, Planner, Staff Liaison to HPB
Merrilyn Rathbun, Fort Lauderdale Historical Society, Consultant to HPB
Assistant City Attorney
Jamie Opperlee, Recording Secretary

Call to Order

Chair Christopher Eck called the meeting of the Historic Preservation Board to order at approximately 5:11 p.m. Roll call was taken with the following Board Members being present: Ms. Dandy, Mr. Fogel, Mr. Welch, Mr. Howard, Ms. Graff, Mr. Saunders, and Chair Eck.

Approval of Minutes February 7, 2005 Meeting

Motion made by Mr. Saunders, and seconded by Mr. Howard to approve the minutes of the February 7, 2005 meeting. In a voice vote, the motion was approved unanimously.

For the Good of the City

Chair Eck announced that Mr. Richard Locke wished to address the Board and requested to do so out of the agenda order to accommodate his need to leave early.

Mr. Locke gave the following prepared statement:

“Good Evening. I am Richard Locke, 805 SW 4th Street. You have before you a copy of part of Sailboat Bend’s 1988 study as legal backup for our Historic District, but nothing from 1992. The City Attorney’s opinion on demolition has

opened a Pandora's Box. You all know that you flounder in legal technicalities concerning renovations, indeed all aspects of historic development. Why? It's not your fault; it's the ordinance, which is a product of its time. It provides no explicit historic context to inform your decisions. The Historic Overlay is tacit as to history. Doesn't that strike you as odd?

Let me explain the dilemma that we, as Ft. Lauderdale's first integrated community, faced in obtaining historic designation. How do you get the biased all-white bureaucracy of City Hall to designate a historic district which visually documents, in all its structures, 90 years of cultural discrimination by the privileged Eastside against the lower-class Westside, both blue-collar African-American & what they called "White Trash" while City Hall still believes in the morality of that discrimination and practices it? Especially since Sailboat Bend after 1960 felt the full scorn of that racial bias. We're talking about 1986, barely 20 years after integration was forced on a resentful White South.

How did we do it? We tricked them. You bow & praise "Massa" and give him a Trojan Horse -- our beautiful jewel-box homes for public use. We spoke softly about blue-collar & integration. We did what was necessary to preserve the archeological evidence until our true historic value could be recognized by the City. That time is now. This pitifully inadequate ordinance was tossed at us by City Hall like a bare bone on a "take it or leave it" basis. We took the alms, made the ordinance work, and bided our time for 15 years.

The overall Historic District Ordinance says one of: historic, architectural, archeological, aesthetic or cultural interest and value must be used for historic designation. They were all considered in 1988 and 1992 by the HPB & the City Commission, and are a vital part of the Legislative History & Intent and the unedited study. The SB Overlay and the enabling language, written by City Hall, are silent about historic parameters -- thus implicit. All are relevant to the HPB's interpretation of the historic context, which now depends on each member's subjective understanding.

We now recognize the basis for historic designation wasn't just a bunch of "vernacular" buildings that historians said were architecturally insignificant, even if 50 years old. The basis is that Sailboat Bend is an artifact of the tiny blue-collar or poor white class that built pre-1940 Fort Lauderdale, and in the 1960's of working-class Blacks who, together, first integrated Ft. Lauderdale.

Archeologically, it is tiny -- like an enchanted Fairyland. The aesthetic evidence need not be itemized. A cultural lower-class social idea and people that are now "gone with the wind." The railroad tracks are the east/west divide, defining the Westside as the "wrong side of the tracks." That is not a cliché! The wide railroad bunker, flanked by roads, was an effective police line keeping the underclass away from the "good guys." It wasn't called Dixie Highway for nothing! We are one of a few blue-collar historic districts.

Let me give you another Icon: Our tiny homes are like supplicants, humbly praying that they blend in, hiding under the jungle canopy so the elite won't

single them out for discrimination. These multiple-unit townhouses are like a hefty football team on an open field after victory, with outstretched arms and hands, saying: "Look at us!" As we predicted, the New Order elite now covet our previously scorned Downtown land, not knowing or caring what they buy and bury.

Our legal and expert historic basis is that "vernacular" (an elitist term) is an important architectural style as an artifact of blue-collar workers, both pre- and post-1940. Our subterfuge is that we wrote that definition into the Material Guidelines by example, not explicitly. The MG is a hodge-podge of architectural details and methods created by vote of all residents -- from all buildings and for all buildings -- as a convenient checklist to simplify renovations. This democratic opinion was accepted by the City Commission (but not City Hall) as basis for historic designation.

We knew the HPB's power to interpret the historic context could be abused. But the small democrats among us felt public hearings would keep your toes to the fire. Thankfully, you have done so in the main. The archeological milieu remains intact. I especially thank you for preserving the Parker apartments last month.

I would like to go into particulars in a future forum. I ask you to withhold judgment on the study until we can provide some missing materials and expert opinions as to our blue-collar status.

I also ask you to be generous in your approval of the renovations before you today. They are within the historic vernacular concept of the owner's personal artistic sense as outlined in the MG. Indeed, why are you even concerned about these tiny alterations? After all, you approve huge townhouses that violate historic massing, spatial, height, landscaping and architectural parameters readily visible from the extant archeological record.

Victoria Sazera, who lives across from Lauderdale Park, put this emotionally at your May, 2004 Public Hearing. To paraphrase her: You wouldn't allow me to put a small fence around my historic home so my child could play. Yet you're allowing these huge townhouses, which will dwarf my tiny historic home and my living environment. It isn't fair!

Not to be overly critical -- It's the ordinance, not you -- I leave you with a Biblical metaphor: Ye strain at a gnat, and swallow a camel. You have it in your power to expand the historic matrix from architectural and artistic to include the archeological and cultural. Strengthening the ordinance by amendment is a future option, which won't help you now. Thank you for your consideration."

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

I. Cases

- 1. Owner: Robert R. Talbott Case No. 3-H-05 (SB)(41-H-02)**
Location: 724 SW 1 Street
Request: Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration:
▪ Addition of garage and family room, including colonial windows, French doors, shingle roof, and poured concrete driveway, terra cotta in color.
Zoned: RMM-25/ Sailboat Bend Historic District
Legal: Town of Fort Lauderdale. Block 20, the North 86.50 feet of Lots 11 and 13, of a subdivision of Lots 9 and 10. P.B. 3, P. 15 (D).

Mr. Cromar explained that the owner was requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for Alteration for a garage addition. He said the Board should consider the criteria for a COA for Alteration from Section 47-24.11.C.3. and the Material and Designs Guidelines for the Sailboat Bend Historic District from Section 47-17.7.

Ms. Rathbun explained that the house was a wood frame vernacular (folk) bungalow. She said that it was shown in a paste-over on the 1963-1970s updated Sanborn Fire Insurance Map but was not listed in the SBHD historic study, the Florida Master Site File or the updated historic survey for the city. She added that the house therefore might have been moved from another site.

Ms. Rathbun further stated that the applicant wanted to add a side wing to the east side of the existing structure. She said that this new wing would be stepped back from the front of the original house approximately nine feet. Ms. Rathbun added that the applicant, to differentiate between the new structure and the original, proposes placing a Colonial style triple window, which is shorter than the height of the windows in the original structure.

Ms. Rathbun described the material specifications for the alterations. She noted that the applicant had stated that he wanted the roof ridge of the new addition to be lower than the roof ridge of the original house but the drawings accompanying the application did not show the lower ridge. She said that the applicant must therefore state his intentions at this meeting. She added that this lower ridge with the setback from the front of the original house would mitigate the impact of this sizable addition.

Mr. Robert Talbott, owner, explained that new plans had been drawn depicting the lower roof ridge. He said he wanted this change to be sure the new addition did not appear larger than the original house.

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

Mr. Saunders noted that after this house was moved, it had been a real mess; he congratulated Mr. Talbott on all the work he had done to restore it.

Motion made by Mr. Saunders, and seconded by Ms. Dandy to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration as presented, with the stipulation that the plans include the lowered roof ridge Mr. Talbott spoke about. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

2. **Owner:** **Janice L. Kerrigan** **Case No. 4-H-05 (SB)**
 Location: **808 SW 4 Court**
 Request: Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration:
 ▪ Addition of garage, including six-panel single door on front, solid
 panel double doors on rear, asphalt shingle roof, and two single-hung
 windows on east side to match house.
 Zoned: RS-8/ Sailboat Bend Historic District
 Legal: Bryan Place. Portions of Lots 13, 14, and 15.
 P.B. 1, P. 60 (D).

Mr. Cromar explained that the owner was requesting a COA for a garage addition. He said that the Board should consider the criteria for a COA for Alteration from Section 47-24.11.C.3. and the Material and Designs Guidelines for the Sailboat Bend Historic District from Section 47-17.7.

Ms. Rathbun explained that the house was designed by Fort Lauderdale architect Robert Jahelka in 1949. She said that although the house was not considered historic, the simple “modern” style of the house was compatible with the prevailing vernacular house style of the district. Ms. Rathbun continued, stating that the applicant was requesting a COA for a one-story, gable roofed garage addition on the east wall of the house. She added that the plane of the front wall of the new garage would be on the same plane as the front wall of the existing house.

Ms. Rathbun described the material specifications for the alteration and noted that the owner should provide a photograph or drawing of the entire front façade of the existing two-story house at this hearing.

Ms. Janice Kerrigan, owner of the property, explained that she had already made many other improvements to the house.

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

Motion made by Ms. Graf, and seconded by Mr. Fogel to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration as presented. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

III. For the Good of the City

Chair Eck noted that the Board had received copies of the Sailboat Bend report and noted that they would discuss this at the next meeting.

Mr. Fogel asked if there was an update to the Sailboat Bend Historic District Study. Mr. Cromar said that there had been an update to the historic surveys within the last five years but this was

not necessarily a companion to the original Sailboat Bend study. Mr. Cromar added that the update made no generalized recommendation or summary but was short enough for the Board members to comprehend very quickly. He said he agreed to provide board members with copies of this report.

Mr. Fogel asked for an update on applications the Board had denied. Mr. Cromar informed the Board that the Townhomes at Waverly Road project that the Board had not approved at the last meeting was on the City Commission's March 15 agenda to appeal the HPB's decision. Mr. Howard said he was concerned that an appeal of their decision might have an effect on other projects they had denied. The Assistant City Attorney said that the outcome of one appeal had no bearing on any other decision. She added that the City Commission must first decide if there was basis for an appeal. Chair Eck pointed out that the HPB's decisions were made on a case-by-case basis, considering the particulars of the individual properties.

Mr. Fogel said he wanted the board to be cautious about taking a hard line on building dates. He said he thought that many other factors should be considered when the Board made their determinations. He said he thought that the exact age of a building should not be the sole, or even the primary criterion the Board relied upon.

Mr. Saunders said he wanted an update on the 700 and 712 SW 2nd Court properties. The Assistant City Attorney said that the owner had been granted two extensions by the judge. She said that the first extension was granted to allow additional time to retain an attorney. She added that the City did not know why the second extension had been granted. The Assistant City Attorney said that the owner's answer to the City's complaint for foreclosure was due this week and that she agreed to keep the Board apprised.

Mr. Saunders said that he was concerned that the City was unable to cut the grass on those properties. The Assistant City Attorney stated that the owner's permission was required to access the property; the City only resorted to using warrants to access property when there were life safety issues.

There being no further business to come before this Board, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 5:55 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.
--