

Fort Lauderdale, Florida

1. **Owner:** George Hunker **Case No. 6-H-05**
Location: 700 NE 17th Avenue
Request: Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration:

- Replace six (6) Jalousie windows with six (6) Colonial style aluminum impact resistant windows.

Zoned: RCS-15/ Sailboat Bend Historic District
Legal: Victoria Courts. Block 2, Lot 12.
P.B. 9, P. 49.

Mr. Cromar said that the property owner was not present. He said that the Board could defer until a representative of the property was present. Chair Eck said to defer the case until later in the meeting.

2. Owner: R. Eric Russo **Case No. 26-H-02**
Location: 615 NE 15th Avenue
Request: Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition: (partial)
▪ Removal of a small Florida room at rear of structure.
Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration:
▪ Addition to the rear of the property of a kitchen, two (2) bedrooms, two (2) full bathrooms and a half (1/2) bathroom, and a one-car garage off the alley.
Zoned: RC-15
Legal: Town of Progresso. Acreage in Section 2, Township 50 South, Range 42 East. P.B. 2, P. 18 (D).

Mr. Cromar stated that this applicant had requested a COA for demolition of a portion of a historically designated structure and a COA for Alteration for a 1,500 square foot addition to the rear. He advised the Board to consider the General Criteria for granting Certificates of Appropriateness as listed in Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.i.a-f, the criteria for demolition found in Section 47-24.11.C.4.c.i-iii, and the additional guidelines for alterations as listed in Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.ii.a-h.

Ms. Rathbun stated that the applicants had come before the Board requesting historic designation in July 2002. She said that the Board had approved their request and the City Commission had declared the house historic. Ms. Rathbun continued, stating that the owners had indicated at that time that they wanted to build an addition to the house at some later time. She said that the applicants were now appearing before the Board to present plans for a three-story addition to the rear of the structure. Ms. Rathbun noted that in order to accomplish the project, a small porch at the rear of the house would need to be demolished. She said that this porch did not appear to be original to the house. She added that the applicants said they would make no changes other than the removal of the porch and the attachment of the addition.

Ms. Rathbun described the proposed addition and noted that it would be located the full length from the front of the historic house, which would minimize the impact on the older structure. She noted that the applicant had explained that landscaping would further mitigate the impact of the new addition.

Ms. Rathbun advised the Board to refer to the general criteria for COA's from ULDR Section 47-24.11, and to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation when considering the application. She said that the Board should also consider additional guidelines for new additions to an historic structure in Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.iii.a, b and i.

Mr. Eric Russo, owner, said that the addition would help protect the house. He added that the extra space would make the house more “livable” by today’s standards and therefore it would be less likely that someone would buy the house just to tear it down.

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. Russo showed a drawing depicting the height of the new addition. Ms. Rathbun then clarified that the design of the addition did have a separate roof.

Ms. Graff asked how the new addition would fit in. Mr. Russo said that the house to the north of his had a “tower” in the middle that was taller than two stories. Ms. Dulce Conde, the project architect, said that the tallest part of the third story was still below the thirty-five foot height limit for residential development.

Mr. Jolly said that this design was a nice alternative to the many three-story townhouses in the area.

Ms. Nothard complimented Mr. Russo on his application package. She added that she was concerned about preservation of the character of the area. She asked Mr. Russo if he had considered taking more space at the rear of the property. Mr. Russo said that the project was already all the way to the setback at the rear of the property. Ms. Nothard said she was also concerned that the addition was not differentiated from the existing structure. She continued, stating that the same windows and siding had been used in the design. Mr. Russo said they had used that window design before they realized that the addition should be distinguished architecturally from the existing building. He offered to alter the window design.

Mr. Saunders asked if there had been notice to the neighbors of the project. Mr. Russo said that proper notice had been made to his neighbors.

Mr. Wieland asked Mr. Cromar how the building addition related to the landmark designation. Mr. Cromar explained that landmark designation was given to a structure and its site. He added that the addition had landmark designation as part of the site.

Mr. Welch stated that the application was an admirable effort. He asked Mr. Russo to confirm that landscaping would help camouflage the three-story portion of the design. Mr. Russo confirmed.

Mr. Fogel remarked that the application was very well done and encouraged Mr. Cromar to use it as an exemplar to which new applicants could refer. Mr. Fogel noted that the proposed structure would be massive in the back but felt that with the camouflaging landscaping this would work here.

Chair Eck stated that he was initially concerned about the size but was pleased that Mr. Russo was preserving the structure. He said that he also thought that the windows should be better differentiated from the existing ones.

Motion made by Mr. Fogel, and seconded by Mr. Welch to approve the Certificates of Appropriateness for Demolition and Alteration, with the condition that the applicant differentiate

1. **Owner:** George Hunker **Case No. 6-H-05**
Location: 700 NE 17th Avenue
Request: Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration:
 ▪ Replace six (6) Jalousie windows with six (6) Colonial style
 aluminum impact resistant windows.
Zoned: RCS-15/ Sailboat Bend Historic District
Legal: Victoria Courts. Block 2, Lot 12.
 P.B. 9, P. 49.

Mr. Cromar said that the applicant was requesting a COA for Alteration to replace six windows on the structure. He noted the applicant was the next-door neighbor of the previous applicant, Mr. Parker, and that the houses were part of the Victoria Court historic designation. Mr. Cromar continued, stating that the Board should consider the General Criteria for granting Certificates of Appropriateness as listed in Section 47-24.C.3.c.i.a-f as well as the additional guidelines for alterations as listed in Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.ii.a-h.

Ms. Rathbun stated that the house was part of the Victoria Court Multiple Property historic designation. She said that Mr. Hunker was asking to replace jalousie windows, which were not original to the house, with Colonial style windows. Ms. Rathbun said that the requested Colonial style windows were compatible with the historic house.

Ms. Rathbun advised the Board to refer to the general criteria for COA's from ULDR Section 47-24.11. She said the Board should also refer to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation describing proper replacement for deteriorated historic features.

Mr. George Hunker, owner, stated that he was trying to get the house back to the way it looked fifty years ago, before the jalousie windows were installed.

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. Fogel said that it would have been nice if Mr. Hunker had provided a photo of the whole facade of the house with the application package instead of just a close-up of the window.

Motion made by Ms. Nothard, and seconded by Mr. Saunders to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration as presented. In a roll call vote, the motion passed unanimously.

- | | | |
|-----------|---|------------------------------------|
| 4. | Owner: Sailboat Ventures, LLC | <u>Case No. 5-H-05 (SB)</u> |
| | Location: 200 SW 9th Avenue | |
| | Request: Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition: | |
| | ▪ Demolition of structure on site. | |
| | Certificate of Appropriateness for New Construction: | |
| | ▪ Construction of a seven-unit (7) townhouse development. | |
| | ▪ Modification of front yard (SW 9 Avenue) setback from 25' to 15'. | |
| | ▪ Modification of rear yard setback from 20' to 15' | |
| | Zoned: RMM/25 & RML/25 Sailboat Bend Historic District | |
| | Legal: <u>Bryan Subdivision</u> . Block 21, the West half of Lot 15 and all Lot 17. | |
| | P.B. 1, P. 29. | |

Mr. Cromar said that the applicant had requested Certificates of Appropriateness for demolition and new construction, as well as a modification to yard setbacks. He advised the Board to consider the general criteria for COA's as listed in Section 47-24.3.c.i.a-f, the criteria for demolition found in Section 47-24.11.C.4.c.i-iii, and the criteria for new construction as listed in Section 47-24.11.C.3.iii.

Mr. Cromar added that with respect to the applicant's request for yard modifications, the Board should consider whether the request would interfere with the light, air, and view of adjacent properties, and the criteria as listed in Section 47-17.5.A.1-4. He continued, stating that the Board should also consider whether the Material and Design Guidelines for the Sailboat Bend Historic District as listed in Section 47-17.7.

Ms. Rathbun said that the applicant had provided extensive drawings of the project, helping to describe the impact of the proposed project on the immediate neighborhood. She said that the applicant wanted to demolish two existing one-story apartment buildings to facilitate this project. She continued, stating that the existing structures were constructed sometime after the 1960s since they were not listed in the City's historic surveys and did not appear on any of the updated Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps.

Ms. Rathbun said that that any criteria under Section 47-24.11.C would apply in this case. She added that the applicant had also requested a 20-foot yard setback for a principal structure, for both the right and left sides. She continued, stating that the criteria in Section 47-15.5 allowed the Historic Preservation Board to grant a distance separation reduction. Mr. Rathbun noted that the Board had allowed similar modifications at 842 SW 2 Street and at Himmarshee Townhomes. She described the material and design elements and noted that the requested materials meet the SBHD Materials and Design guidelines.

Ms. Rathbun said that the Board should take into consideration additional guidelines for new construction in an historic district under Section 47-24.11. .

Mr. Robert Lochrie, representing the applicant, explained that they had worked on the project for some time. He showed an aerial view of the area and an elevation view of the project. He said that the applicant planned to preserve two live oak trees that were of concern to the neighborhood association.

Mr. Lochrie described the plans for the buildings and driveway access. He said that there would be only two driveway entrances. Mr. Lochrie stated that the buildings were different styles and colors in order to break up monotony. He said that the Sailboat Bend Association Executive Committee had reviewed and approved the design.

Mr. Walter Chatham, architect, stated he would answer any questions from the Board.

Chair Eck proceeded to open the public hearing.

Mr. John Kleinedler informed the Board that six months ago, the Sailboat Bend Civic Association had created its own guidelines for development in the community. He said that Mr. Lochrie's project had begun around that time and was the first one to fully comply with new Sailboat Bend guidelines. He continued, stating that the civic association general membership had unanimously approved it. Mr. Kleinedler said he thought that this was the best project he had seen in four years.

Mr. Nolan Hahn, neighbor, stated that he was very pleased with the design as well.

Mr. Don Wilkin, neighbor, said that the neighborhood association general membership had voted unanimously to approve the project at the November meeting.

Mr. Dave Parker, neighbor, said that the architect had taken special effort to consider the historic home next door, making sure that the building was not in shadow or engulfed by the new structure.

Mr. Richard Locke, neighbor, said he apologized if any of his remarks at the prior meeting had offended anyone. He said that he was not present this evening to oppose this particular project. He continued, stating that he felt that this area was so built-out already that the historic element was all but lost. He said that trees depicted in the drawings did not exist and he felt that tree canopies around historic properties should be preserved.

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.

Mr. Fogel said that this decision was a difficult one. He said that he thought the architect had done a nice job but did not like the fact that it was three stories. He said that he thought it unfortunate that the entire two-block area was now "townhouse row" and that he was personally opposed to three stories in that neighborhood.

Ms. Nothard said that it was good to see such cooperation between the developer and the neighborhood. She said that she thought the designer had made an attempt to minimize the visual effect of the garages. She said that she too was somewhat concerned with the fact that it was three stories. She added that this was now part of the "flavor" of the neighborhood.

Mr. Jolly stated that he was the Chair of the Sailboat Bend Guidelines Committee.

Ms. Graff stated that she had been concerned about the height but felt the project would fit into the surrounding area.

Chair Eck said he was pleased to see how compatible the buildings were in the street-level elevation drawings.

Motion made by Mr. Saunders, and seconded by Ms. Nothard to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition, with consideration of the demolition criteria: Section 47-24.11.C.4.c.i-iii. In a roll call vote, the motion passed unanimously.

Motion made by Mr. Saunders, and seconded by Ms. Nothard to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for New Construction, with consideration of the material and design guidelines: Section 47-17.7.B.1.a.i, Section 47-17.7.B.2.a, b, and c, Section 47-17.B.3 a.iii, iv, vi, and viii and in the commentary regarding the setbacks from Ms. Rathbun. In a roll call vote, the motion passed unanimously.

II. Other Business

III. For the Good of the City

Mr. Cromar provided the Board with an update on the appeal for Townhomes of Waverly Road. The City Commission had heard the owner's appeal of the HPB decision and there would be a hearing at the April 19 City Commission meeting at 6:00 p.m.

Mr. Fogel announced that his term on the Board was complete. He stated that he had enjoyed his tenure and encouraged all Board members to communicate with each other and the public, and to speak their minds when discussing cases. He said that he had been frustrated at times by the reticence to speak of some Board members.

- Overview of Sunshine Law

The Assistant City Attorney said that she would reserve discussion on this topic until the new Board was assembled in June.

- Discussion of Sailboat Bend Historic District Study

Mr. Cromar said that staff had provided the Board with copies of the Sailboat Bend Historic District Study and the Archaeological & Historical Conservancy's summary report of the historic property survey update. Mr. Cromar noted that the Board member packets also included a page of ULDR Section 47-17. He said that Chair Eck had noticed that his copy of the ULDR notebook that staff provides for Board members had code language that was different from the current City code. Mr. Cromar said that the attached copy highlighted the text regarding "buildings which were built prior to 1940." Chair Eck said that he thought that the discussion of the Sailboat Bend Historic District regulations was better left until June, when the Board had its new members in place.

Mr. Fogel said he wanted one more update on the properties at 700 and 712 SW 2 Court. The Assistant City Attorney said that the City was in litigation with the owner, and the City was in the process of responding to discovery requests. Mr. Fogel said he was disappointed that this case had remained unresolved for the six years he was on the Board.

Ms. Nothard said she had received a copy of a letter sent to City Manager George Gretsas and City Attorney Harry Stewart regarding the Stranahan House. Chair Eck said that the City Attorney had advised him to not participate in any discussions the Historic Preservation Board may have in regard to the letter because Chair Eck was on the Board of the Stranahan House. He asked Vice Chair Saunders to complete the meeting on his behalf. Mr. Jolly disclosed that he was on the Board of the Broward Trust for Historic Preservation and would leave the discussion as well.

Ms. Nothard continued, stating that the letter concerned an application made to the Historic Preservation Board regarding the Stranahan House.

The Assistant City Attorney said that the City Attorney's Office was reviewing the application to determine if it should be heard by the HPB. The Assistant City Attorney said that the Board should not discuss the case tonight. She continued, stating that since the case was not on the agenda for this meeting, the interested parties had not received notification that it would be discussed. She added that the case might end up on the HPB agenda at a later date. She informed the Board that the City Attorney had taken the application for review because there was ongoing litigation regarding the case. Ms. Nothard asked that the Assistant City Attorney update the Board on the case.

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

VICE-CHAIR

William Saunders

ATTEST:

Jamie Opperee, 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.
--