

**Historic Preservation Board  
City of Fort Lauderdale  
Monday, September 18, 2006- 5:00 P.M.  
City Hall  
First Floor Conference Room  
100 North Andrews Avenue  
Fort Lauderdale, Florida**

<b>Board Members</b>	<b>Attendance</b>	<b>2006</b>		
		<b>Present</b>	<b>Absent</b>	<b>Total</b>
Carolyn Dandy	P	9	0	9
Mary-Jane Graff	A	8	1	9
Nolan Haan, Chair	P	9	0	9
Bill Howard	P	7	2	9
Joanne Johnsen	P	6	0	6
Daryl Jolly, Vice Chair	A	7	2	9
Susan Jordan	P	8	1	9
William Saunders	A	6	3	9
Tom Welch	P	9	0	9
Clay Wieland	A	7	2	9

**City Staff**

James Cromar, Staff Liaison to the HPB

Assistant City Attorney

Merrilyn Rathbun, Fort Lauderdale Historical Society, Consultant to HPB

Jamie Opperlee, Recording Secretary

**Call to Order**

Chair Haan called the meeting of the Historic Preservation Board to order at 5:00 p.m.

**Approval of Minutes of August 2006 Meeting**

**Motion** made by Ms. Johnsen, seconded by Mr. Welch, to approve the minutes of the August 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

3. **Applicant:** Joseph DeVerteuil 16-H-06 SB  
**Location:** 307 SW 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
 Request: Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition:  
       ❖ Single-story multi-family building.  
 Zoned: RML-25  
 Legal: Waverly Place  
       Block 108, Lots 17 and 18,  
       P.B. 2, P. 19.

[This item was taken out of order]

Ms. Nectaria Chakas, attorney for the owner, requested that the case be deferred to the Board's October meeting. She said that the applicant had moved the request for a COA for New Construction to October, and she thought it prudent to hear both issues at the same time.

**Motion** made by Mr. Welch, seconded by Mr. Howard, to defer the case to the Board's October 23, 2006 meeting. In a roll call vote, the motion was approved unanimously.

1. **Applicant:** One River Plaza Company 14-H-06  
**Location:** 305 South Andrews Avenue  
 Request: Historic Designation  
       ❖ Nine (9) story building and two (2) story building  
       ❖ One (1) story building  
       ❖ Seven (7) story parking garage  
 Zoned: RAC-CC  
 Legal: Town of Fort Lauderdale. Portion of Lots 15, 16,17, Block 26  
       P.B. "B", P.40. AND Town of Fort Lauderdale. Lot 18, Block 26,  
       P.B. "B", P.40. AND TOWN OF FORT LAUDERDALE, Lot 14, Block  
       26, P.B."B", P. 40 (D), together with  
       Dade County Bank Subdivision of Town of Fort Lauderdale,  
       Lots 1, 2, and 3, Block 26, P.B. 3, P. 114 (D)

Mr. Cromar stated that this was a request for local historic designation of three structures located at 305 South Andrews Avenue: a nine (9) story building and two (2) story building, the adjacent one (1) story building to the north, and the seven (7) story parking garage to the south, all under the common ownership of One River Plaza, Inc. Mr. Cromar reminded the Board that this case was deferred from the July 17, 2006 and August 7, 2006 agendas at the applicants' request to allow them to further develop a more complete application package. Mr. Cromar advised the Board to review this application and decide if the structures met one or more of the criteria found in Section 47-24.11.B.6.a.-h. Staff would then forward the record of the meeting

along with the Board's recommendation to the City Commission for their consideration and possible designation of this property.

Ms. Rathbun explained that One River Plaza was built in 1925. She said that John Peterman was the architect of record, although the architectural firm of Rubusch and Hunter was involved in the project and was most likely concerned with the engineering of the high-rise building. Ms. Rathbun noted that Mr. Peterman had designed the South Side, West Side and Old Dillard Schools as well as many commercial projects during the 1920s real estate boom.

Ms. Rathbun continued, stating that in September 1926, Fort Lauderdale and South Florida suffered major damage from the so-called 100-year Miami Hurricane, but the bank building was sufficiently intact to house people made homeless by the storm.

Ms. Rathbun informed the Board that in 1929 the bank was consolidated with the Fort Lauderdale Bank and Trust; the building was then sold to William L. Sweet and renamed the Sweet Building. She said that Mr. Sweet and his family owned the building for thirty-seven years, during which time the building was the City's premier commercial/office address.

Ms. Rathbun stated that in 1966 the building was sold to Raphael Panaro, a local realtor, who stripped the building of most of its Beaux Arts detailing and changed the original windows on the street facing elevation. She continued, stating that the applicant, who purchased the building in 1979, was requesting designation of the entire site from Riverwalk on the south to West Las Olas (Wall Street) on the north. Ms. Rathbun, commented on the nine-story Sweet Building, its two-story extension and the adjacent one-story commercial building to the north. She said that the adjacent store building was built sometime between 1924 and 1928, and was shown on the 1928 Sanborn map. She added that it was originally separate from the Sweet Building and replaced a wood frame commercial building; now this one story building was incorporated into the Sweet Building.

Ms. Rathbun said that the request for designation included a modern parking garage to the south of the historic buildings. Ms. Rathbun stated that even though the garage was part of the site, it would not be considered historic or significant.

Section 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:
  - a. Its value as a significant reminder of the cultural or archeological heritage of the city, state, or nation,
  - c. Its identification with a person or persons, who significantly contributed to the development of the city, state, or nation

Ms. Rathbun advised the Board to see the applicant's exhibits and read his narrative in regard to criterion c. As to criterion a., she stated that the building was considered to be Fort Lauderdale's first "skyscraper."

Ms. Rathbun recommended historic designation under criteria a. and c.

Mr. Steve Tilbrook, attorney for the owners, explained that the current owners had 50 years of experience in preserving commercial historic buildings. Mr. Tilbrook asked the Board to consider the difficult decisions a property owner could be forced to make in order to maintain the balance between historic preservation and economic viability. Mr. Tilbrook said he concurred with Staff and Ms. Rathbun's findings.

Mr. Tilbrook discussed the property's place in the history of Fort Lauderdale, as the City's first high rise commercial office building, and the City's center of commerce. He noted the site's association with the following contributors to City history: William Sweet; Dr. David Stella; George English; Dwight Rogers; Dwight Rogers Jr.; Virginia Young; George Allen and Carol Taylor.

Mr. Tilbrook explained that the property met criterion 47-24.11.B.6.a as a significant reminder of the cultural heritage of the City of Fort Lauderdale. He said he thought the property also met criterion 47-24.11.B.6.c; the site was identified with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the development of the City [those he had previously indicated].

Mr. Tilbrook stated there were benefits to designation, in the form of tax incentives, and encumbrances, including the permitting process for any future work at the property. Mr. Tilbrook said that he therefore wanted to state the specific criteria he thought did not apply to this property. He said he did not believe the building was the work of a master architect or builder; the building was not recognized for its outstanding or distinguishing architecture or quality of architecture. Mr. Tilbrook continued, stating that the owners were seeking designation based on the site's role in the City's history and wished to be able to make changes to the exterior architecture in the future that would allow it to continue to be financially viable.

Mr. Tilbrook said he wanted to establish a list of the non-contributing aspects of the building to maintain the ability to modify them in the future: windows and awnings; rooftop antennas; rooftop cellular equipment sites; generators; ground floor uses and the parking garage.

Mr. Tilbrook asked the Board for their recommendation for designation, and for their "recognition of the non-contributing aspects of this building and the non-applicable criteria for this building so that future boards will have that in the record when they consider applications for this building in the future."

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

Chair Haan said he could not consider the parking garage historic, or recommend it for designation. Mr. Tilbrook said he had not wanted to "split hairs" in his presentation, but felt he must. He noted that there were several aspects to the property: the site, the Sweet Building, the

parking garage, and “other contributing aspects.” Mr. Tilbrook explained that they were seeking designation for the “site as a whole” and the Sweet Building specifically. He said the owners were requesting designation for the “site” of the parking garage because of its location, but not the parking garage structure.

Mr. Tilbrook said both Fort Lauderdale’s and Florida’s code recognized that “ certain improvements that are accessory to historic structures but are necessary for the efficient contemporary use of those structures may be designated landmarks as well.” Mr. Tilbrook said that when the original parking for the building was taken for the Las Olas Riverfront development, new parking was needed to maintain One River Plaza as a commercial building, so the parking garage was built. He said that therefore he believed that it was appropriate to designate the site [of the parking garage] as a landmark site.

Chair Haan tried to clarify Mr. Tilbrook’s thinking on the designation, “... the building itself is worthy of designation because of all these important people that used to work there, but you do not think that the building itself is that special.” Mr. Tilbrook said they believed the building was worthy of designation, based on its role in the City’s history, but he wanted to establish the list of non-contributing parts of the building so that these could be altered in the future without being “subject to strict scrutiny during review.”

Ms. Rathbun confirmed for Chair Haan that the two-story structure on the site dated to the 1920s and could be considered historic.

Ms. Jordan said she was confused about the request for designation of the parking garage “site” [but not the garage itself] as well. Mr. Tilbrook said the site had remained intact since the property was platted, and they felt it appropriate, and supported by law, that the site be designated.

The Assistant City Attorney explained how designation worked: a structure was designated historic and the property upon which it was located became part of a landmark site. She noted that once a property was approved for designation, the City used a legal description of the property and a specific designation of the building itself. Ms. Rathbun used the example of the Bonnet House, and explained that everything on the thirty-five acre site was considered a landmark site: all buildings, gardens, garden feature, archeological site, and orchards. In the case of the New River Inn, the Inn itself and the land on which the Inn sat was designated, but anything surrounding it was not.

Mr. Tilbrook said he read the code differently than Staff, and believed that a site could be designated because of its role in the City’s history, with a non-contributing structure on it. Ms. Rathbun stated that obviously the parking garage was not worthy of designation, but she did not see that the entire site was integrated, noting that there had been separate owners and businesses located there.

Mr. Tilbrook reiterated that they wanted designation for the site intact; if the Board wanted to bifurcate the site for consideration, he must confer with his client. Mr. Welch said he did not understand Mr. Tilbrook’s insistence that the “site” and the parking garage be differentiated and only the “site” designated. Mr. Tilbrook explained, “Broward County and the state of

Florida offer tax exemptions for accessory buildings that are located on historic sites.” Mr. Tilbrook’s client felt that these tax incentives were important for the building to “work competitively in the marketplace.” Mr. Tilbrook continued, stating that if the owners were unable to obtain the tax incentives for the parking garage, they would need to reconsider the application.

Mr. Jerry Vogel, owner, explained how necessary the parking garage was to the tenancy of the building. He said he agreed that the parking garage was not worthy of designation, and that the Sweet Building was not architecturally significant. But, Mr. Vogel said, the garage was required to “save the office building.”

Mr. Haan reminded Mr. Vogel that “the integrity of this Board is to designate historically qualified structures; the site that is underneath the building then would become designated. We are not designating this whole square block.” Ms. Jordan said she agreed that their job was to consider the historic worthiness of buildings. She said she thought this was an economic issue, which was not the Board’s province.

Mr. Tilbrook requested a continuance to add to the application.

**Motion** made by Ms. Jordan, seconded by Ms. Johnsen, to continue the case to the Board’s October 23, 2006 meeting. In a roll call vote, the motion was approved unanimously.

- 2. Applicant: Broward Trust for Historic Preservation** **11-H-06**  
**Owner: Trustee of JDM Trust**  
**17<sup>th</sup> Street Best Western & Marina (Americana Motor Inn)**  
**Location: 2150 SE 17 Street**  
 Request: Historic Designation  
 Zoned: B-1  
 Legal: Harbor Heights. All of Parcel “A” less the South 35 feet, and  
 the West 5 feet of Parcel “B” less the South 35 feet.  
 P.B. 34, P. 33

Mr. Cromar stated that this was a request from the Broward Trust for Historic Preservation for local historic designation status of the one-story concrete structure at the site of the Americana Motor Inn, 2150 SE 17th Street. Mr. Cromar advised the Board to review the application and decide if the structure met one or more of the criteria found in Section 47-24.11.B.6.a.-h. He continued, stating that staff would then forward the record of the meeting along with the Board’s recommendation to the City Commission for their consideration and possible designation of this property.

Ms. Rathbun informed the Board that the applicant was requesting designation of the 1966 Americana Motor Inn lobby/restaurant building as a landmark under criteria e. and f. of Section 47-24.11 of the City of Fort Lauderdale ULDR.

Section 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:
  - e. Its value as a building recognized for the quality of its architecture, and sufficient elements showing its architectural significance,
  - f. Its distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style valuable for the study of a period, method of construction, or use of indigenous materials

Sec. 47-24.11B.3.f. If the board recommends a designation, it shall explain how the proposed landmark or historic district qualifies for designation under the criteria contained in this section. This evaluation may include references to other buildings and areas in the city and shall identify the significant features of the proposed landmark, historic buildings or historic district. The board evaluation shall include a discussion on the relationship between the proposed designation and existing and future plans for the development of the city.

Ms. Rathbun explained that the Americana Motor Inn was located in the Harbor Beach area of Fort Lauderdale, which was first platted in December of 1941, but was returned to acreage during WW II. She said that construction began on the American Motor Inn South, with its distinctive star shaped lobby building, in 1964.

Ms. Rathbun confirmed that the most distinct architectural feature of the complex was the lobby/restaurant building, with a star-shaped footprint and a multi-peaked concrete roof shell. She said that after WW II, architects began investigating new building technologies and structural systems, and this sort of exploration was integral to the architectural style that became known as Mid-century Modernism, or, in South Florida, MiMo or Miami Modernism. She informed the Board that the applicants had provided a narrative that discussed the American Motor Inn lobby/restaurant as a prime example the Mid-century Modern Style. Ms. Rathbun stated that the motor inn lobby/restaurant building meets criteria e. and f. of Section 47-24.11 of the ULDR and should therefore be designated as an historic landmark.

Mr. Warren Adams, Executive Director of the Broward Trust, stated he had a Masters with Distinction in Historic Preservation from the University of York in England; he was currently completing his PhD in Architectural History; he was a member of the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors; he was a member of the Palm Beach County Historic Resource Review Board and he was the Preservation Planner for the city of Delray Beach. Mr. Adams presented a photo showing the location of the Motor Inn, and noted that the Trust was interested in designating the building only, not the site. Mr. Adams explained the building was designed 1964 and it was opened in 1966; the architect was Arthur Rood. Mr. Adams continued that the building was constructed of a hyperbolic paraboloid concrete shell with a large porte cochere.

Mr. Adams stated the Trust believed the building met two of the criteria for designation. He said that the first criterion was 47-24.11.B.6.e: its value as a building recognized for the quality of its architecture. Ms. Diane Smart, President of the Broward Trust for Historic Preservation, presented copies of two magazines and a book that had features the hotel. Mr. Adams presented a copy of a letter from architect Michael Graves expressing his concern that the Americana might be demolished and that he favored the plan to move the structure to another site, allowing the owner to redevelop the site while saving the building.

Mr. Adams said that the Trust believed the structure also met criterion 47-24.11.B.6.f: Its distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style valuable for the study of a period, method of construction, or use of indigenous materials. Ms. Smart explained that the building's value for the period related to three of Mr. Rood's influences: Pierre Nervi, the father of this type of architecture; Felix Candela, Spanish architect who built upon Mr. Nervi's ideas, and Paul Revere Williams, architect of the Theme Building at the Los Angeles International Airport

Mr. Adams said the Trust was willing to work with the owner and developer to relocate the building and would postpone the final designation meeting with the City Commission until the structure was moved. He said that the Trust had found a possible end user and a potential site, and had spoken with several potential movers.

Mr. Ron Mastriana, representing the property owner's interests, objected to the fact that a third party had applied for designation of this property. He said he was developing The Sails, a project on the site, and he had already agreed to donate the lobby/restaurant building and contribute up to \$100,000 toward the relocation of the structure. Mr. Mastriana said that he thought that allowing third party applications for historic designation deprived owners of their property rights. Mr. Mastriana noted that a couple of City Commissioners had strongly opposed certain issues related to this at the Ireland's Inn hearing.

Mr. Mastriana said the developers had met early on in the project with neighbors and expanded the original project to accommodate the neighbors' wishes. Mr. Mastriana feared that if the Americana were designated in its current location, "one of the most significant projects" to come to Fort Lauderdale would be destroyed.

In considering the criteria in 47-24.11.B.6.e and f, Mr. Mastriana admitted the structure was unique and "whimsical", but felt it was far from architecturally significant, and certainly not valuable for study. Mr. Mastriana said that he did not think that the building's mention in the magazines or book to which Ms. Smart had referred was significant. Mr. Mastriana said they had some of the original plans, and it appeared to them that the architect was not Arthur Rood, but Art Williams Jr.

Chair Haan proceeded to open the public hearing.



Mr. Darrell Calvin, representing the Broward Art Guild, said they might be the recipients of the building. He said that if they received it, they planned to make it an information center for all Broward County arts and cultural organizations.

Mr. Daniel O'Connor, representative of the Trust that owned the property, said he did not consider something that was "gaudy" to be architecturally distinctive, and most neighbors considered it an eyesore. Mr. O'Connor said that he thought that designating the property would "cut the heart out of a project" and they would be left with something not worthwhile for the City or the neighbors.

Mr. John Gattuso, President of the Breakwaters Homeowners Association, said the Board had voted unanimously against keeping the Americana structure.

Mr. Ed Yevoli, neighbor, stated the entire area was an eyesore. He said that no one had cared about the building for years, and it appeared that "all of sudden that there's some money in the picture, it seems that they would like to have the developer pay somewhere around a million dollars to move a structure which, until now, was not historically significant to them." Mr. Yevoli said he hoped this would not become a barrier to development either by presenting an actual physical impediment or by increasing the costs of the pending project.

Mr. Richard Rothman, neighbor, felt that the site was an eyesore and an anachronism. He noted that it was more difficult to bring development into the community due to the recent hurricanes and insurance rates, and felt the pass-along impact of the new project was important.

Ms. Maria Galligan, resident and member of the Broward Art Guild, agreed that the building had been neglected, but felt it had a lot of merit.

Ms. Nancy Herkert felt the building was "spectacular" and could become an icon of the City.

Ms. Annette Ross, neighbor, described the decline of the neighborhood. She said that she thought that the roofline of the Americana was interesting, but she did not want Mr. Mastriana's project "stopped in its tracks." She remarked on Mr. Mastriana's cooperation with the neighbors while designing the project.

Ms. Jeannie Burke, Harbordale Civic Association, said she supported the new project, and agreed that Mr. Mastriana had invited and incorporated input from the neighbors.

Ms. Eugenia Ellis, South Beach Alliance, said they had met several times with the developer and with the Broward Trust. She said that she agreed that the site was an eyesore and did not object to designation of the structure itself, but did not want the designation to affect redevelopment of the site.

Mr. Gerard Delaney, Broward Art Guild, admitted the property was neglected, but thought the building was unique and could have a new life and a new purpose.

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

Mr. Adams reiterated that the Trust wanted to move the building, and said they were willing to continue negotiations to achieve this. Mr. Adams explained that once the HPB gave their approval, the applicant could begin to find grant money to help cover the costs of relocating the building. He said that the Trust would wait until after the building was relocated to get the final approval from the City Commission. The Assistant City Attorney said this was possible and there was another ongoing case like this in the City already.

Mr. Mastriana said they hoped to demolish structures on the site in January, and begin construction two months later, so he could see extending a deadline of five months for the building's removal. Mr. Mastriana said he wanted the City to agree not to hold up any demolition permits for other structures in the meantime. The Assistant City Attorney said she did not think this would be an impediment. Mr. Cromar added that he did not have authority to make any guarantees for the Planning Dept. that there would be no delays in demolition permits.

Ms. Smart asked Mr. Mastriana to be flexible regarding the timeline because she was not sure how long it would take to find the funding to move the house. Mr. Mastriana said he would agree to a six-month timeline.

Ms. Smart informed the Board that they were considering a site at Southeast 24<sup>th</sup> Street, Miami Road and Federal Highway. She explained that the land was leased to the City by Alamo in 1999 for a visitors/welcome center, but there had been no interest in this, and the lease agreement indicated that the Commission had discretion over its use.

The Assistant City Attorney explained to Ms. Jordan that the designation could be limited to the building in the legal description of the property. The Assistant City Attorney did not believe the HPB could stipulate deadlines, but noted that the public record would include the discussions between Mr. Adams, Ms. Smart and Mr. Mastriana regarding this.

The Assistant City Attorney read from Section 47-24.11B.3.f [above] and said there was no allowance for a time limit; the HPB could only determine, using the criteria, if the building was worthy of designation or not. Chair Haan said that he wanted to prevent the owner from appealing the HPB's decision for six months, while trying to hold the Trust to their promise to move the building within the same period. The Assistant City Attorney advised the Board to follow the law strictly, since they could not control what happened at the Commission level.

Mr. Adams, Ms. Smart and Mr. Mastriana discussed continuing the application for five to six months. Mr. Cromar said that the Planning representative to the DRC requested that the applicant resolve the historic designation issue before completing the review process, including Planning and Zoning Board review, for the proposed project.

Mr. Mastriana offered to enter into an agreement with the Trust to donate the building and provide \$100,000 in funding to relocate the building within six months. He continued, stating that if this could not be accomplished with six months, the Trust would agree to withdraw their application. Ms. Smart said she could not enter into any agreement without first discussing the matter with her Board.

**Motion** made by Mr. Howard, seconded by Ms. Johnsen, to continue the case to the Board's October 23, 2006 meeting. In a roll call vote, the motion was approved unanimously.

**4. Applicant: City of Fort Lauderdale 17-H-06**

**South Side School**

**Location: 701 South Andrews Avenue**

Request: Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition:

- ❖ Exterior stairwells (2), electric shed, all windows and doors.

Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration:

- ❖ Repair and enhancement of exterior facades.
- ❖ Replacement of all windows and exterior doors.
- ❖ New finishes and fixtures to match historic period finishes.
- ❖ Horizontal slider windows on front façade

Zoned: RAC-CC

Legal: Town of Fort Lauderdale  
Block 60, Lot 1. P.B. "B", P.40. (D)

Mr. Cromar stated that this was a request for a COA for Demolition of features of the South Side School, and a COA for Alterations to the building, a locally designated landmark that last month received national designation status. Mr. Cromar advised the Board to consider the General criteria for a COA, Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.i., as well the Criteria for Demolition, Section 47-24.11.C. 4.c.i.-iii. In determining whether to grant this COA for Alterations, Mr. Cromar advised the Board to consider both the General Criteria for a COA, Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.i. and the Additional Criteria for alterations, Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.ii.

Ms. Rathbun stated that the South Side School was a historically designated landmark in the City of Fort Lauderdale and had recently been named to the National Register of Historic Places. She provided an excerpt from the historic context narrative submitted to the Secretary of the Interior for the nomination of the property to the National Register.

Ms. Rathbun continued that the applicant requested demolition of an existing non-historic accessory building (electrical shed) next to the southeast façade of the building and also wanted to remove two existing exterior staircases, both of which were later additions and were not considered historic. She noted that the applicant also wished to remove 160 windows and 5 doors that were either damaged or not original to the building.

#### Section 47-24.11.C

##### 4. Demolition

##### c. 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 informed the Board that in these instances, criteria ii. and iii. would apply and demolition was recommended.

Ms. Rathbun continued that the historic windows were Colonial style wood double-hung sash windows with multiple lights and transom windows above. She said that the doors and windows were to be replaced with new, code-compliant and historically compatible wood windows and doors. She added that exterior finishes were to be restored to match the original materials as well.

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 done;
  - 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."

**The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation**

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.
5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.
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.

Mr. Frank Snedaker, City Architect, said they had hired Richard Heinsenbottle and Associates in Coral Gables to do the design work.

Mr. Richard Heinsenbottle, architect, said he thought that this would be a "tremendous transformation." He assured the Board the demolition would be consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's standards, and any elements they removed would be non-contributing. Mr. Heinsenbottle explained that the new windows were impact resistant and matched the original windows. Mr. Heinsenbottle added that they would conduct historic paint analysis to determine the proper colors to use on the building.

Mr. Heinsenbottle informed the Board that they intended to build an outdoor amphitheater and small stage at the rear of the building that would blend with the architecture of the original building.

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

**Motion** made by Mr. Howard, seconded by Ms. Johnsen, to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition, citing Section 47-24.11.C. 4.c.ii and iii and the Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration citing Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.i.a), c) and f). In a roll call vote, the motion was approved unanimously.

5. **Applicant:** Villas Florence, Inc.

**18-H-06 SB**

**Location:** 1114-1116 SW 4 Street

**Request:** Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration:

- ❖ Installation of fountain and other improvements in courtyard. (AFTER THE FACT)

Zoned: RMI-25

Legal: Waverly Place.

Block 105, Lot 17 and 18. P.B. 2, P. 19 (D)

Mr. Cromar informed the Board that this was a request for a COA for Alterations (after-the-fact) for a fountain and other improvements in the courtyard between the buildings at 1114 and 1116 SW 4 Street in the Sailboat Bend Historic District. Mr. Cromar advised the Board that in addition to considering the SBHD Material and Design Guidelines from Section 47-17.7., they should consider both the General criteria for a COA Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.i., and the Additional criteria for alterations Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.ii when deciding whether to grant a COA for Alteration.

Ms. Rathbun stated that the applicant had requested a Certificate of Appropriateness for a five-tiered fountain in the courtyard of an apartment complex consisting of two one-story apartment buildings. She said that these buildings did not appear on any of the Sanborn Fire Insurance maps for the City of Fort Lauderdale. She added that they were not built during the SBHD period of significance and they were not considered historic in the district.

Ms. Rathbun explained that the Materials and Design Guidelines for the SBHD Section 47-17.7 did not address stand-alone garden features such as fountains. She said that the applicant also intended to install concrete pavers in the courtyard, and the SBHD Guidelines did not specifically address pavers.

Sec. 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.

- iii. Additional guidelines; new construction. Review of new construction and alterations to designated buildings and structures shall be limited to exterior features of the structure, except for designated interior portions. In approving or denying applications for certificates of appropriateness for new construction, the board shall also use the following additional guidelines. Where new construction is required to be visually related to or compatible with adjacent buildings, adjacent buildings shall mean buildings which exhibit the character and features of designated or identified historic structures on the site or in the designated historic district where the site is located.
- e) The relationship of a building to open space between it and adjoining buildings shall be visually compatible to the buildings and places to which it is visually related.

- f) The relationship of the materials, texture and color of the facade of a building shall be visually compatible with the predominant materials used in the buildings to which it is visually related.

Ms. Rathbun confirmed that the fountain and the pavers were compatible in the SBHD.

Mr. Carlos Molina, owner, said the fountain and landscape improvements would be in harmony with and improve the area.

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

**Motion** made by Ms. Jordan, seconded by Ms. Johnsen, to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration citing Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.iii.e), and f). In a roll call vote, the motion was approved unanimously.

## **II. Other Business**

The Board's next meeting was scheduled for October 23, 2006.

## **III. For the Good of the City**

The Office of the City Clerk is presenting a workshop: "Proper Conduct of a Meeting/ Florida Sunshine Law on Thursday, September 21<sup>st</sup>, 2006 at War Memorial Auditorium, 800 NE 8<sup>th</sup> Street. The meeting begins at 6:00 p.m. with refreshments at 5:30 pm.

On July 19, 2006, the South Side School achieved Listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

This year, Fort Lauderdale is hosting Florida Neighborhood's Conference on October 5-7, 2006. Contact Jeri Pryor -954-828-6656 -for more information

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

Chairman,

---

Nolan Haan, Chair

Attest:

---

Jamie Opperlee, Recording Secretary