

**Historic Preservation Board
City of Fort Lauderdale
Monday, June 5, 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	6	0	6
Mary-Jane Graff	P	6	0	6
Nolan Haan	P	6	0	6
Bill Howard	P	4	2	6
Joanne Johnsen	P	3	0	3
Daryl Jolly, Vice Chair	P	6	0	6
Susan Jordan	P	6	0	6
Tom Welch	P	6	0	6
Clay Wieland	P	5	1	6
William Saunders, Chair	P	6	0	6

Staff Present

Michael Ciesielski, Staff Liaison to HPB
Assistant City Attorney
Merrilyn Rathbun, Fort Lauderdale Historical Society, Consultant to HPB
Lavya Vassor, Recording Secretary

Guests Present

Phil Resnick
Charles Jordan
James Archer

Call to Order

Chair Saunders called the meeting of the Historic Preservation Board to order at 5:05 p.m.

Approval of Minutes of May 2006 Meeting

Motion made by Mr. Wieland, seconded by Ms. Graff, to approve the minutes of the May 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:** Phil Resnick **Case No. 12-H-06**
Location: 742 NE 17th Avenue
Request: Historic Designation
Zoned: RCS-15
Legal: Victoria Courts, Court 2. Lot 21.
P.B. 9, P. 49.

Mr. Ciesielski explained that this case was a request for local historic designation status of a single-family home in Victoria Park, located at 742 NE 17th Avenue, and owned by Phil Resnick. Mr. Ciesielski advised the Board to review the application and decide if the property met one or more of the criteria found in Section 47-24.11.B.6.a.-h. The Board's recommendation, then, would be forwarded to the City Commission and a public hearing would be held to determine if the property met the criteria for historic designation.

Ms. Rathbun explained that the home was first listed in the 1944 Fort Lauderdale City Directory, in which it was indicated that the house had been recently built. Ms. Rathbun described the house as a side-gabled massed plan, constructed of concrete block with stucco wall cladding. The roof was low-pitched with exposed rafter ends. The windows of the front elevation were replaced with shallow bay windows in the 1960s; all of the other windows had the original metal jalousies.

Ms. Rathbun continued that the Resnick house was located in the Victoria Courts subdivision, on the same block as the Victoria Courts Multiple Property Designation. This subdivision covered two city blocks and only structures on half of one block, between NE 17th Avenue and 17th Road, were part of the multiple historic property designation. The Resnick house was built much later than the designated cottages, but the builder had added decorative corner boards, and half timbering to the gable ends that referenced the nearby historic homes. These decorative details were characteristic of vernacular houses of the 1940s and earlier.

In Ms. Rathbun's opinion, the Resnick house met Section 47-24.11.B.6.f of the City of Fort Lauderdale ULDR and was therefore worthy of designation.

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:

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

The applicant, Mr. Phil Resnick, offered to answer any questions the Board might have.

Ms. Graff wondered why designation was requested for this house because changes had been made to the house that she felt detracted from its historic architectural value. Ms. Rathbun felt that these changes were not that significant, and the house still had its historic character. Ms. Graff felt the house was not outstanding enough to warrant designation. Mr. Resnick explained to Mr. Haan that he felt the house was unique and should be preserved as a way to give back to the area.

Mr. Welch agreed with Ms. Rathbun, and felt the house represented a period of construction and was worthy of designation based on Criterion "f." Ms. Jordan felt it important that they begin to recognize younger houses.

Motion made by Mr. Wieland, seconded by Mr. Welch, to approve the application, citing Section 47-24.11.B.6.f. In a roll call vote, the motion was approved 9 – 1 with Ms. Graff opposed.

- 2. Applicant:** Charles & Donna Jordan **Case No. 14-H-05 (SB)**
Location: 716 Bryan Place (SW 4 Place)
Request: Certificate of Appropriateness for Relocation:
- Move southern portion of existing structure 20'-11" south and 3'-1" east
 - Move northern portion of existing structure (bedroom wing) 2'-11" south and 3'-1" east.
- Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration:
- Restoration of single-family residence on site.
 - Addition of one-story extension, 18 feet in length, along the eastern façade between the two portions of the existing structure.
 - Addition of second story to existing one-story structure.
 - Installation of swimming pool.
 - Construction of attached three-car garage, covered walkway, and detached structure for servant's quarters.
 - Request for yard modification
 - Front yard reduction from 25 ft. to 20 ft.
- Zoned:** RS-8
Legal: Rio Alta Resubdivision of Block 34, Town of Fort Lauderdale.
Lot 4 and the west one-half of Lot 5.

Mr. Ciesielski explained that this case was a request for two Certificates of Appropriateness: Relocation and Alterations.

The Assistant City Attorney confirmed that this request for a Certificate of Appropriateness differed drastically from the previous request, and the City had decided that this application should be considered as an entirely new COA. She noted that the agenda would be amended to change this case number to the original case number, and the Board's decision this evening would supercede their previous recommendation, so only one project plan was approved.

Mr. Ciesielski advised the Board to consider whether the application met the criteria for Relocation in Section 47-24.11.C.3.c. General Criteria, as well as Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.iv. Additional Guidelines for Relocation.

Mr. Ciesielski informed the Board that the applicant had submitted an attachment specifying the exact distances that the smaller and larger portions of the building would be moved. The applicant had also presented his justification why the relocation complied with the additional guidelines for relocation.

Mr. Ciesielski continued that this request also sought a front yard modification. This included the restoration of the single-family residence on site, construction of an attached three-car garage, covered walkway, and detached structure, the addition of a one-story extension along the eastern façade between the two portions of the existing structure, the addition of a second story, the installation of a swimming pool, adding a covered deck, and changes to windows and doors.

Mr. Ciesielski advised the Board to consider the General Criteria for granting Certificates of Appropriateness listed in Section 47-24.3.c.i.a-f, the additional guidelines for alterations listed in Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.ii., and the Material and Design Guidelines for the SBHD listed in Sec. 47-17.7 when determining whether to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for these alterations..

Ms. Rathbun explained that the applicant had come before the Board in August of 2005 requesting Certificates of Appropriateness for a project on this house and she referred to her August 2005 HPB memo.

Ms. Rathbun explained that the house was designed by significant local architect J.M. Peterman in 1939. In 1923, Peterman was the first locally based architect to open an office in Fort Lauderdale. During the 1920s “boom” he designed six hotels, two of which were built, and a number of apartment and commercial buildings. He was the architect for the South Side School, the West Side School, the Old Dillard School and the 1927 Broward County Courthouse.

In Ms. Rathbun’s opinion, the Weidling House was a very fine example of the Art Moderne style, commonly called “Deco” in South Florida. She noted that the applicant had provided a discussion of the Nautical Deco House, a classification which would include this house. This was a popular variation of the Deco style commonly found on waterfront sites and meant to suggest a ship or ocean liner.

Ms. Rathbun described the house as a one-story building that had an L-shaped plan with many curvilinear walls and projections. The detached garage was connected to the main house by means of a covered walkway. The parapeted, flat roof was used as a rooftop terrace, accessed by a floating staircase. Windows were primarily metal-framed casement, and there was at least one porthole window by the main entry. A continuous eyebrow, located just below the parapet, followed the contours of the main elevations of the house.

Ms. Rathbun informed the Board that this was a new application for a COA, which would supersede any previous plan’s COA. The applicant was now requesting to move the bedroom wing 18 feet to the north, which would necessitate the building of an extension, with windows, doors and louvers in the middle of the building. A double door entry would be added to this extension. In Ms. Rathbun’s opinion, the extension was appropriate for the updated use of the house

Sec. 47-17.7 Material and design guidelines

- B. Materials and designs
 - 1. Exterior building walls
 - a. Materials and finish.
 - i. stucco, smooth
 - 2. Windows and doors
 - a. Materials
 - i. glass (...non-reflective, tinted
 - v. steel and aluminum
 - vi. glass block
 - b. Configurations
 - i. doors: garage nine (9) feet maximum width.
 - ii. windows, rectangular,; circular;

- c.. Operations
 - i. windows; fixed with frame; awning; louvers.

Ms. Rathbun noted that the windows would have impact resistant glazing.

- d.. General
 - vi. Screened windows , screened doors
- 3. Roofs and gutters
 - a. Roof materials
 - viii. Built-up roof behind parapets

Ms. Rathbun explained that cementitious sealant on concrete rooftop decks was requested.

- c. Configurations
 - i. Flat with railings and parapets, where permitted, solar collectors and turbine fans at rear port.

Ms. Rathbun felt the modifications were appropriate for the reuse of the building and were also compatible with the SBHD Materials and Design Guidelines.

Ms. Rathbun continued that the new construction would require a yard modification. The applicant had requested principal structure yard setbacks 77' in front, 25' rear, 5'4" left side, 8'9" right side and accessory structure #1 yard setbacks in front 20', 115' rear, 5' left side, 5' right side.

Section 47-15.5 Application for yard and minimum distance separation reduction.

A. Yards. The historic preservation board may authorize a reduction in yards and minimum distance separation requirements for residences located in RS-8, RML-25 and other residential zoning districts located within the SBHD when the historic preservation board finds a reduction in yards does not interfere with the light, air, and view of adjacent properties and:

1. Reducing the required yard is compatible with the yards or abutting properties and yards across from the yard proposed for reduction.
2. The yards proposed to be reduced are consistent with the yards existing in connection with contributing structures in SBHD; or
3. A reduction in the required yard is necessary to preserve a structural or landscaping feature found by the historic preservation board to contribute to the historical character of the SBHD; or
4. In other residential zoning districts within the SBHD, the board may authorize yard reductions subject to criteria in subsections A.1 through 3 if the proposed use and dimensions of a development are the same as those permitted in the RS-8 and RML-25 zoning districts. Once a yard reduction or minimum distance separation requirement is approved, uses and structures in these zoning districts may not be altered without the issuance of a certificate of appropriateness.

B. Reduction of yards may be permitted as follows:

1. RS-8 zoning district. Principal residential structures: Front yard: fifteen (15) feet

It was established that Mr. Jordan was not present to be sworn in when the notary was present, so his testimony was allowed, with this disclosure.

Mr. Charles Jordan, owner, explained that he wanted to move the house toward the river and toward the east property line because moving the house would result in encroaching on the setbacks. This move was desired to get the house to higher ground. Mr. Jordan explained that moving the house necessitated cutting it, and they had decided to add the extension when reconnecting the house sections. Mr. Jordan noted that the upper floor of the extension was stepped back, a common architectural recommendation for Nautical Deco houses.

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. Haan asked Ms. Rathbun's opinion of the addition; Mr. Rathbun stated that this was permissible in the case of adaptive reuse. Mr. Jordan confirmed that the integration of the new addition and the original house would be "seamless." Mr. Jordan explained that the second floor architecture was compatible with the original; he noted there were elements that were "reminiscent of the Nautical Deco style without being a repeat" of it. Mr. Haan wanted to know how the historic portion of the building would be differentiated from the new part.

Mr. James Archer, Mr. Jordan's architect, admitted that the first floor was seamless. He felt the main differentiating characteristic was the stair that connected the two floors and provided access to the center courtyard. He also felt the second floor was differentiated by "fenestration and more by use, not so much by features or decorative treatments." Mr. Jordan remarked that doors in the addition were double; all other doors were single. Chair Saunders asked if it would be possible to identify the new and old sections of the structure. Mr. Jordan said this would not be possible on the first floor, but "taken in total, what will look like the original versus the new is more a division between the first floor and the second floor, not necessarily that one link."

Motion made by Mr. Haan, seconded by Mr. Howard, to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for Relocation as presented, citing Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.iv.a,b,c and d. In a roll call vote, the motion was approved 10 – 0.

Motion made by Mr. Haan, seconded by Mr. Wieland, to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration as presented, citing Section 47-17.7.B.1.a.i, 2.a,b,c and d, 3.a and C.i and Section 47-15.5.A.1 and 2. In a roll call vote, the motion was approved 10 – 0.

3.	Applicant:	<u>Charles M. Jordan and Donna A. Jordan</u>	<u>Case No. 21-H-03</u>
		Residence for Charles & Donna Jordan	
	Location:	1216 Coontie Court (SW 4th Court)	
	Request:	Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition:	
		• Single-family house	
	Zoned:	RS-8	
	Legal:	<u>Waverly Place</u> , Block 103. Lots 7 and 8. P.B. 2, P. 19 (D)	

Mr. Ciesielski explained that this was a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition of a single-family home located at 1216 Coontie Court in the Sailboat Bend Historic District. The applicant had received unanimous approval from the Historic Preservation Board

for this demolition on July 7, 2003, but the Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition had expired.

Mr. Ciesielski advised the Board to consider the three criteria for demolition listed in Sec. 47-24.11.C. 4.c.i.-iii.

Ms. Rathbun explained that the applicant had been granted a COA for demolition in 2003, but it had expired. The applicant was now renewing his request. Ms. Rathbun referred to her July 2003 HPB memorandum.

Ms. Rathbun stated the house was built in 1956, well out of the SBHD period of significance (1913 to 1940) and did not meet the usual standard for historic significance of a building or site, i.e. fifty years or older.

Ms. Rathbun described the existing building as a one-story building with an irregular U shaped footprint. The main portion had a low-rise gable roof, and one-story flat roofed additions had been added to the street elevation. In Ms. Rathbun's opinion, the design of the building was basic 50s style architecture with no apparent architectural details of historic significance and the house was not characteristic of the historic housing stock of the SBHD.

Sec. 47-24.11 C 4c

Criteria Demolition

- i. The designated landmark, landmark site or property within the historic district no longer contributes to a historic district: or
- ii. The property or building no longer has significance as a historic architectural or archeological landmark; or
- iii. The demolition or redevelopment project is of major benefit to a historic district.

Ms. Rathbun explained that the applicant had requested demolition under criteria I and ii; criterion ii did not apply as this building never had significance in the SBHD. Ms. Rathbun felt the demolition would have no adverse impact on the character of the historic district, and criteria I and iii would apply.

Mr. Charles Jordan, owner, felt the ordinance was not specific enough about Demolition Certificate of Appropriateness expiration dates. He explained that he originally planned, and had received approval for, a two-story house on the lot, but planned to present a new building plan for approval at some future date.

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. Jordan explained to Mr. Haan that he felt the word "demolition" should be specifically included in the ordinance; the current ordinance language mostly concerned site plan approval, not demolition. The type of work specified was above-ground construction, not demolition. Mr. Jordan noted that he was not arguing this right now, but he felt the language should be made clearer to avoid any future challenges.

Motion made by Mr. Haan, seconded by Mr. Wieland, to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition, citing Section 47-24.11.C.4.c.i and ii. In a roll call vote, the motion was approved 10 – 0.

II. Other Business

- Update on CLG Status/discussion of proposed “Rules and Procedures” Resolution

Mr. Ciesielski distributed an FAQ sheet regarding the Certified Local Government, and a biography form that all Board members must complete and return to Mr. Ciesielski so he could file them with the application.

Mr. Ciesielski explained that the CLG Program’s purpose was to encourage local government participation in federal and state historic preservation programs, with the goal of preserving the historic heritage of local communities taking part in the program. Mr. Ciesielski felt the primary benefits of becoming a CLG were:

- ❖ Receiving technical assistance and training for staff and members of the Historic Preservation Board.
- ❖ Having a formal comment role in the National Register nomination process for properties within the CLG’s jurisdiction
- ❖ Competing for Historic Preservation grant funds set aside solely for CLGs

Mr. Ciesielski informed the Board that in his visit to Tallahassee three months ago he had had an opportunity to discuss the status of the City’s CLG application and the various pieces of documentation that the City staff had submitted over the past several years. It now appears that the City’s deficiencies as far as acquiring CLG status are concerned are primarily administrative and procedural in nature and can be cured, for the most part, by having the City Commission adopt a resolution which would encompass all those rules and procedures which Tallahassee requires its local Boards to follow. Mr. Ciesielski remarked that many of these requirements would entail a lot more paperwork, bookkeeping and record keeping, and that a lot more information would need to be provided to Tallahassee on a regular basis.

Chair Saunders thanked Mr. Ciesielski for his work on the CLG designation.

- Election of HPB Chairman/Vice-Chairman

Motion made by Mr. Wieland, seconded by Mr. Welch, nominating Mr. Haan as Chair, and Mr. Jolly as Vice Chair. In a roll call vote, the motion was approved unanimously.

III. For the Good of the City

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 6:28 p.m.

Chairman,

William Saunders, Chair

Attest:

Jamie Opperlee, Recording Secretary