

**Historic Preservation Board
City of Fort Lauderdale
Monday, April 16, 2007 - 5:00 P.M.
City Hall
First Floor Conference Room
100 North Andrews Avenue
Fort Lauderdale, Florida**

<u>Board Members</u>	<u>Attendance</u>	2007	
		<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
Jay Adams	P	2	0
Carolyn Dandy	P	1	1
Mary-Jane Graff	P	2	0
Nolan Haan, Chair	P	2	0
Bill Howard	P	2	0
Joanne Johnsen	P	2	0
Daryl Jolly, Vice Chair	A	1	1
Susan Jordan	P	2	0
Clay Wieland	P	2	0
Patricia Hale	P	1	0

City Staff

Michael Ceisielski, Staff Liaison to the HPB
Assistant City Attorney
Pat Garbe Morillo, Staff Liaison to the HPB
Anthony Fajardo, Planning Department
Merrilyn Rathbun, Fort Lauderdale Historical Society, Consultant to HPB
Jamie Opplerlee, Recording Secretary

Guests

Barbara Hall	Maraima Salas
Anthony Abbate	Art Bengochea
Richard Steiner	Ari Sklar

Index

	<u>Case Number</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Page</u>
1.	6-H-07 (SB)	Christina Seber	2
2.	7-H-07 (SB)	Richard Steiner and Natalie Anderson FL Sunrise Propco, LLC	4 8

For the Good of the City	10
--------------------------	--------------------

Call to Order

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

Approval of Minutes of December 2006 and March 2007 Meetings

Motion made by Ms. Johnsen, seconded by Ms. Graff, to approve the minutes of the December 2006 meeting. In a roll call vote, the motion was approved unanimously.

Motion made by Ms. Jordan, seconded by Mr. Wieland, to approve the minutes of the March 2007 meeting. In a roll call vote, the motion was approved unanimously.

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

I. Cases

[Index](#)

1. **Applicant:** Christina Seber **6-H-07 (SB)**
Owner: Christina W. Seber
Location: 801 SW 4TH ST. (Tequesta St.)
Request: Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration
Addition to single family residence
Zoned: RML-25
Legal: Lot 2, Block 64 of Bryan Subdivision, PB 1, P 29.

[This item was heard out of order]

Ms. Morillo stated this was a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for Alteration to a single-family residence, comprising the addition of 415 square feet of floor space to the north and west elevations of the existing single-family home.

Ms. Morillo advised the Board that in addition to considering the SBHD Material and Design Guidelines as indicated in Section 47-17.7. of the ULDR, the Board should consider both the General criteria for a COA in Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.i. and the additional criteria for alterations in Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.ii when deciding whether to grant a COA for Alteration.

Ms. Rathbun informed the Board that the house appeared on the 1928 Fort Lauderdale Sanborn Fire Insurance map, but not on the 1924 Sanborn and was not in any of the City surveys or listed in the Florida Master Site File. It was built during the period of significance of the district (1913 to 1940) and was considered historic in the SBHD.

Ms. Rathbun described the house as a one-story wood frame structure with a square footprint and a low-pitched hip roof covered in Spanish tiles. The house had wood siding and rectangular single hung windows with three over one lights and decorative wood shutters. The main entry was centered on the front facing façade. At the rear of the house, French doors lead to a raised wood deck.

Ms. Rathbun said the applicant wanted to replace the wood deck at the rear of the house with an addition comprising a new study, a small bathroom, a screen porch and a pantry. This addition would wrap around the northwest corner of the existing house. A

small storage room, with access from the exterior, would be added to the west side of the house near, but stepped back from the front street-facing elevation. Ms. Rathbun said the rear addition would have a hip roof of a lower pitch than the existing house roof with Spanish tile cladding, and the storeroom would have a shed roof, contiguous to the existing roof, with Spanish tile cladding.

Ms. Rathbun cited the relevant code section:

Section 47-17.7 Material and design guidelines

- B. Materials and designs
 - 1. Exterior building walls
 - a. Materials and finish.
 - ii. wood—other 1x8 V JT Laid horizontally
 - 2. Windows and doors
 - a. Materials
 - i. glass--clear
 - iv. aluminum
 - b. Configurations
 - ii. windows-- rectangular
 - c. Operations
 - i. windows; single hung;
 - d. General
 - i. wood shutters—non-operable
 - 3. Roofs and gutters
 - a. Roof materials
 - ii. cement tiles
 - c. Configurations
 - i. Roof: The pitch of new roofs may be matched to the pitch of the roof of existing structures on the lot. Simple gable and hip, pitch no less than 3:12 and no more than 8:12. Shed roofs attached to a higher wall, pitch no less than 3:12.

Ms. Rathbun declared that the requested materials met the SBHD Materials and Design Guidelines; the proposed addition was appropriate in the historic district, and approval was recommended.

Mr. Ceisielski noted that the architect for this case was not present, and advised the Board to hear the “other business” item first.

Upon returning to the case, Mr. Art Bengochea, architect for the project, described the proposed addition, noting that the applicant would request no variances or waivers for it. Mr. Bengochea presented photos of the existing home, drawing the Board’s attention to the rear deck area where the addition would be located.

Mr. Bengochea said they intended to use lap siding to differentiate the new construction from the old. The roof material would match the existing material that had been applied not long ago.

Chair Haan thought the door on the addition seemed to be below the floor grade, and Mr. Bengochea explained that this was for the storage shed.

Chair Haan opened the public hearing. As no one present wished to address this item, Chair Haan closed the public hearing and brought the discussion back to the Board.

Motion made by Mr. Howard, seconded by Ms. Jordan, to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration per section 47-17.7.B.1, 2,3,5 &6. Board unanimously approved 9 - 0.

[Index](#)

2. Applicant: Richard Steiner and Natalie Anderson **7-H-07 (SB)**
Owner: Richard Steiner and Natalie Anderson
Location: 809 SW 4th Court
Request: Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration

- Request for yard modification
Front yard reduction from 25 ft to 20 ft.
- Second story addition to single family residence with balcony
- Add one story portico with columns on façade, south elevation
- New porch on rear (north) elevation
- Installation of twenty-five (25) wood-vinyl clad, impact resistant windows and new wood entrance door

Zoned: RMM-25

Legal: Lot 24, Block 64, Bryan Subdivision P.B.1, P. 29

[This item was heard out of order]

Ms. Morillo stated that this was a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for alteration to a single-family residence, comprising: a second story addition with a balcony; a one-story portico to the south façade; a porch to the north façade; installation of impact resistant windows; a new entrance door, and yard modifications consisting of a front yard reduction from the required 25 foot setback to a proposed 20 foot setback for a total reduction of 5 feet.

Ms. Morillo advised the Board that in addition to considering the SBHD Material and Design Guidelines as indicated in Section 47-17.7. of the ULDR, the Board should consider the General criteria for a COA in Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.i., additional criteria for alterations in Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.ii, and application for yard and minimum distance separation reduction in Section 47-17.5.

Ms. Morillo reminded the Board that the proposed “Servants’ Quarters” shown on the plan were NOT part of this application and were not being proposed for review.

Ms. Rathbun described the home as a front-facing gable folk house with stucco over a wood frame, with a rectangular footprint and an enclosed front porch with a centered entry. The house was shown on the 1928 and the 1937 Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps for Fort Lauderdale, but not on the 1924 Sanborn Map for the City. The house was probably built circa 1925 to 1926 in the period of significance for the SBHD. Ms. Rathbun noted that the property was listed in the 1985 Original Town Survey and on the FMSF as BD1171.

Ms. Rathbun explained that the applicant was requesting replacement of windows with new impact resistant windows and the replacement of a rectangular window in the gable with two triangular windows. He also wished to add a small portico with columns to the front porch entry.

The awning that currently covered the front entry would be removed. Ms. Rathbun pointed out that the construction of the portico would require a yard reduction to 20 feet in the front.

Ms. Rathbun cited the relevant code sections:

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; 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:
2. RML-25 zoning district. Principal residential structures: Front yard: 15 feet, side yard: 5 feet, rear yard: 15 feet

Ms. Rathbun continued that the applicant wished to put a second story addition, with balcony, on the rear portion of the house. This addition would be built over what

appeared to be an earlier flat-roofed first floor addition to the rear of the historic house. The new second story addition would extend to the north to cover a new porch and a second story balcony would be built.

Ms. Rathbun stated the addition would have a front-facing gable roof matching the pitch of the historic house roof. According to the applicant's plans, a portion of the historic roof at the rear and part of the rear wall would have to be removed to accommodate the new addition, which extended over the rear of the historic house.

The applicant requested the following materials:

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
 - iv. vinyl clad wood.
 - b. Configurations
 - ii. windows rectangular, octagonal; triangular-gables end only;
 - c. Operations
 - i. windows; double hung; fixed with frame; sliders (rear and side only);

Ms. Rathbun explained that the applicant would replace existing windows with code-compliant windows of similar operation and configuration: triangular (polygonal) fixed windows would be installed on the front-facing gable end to replace an existing rectangular window; octagonal windows would be placed in the second story gable end; rectangular windows, two on either side of the front entry and on either sidewall of the porch would replace the existing windows on the porch. The existing front door and sidelights would be replaced with a paneled wooden front door with a double light at the top. New French doors with sidelights would lead from the second floor master suite to the new balcony at the rear of the new addition.

- 3. Roofs and gutters
 - a. Roof materials
 - iv. steel standing seam
 - b. Gutters.
 - iii. ESP aluminum.
 - c. Configurations
 - i. Roof: The pitch of new roofs may be matched to the pitch of the roof of existing structures on the lot.

Simple gable and hip, pitch no less than 3:12 and no more than 8:12.

5. Garden walls and fences.
 - a. Materials and style
 - ii. wood, vertical wood board.

6. Arcades and porches
 - a. Material and finish
 - ii. Wood; posts and columns

Ms. Rathbun explained that the applicants had submitted two photos of porticos existing in the SBHD, one of which was large enough to be considered a porch. The proposed portico would replace a deteriorated awning. Ms. Rathbun pointed out that this type of construction was appropriate and encouraged within the SBHD, and the requested materials were appropriate within the SBHD.

Ms. Rathbun noted that the servants' quarters on the site plan should not be considered part of this application.

Mr. Adams left at 5:30.

Mr. Richard Steiner, applicant, presented photos of the home, and drew the Board's attention to the deteriorated existing awning which the portico would replace. He noted that the portico would be more in keeping with the architectural styles of the neighborhood. Mr. Steiner explained that the portico would not obstruct the air, light or view of any neighboring property.

Chair Haan opened the public hearing. As no one present wished to address this item, Chair Haan closed the public hearing and brought the discussion back to the Board.

Mr. Steiner confirmed for Chair Haan that there would be no awnings on the front windows; the existing shutters would be removed.

Chair Haan noticed that it appeared on the plans that a wall in the remodeled bath would interfere with the window. Mr. Steiner said the plans were incorrect; they would change this bath window for a smaller one. The new window would line up with the window on the second floor.

Chair Haan noted that the second floor window to which they were both referring seemed to be pictured differently on the interior plans and the exterior elevations. Mr. Sklar, Mr. Steiner's architect, explained that the intent was to have the first and second floor windows align. He said this had been included in the floor plan, but had not been included in the elevations.

Mr. Sklar re-drew the second-floor window on the elevation. The Assistant City Attorney reminded the Board that the window location was not within their purview; the window

design and materials were. She said the Board's motion could include the caveat that the plans must be corrected, and noted that the applicant must work this out with the building official.

Chair Haan noted that the siding would be the same as the existing building, and pointed out that the Secretary of the Interior's guidelines specified that the new construction must be differentiated from the old. He remembered that the Board had approved some other projects with changes that were not differentiated, and felt they must be consistent in their application of this rule. Ms. Rathbun wasn't sure there must be different siding, provided it was clear in some way that this section was an addition. She noted that in this case, the addition was not exactly in line with the old house. Ms. Rathbun said there had been some questions among preservation professionals regarding this rule and its application.

Ms. Jordan asked how to indicate the window problem in their motion, and the Assistant City Attorney advised that the motion could state that approval included the editing done to the plans by Mr. Sklar at the meeting this evening.

Motion made by Ms. Jordan, seconded by Mr. Wieland, to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration per section 47-17.5.A.1, 2,3,4,b.2 and 47-17.B.1, 2,3,5 & 6, with the plans as edited. Board unanimously approved 8 - 0.

[Index](#)

II. Other Business

[This item was heard out of order]

Presentation of the proposed Stay Social (Holiday Inn) Refurbishment Project and its potential impact on the Bonnet House and Bartlett Estate, 900 Birch Road.

FL Sunrise Propco, LLC

DRC Case No. 132-R-06

Zoned: SLA (Sunrise Lane District)

Location: 999 N. Fort Lauderdale Beach Blvd

Ms. Morillo explained that pursuant to Objective 11, Policy 11.3 of the Historic Preservation Element of the Comprehensive Plan, all proposed impacts to historic resources shall be reported to the Historic Preservation Board for review and comment.

Ms. Rathbun stated that the Stay Social development was located on several lots at the southeast corner of Sunrise Boulevard and North Fort Lauderdale Beach Boulevard (A1A) in the Atlantic Beach Development Subdivision. This land was at one time owned by Frederick Bartlett, who was the developer of the subdivision.

Ms. Rathbun declared that The Bonnet House historic resource was named to the National Register of Historic Places on July 5, 1984 and had received local landmark site status in 2004. The thirty-five acre parcel was located between the Intracoastal

Waterway (the New River Sound) and the ocean at Fort Lauderdale. She explained that the site was a native barrier island habitat, which was modified with the introduction of exotics such as an experimental grove of fruit trees and other non-native species by the original owner, Frederick Bartlett and his father-in-law, Hugh Taylor Birch. The site was now operated as an historic house museum and gardens

Ms. Rathbun continued that in addition to the introduction of non-native species plants, Bartlett tailored the natural landscape features to augment his garden design; he dredged the natural slough on the property to form reflecting lagoons and lined the southern lagoon bank with a formal row of Royal palms. He designed and placed about the gardens several architectural features as focal points to enhance the aesthetic experience for garden visitors.

Ms. Rathbun noted that two of these focal points could be affected by the proposed project: the Thatch Bridge Gazebo, which separated the north and south lagoons, and the Island Theatre. Ms. Rathbun referred to a photograph of the lagoon and bridge taken in September of 2006, showing the upper portion of the hotel building visible to the right of the bridge.

Regarding the possible impact to the Island Theatre, Ms. Rathbun explained that the site of the proposed project, the existing thirteen-story Holiday Inn, was 421 feet northeast of the Island Theatre. The project included refurbishment of the hotel building, with new lighted signage, but no additions to the building. Ms. Rathbun stated that the view corridors toward the north (from Bonnet House) were of less significance than the southern view corridors, and events usually took place on the lawn in front of the main house and on the southern portion of the garden. She noted that the mature tree cover on the northern edge of the property also served to mitigate the impact of the large buildings to the north of the property.

Ms. Rathbun said the proposed signage for the Stay Social project would be mounted at the top of the building on the east façade and the west façade. The eastern signage would not be visible from the Bonnet House grounds, but it was possible that some portion of the western sign would be visible from the area of the Island Theatre. As that area was not in use at night, the impact of the signage, would be minimal. Ms. Rathbun added that some new windows, which would be visible from the Bonnet House grounds, were planned for the hotel building, but it was far enough from the activity centers of the historic resource that the light from the windows would not impact the historic resource.

Ms. Rathbun informed the Board that the hotel building was constructed 38 years ago, before the property was added to the National Register of Historic Places. The building shadow currently had no impact on the resource and as there would be no change in the height or size of the building, there would be no change in shadows that would affect the historic resource.

Ms. Rathbun said the hotel building was visible from the southern portion of the gardens behind the Thatched Bridge focal point, as it had been for 38 years. The new signage would not be visible from this part of the property and would not impact the historic resource.

Ms. Rathbun concluded that there would be no serious impact on the Bonnet House and Gardens by the Stay Social refurbishment project.

Ms. Morillo said the president of Bonnet House, Scott Strawbridge, had sent a letter to Mark LaFerrier stating his support for the project.

Ms. Barbara Hall, representative of the applicant, explained that the refurbishment would not occur outside the current footprint and no rooms or windows would be added. She presented photos of the existing hotel building, and renderings of the proposed refurbishment and explained the plans included painting the building, improving the landscaping, adding some window elements and upgrading the rooms.

Ms. Hall stated they had met with the Bonnet House Board and responded to their request regarding the signage. Ms. Hall noted that since there would be no new windows, there would be no additional light affecting the Bonnet House.

Chair Haan opened the public hearing. As no one present wished to address this item, Chair Haan closed the public hearing and brought the discussion back to the Board.

Mr. Howard noted that this was what was possible when the sides got together to discuss possible issues and work them out before they became critical.

III. For the Good of the City

Ms. Jordan informed the Board about a house in Victoria Court Subdivision that was in great need of repair, and asked what action the Board could take to protect the house. Chair Haan advised that the house could be reported to Code Enforcement.

The Assistant City Attorney said Community Inspections used to provide a list to the HPB, but this had not been happening for some time. She added that this list had been "wildly inaccurate." She advised Board members they could complain as residents to Code Enforcement regarding any property. She added that the Board could not request accountability from City Code Enforcement staff.

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 6:08 p.m.

Chairman,

Nolan Haan, Chair

Attest:

Travis Woods [for Jamie Opperlee, Recording Secretary]