

**Historic Preservation Board
City of Fort Lauderdale
Monday, October 23, 2006 - 5:00 P.M.
City Hall
First Floor Conference Room
100 North Andrews Avenue
Fort Lauderdale, Florida**

Board Members	Attendance	2006 Cumulative Attendance	
		Present	Absent
Carolyn Dandy	A	9	1
Mary-Jane Graff	A	8	2
Nolan Haan, Chair	P	10	0
Bill Howard	P	8	2
Joanne Johnsen	P	7	0
Daryl Jolly, Vice Chair	P	8	2
Susan Jordan	P	9	1
Clay Wieland	P	8	2

City Staff

James Cromar, Staff Liaison to the HPB

Michael Ceisielski, Planner II

Assistant City Attorney

Merrilyn Rathbun, Fort Lauderdale Historical Society, Consultant to HPB

Jamie Opperlee, Recording Secretary

Index

	Case Number	Applicant	Page
1.	11-H-06	Broward Trust for Historic Preservation	<u>2</u>
2.	2-H-06	City of Fort Lauderdale	<u>3</u>
3.	16-H-06 SB	Joseph DeVerteuil	<u>6</u>
		Review & Comment - Orion Resort	<u>10</u>
		For the Good of the City	<u>14</u>

Call to Order

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

Approval of Minutes of September 2006 Meeting

Motion made by Ms. Jordan, seconded by Ms. Johnsen, to approve the minutes of the September 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

Mr. Cromar noted that three cases had been continued at the Board's September meeting. He said that the Board would not be reviewing Case No. 14-H-06, the historic designation of New River Plaza, since the applicant had withdrawn the application.

1. **Applicant:** Broward Trust for Historic Preservation 11-H-06
Owner: Trustee of JDM Trust
17th 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

Continued from September 18, 2006 agenda.

Mr. Cromar stated this was a request for designation of the concrete structure located at 2150 Southeast 17th Street. He said that the question before the Board this evening was whether the structure met one or more of the criteria listed in Section 47-24.B.6.a – h.

Mr. Jolly recused himself from the case.

Chair Haan requested an update from both parties.

Mr. Ron Mastriana, project developer, stated they had an agreement with the Broward Trust including the following:

- the **structure only** would be designated;
- the structure would be donated to the Broward Trust or some other entity, provided it is moved from the site prior to May 1, 2007;
- the developer would contribute \$100,000 for the proposed move;
- if 85% or more of funding was obtained by May 1, 2007, the deadline may be extended; otherwise, the Trust would withdraw its application, which would allow for demolition of the structure.

Mr. Warren Adams, Executive Director of the Broward Trust, stated the Trust believed the site had lost its integrity due to the construction of the 17th Street Bridge and would be even further compromised by additional construction. Mr. Adams believed the structure met criteria 47-24.11.B.6.e and f regarding the architectural quality of the structure. He acknowledged that the City Commission would ultimately determine whether the structure alone should be designated.

Motion made by Mr. Howard, seconded by Ms. Jordan, to approve the request for historic designation of the structure only, per Section 47-24.11.B.6.e and f. In a roll call vote, Board approved 5 – 0 with Mr. Jolly abstaining.

2. **Applicant:** City of Fort Lauderdale 2-H-06
Owner: John Kirchner (formerly Pineapple Tree, Inc.)
Location: 1610 NE 2 Court
 Request: Historic Designation
 Zoned: RC-15
 Legal: Victoria Park Corr Amen Plat
 Block 5, the east 30 ft of Lots 1 and 2, and the west 46 ½ ft of
 Lots 5 and 6. P.B. 10, P. 66.

Mr. Cromar stated that this was a request for historic designation of the John Kirchner House at 1610 NE 2 Court. He explained that on December 6, 2005, the City Commission had authorized staff to prepare an application for historic designation of this property, but a change in ownership had delayed the presentation of this application to the Board. 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 through h.

Ms. Rathbun reported that the house was shown on the 1928 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map and was listed on the 1989 Historic Survey for the Northeast Quadrant of the City. She explained that the house was a two-story Spanish Eclectic apartment structure built of hollow clay tile. She noted that it had an L-shaped footprint and a flat roof with parapet. Ms. Rathbun added that the parapet had multiple merlons and crenels with barrel tile cresting in the crenels and tile coping on the merlons. She said that other significant details were cluster canales and the original stucco wall cladding.

Ms. Rathbun stated that the Victoria Park Subdivision was platted by Alfred G. Kuhn in 1924 and in 1926, much of South Florida was devastated by a hurricane. She said that Pineapple Court was one of the few houses built in the subdivision before that storm. She continued, stating that after the hurricane, serious development was curtailed in the area until after WW II. Ms. Rathbun said that she thought this building was a very good example of the Spanish Eclectic building style of 1920s Fort Lauderdale.

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:
 - 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,

Section 47-24.11B.3.f. If the board recommended 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 stated that the Kirchner House was worthy of designation under 47-24.11.B.6.e and f.

Ms. Pat Rathburn, representative of the owner, said a former City Commissioner had begun the designation process when he believed the former owner intended to demolish the house. Ms. Rathburn said that her client intended to maintain the building as a rental apartment and did not desire designation, as he believed this would restrict his ability to obtain financing or make repairs or improvements to the property.

Mr. Rahtburn said she had researched the property and determined that it did not meet the criteria for designation. She said that she also thought that it was important that the HPB and the City Commission not "dilute" the designation process by designating buildings that did not meet the criteria.

Ms. Rathburn said that she thought that the information contained in the application was sparse, generic and inconsistent. She said that she took issue with the construction date stated by the City's consultant. She also argued that the building was not Spanish eclectic, but a mixture of Spanish Eclectic and Spanish Colonial, "and not a particularly noteworthy example of either."

Ms. Rathburn reported that the building was damaged some years ago by a fire and the interiors significantly altered. She said that the front windows were also of differing styles. Ms. Rathburn said that she thought the Board should consider the property in its neighborhood,

and noted that the area comprised several rental apartment buildings, and this property was “an island of 1928 in a sea of sort of tacky 1960, 1980 buildings.”

Ms. Rathburn argued that the consultant’s report with specific regard to criteria 47-24.11.B.6.e did not remark on the building’s architectural quality or significance; it simply identified the style. She said that the consultant thought it significant that the building had survived a hurricane, but the dates were contradictory and the building had not, in fact, survived a hurricane because it had not been built yet. She concluded that therefore, the property did not meet the requirements of criterion “e.”

As to criteria 47-24.11.B.6.f, Ms. Rathburn claimed that no one would study this building for its distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style, since it only possessed some elements of Spanish Eclectic style, and there was nothing extraordinary in its design.

Ms. Rathburn asked the Board to deny the application

Ms. Rathburn informed Mr. Howard that the owner had only recently purchased the building, and was not sure what, if any, plans he had to improve or alter the look of the building. She added that he intended to maintain the building.

Ms. Jordan asked about historical references to the building; Ms. Rathburn said her research had indicated it was build “somewhere around 1927, 1928; no one famous ever lived there...no architect of note and there’s no indication of the architect at all.” Ms. Jordan asked about a building permit; Ms. Rathburn said she had not located one.

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

Ms. Jordan stated that even though her own home was not significant for its builder or for having been occupied by anyone famous, it still qualified for designation under six of the eight designation criteria. Ms. Jordan said that she thought this property was historically worthy as well. Mr. Howard agreed that there were enough architectural elements to justify designation. Ms. Jordan remarked that the fact that the building was “an island of 1928 in a sea of 1970s buildings,” including several town homes, made it all the more important to preserve some history in the neighborhood.

Ms. Rathburn, the Board’s consultant, clarified that the hurricane to which they referred was in 1926 and the Sanborn map was drawn in 1928. She said that after the 1926 hurricane, there had been very little building in Fort Lauderdale; she added that the houses identified on the 1928 map were therefore assumed to have been built prior to the hurricane.

Ms. Rathburn, the owner’s representative, said that she thought that the consultant was “stretching this to make it fit a criteria that it doesn’t fit.” She stated, “By saying that it is one

building in an area that everything else is 60s and 70s and 80s tacky, means that everybody else on the block got to build what they wanted to do, cash out and leave, and my client is going to be sitting there with the designation of historic designation on it, which will restrict his ability with respect to financing and alteration of the house in case he does want to make improvements.”

Chair Haan noted that if this house were located in Sailboat Bend, it would be “one of the most treasured, premier houses in the neighborhood.” He said that he thought the building was beautiful and representative of the style of the time, and that they must preserve buildings for future generations.

Ms. Jordan said that she thought the house was special because it was built at a time when so little construction was taking place in Fort Lauderdale. Mr. Howard said he viewed this building as an opportunity; whoever owned it could make the effort to restore the building to “whatever glory it had.” Chair Haan pointed out that there were tax breaks and other opportunities for historic properties, and said he hoped the owner would embrace “the pride of ownership of a historic building, rather than fight it and resent it.”

Motion made by Ms. Jordan, seconded by Mr. Howard, to approve the request for historic designation per Section 47-24.11.B.6.e and f. In a roll call vote, Board approved 5 – 1 with Ms. Johnsen opposed.

3. **Applicant:** Joseph DeVerteuil 16-H-06 SB
Location: 307 SW 11th Avenue
Request: Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition:
 ❖ Single-story multi-family building.
 Certificate of Appropriateness for New Construction:
 ❖ Six (6) townhouse development/ “The Grove at Sailboat Bend”
 ❖ 16-ft wide garage doors (modification from 9-ft maximum width as stated in Design Guidelines – ULDR Sec. 47-17.7.B.2.b.i.)
 ❖ Request for yard modification
 ○ Front yard reduction from 25 ft to 19 ft 8 in.
 ○ Corner yard reduction from 25 ft to 20 ft.
 ○ Side yard reduction from 10 ft to 7 ft 2 in.
 ○ Rear yard reduction from 20 ft to 15 ft.
Zoned: RML-25
Legal: Waverly Place
 Block 108, Lots 17 and 18.
 P.B. 2, P. 19.

COA for Demolition continued from September 18, 2006 agenda.

Mr. Cromar stated that this was a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition of a single-story multi-family building in the Sailboat Bend Historic District. Mr. Cromar reminded the Board that this request had been deferred at their September 18, 2006 meeting. In reviewing the request for a COA for Demolition, Mr. Cromar advised the Board to consider the Material and Design Guidelines for SBHD from 47-17.7, the General criteria for a COA in Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.i., and the Criteria for Demolition in Section 47-24.11.C. 4.c.i-iii.

Mr. Cromar continued that this was also a request for a COA for New Construction of six townhouses, including a request for yard reductions for the front, corner, side, and rear yard setbacks, and an exception from the SBHD Material and Design Guidelines for garage doors exceeding nine feet in width. Mr. Cromar advised the Board to consider the following:

- The General criteria for a COA in Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.i
- The Criteria for New Construction in Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.iii
- The Material and Design Guidelines for the Sailboat Bend Historic District in Section 47-17.7
- The Yard and minimum distance separation reduction (or setback reduction) requirements as listed in Section 47-17.5.A, and Section 47-17.5.A.1, and either Section 47-17.5.A.2, or 3, or 4.

Mr. Cromar said that prior to reviewing Case 16-H-06 (SB), the Board should review and comment on the proposed impacts of this project to the West Side Fire Station, located to the east across SW 11 Avenue.

II. Other Business

Presentation of the proposed "Grove at Sailboat Bend" (six unit townhouse project) and its potential impact on the West Side Fire Station, 1022 W. Las Olas Blvd.

Joseph Deverteuil

DRC Case No. 31-R-06

Zoned: RML-25

Location: 307 SW 11th Avenue

Mr. Cromar explained that in accordance with Policy 11.2 of the City of Fort Lauderdale Comprehensive Plan, the City requested that DRC-level applicants prepare reports to identify "the location, extent, status and proposed impact to historic or archaeological resources." He added that pursuant to Policy 11.3 from the Historic Element of the City's Comprehensive Plan, "All proposed impacts to historical resources shall be reported to the HPB for Review and Comment." He said that therefore the applicant would make a presentation explaining the impacts of this project to the West Side Fire Station, located to the east across SW 11 Avenue. Mr. Cromar added that the Board would hear from Merrilyn Rathbun, who provided an independent analysis of the impacts report. He said that staff would then forward the Board's comments to the Planning and Zoning staff for its review of this application.

Mr. Cromar advised the Board that the potential impacts to the Fire Stations required Board review and comment; the Board must take official action regarding the request for the COA for Demolition and the COA for New Construction with the yard reduction requests and garage door width modification.

Ms. Nectaria Chakas, representative of the owner, said they would combine their presentations regarding the impact to the fire Station and the requests for Certificates of Appropriateness. Chair Haan agreed.

Ms. Chakas described the property's proximity to the Fire Station and presented a site plan of the project. She noted that access to the garages was from a central driveway. She said the applicant was requesting exception to the Sailboat Bend design guidelines for the double-wide garage doors, stating that the doors would be painted to appear as single doors. She added that they were also requesting a reduction of the side yards, the purpose of which was to accommodate open-air porches that the civic association had recommended. Ms. Chakas explained that the required setback along Las Olas Boulevard on the front of the property was 25'; the setback to the porch was 19' 8". She said that along Southwest 11th, the required corner yard was 25'; they provided 20' to the porch. She added that the required alleyway setback was 20'; they were providing 15' to the porch.

Ms. Chakas provided renderings of the project and pointed out that they intended to preserve nearly all of the 49 trees currently on the site. She drew the Board's attention to the "context plan" depicting the project in context with the rest of the street. She said the Board had also been provided with a tree survey, and noted that they had an extensive landscape plan for the project.

Ms. Chakas reported that they had met with and "worked very extensively" with the Sailboat Bend Civic Association and presented a letter of support from the association. She confirmed for Mr. Howard that the civic association approved the porches and the garage doors.

Ms. Rathbun informed the Board that the Planning staff had asked the Fort Lauderdale Historical society to assess the impact of the project on the West Side Fire Station. She said that the townhouse project was to be built directly across Southwest 11th Avenue from the Fire House. Ms. Rathbun explained that the Fire House was 50 feet from the lot line on Southwest 11th Avenue, and the townhouse project had a 25-foot setback from the project lot line; the road width added another 60 feet to their separation.

Based on the specifications provided by the developer, Ms. Rathbun concluded there would be no adverse impacts on the Fire Station.

Ms. Rathbun explained that the applicant had asked to demolish the single-story concrete duplex apartment building. She stated that the building was not shown on the 1928 or 1937 Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps, but was shown on the 1960s Sanborn map. She said that the

building was not listed on the HPB Database of architect-designed properties, which suggested that it was not architect designed or that it was built after 1954. She added that the building was not built during the SBHD period of significance (1913 to 1940) and was not considered historically significant in the district.

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 stated that Criteria 47-24.11.C.4.c.ii and iii applied in this case.

Ms. Rathbun continued that the applicant wished to build a six-townhouse development on the site. She noted that the plan called for two three-story buildings with flat roofs and parapets. She said that the third floor of each building would be stepped back from the West Las Olas street side. Ms. Rathbun said that the overall height of the new buildings was thirty-one feet, well under the permitted thirty-five foot height. She added that the applicant intended to retain forty-nine existing trees on the property and provide additional landscaping.

Ms. Rathbun stated that the applicant had requested materials consistent with Material and Design Guidelines from ULDR Section 47-17.7.B.1, 2, 3, and 5, except for the garage door specifications in 47-17.7.B.2.b.i. She said that the applicant had requested sixteen-foot garage doors, but a nine-foot width was the maximum allowed under Sec. 47-17.7.B.2.b. She added that since the doors were located on the side elevations, facing a central drive between the two buildings; the doors would not be visible from the street.

Ms. Rathbun explained that in determining compatibility of new construction with adjacent buildings in the SBHD, “adjacent buildings or structures” referred to any/all historically significant buildings within the district, i.e. any house or building built within the period of significance for the district, 1913 to 1940. She said that the applicant was applying for yard and minimum distance separation reduction and had included a list of five (5) houses with similar front and side yard setbacks. She noted that only one of the five houses, 1031 Tequesta (SW 4th) Street was listed on the FMSF or on the City’s historic surveys.

Ms. Rathbun stated that the applicant had requested the following setbacks: a front yard setback reduced from the required 25 feet to 19 feet 8 inches; a corner yard setback reduced from the required 25 feet to 20 feet; a side yard setback reduced from 10 feet to 7 feet 2 inches, and a rear yard setback reduced from 20 feet to 15 feet.

Section 47-17.5 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

Ms. Rathbun stated that the criteria in Section 47-17.5.A.1 and 2 applied and the reductions were consistent with those of the historic house at 1031 Tequesta Street.

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

Chair Haan said the issue that “always” arose in Sailboat Bend concerned building mass, and that they were hesitant to recommend setback modifications except for porches or outdoor seating areas. Chair Haan did not object to this request because it would not increase the footprint of the building. He asked if the porches could be made wider, and Ms. Chakas agreed to create 8-foot porches, if the Board granted the yard modification to accommodate this.

Chair Haan asked if foam products were used for decorative elements. Mr. Robert Vick, project architect, explained that these were not made of foam, but an injected styrene product comparable to wood. Mr. Vick distributed swatches of the proposed paint palette for the building.

Chair Haan noted that the third story was only ten feet wide, diminishing the mass of the third story. Chair Haan said he loved the fact that they were saving so many trees on the site as well. He complimented Mr. Vick on the streetscape he had submitted and added that this had helped the Board to put the project into perspective.

Motion made by Mr. Howard, seconded by Mr. Wieland, to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition, per Section 47-24.11.C.4.c. ii & iii. In a roll call vote, Board approved 6 – 0.

Motion made by Mr. Howard, seconded by Ms. Jordan, to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for New Construction per Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.iii.a.b.c.d.e, allowing the applicant to enlarge the porches up to 8 feet deep, unless it doesn't meet Code requirements. In a roll call vote, Board approved 6 – 0.

II. Other Business

Presentation of the proposed “**Orion Resort**” (twenty-story resort) and its potential impact on the Bonnet House, 900 North Birch Road.

Transacta Prive Developers, Ltd

DRC Case No. 46-R-06

Zoned: ABA (A-1-A Beachfront Area District)

Location: 700 N. Atlantic Blvd.

Mr. Cromar explained that in accordance with Policy 11.2 of the City of Fort Lauderdale Comprehensive Plan, the City requested that DRC-level applicants prepare reports to identify “the location, extent, status and proposed impact to historic or archaeological resources.” He added that pursuant to Policy 11.3 from the Historic Element of the City’s Comprehensive Plan, “All proposed impacts to historical resources shall be reported to the HPB for Review and Comment.”

Mr. Cromar stated that regarding DRC Case No. 46-R-06, the Board would review the report from Dr. Lucy Wayne, “An Evaluation of the Historical Impacts of the Proposed Orion Resort.” He said that the Board would also hear from Merrilyn Rathbun, who provided an independent analysis of the impacts report. He added that staff would then forward the Board’s comments to the Planning and Zoning Board for its review of this application.

Mr. Donald Hall, attorney for the developers, announced that Dr. Lucy Wayne had prepared their analysis, and he provided a summary of her curriculum vitae. He stated that Dr. Wayne had a Doctorate in Historic Preservation Planning, a Masters Degree in Anthropology, and a Bachelors Degree in Art History. He said that she was also a registered professional archeologist with the Florida Archeological Council, and had published numerous articles.

Mr. Hall stated that the Orion development team respected Bonnet House, and said that they thought that this development could be a benefit to it. Mr. Hall presented an aerial view of the area and noted that the project site was neither adjacent to nor contiguous with the Bonnet House property. Mr. Hall referred to pages 33 through 35 of Dr. Wayne’s report, noting that she had concluded that there was “no adverse impact on Bonnet House from the construction of this project, and in fact, there was the potential for positive impact...”

Mr. Hall said that he thought the “workable definition” of an adverse impact was whether the impact would prevent the reasonable use and enjoyment of another parcel of property. He said that the developer believed that was not the case here. Mr. Hall noted that the ULDR did not include specific guidelines, standards, or criteria that could be used to make this determination. He said that because of this, Dr. Wayne had used state and national guidelines.

Mr. Hall said that Review and Comment regarding the provisions for Neighborhood Compatibility was not within the HPB's jurisdiction, but was the responsibility of the Planning and Zoning Board and the City Commission.

Mr. Hall remarked that all of the land south of Bonnet House was zoned ABA or PRD (Planned Resort District) and was meant to encourage the sort of development that was proposed for this site. Mr. Hall described the distances between the properties: 212 feet between the property lines, 660 feet between the project property line and the Bonnet House building, and 232 feet between the project hotel and the Bonnet House property line.

Mr. Hall reported that in DRC Staff review, the project met the City's Adequacy requirements. Mr. Hall said that he thought the building's color scheme of blue, white and silver would minimize its visibility from surrounding properties.

Mr. Hall said that he thought that the City's consultant did not have the "requisite experience to prepare this impact evaluation." He said that he thought her report included "unsupported statements as to what 'might' or 'could' be an impact."

Mr. Hall said that he thought the distances between the properties, and the requirement for the developer to follow best management construction practices would prevent Ms. Rathbun's contention that construction activity would affect the house. As to the detrimental effect the project might have on Bonnet House visitation, Mr. Hall said he did not understand this, noting that the entrance was currently not easy to find.

Mr. Hall stated that the existing views of the Bonnet House would be maintained. He explained that the site and grounds were engaging and charming and "people are not going to be walking around the property...looking up," and the view would become more occluded as the foliage recovered from last year's hurricane damage.

Mr. Bill Spencer displayed the project site plan and presented a series of photos creating a panoramic view from Bonnet House. He said that he thought that the pedestrian areas around the project would enhance visitors' experience and lead to increased use of Bonnet House by the hotel residents and guests. Mr. Spencer reported that they had conducted a shadow study that concluded there would be no adverse effect on the Bonnet House.

Mr. Spencer showed a 180-degree view from the Bonnet House porch with superimposed images of the proposed project and other development to the South. He stated the Orion would have "little, if any, influence" compared to existing development and current construction.

Ms. Rathbun informed the Board that the City had requested that the Fort Lauderdale Historical Society assess the impact of the proposed Orion project on the Bonnet House. Ms. Rathbun explained that the developer's consultant, Dr. Wayne, had concluded that the effects of the project construction noise, vibration, air quality and traffic would be temporary and have no

adverse impact on Bonnet House. Ms. Rathbun noted that the developer had not determined a definitive timetable for construction, and said that he thought that a protracted construction period would adversely affect visitation, and therefore the income stream, of Bonnet House.

Ms. Rathbun referred to the superimposed photos provided by the applicant, and said Dr. Wayne had also stated that the Orion would have no further impact on Bonnet House views than the existing development. Ms. Rathbun took issue with the superimposed renderings presented by the applicant, and informed the Board that because of the proximity of the Orion to the Bonnet House, it would have much stronger impact. She added that the Trump building would be largely blocked by the Orion.

Ms. Rathbun presented photos taken from various vantage points on the grounds and explained that the grounds and focal points designs were carefully planned, and if the Orion were built, it would become the "unintended focal point."

Ms. Rathbun reported that Dr. Wayne's report stated that landscapes and views were not part of the National Register Nomination for the resource, but the City of Fort Lauderdale's ULDR Neighborhood Compatibility requirements clearly stated the necessity of preserving the Bonnet House view corridors. She quoted from the ULDR Section 47-25.3: "All developments that are located on lands within the CBA zoning district's defensible space preserve view corridors. The City recognizes that existing and new views to and from the Intracoastal Waterway, Atlantic Ocean, Bonnet House and public parks are important to maintain."

Ms. Rathbun concluded that the Orion Resort project, as proposed, would have a damaging impact on the historic view corridors of the Bonnet House Museum and Gardens.

Mr. Mike McNerny, Bonnet House Board member, said that he thought the photos displayed by the applicant were misleading, and stated the building would loom over Bonnet House. Mr. McNerny said the elevation of the building facing the Bonnet House would be 400 feet long by 200 feet tall.

Mr. McNerny presented his own photos depicting the views from the Bonnet House. Mr. McNerny informed the Board that the developer had already submitted the plans to the City when they first approached him with their proposal. Mr. McNerny said, "The idea that this is going to help Bonnet House because it's going to bring us more hotel rooms... that's intellectually not correct." Mr. McNerny said that he thought there was "no good from this building with regard to the Bonnet House; there's nothing but negative."

Mr. Hall reminded the Board that "adverse impact is the test." Mr. Hall explained that the first 35 feet of building pedestal was 400 feet long, but the tower portion of the building was only 200 feet long. Mr. Hall also stated that the "views, as exist today, will be maintained" and there would also be a view from the Bonnet House of this and other buildings.

Chair Haan asked if anyone had verified the accuracy of the applicant's schematic drawings; Mr. Spencer said their architect had verified them. Mr. Spencer said they had provided Mr. McNerny with the CAD information for him to independently verify but did not know if he had. He noted that they had received no input from the Bonnet House other than the suggestion that the building was too high.

Mr. Wieland asked if the developer had considered shortening the building. Mr. Hall stated that this building was already 50 feet shorter than the maximum allowed in that zone. Mr. Hall thought it "more than unreasonable" that the Bonnet House, "through its own interpretation of what is appropriate, dictate the height of a building 212 feet away from the property line and 660 feet away from the building."

Mr. Wieland remarked, "As always, aesthetically, nobody cares; money always wins." Mr. Howard stated he found the project "onerous on the Bonnet House," and said that he thought it would cause a "tremendous lessening of the enjoyment of the Bonnet House." Ms. Jordan noted the photos with the proposed view after construction, and said she could not "imagine not seeing more open space." She said that she thought the project "overwhelms that historic resource." Ms. Johnsen noted that in her experience in places like New York City, they continually faced similar issues with large buildings around Central Park. She said that while she saw the developer's point of view, she hated to see the view encroached upon, and she wanted to keep Bonnet House as it was. Mr. Jolly agreed that the building was encroaching, and "too big, too tall, too massive."

Chair Haan complimented Dr. Wayne on her report even though he disagreed with her conclusions. He said he understood and agreed with the Bonnet House's concerns, and apologized to the developer that they would not have the HPB's support. Chair Haan said that he thought the Orion could use the view of the Bonnet House as part of their sales pitch, but the Bonnet house would never say the same about the Orion.

III. For the Good of the City

Mr. Cromar reminded the Board that their next meeting would be on November 6, 2006.

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 7:52 p.m.

Chairman,

Nolan Haan, Chair

Attest:

Jamie Opperlee, Recording Secretary