

**Historic Preservation Board
City of Fort Lauderdale
Monday, March 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	3	0	3
Mary-Jane Graff	P	3	0	3
Nolan Haan	P	3	0	3
Bill Howard	P	3	0	3
Daryl Jolly, Vice Chair	P	3	0	3
Susan Jordan	P	3	0	3
Tom Welch	P	3	0	3
Clay Wieland	P	3	0	3
William Saunders, Chair	P	3	0	3

Staff Present

James Cromar, Staff Liaison to HPB
Mike Ciesielski, Planner II
Assistant City Attorney
Merrilyn Rathbun, Fort Lauderdale Historical Society, Consultant to HPB
Sandra Goldberg, Recording Secretary

Call to Order

Chair Saunders called the meeting of the Historic Preservation Board to order at 5:03 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, Chair Saunders.

Approval of Minutes of February 2006 Meeting

Motion made by Mr. Howard, seconded by Mr. Welch, to approve the minutes of the February 2006 meeting. In a roll call vote, the motion was approved unanimously.

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

I. Cases

- | | | | |
|----|-------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| 1. | Applicant: | <u>Broward Trust for Historic Preservation</u> | <u>Case No. 26-H-05</u> |
| | Location: | 619 North Fort Lauderdale Beach Blvd
Sea Club Resort (Jolly Roger Hotel) | |
| | Request: | Historic Designation | |

Zoned: ABA (A-1-A Beachfront Area)
Legal: Birch Ocean Front, Subdivision No. 2.
Block F, South 100 feet less West 110 feet.
P.B. 21, P. 22.

Mr. Cromar informed the Board that the Broward Trust for Historic Preservation had submitted the application for local historic designation of the Sea Club Resort property, commonly known as the Jolly Roger Hotel. Mr. Cromar advised the Board to review this application and decide if this property met one or more of the criteria found in Section 47-24.11B.6.a.-h. He explained that Staff would then forward the record of the meeting along with the Board's recommendation to the City Commission, who would make the decision regarding designation of this building.

Ms. Rathbun informed the Board that Tony Sherman was the project architect, and George W. Gill, Sr. and George W. (Bob) Gill, Jr. were the developers of the property in 1952. She explained the Gills' contribution to Fort Lauderdale development and noted that the Gill hotels were noted for their quirky promotions.

Ms. Rathbun continued that The Broward Trust for Historic Preservation was requesting historic designation of the Jolly Roger Hotel (Sea Club Resort). She said that the Trust had provided extensive documentation in support of their application, including a narrative detailing Tony Sherman's career, information on the Gills and a discussion of the building as it represents the Mid-Century Modern style.

Ms. Rathbun stated that the Trust had cited the following criteria in requesting historic designation of the hotel:

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

B. Historic designation.

6. Criteria. The criteria for the designation of property as a landmark, landmark site or historic district shall be based on one (1) or more of the following criteria:

c. Its identification with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the development of the city, state, or nation,

[i.e. George W. (Bob) Gill, Jr.]

d. Its identification as the work of a master builder, designer, or architect whose individual work has influenced the development of the city, state, or nation,

[i.e. M. Tony Sherman]

f. Its distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style valuable for the study of a period, method of construction, or use of indigenous materials,

She cited the hotel as a significant example of the Mid-Century Modern style.

Ms. Rathbun pointed out that the hotel could also be considered under the following:

Sec. 47-24.11.

B. Historic designation

6. Criteria.
 - e. Its value as a building recognized for the quality of its architecture, and sufficient elements showing its architectural significance

Ms. Rathbun explained that the original paint scheme of the Jolly Roger was lost some time ago but the historic structure, i.e. the crows nest roof detail with port holes, the lobby window wall and the natural keystone terrace foundation and pool area wall, remained.

Ms. Rathbun announced that the Jolly Roger Hotel was worthy of designation under any or all of the above criteria.

Mr. Dick Coker, attorney representing the property owner, objected, stating the ordinance allowing a party other than the property owner to apply for historic designation was unconstitutional. He wanted to be certain it was understood that his arguing specifics of the case here would not be interpreted as waiving the owner's objection to the ordinance. Chair Saunders noted that arguments regarding the ordinance could not be addressed by the Historic Preservation Board, and should be addressed to the City Commission and Mayor.

Chair Saunders noted that the owner and applicant would both make presentations, and reminded the public that their input would be limited to three minutes.

Mr. Jolly announced a possible conflict and stepped down for this case.

Ms. Diane Smart, President of the Broward Trust for Historic Preservation, asked if the applicant would be permitted to rebut the owner's presentation. The Assistant City Attorney advised Chair Saunders regarding parameters for any rebuttal.

Ms. Diane Smart, President of the Broward Trust for Historic Preservation, noted that the Trust had made several attempts to discuss possibilities for the property with the owner, but the owner had cancelled a planned meeting.

Mr. Warren Adams, Executive Director of the Broward Trust for Historic Preservation, gave a PowerPoint presentation regarding the history of the property. He displayed photos of the front portion of the building, depicting the portholes, the funnel-shaped top and decking, which were unique to the property. Ms. Smart clarified that they were only requesting designation for the original, eastern portion of the property built in 1952. Ms. Smart noted the architectural influence on the building from the 1939 World's Fair.

Mr. Adams explained that only one designation criterion was required for designation, but this building met several: its association with a person, George Gill, who significantly contributed to the development of Fort Lauderdale; it was the work of master architect Tony Sherman whose work had influenced the development of the City. Mr. Adams cited the several other buildings designed by Tony Sherman. Ms. Smart referred to the Catalina Hotel in Miami, designed by Mr. Sherman, and remarked that this was an example of Mid-Century Modern architecture that was reborn as an economically viable and successful small hotel. Mr. Adams informed the Board that the Tropicana Hotel in Las Vegas was perhaps Mr. Sherman's most famous building.

Mr. Adams continued that another criterion the building met was having distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style valuable for the study of a period or the method of construction; he felt this was a fine example of Mid-Century Modern architecture. Mr. Adams produced photos of the property from the 1950s prior to any alterations. Mr. Adams said that he

thought that the building met three of the required criteria for historic designation and asked the Board to recommend to the City Commission that historic designation be approved.

Mr. Coker asked what had prompted the Broward Trust to request designation for the structure. Ms. Smart replied that several Mid-Century Modern hotels had been knocked down at the beach and the Trust wanted to “draw a line in the sand” to preserve what she termed “one of the finest pockets of Mid-Century Modern architecture in the United States.” Mr. Coker wanted to understand why the Trust was concerned now with the Jolly Roger. Ms. Smart said it was because the hotel was designed by a master architect, as was the Fort Lauderdale Beach Hotel.

Ms. Smart informed Mr. Coker that the Trust had already prepared an application for designation for Ireland's Inn, and they were now in the process of the application for the Yankee Clipper. They had also worked very hard on the Fort Lauderdale Beach Hotel.

Mr. Coker stated that designation was a devastating process to a property owner, potentially destroying the economic value of a property. Mr. Coker said designation could stop a real estate transaction and cost an owner tens of millions of dollars. Mr. Coker wanted the Board to consider not just the good intentions of organizations such as the Trust, but also the consequences of designation to the property owner.

Mr. Coker stated that because of the way the building was constructed, wear and tear and constant flooding had resulted in a building that was beyond repair. He said that the property owner was therefore between a rock and a hard place, because he could not occupy it or renovate it or demolish it.

Mr. Coker then distributed copies and read portions of Dr. Paul George's resume. He asked Dr. George to give his opinion regarding whether or not the Jolly Roger met various criteria for historic designation.

Mr. Coker referred to the first criterion and asked Mr. George whether the structure was a significant reminder of the cultural architectural heritage of the city, state or nation. Dr. Paul George, architect, stated, “I don't see it that way at all.” He said that he thought that the Fort Lauderdale Beach Hotel and Yankee Clipper were much better examples of period architecture.

Regarding its location as the site of a significant local state or national event, Dr. George said he knew of no significant event that happened there and noted that this hotel was in fact considered off the beaten path.

As to its identification with a significant person who contributed to the development of the city, state or nation, Dr. George noted that because of the small local population at the time, anyone such as Mr. Gill would be a recognized figure in the community.

Mr. Coker then asked about the building's identification as the work of a master builder, designer, or architect whose individual work had influenced the development of the city, state or nation. Regarding the Gill family, Dr. George felt that Mr. Gill was not a master builder, but a “cookie-cutter” builder, about whom nothing was distinctive.

Regarding Mr. Sherman, the architect, Dr. George said he would not even regard him as being among the top Miami architects, where Mr. Sherman more often worked.

Mr. Coker then asked Dr. George's opinion whether the building was recognized for the quality of its architecture, and sufficient elements showing its architectural significance. Dr. George replied that it was an isolated example of a style and had not inspired imitation.

Regarding whether the building had distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style valuable for the study of a period, method of construction, or use of indigenous materials, Dr. George reiterated that it stood alone, without other buildings of a that style, which would have given value to the neighborhood.

Mr. Coker then asked if the building fit the criterion regarding a building's character as a geographically definable area with several sites, buildings or structures that were united by events, or aesthetics. Dr. George replied that again, this building stood alone in terms of style.

Regarding the final criterion, the character as an established, geographically definable neighborhood united in culture, architectural style, or physical plan and development, Dr. George reiterated that the building was removed from most of the "action" at Fort Lauderdale beach at the time it was built.

Dr. George informed the Board that he had come to Fort Lauderdale to head a state preservation board in 1987, overseeing all of Broward County. He said he had spent four years researching and writing about Fort Lauderdale history.

Mr. Michael Noell, Gulf Design Group, explained that the owner of the Sea Club Resort had retained him to inspect the building's below-ground structure. Mr. Coker distributed copies of the concrete testing report created by Mr. Noell. Mr. Noell remarked that the basement was open to the environment and was extremely damp, owing to periodic flooding throughout the years. Mr. Noell noted that the steel supports had begun to disintegrate, which would eventually render the concrete structure completely useless. He said that core testing had been performed on the walls, slab and ceiling, revealing extremely high chloride content, up to five times what code allowed. Mr. Noell explained that the compressive strength of the concrete was approximately one third what it should be. Mr. Noell was certain that the building would fail, but could not be certain when. Mr. Noell then presented a series of photographs and described the damaged to various areas depicted. Mr. Noell explained that the building was "literally floating in about 4 feet of water."

Mr. Coker then distributed copies of a report created by DeRose Design Consultants.

Mr. Larry DeRose, DeRose Design Consultants, also remarked on the fact that the basement was several feet below street level and open to the atmosphere, and noted that there was another level below the lobby area. He said that over the years, this lower level had been inundated with high salt-content of water and salt air. Mr. DeRose explained that the concrete had become "polluted" with chlorides and he was certain that the building could not be saved. Mr. DeRose noted that several other buildings in the area were built much higher and were fully enclosed, protecting them from the exposure suffered by the Jolly Roger. He said his opinion was that this building was not the creation of a master builder.

Mr. DeRose confirmed for Mr. Coker that it was "not possible to repair this building," and a building permit could not even be obtained to repair its foundation. Mr. DeRose explained to Mr. Coker that he was a licensed engineer in the state of Florida and had designed the building adjacent to this one: the Atlantic.

Mr. Adams felt that historic designation could have a positive effect on a building's value, not necessarily a devastating one as Mr. Coker had said. Mr. Adams added that designation should be based upon the criteria. It was also Mr. Adams's opinion that George Gill had contributed to the development of the City of Fort Lauderdale, and noted that Mr. Sherman had designed the Yankee Clipper, which was also being considered for historic designation. Mr. Adams said that since the building stood alone, as Dr. George had said, it must be valuable for the study of a period of architecture. Mr. Adams wanted to reserve the Trust's right to conduct its own inspection of the property.

Ms. Smart noted that a structure's current condition was not a criterion for designation. Ms. Smart noted that several other buildings in the area were built below grade as well and were surviving. She also listed several other hotels and houses that had been located near the Jolly Roger, indicating that it was therefore not off the beaten track, as Dr. George had indicated. Ms. Smart reiterated the Broward Trust's offer to show the owner their presentation on several historically designated properties that had been brought back to life and were economically viable.

Mr. Coker referred to the engineer's opinions and test results and reiterated that the building was not restorable. Mr. Coker said that virtually any older building could be found to meet the criteria, but that it was up to the Board and the City Commission to decide if they really wanted to fight for a building that the engineers had stated could not be saved.

Chair Saunders proceeded to open the public hearing.

Mr. John O'Connor, publisher of Home Fort Lauderdale and Home Miami Magazines, explained that he was a graduate of Harvard Graduate School of Design, with a master's degree in the history of architecture specializing in American architecture. Mr. O'Connor had compiled a list of Miami resort, hotel and condo renovation or restoration/new construction projects. Mr. O'Connor listed several of these projects and their current prices per square foot, and added that Miami Beach had reaped the financial benefits of its mid-century architecture in added tourism dollars and higher real estate prices. He said he wondered why Fort Lauderdale continued to squander these same opportunities. He said that he thought the Jolly Roger could be restored to become a destination on Fort Lauderdale beach.

Mr. Steve Glassman, President of the Central Beach Alliance, the Jolly Roger's local neighborhood association, stated that the CBA Board supported historic designation for the Jolly Roger. He said that they hoped to have a vote from all members of the CBA prior to the City Commission's meeting in April. Mr. Glassman noted that many consultants had agreed that the Fort Lauderdale Beach Hotel could not be restored either, but this building's façade was currently being restored. He asked the Board to support historic designation for the Jolly Roger.

Mr. Randall Robinson, co-author of "Miami Modern Revealed," said the Jolly Roger had been included in his book, because he felt it emblematic of the type of mid-century architecture present in Fort Lauderdale. He said that he thought that the Jolly Roger was "part and parcel" of the A1A strip in Fort Lauderdale and was central to one of Fort Lauderdale's most formative periods.

There being no more members of the public wishing to speak on the item, Chair Saunders brought the discussion back to the Board.

Mr. Howard felt it was unfortunate that the designation process dictated that this type of meeting must take place. He noted that the Board's decision on what to recommend to the City Commission could only be based upon the criteria.

Mr. Adams clarified for Chair Saunders that Tony Sherman had designed the original portion of the building and a later addition, but they were only seeking designation for the original section.

Mr. Wieland asked Dr. George where in Broward County he conducted history tours. Dr. George explained that he gave walking tours on Lauderdale beach, downtown Fort Lauderdale Evergreen Cemetery, downtown Hollywood and Hollywood Beach, and a boat tour of the New River and intracoastal waterway. Mr. Wieland asked Dr. George Will, what would happen [to his tours] when there were no more places to tour. Dr. George stated that it became much more difficult.

Mr. Haan complimented the Broward Trust on their presentation and their packet. Mr. Haan said he took offense at the idea that restoration was "impossible." He said that he believed that there was a way to restore any building, given enough effort and ingenuity. He said that he thought that many of these issues were subjective, and he hoped the owner would embrace the challenge.

Ms. Jordan remarked that the Board was concerned not with economic viability but with historical architectural worthiness. She noted that since Fort Lauderdale was a young city, 50-year-old buildings were vitally important to their heritage.

Mr. Welch thanked the Broward Trust for their efforts to save such properties, and said he felt that this could be a win-win situation for the owner to save a portion of the building. He said that another portion of the property could be redeveloped and tied in to the historic portion.

Ms. Graff agreed, and added that there were several properties in Miami that had also been in poor condition that had been saved. She said that she thought that they must save the few structures they had left, and there must be some way to remedy the structural instabilities.

Motion made by Mr. Howard, and seconded by Mr. Wieland to approve the application for historic designation, citing Sections 47-24.11.B.6.c, d, e and f. Roll call vote showed: Yeas: Ms. Dandy, Ms. Graff, Mr. Haan, Mr. Howard, Ms. Jordan, Mr. Welch, Mr. Wieland; Nays: Chair Saunders. Motion approved (7-1).

2.	Applicant:	<u>Sam Engle, Jr.</u>	<u>Case No. 6-H-06</u>
	Location:	1115 SW 2 Court	
	Request:	Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Installation of PVC fence.	
	Zoned:	RML-25 (Sailboat Bend Historic District overlay)	
	Legal:	<u>Waverly Place,</u> Block 116, Lots 8, 9, and 10 P.B. 2, P. 9 (D)	

Mr. Cromar explained that this case was before the HPB according to a provision of ULDR Section 47-17.4.A.1, because the Building Department had determined that the application did not meet existing guidelines provided in Section 47-24.11.C, Certificate of Appropriateness, and the material and design guidelines for Sailboat Bend. He said that in this case, the applicant

proposed the construction of a fence using PVC, a material not on the list of approved materials in the Material and Design Guidelines for SBHD in Section 47-17.7. Mr. Cromar advised the Board that in addition to considering the SBHD Material and Design Guidelines, they should consider both the General criteria for a COA Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.i, as well the Additional criteria for alterations Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.ii when considering whether a Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration shall be granted.

Ms. Rathbun explained that the applicant was requesting installation of a PVC fence to replace wood fences damaged by Hurricane Wilma. She said that these fences separate patios located at the rear of the town house units and would not be visible from the street. Ms. Rathbun stated that PVC was not a material listed in the material and design guidelines for the SBHD and the Board must determine if this was an acceptable use in this instance in the district. Ms. Rathbun cited the following Section for the Board's consideration:

Sec. 47-17.7 Material and design guidelines

- B. Materials and designs
 - 5. Garden walls and fences.
 - a. Materials and style
 - i. stucco: float finish, smooth or coarse, machine spray, dashed or trowelled.
 - ii. wood picket, lattice, vertical wood board.
 - iii. Masonry: coral, keystone or split face block: truncated or stacked bond block.
 - iv. metal: wrought iron, ESP aluminum, green vinyl coated chain link.

Mr. Sam Engle, owner, said he was also an architect, and had designed and built the building in 1974. Mr. Engel explained that the PVC fences he wanted to install looked more like original sailboat bend fences and were immune to termite damage. He noted that an existing masonry fence would actually hide most of the PVC fence.

Chair Saunders said he had visited the property and there was an existing PVC fence that had been approved several years ago. Chair Saunders felt the Board should suggest to the City Commission that the ordinance be amended to allow PVC fencing.

Mr. Haan said he had visited the property and against his better judgment, liked the fence.

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

Mr. Jolly stated he was not totally opposed to PVC, and they should approve the fence.

Ms. Jordan felt that this fencing should match the existing PVC fence on the east side in order to unify the property. Mr. Engle agreed.

Motion made by Mr. Wieland, and seconded by Mr. Howard to approve the application as presented, with the fencing to match the existing fencing on the property: solid tongue and groove with 1' white lattice. Roll call vote showed: Yeas: Ms. Dandy, Ms. Graff, Mr. Haan, Mr. Howard, Mr. Jolly, Ms. Jordan, Mr. Welch, Mr. Wieland, Chair Saunders. Motion approved (9-0).

3. **Applicant:** **Oceanic Rose Developer Inc.** **Case No. 38-H-03(SB)**
 Location: **921 West Las Olas Blvd.**
 Request: Certificate of Appropriateness for New Construction:
 • 16-foot wide doors on two garages on west façade (modification from
 9-foot width as stated in Design Guidelines – ULDR Sec. 47-
 17.7.B.2.b.i.)
 Zoned: RML-25/Sailboat Bend Historic District Overlay
 Legal: Waverly Place Block 113, Portions of Lots 8, 9, and 10, Together with;
 the South One-half (S. 1/2) of that certain portion of the 10' foot alley,
 Lying North of and adjacent to, said Lots of 8, 9, and 10.
 P.B. 2, P. 19 (D).

Mr. Cromar informed the Board that this was a request from Oceanic Rose Developer, Inc. for a Certificate of Appropriateness for New Construction for 16-foot wide garage doors on the west side of the new townhouse at 921 West Las Olas Boulevard, in the Sailboat Bend Historic District. Mr. Cromar reminded the Board that the maximum garage door width was nine (9) feet in the SBHD Material and Design Guidelines, but the Board could approve a modification of the guidelines. He added that in determining whether to recommend approval, the Board should consider the Material and Design Guidelines listed in Section 47-17.7, and both the General criteria for a COA Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.i, and the Additional criteria for new construction Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.iii.

Ms. Rathbun informed the Board that this applicant had come before the Board in December 2003 requesting a COA for demolition of an existing single-family residence at 921 West Las Olas Boulevard and a COA for new construction of a three-unit, three-story townhouse.

Ms. Rathbun continued that the applicant was now asking for a modification from the 9-foot garage door width to a 16-foot width for two garages in the project. She said that the applicant stated that in 2003 the HPB had approved his plans, which included the 16-foot wide garage doors and the applicant was now asking that the Board confirm and clarify its earlier approval. Ms. Rathbun cited the following code Section for the Board's consideration:

Sec. 47-17.7 Material and design guidelines

- B. *Materials and designs*
 - 2. *Windows and doors*
 - b. *Configurations*
 - i. *doors: garage nine (9) feet maximum width. Other;*

Ms. Janna Lhota, attorney for the owner/developer, explained that the old application was filed in October 2003, and had provided in the technical specs for 16 foot garage doors on the side and 9 foot doors on the front elevation. She directed the Board's attention to page 3 of the December 3, 2003 minutes, which described the configuration of the garage doors. She provided an excerpt of the Board's December 2003 meeting referring to this case, and noted the justification of the 16-foot garage doors. She described the orientation of the townhomes and noted that the 16-foot doors were needed on the west side to accommodate greater maneuverability for the two recessed townhomes. Ms. Lhota stated that the Board had approved the COA in 2003 without condition.

Ms. Lhota continued that the plans were permitted and approved without any changes requested, the project was built and they were now awaiting the certificate of occupancy. She asked the Board to confirm their earlier approval.

Chair Saunders referred to the motion in the December 2003 minutes and noted that it did not specifically address 16-foot garage doors. Mr. Haan agreed, and was sure that the developer had assumed he had to permission for the 16' doors. Mr. Haan said that while this was an unfortunate precedent, he felt this was a fairly innocuous situation, and felt it would be harmful to force the builder to alter the doors now.

Mr. Chris Crousillat, project general contractor, informed the board that it would cost \$70-\$75,000 to change the doors, but he was unsure that this was even possible without affecting the structural integrity of the building.

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

Motion made by Mr. Wieland, and seconded by Mr. Haan to allow modification for 16-foot garages on the west side façade. Roll call vote showed: Yeas: Ms. Dandy, Ms. Graff, Mr. Haan, Mr. Howard, Mr. Jolly, Ms. Jordan, Mr. Welch, Mr. Wieland, Chair Saunders. Motion approved (9-0).

II. Other Business

Presentation of the THKO office building proposal and its potential impact on the neighboring historic resources.

Las Olas and Andrews LLC.
DRC Case No. 89-R-05
Zoned: RAC-CC
Location: 1 West Las Olas

Mr. Cromar announced that the applicant was not present. The Assistant City Attorney explained to the Board that the applicant must be present and the consultant should not give her presentation in the owner's absence.

Ms. Rathbun confirmed for Ms. Jordan that the McCrory, Weidling and Sweet Buildings were not designated; only the Bryant Building was. Ms. Jordan felt they should consider designating those other buildings.

III. For the Good of the City

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 7:17 p.m.

CHAIRMAN

William Saunders, Chair

ATTEST:

Sandra Goldberg [for Jamie Opperlee, Recording Secretary]