

**Historic Preservation Board
City of Fort Lauderdale
Monday, February 6, 2006- 5:00 P.M.
City Hall
First Floor Conference Room
100 North Andrews Avenue
Fort Lauderdale, Florida**

Board Members	Present/Absent	2006 Cumulative Attendance		
		P	A	Total
Carolyn Dandy	P	2	0	2
Mary-Jane Graff	P	2	0	2
Nolan Haan	P	2	0	2
Bill Howard	P	2	0	2
Daryl Jolly, Vice Chair	P	2	0	2
Susan Jordan	P	2	0	2
Tom Welch	P	2	0	2
Clay Wieland	P	2	0	2
William Saunders, Chair	P	2	0	2

Staff Present

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

Call to Order

Chair Saunders called the meeting of the Historic Preservation Board to order at 5:00 p.m. Roll call was taken with the following Board Members being present: Ms. Dandy, Ms. Graff, Mr. Haan, Mr. Howard, Mr. Jolly, Ms. Jordan, Mr. Welch, Mr. Wieland, Chair Saunders.

Approval of Minutes of January 23, 2006 Meeting

Motion made by Mr. Howard, seconded by Mr. Welch, to approve the minutes of the January 23, 2006 meeting. In a roll call vote, the Board approved the motion (9-0).

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

I. Cases

1. **Applicant:** Alyssa S. Plummer & J. Daniel Subtelny **Case No. 4-H-06 (SB)**
Location: 1123 West Las Olas Boulevard
Request: Certificate of Appropriateness for Alternation:
 - Addition to west side of structure to include new gabled roof.
 - Replace porch roof.

- Install new metal roof.
 - Install new windows and French doors in kitchen.
- Zoned: RML-25 (Sailboat Bend Historic District Overlay)
Legal: Waverly Place.
Block 111, Lots 11, 12, 13, and 14, less the North 37.5 feet.
P.B. 2, P. 19 (D).

Mr. Cromar advised the Board to consider whether this request met the General Criteria for Alterations in Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.i, the Additional Criteria for Alterations in Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.ii, and also whether the proposed materials and design met the Material and Design Guidelines in Section 47-17.7 for alterations in the Sailboat Bend Historic District [SBHD].

Ms. Rathbun explained that the house was listed on the Florida Master Site File and was shown on the 1928 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map for the City. She noted that the property was considered historic in the SBHD.

Ms. Rathbun continued that the request was for a COA for Alteration to extend the kitchen area and to make repairs to bring the house up to Code. She said that the applicant had requested the following materials:

Section 47-17.7 Material and design guidelines

- B. Materials and designs
 - 1. Exterior building walls
 - a. Materials and finish
 - ii. wood – clapboard, three and one-half (3 ½) inches to (7) inches to the weather;

Clapboard will match the original siding.

- 2. Windows and doors
 - a. Materials
 - iii. painted and stained wood.
 - b. Configurations
 - i. doors: other; French doors
 - ii. windows, rectangular
 - c. Operations
 - i. windows; single and double hung;
 - ii other

Ms. Rathbun explained that new windows in the addition would be double hung, and new French doors, leading from the kitchen to the porch would be installed. She noted that these new windows and doors were appropriate to the period of the resource.

- 3. Roofs and gutters
 - a. Roof materials
 - v. 5-V crimp
 - vi. galvanized metal shingles
 - b. Gutters
 - iii. ESP aluminum
 - c. Configurations
 - i. Roof: The pitch of new roofs may be matched to the pitch of the roof of existing structures on the lot. Simple gable

and hip, pitch no less than 3:12 and no more than 8:12.
Shed roofs attached to a higher wall, pitch no less than 3:12.

Ms. Rathbun declared that the requested changes were appropriate in the Sailboat Bend Historic District.

Mr. James Archer, architect, explained that the addition would increase the kitchen five feet on one side. They also intended to repaired some "ill-conceived" previous alterations and additions, including the kitchen and porch roofs. He noted that the French doors would be the only truly new component.

Chair Saunders proceeded to open the public hearing. There being no one present wishing to speak on the item, Chair Saunders brought the discussion back to the Board.

Several Board members disclosed that they had either visited or driven by the property.

Motion made by Mr. Howard, and seconded by Ms. Graff to approve the application as presented. Roll call vote showed: Yeas: Ms. Dandy, Ms. Graff, Mr. Haan, Mr. Howard, Mr. Jolly, Ms. Jordan, Mr. Welch, Mr. Wieland, Chair Saunders. Board approved (9-0).

2.	Applicant:	<u>Tarragon South Development Corp.</u>	<u>Case No. 27-H-05</u>
	Location:	115 NE 3 Avenue	
		The Exchange (Bell South Building)	
	Request:	Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration:	
		• Adaptive re-use of the building.	
	Zoned:	RAC-CC	
	Legal:	<u>George M. Phippens Subdivision of Lots 3, 4, 5, 6, Block I, and Lots 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, Block 14, of the Town of Fort Lauderdale.</u>	
		Block "E", Lots 2, 4, 6, 8, and 10.	
		P.B. "B", P. 146 (D).	

Chair Saunders said he had a conflict of interest and recused himself from hearing this item. Vice Chair Jolly took over the proceedings as Chair.

Mr. Cromar informed the Board that the Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration was for a proposed adaptive re-use to convert this building to residential units. Mr. Cromar advised the Board to consider both the General Criteria for Alterations in Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.i, and the Additional Criteria for Alterations in Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.ii. He advised the Board to pay special attention to whether the proposed re-use met the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation of Historic Buildings.

Mr. Cromar explained that the applicant had presented the proposed alterations to the City Commission prior to the building's designation. He added that because of the recent historic designation, it was within the HPB's purview to review the COA for Alteration.

Ms. Rathbun explained that the applicant had appeared before the HPB in December 2005 to request historic designation for the Southern Bell Telephone Company Exchange Building and that the City Commission had granted the designation. She stated that the building was a six story C.B.S. structure with an adjacent, smaller, six-story structure located at the southwest

corner of the larger building. She noted that the applicant's consultant had provided a detailed report on the history of the building and the telephone company in Fort Lauderdale.

Ms. Rathbun continued that the building was constructed just north of the site of the original Telephone building. She said that when it was built in 1948, the building was only three stories; upper stories were added at a later date. She continued, stating that since the structure was built to house telephone exchange equipment, there were no windows in the upper stories, but blank recesses, with window surrounds were placed on the upper stories. She added that this detail was replicated when additional floors were added.

Ms. Rathbun explained that the building had highly simplified classical design elements. She said that the entry had a projecting rectangular door surround with an arched opening. She added that a short flight of steps led to a rectangular door, recessed within the arch. Ms. Rathbun continued, stating that this door surround and arched opening was replicated at the north corner of the 3rd Avenue elevation and the east corner of the 2nd Street elevation. She said that false windows were recessed within these arches, and the first floor window recesses had wide projecting window surrounds.

Ms. Rathbun advised the Board to consider the following:

Section 47-24.11. Historic designation of landmarks, landmark site or buildings and certificate of appropriateness.

- C. Certificate of appropriateness.
 - 3. Alterations, new construction or relocation.
 - c. Criteria.
 - i. General. In approving or denying applications for certificates of appropriateness for alterations, new construction, demolition or relocation, the historic preservation board shall use the following general criteria and additional guidelines for alterations, new construction, relocations and demolitions as provided in subsections C.3.c.ii, iii, and iv, and C.4:
 - a) The effect of the proposed work on the landmark or the property upon which such work is to be
 - c) The extent to which the historic, architectural, or archeological significance, architectural style, design, arrangement, texture, materials and color of the landmark or the property will be affected;
 - f) Whether the plans comply with the "United States Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings."

Ms. Rathbun explained that the applicant's consultant had submitted a report arguing the project's compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation as follows:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation

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.

Ms. Rathbun said that the applicant reasonably argued the necessity of replacing the window blanks with operable windows. She said that the windows for the project do not exactly follow the placement of the original window blanks, but the applicant argued that the overall character of the building was maintained.

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.

Ms. Rathbun explained that additional window openings would be added to the north elevation; the applicant argued that the additional windows gave the same visual sense as the original building. She said that the original south elevation of the building had received minimal treatment. She added that the new project would open this façade to be compatible with the rest of the building.

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 continued that the applicant stated he would endeavor to retain as much of the original material, i.e. ground floor window surrounds and the limestone base, as was practical.

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.

Ms. Rathbun reported that the applicant maintained that the rooftop amenities would not be visible from the street, as the existing parapet would conceal them.

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.

Ms. Rathbun stated that the applicant stated that the rooftop amenities and other additions could be safely removed in the future.

Ms. Rathbun noted that a main entrance to the building was centered in the recessed façade. She said that the colonnade allowed access from the northeast entry to a main stair and handicapped access at the southeast corner of the building

Ms. Rathbun said that she thought that the applicant's project was an appropriate re-use of this historic resource.

Mr. Danny Bivins, Vice President of Tarragon South Development Corp., informed the Board that the building had sat vacant for about 10 years when they had purchased it in 2004. He said that they purchased the building with the intention of renovating it and preserving the architecture of the original building. He said that they had hired John Barranco as their

architect, and Ellen Uguccioni of Janus Research to perform architectural research. Mr. Bivins explained that this conversion would result in 87 residential loft units.

Vice Chair Jolly proceeded to open the public hearing.

Ms. Ellen Uguccioni, Janus Research, displayed drawings and site plans for the project and explained the former and future configuration of the building and surrounding area. She noted that Tarragon intended to try to preserve the limestone door opening surrounds. She admitted that the terra cotta block construction might not be up to Code and therefore might need to be replaced. Ms. Uguccioni stated that in her opinion, this was a “certifiable rehabilitation and a project that would ... reuse a building that otherwise I don’t think could have been reused.”

Mr. James Archer, architect, complemented the design team and cautioned them when they added the ornamentation to “give credence to...using real materials.” He explained that this meant not replacing the limestone surrounds with Styrofoam.

There being no one else from the public wishing to speak on the item, Vice Chair Jolly brought the discussion back to the Board.

Mr. Howard asked about the parking arrangements for the residents. Mr. Bivins said that parking would now be available behind the building, and through leased spaces in the Comerica Building parking garage. He added that they also had leased 75 spaces from the City parking garage.

Mr. Wieland asked about the aboveground power lines. Mr. Bivins said that they intended to put all of the power lines underground.

Mr. Haan said the report from Janus Research had made the Board’s job easier by addressing every issue they must consider. Mr. Haan asked if the building must be brought up to hurricane code; he feared this would necessitate removal of the limestone surrounds. Mr. Bivins said that they were trying to preserve the surrounds, but the code question was another issue. He described the terra cotta blocks of which the building was constructed as quite friable and said they would probably want to replace these for structural safety, not code compliance. He noted that the building was constructed on pilings and was actually over-engineered.

Mr. Bivins continued, stating that there are two terrazzo staircases in the building that had risers one inch shorter than the fire code allowed. He said that they hoped to be able to get around the standard building code to preserve them.

Mr. Haan said that with all of the features that they might be required to remove, he wondered what would remain “historic” about the building. Mr. Bivins said they were attempting to build a building that would preserve the architectural integrity of the building that was there now. He assured Mr. Haan that much of the original structure would be maintained.

Mr. Welch felt this was a great example of adaptive reuse. He wondered what would set this project apart from the other loft projects currently being constructed in the area. Mr. Bivins said the columns, the 15’ ceiling, and the terrazzo floors were distinctive. He added that the historic designation would be included in the building’s marketing and would be displayed inside the building.

Ms. Uguccioni noted that even though there were problems with the terra cotta cladding, the interior of this building, the spaces themselves, were “incredible...expansive...an impressive space on the interior.” She said that she thought that the reconstruction was being done with such care and concern that it fell into the realm of a “historic preservation project.”

Mr. John Barranco, architect, clarified that the exterior walls on the lower floors were damaged from compression. He said that they intended to replace this with a consistent material and relieve the pressure. Ms. Jordan wondered about the structural integrity of the building’s interior. Mr. Barranco explained that the building was structurally intact; every exterior wall could be removed and the building would remain standing.

Mr. Haan asked Ms. Rathbun if she was comfortable with the project. She said that she thought that it was an important adaptive reuse and some adjustments must therefore be made.

Mr. Haan wanted the City to be aware that the HPB favored allowing the stairways to remain intact and he asked Mr. Bivins to petition the City in this regard.

Motion made by Mr. Haan, and seconded by Ms. Jordan to approve the application as presented, including the specific references cited by Mr. Cromar and Ms. Rathbun, and the Janus Research report, with the condition that the applicant utilize matching materials as much as possible. Roll call vote showed: Yeas: Ms. Dandy, Ms. Graff, Mr. Haan, Mr. Howard, Ms. Jordan, Mr. Welch, Mr. Wieland, Vice Chair Jolly. Board approved (8-0).

- 3. Applicant:** Ian Crewe **Case No. 5-H-06 (SB)**
Location: **327 SW 12th (Seminole) Avenue**
Request: Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration:
• Installation of 10' x 10' storage shed
Zoned: RML-25 (Sailboat Bend Historic District Overlay)
Legal: Waverly Place.
Block 109, Lots 1, 2, and 3, P.B.2, P. 19 (D.)

Mr. Cromar advised the HPB to consider whether the request met the General Criteria for Alterations in Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.i, the Additional Criteria for Alterations in Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.ii, and whether the proposed materials and design met the Material and Design Guidelines listed in Section 47-17.7 for alterations in the SBHD.

Ms. Rathbun informed the Board that the two houses at 327 SW 12th Avenue were shown on the 1928 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map for the City and were listed in the 1985 Historic Property Survey for the City, but were not listed on the Florida Master Site File. She said that the houses were considered historic in the SBHD.

Ms. Rathbun continued that the proposed shed was a vernacular style building with a low-pitched gable roof and a double door entry. She said that the shed would be sited to the rear of the smaller residence [guesthouse] on the property. Mr. Rathbun stated that the property was a corner lot, but since the lot was fenced, the shed would not be noticeable from SW 4th Street.

Mr. Ian Crewe, owner, displayed photos of the proposed shed and explained that it would be located behind his guesthouse facing an alley. He noted that his old shed had been knocked down in the hurricane. Mr. Jolly confirmed that he was glad the hurricane had removed the old

shed, as it was a visible eyesore. Mr. Crewe confirmed for Chair Saunders that the new shed would be camouflaged from the neighbors by a fence and landscaping.

Mr. Haan felt they must approve a rear yard setback modification. Mr. Cromar said that Section 4-19.2.EE. dealt specifically with utility and tool sheds and cited this Section, saying they were permitted "no closer than 5' from any property line." He noted that the Zoning Department had already approved the location and no variance was required. The Assistant City Attorney confirmed that the Zoning Department had determined this was not needed.

Chair Saunders proceeded to open the public hearing. There being no one present wishing to speak on the item, Chair Saunders brought the discussion back to the Board.

Motion made by Mr. Welch, and seconded by Mr. Howard to approve the application as presented. Roll call vote showed: Yeas: Ms. Dandy, Ms. Graff, Mr. Haan, Mr. Howard, Mr. Jolly, Ms. Jordan, Mr. Welch, Mr. Wieland, Chair Saunders. Board approved (9-0).

- 4. Applicant:** Fort Lauderdale Woman's Club **Case No. 7-H-04**
Location: 15 S.E. 1 Street
Request: Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration:
• Replace and relocate air conditioning unit to NE corner of structure.
Zoned: RAC-CC
Legal: Stranahan's Subdivision of Lots 13 thru 18, Town of Fort Lauderdale, Block 14. The W. 135' of the S. 100', Block "D". P.B. 3, P. 10 (D)

Mr. Cromar advised the Board in reviewing this request to consider the General Criteria for Alterations in Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.i, and the Additional Criteria for Alterations in Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.ii. He said that this request was scheduled to go before the Board of Adjustment at its February 8th, 2006 meeting for a variance to the setback for the proposed A/C unit.

Ms. Rathbun referred to the February 2004 HPB memo for the historic designation of the Fort Lauderdale Woman's Club and explained that the Woman's Club clubhouse was built in 1916, and designed by Miami architect August Geiger, one of South Florida's most notable architects. She said that he was most noted for his introduction of the Mediterranean Revival style to South Florida. She added that Geiger's work was not a strict interpretation of the style; he used various Spanish elements such as stucco ornamentation and arched loggias, both of which were used in his design for the Woman's Club.

Ms. Rathbun continued that the Woman's Club was the first architect-designed project in the City of Fort Lauderdale. She continued, stating that in 1916 Mr. and Mrs. Frank Stranahan donated land in downtown Fort Lauderdale for the construction of the clubhouse. Ms. Rathbun noted that Ivy Stranahan was a longtime member of the club. She said that in 1949 the clubhouse was remodeled, which resulted in the loss of much of the historic character of the building, but the applicant had promised that the club would restore the building to its original appearance.

Ms. Rathbun explained that the applicant proposed removal the existing air conditioning compressor from its position next to the north facade of the building. She said that a new A/C compressor and pad would be installed at the northeast corner of the building. Ms. Rathbun

pointed out that the equipment in the new position would be less visible from the street and the park surrounding the clubhouse. Ms. Rathbun felt this was an appropriate alteration.

Ms. Susan McClellan, architect, clarified for Chair Saunders that the air conditioner was being replaced because it no longer worked. She confirmed for Mr. Haan that no neighbor had expressed any objection to the project. She informed Chair Saunders that shrubbery would be used for screening.

Motion made by Mr. Haan, and seconded by Mr. Welch to approve the application as presented. Roll call vote showed: Yeas: Ms. Dandy, Ms. Graff, Mr. Haan, Mr. Howard, Mr. Jolly, Ms. Jordan, Mr. Welch, Mr. Wieland, Chair Saunders. Board approved (9-0).

II. Other Business

Applicant: LBJ Investments (Jay Adams)
Progresso Plaza
Location: 901 Progresso Drive

Case No. 28-H-03

Update on recent renovation work.

Ms. Rathbun said she had visited the site, and displayed an historic photo of the property taken in approximately 1926. She described the building details: the arched ground floor openings, the office and storefronts. She presented recent photos that showed the second floor porch railings; the restored supporting beam ends, storefronts and columns. Ms. Rathbun remarked that Mr. Adams was “doing a very good job of restoring it to its original appearance.”

Mr. Jay Adams, principal of LBJ Investments, explained that the building had been in very bad shape. He said that he had provided the contractors with photos from the 1920s to ensure that the building was restored properly.

Ms. Graff said she was concerned about the existing jalousie windows. Mr. Adams said that he was currently replacing the plumbing and the windows were one issue that had to wait until later to be addressed.

Mr. Adams remarked that this was one of the few commercial buildings LBJ Investments had in the National Register of Historic Places.

III. For the Good of the City

Mr. Ceisielski thanked Ms. Jordan for her letter to Barbara Mattick in support of the National Register Listing of the South Side School. Mr. Ceisielski announced he would participate in the presentation of the application to the State Historic Preservation Office in Tallahassee on February 17.

Mr. Ceisielski informed the Board that Susan Harp had received all the required documentation for the Certified Local Government program. He said he hoped to return to them next month describing rules and procedures for national designations. He added that if the requirements were met, the City would achieve Certified Local Government status.

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 6:26 p.m.

CHAIRMAN

William Saunders, Chair

ATTEST:

Jamie Opperlee, Recording Secretary