

**Historic Preservation Board
City of Fort Lauderdale
Monday, May 7, 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	A	2	1
Carolyn Dandy	A	1	2
Mary-Jane Graff	P	3	0
Nolan Haan, Chair	P	3	0
Pat Hale	P	2	0
Bill Howard	P	3	0
Joanne Johnsen	P	3	0
Daryl Jolly, Vice Chair	P	2	1
Susan Jordan	P	3	0
Clay Wieland	P	3	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
Travis Woods, Recording Secretary

Guests

Ana Alzate Jim Hahn
Tom Utterback

Index

	<u>Case Number</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Page</u>
1.	9-H-07(SB)	Salina Bushell	2
2.	5-H-07	Tom Utterback	2
3.	10-H-07	City of Fort Lauderdale	4
		Terranova Homes	6
		For the Good of the City - Certified Local Government presentation	8

commercial building. The requested alterations consisted of the installation of thirty (30) aluminum single-hung impact resistant windows on the second story.

Ms. Morillo advised the Board to consider the General Criteria for a COA in Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.i.a-f, as well as the Additional Guidelines for Alterations for Alteration in Section. 47-24.11.C.3.c.ii.a.-h. when deciding whether to grant a COA for this application.

Ms. Rathbun informed the Board that this property was surveyed for the City of Fort Lauderdale by Fisher & Shepard, Architects & Planners, Inc. Jacksonville, Florida in 1977. In their report, the consultants assigned a list of priorities for the historic buildings surveyed. The T.M. Bryan Building was assigned the Priority 1, the highest, and Fisher and Shepard explained this designation as:

"Priority 1 indicates that the structure should be preserved or restored as the case may be and is of significant value to the District. Significance is not limited to the structure alone but is extended in maintaining the general character and scale of the District."

Ms. Rathbun stated that further research by the Fort Lauderdale Historical Society showed that the building was designed in 1926 by Fort Lauderdale's premier 1920s architect, Francis Luis Abreu. Fisher and Shepard's 1977 report gave the building a plus rating for architectural significance, historic significance and existing condition.

Ms. Rathbun explained that in a partial restoration of the building a few years ago, the owner had replaced metal awning windows and deteriorated original sash windows on the second floor with appropriate two over two sash windows. The applicant was now requesting a COA for the installation of thirty (30) aluminum single-hung windows

Ms. Rathbun pointed out that fenestration was one of the most important design features of a building. The windows currently installed, which the applicant was now requesting to replace, were appropriate to this 1925 commercial building. The applicant had submitted a specification sheet showing a single-hung one over one hurricane resistant window. The drawing submitted in the packet showed the existing two over two sash windows. Ms. Rathbun said the Board must see a drawing of the new windows, with dimensions and finish indicated, in place.

Ms. Rathbun advised the Board that in determining the appropriateness of the modifications they should consider:

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.

Ms. Morillo stated that this was a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for Alteration to realign an ornamental fence along the western perimeter of the site (parallel with the east side of South State Road 7/ 441). She explained that the fence design and material were previously approved by the HPB in September 2003 (6-H-02) and a copy of the September 2003 minutes had been included in the Board's packet.

Ms. Morillo advised the Board to consider the General Criteria for a COA in Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.i.a-f, as well as the Additional Guidelines for Alterations for Alteration in Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.ii.a.-h. when deciding whether to grant a COA for this application.

Ms. Rathbun stated that the applicant was requesting a modification of a previously approved fence location. The Operations manager for the plant and the contractor for the project had determined that the previously approved decorative/security fencing could not be attached to an existing retaining wall because of that wall's condition. It was further determined that a jog in the fencing to avoid an underground obstacle was not necessary.

Ms. Rathbun informed the Board that the applicant now wanted to realign the fencing and run it to the south property line, without the jog. The applicant also stated that the decorative fence material had been incorrectly identified in the original application as wrought iron, but it was actually steel. Ms. Rathbun pointed out that these modifications would not adversely impact the historic resource and approval was recommended.

Ms. Rathbun advised the Board that in determining the appropriateness of the modifications they should consider:

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;

Mr. Jim Hahn, project engineer, explained that WaterWorks wanted to install the fencing to surround the facility. He stated the fence could no be installed on top of the existing, structurally unsuitable wall and they had decided to move the fence back 4.5 feet. Mr.

Hahn informed the Board that the wall would stay in place, and they had no plans to landscape the space between the wall and the fence.

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 Modification of the fence plan per section 47-24.11.C.3.c.i.a. Board unanimously approved 8 - 0.

II. Other Business

Presentation of the proposed “New Cluster Development ‘Terranova Homes’” Project and its potential impact on the historic North Side School, 120 N.E. 11th St.

“Terranova Homes”

DRC Case No. 104-R-06

Zoned: RD-15

Location: 1022 N.E. 2nd Avenue

HPB Review and Comment regarding of the proposed three (3) unit cluster dwelling and any potential impacts the development may have on the historic North Side School located to the west of the subject site.

Ms. Morillo stated that this Review and Comment was being done 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. Morillo noted that the proposed development was also subject to a site plan level III approval and would be presented to the Planning and Zoning Board at a later date. The HPB comments would be forwarded to the Planning and Zoning Board for review with the development application.

Ms. Rathbun stated that the developers of Terranova Homes had a proposal for a three-unit cluster development to be built facing the east elevation of the historically designated resource, North Side School. The historic school was designed in 1927 by the architectural firm of Sutton & Routt of Vincennes, Indiana and Hollywood, Florida. The contractor for the project was John Olsson, one of the earliest building contractors to work in Fort Lauderdale. The school was built at a cost of \$68,544.71 and was intended to address the burgeoning population of the northeast quadrant of the city.

Ms. Rathbun described the school as a two-story, hollow clay tile structure with stucco wall cladding, built in a simple U-shaped configuration with irregularities. It had a south-

facing courtyard with double (two-story) galleries on the main and eastern block of the structure and an open double gallery on the west elevation of the building.

Ms. Rathbun stated the building was designed in the high Mediterranean Revival Style with much enrichment. The eastern block had an elaborate curvilinear gable facing 11th Avenue. An entrance, with elaborate arched door and stucco surround, was located in the primary tower next to the north-facing end of the eastern block. A secondary tower with the elaborated main entrance, buttressed walls, a curvilinear gable and a small belfry was located at the northwest corner of the façade.

Ms. Rathbun said the many elaborations included: cast stucco quoins surrounding the arched door of the primary tower, salomonicas (spiral twisted columns) at the main entrance in the secondary tower and a circular window with stucco surround and swags with vertical supports on either side at the north façade of the eastern block. The primary tower had a hip roof and an arcade with salomonicas

Ms. Rathbun informed the Board that in 1959, an addition, designed by Fort Lauderdale architect Victor Larson, was built at the north- west corner of the historic structure. The new addition replicated the original design of the resource. At that same time, free-standing structures were built south of the resource partially enclosing the southern end of the courtyard.

Ms. Rathbun stated the City of Fort Lauderdale ULDR required that developers of cluster homes design their projects so that the street façade was no wider than and resembled a single-family residence.

Ms. Rathbun explained that the Terranova Homes development at 1022 NE 2nd Avenue was on three lots directly opposite the east elevation of the 1959 free standing addition built to the south of the historic resource. The overall width of the three lots on the street was 75 feet and the depth of the building lot was 135 feet. The street facing width of the proposed project was 41' 11".

Ms. Rathbun stated only one unit entry was located on the street façade. The other units, which are located behind this front unit, had entries on the south elevation of the building and were accessed from a paved drive from the street on the south side of the property. This configuration met the requirements of the City's ULDR for cluster homes. The proposed project would have a 25-foot front setback and would rise 33' 8 ¾" in height at the apex of the street facing gable end.

Ms. Rathbun noted that although the project was located east of the school, there should be no adverse shadow impact on the resource. The architects had designed a Mediterranean Revival building with simple enrichments, a multi-level gable roof and garages on the side (south) elevation. Ms. Rathbun stated the design was compatible with the neighborhood.

Ms. Morillo announced that the applicant would be represented by Ana Alzate.

Ms. Ana Alzate, representative of the developer, presented renderings and elevation drawings of the project and stated it was compatible with new development in the area.

Ms. Alzate was unsure about the parking situation, and Chair Haan thought it was difficult to evaluate the project based on the materials they had been given. The Assistant City Attorney confirmed for Mr. Wieland that the Board should review and comment on the impact to the historical resource. She noted that there were no criteria dictating what materials a developer must present to the HPB for review and comment.

The Assistant City Attorney reminded the Board that their comments would be forwarded to the Planning and Zoning Board, and they should comment on the impact they felt this project would have on the historic resource.

Ms. Hale thought parking was an issue, because if adequate parking were not included, residents and visitors would park on the street and sidewalks.

The Assistant City Attorney advised the Board to concentrate on aspects such as massing, scale and volume rather than parking and landscaping, which would be dictated by code.

Ms. Graff did not feel the design had enough Mediterranean style to be compatible with the school. Ms. Rathbun said she would call this neo-Mediterranean, a modern American interpretation of Mediterranean style. Ms. Alzate pointed out certain elements were interpretations of the Mediterranean style.

Ms. Jordan said it would have been helpful to represent the Townhomes in relation to the school. Ms. Alzate showed how the project was sited relative to the school, noting it was not across from the school's front elevation, but the side, where the cafeteria was located, facing Northeast 2nd Avenue. Ms. Rathbun noted that it was across from the 1959 additions, not the most historic portion of the structure. Chair Haan advised staff that the Board would like more of this sort of information in order to make their comments.

Ms. Jordan, Chair Haan and Ms. Graff agreed that they could detect no negative impact on the school from this project.

III. For the Good of the City

[Index](#)

Presentation and update by Mike Ciesielski regarding the Certified Local Government application for Historic Preservation to the State Historic Preservation Office.

Ms. Morillo informed the Board that this application process had been going on for several years.

Mr. Ciesielski explained that the Certified Local Government program was a local, state and federal partnership, whose goal was to ensure that local preservation programs were effective for their community. He stated that the CLG status brought several benefits, including: affirming the community's commitment to historic preservation; availability of technical assistance and training for staff and Board members and consultants; input in the National Register nomination process; availability of exclusive matching grant funds; assistance with National Register nominations; assistance for developing educational materials.

Mr. Ciesielski said they had encountered several roadblocks along the way, but were now hopefully clearing the last hurdle, the adoption of rules and procedures applicable to the HPB. Mr. Ciesielski explained that these were rules primarily carried out by staff, and that staff already carried out several of these rules. Mr. Ciesielski displayed the list he had created and distributed to the Board and read from it.

The Historic Preservation Board ("HPB"), in addition to those Rules and Procedures as set forth in the City of Fort Lauderdale's Unified Land Development Regulations Chapter 47-32, agree to adopt the following Rules as authorized pursuant to Resolution of the City Commission attached thereto;

1. Initiate and continue an approved process of identification of historic properties within the HPB's jurisdiction and ensure that all inventoried materials are compatible with the Florida Site File.
2. Continue the process of advertising the agenda for all HPB meetings at least three (3) days in advance of each meeting through sign posting at City Hall as well as on the City's Website.
3. Continue the process for recording minutes of each HPB meeting and continue making all HPB meeting records available to the public.
4. Review and comment on any nominations of local properties to the National Register of Historic Places following the regulations of the state historic preservation office, as follows
 - The responsibilities of the HPB in this regard shall be supplementary to the state historic preservation officer
 - Appropriate local officials, owners of record of nominated properties, and applicants, shall be given a minimum of thirty (30) days notice and not more than seventy-five (75) days notice of the HPB meeting at which a nomination will be considered for the National Register.
 - Inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places is voluntary, and when a property owner objects to the nomination he shall submit a notarized written statement to the HPB before the nomination is considered
 - The HPB shall forward its recommendation and action on the nomination to the state historic preservation officer.

5. Objections by property owners must be notarized to prevent nominations to the National Register.
6. Provide the State Historic Preservation Officer with thirty (30) days prior notice of all meetings of the HPB.
7. Submit draft minutes of each meeting to the State Historic Preservation Officer within thirty (30) days of that HPB meeting. Submit approved minutes of each meeting (signed by HPB Chairman) within thirty (30) days after the minutes have been approved.
8. Submit a record of attendance of the HPB members to the State Historic Preservation Officer within thirty (30) days of each HPB meeting.
9. Submit public attendance figures for each meeting to the State Historic Preservation Officer within thirty (30) days of each HPB meeting.
10. Notify the State Historic Preservation Officer of change in HPB membership within thirty (30) days of such action.
11. Notify the State Historic Preservation Officer immediately of all new historic designations or alterations to existing designations.
12. Submit amendments to ordinance to the State Historic Preservation Officer for review and comment at least thirty (30) days prior to adoption.
13. Maintain a detailed inventory of designated districts, sites, and structures within the jurisdiction of the HPB.
14. Submit an annual report by November 1 covering activities of previous year October 1st through September 30th. The items to be included in this annual report are
 - A copy of the Rules and Procedures
 - A copy of the historic preservation ordinance
 - Resume(s) of HPB members
 - Changes of HPB members
 - A list of new local designations
 - A list of new national register listings
 - A review of survey and inventory activity with a description of the system used
 - A program report of any grant-assisted activity
 - Number of projects reviewed by the HPB
15. Ensure that the survey and inventory of historic materials are updated periodically and are open and available for public inspection.
16. Ensure that duplicates of all inventory materials will be provided to the State Historic Preservation Officer.
17. Encourage members of the HPB to participate in survey and planning activities of the Certified Local Government.
18. Encourage members of the HPB to attend pertinent informational or educational meetings, workshops, and conferences.
19. Ensure that these Rules of Procedure will be made available for public inspection.
20. The Rules of Procedure will; be kept on file with the Planning and Zoning Department and the City Clerk and will be made available for public inspection.

Mr. Ciesielski pointed out that all of this language had been copied from Tallahassee's checklist of CLG requirements. He explained that these rules discussing National

Register applications applied to all national designation; local designations, which the HB now reviews, carry much more protection than national designations, as nationally designated properties are more of an honorary listing. Mr. Ciesielski then offered to provide a list to the Board of City properties with national, local and both designations and to provide it at the next meeting.

Mr. Ciesielski asked the Board to recommend that these rules be approved and adopted, and they would be taken in the form of a resolution to the City Commission for adoption at the June 19, 2007 meeting.

The Assistant City Attorney explained that the City Manager must approve the process and put this on the City Commission agenda as a resolution so the Commission could direct staff to follow these rules. The resolution would be sent to Tallahassee with the application.

Motion made by Ms. Jordan, seconded by Ms. Johnsen, to recommend the rules and procedures presented by Mr. Ciesielski to the City Commission for their adoption and approval. Board unanimously approved 8 – 0.

Mr. Morillo announced that the Better Meetings Academy had been rescheduled for Wednesday June 6 at 5:45 p.m. She agreed to email this information to the Board.

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

Chairman,

Nolan Haan, Chair

Attest:

Travis Woods [for Jamie Opperlee, Recording Secretary]