

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.

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;

Ms. Rathbun stated this was an appropriate alteration.

Susan McClellan, architect, explained that they wanted to replace the asphalt tiles with barrel tiles to return the building to its proper character. Judy Dixon, applicant, presented a photo of the tile colors they intended to use, and a rendering of what the roof would look like when it was complete. She confirmed this was similar to the original color of tile that was on the building.

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

Mr. Ciesielski explained to Chair Haan that the 15 day Administrative Approval provision found in Section 47-17.4 could only be used for alterations to buildings in the Sailboat Bend Historic District and was not permitted for a building that was designated historic.

Mr. Adams asked if the tile was handmade or manufactured. Ms. Dixon stated they were made in Italy and were the closest tiles they could find to the original. Mr. Adams advised her to consider handmade tiles.

Motion made by Ms. Jordan, seconded by Ms. Graff, to approve the certificate of appropriateness for alteration per section 47-24.11.C.3.c.i.a) and c). In a roll call vote, with Ms. McClellan abstaining, the vote was as follows: Mr. Adams – yes; Ms. Dandy, yes; Ms. Graff – yes; Ms. Grigsby – yes; Ms. Harrison – yes; Ms. Jordan – yes; Chair Haan - yes. Motion passed 7 - 0.

[Index](#)

2. Applicant: Brian Plewinski **Case No. 20-H-07**
Owner: Amera Broward 925, Ltd., (Starbucks)
Location: 1100 W. Broward Blvd.

Request: Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration:
• Install wall sign
• To change the cabinet on top of the existing pole sign
Zoned: B-1
Legal: Waverly Place 2-19 D. All of Lots 24-28, Block 124, less St & N1/2
Vac Alley Abutting Said Lots.

Ms. Morillo stated this was a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Installation of a wall sign and to change the Cabinet on top of the existing signpost.

Ms. Morillo advised the Board that in addition to considering the SBHD Material and Design Guidelines 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. a-f, and the additional guidelines for alterations in Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.ii.a-h when deciding whether to grant a COA for Alteration.

Ms. Rathbun explained that the old Phillips Petroleum Service Station in the SBHD was designed by architect L. Reinhardt in 1954. The building, a Mid-Century Modern structure, was located in the Broward Boulevard commercial corridor. She informed the Board that a previous applicant/owner had converted the service station to a restaurant by exchanging the garage bay doors for fixed glass windows. A COA for the project had been approved by the HPB in April 2003.

Ms. Rathbun continued that the original applicant/owner had received a COA for two signs. One was a (3 foot by 4 foot wide sign attached to the roof overhang in alignment with the front entrance and the other was a stand-alone, two-faced sign six feet high and 10 feet wide, 14 feet above the ground. She explained that the 14-foot height was allowed by the ordinance on Broward Boulevard and the freestanding sign was placed 5 feet from the property line as required by the ordinance.

Ms. Rathbun informed the Board that this applicant was requesting to change out the existing signs for signs with his company logo and business name. The 4 foot by 4 foot circular Starbucks Coffee logo cabinet sign would be placed on the existing 14-foot steel post. The business name sign would be attached to the roof overhang, as was the previous sign, but Ms. Rathbun pointed out that the new sign was 21 feet, 7 inches wide and would be internally illuminated.

Ms. Rathbun stated that the SBHD did not have sign regulations and relied on the City's regulations. As the building was built out of the period of significance, it was not considered historic. It represented a good example of the Mid-century Modern style and

was probably eligible for stand-alone historic designation. Ms. Rathbun felt that the building was an important part of the City's historic fabric and should be preserved. She stated the retrofitting of the service station as a restaurant was a good adaptive reuse of the structure and should extend its life.

Ms. Rathbun advised the Board to consider the following:

Sec. 47-16.21. Sign regulations

B. Sign regulations

2. Except for temporary real estate and builders' signs permitted under Section 47-22, Sign Regulations, signs may be lighted but only by external, incandescent light bulbs illuminating the text of the sign from the exterior. The intent of this subsection is to prohibit light box signs and the use of tube-light lighting

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.

- 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:
 - b) The relationship between such work and other structures on the landmark site or other property in the historic district;

Ms. Rathbun stated the impact of the signs on structures in the historic district and the SBHD as a whole would be minimal.

Mr. Brain Plewinski, applicant, presented photos of the existing signs, and renderings of the proposed signs.

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

Mr. Ciesielski explained to Chair Haan that there was no neon light restriction on the Broward Boulevard corridor; the neon light restriction only applied in the H-1 or Himmarshee district.

Motion made by Ms. Jordan, seconded by Ms. McClellan, to approve the certificate of appropriateness for alteration per section 47-16.21.B.2 and 47-24.11.C.3.c.i.b). In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Mr. Adams – yes; Ms. Dandy, yes; Ms. Graff – yes; Ms. Grigsby – yes; Ms. Harrison – yes; Ms. Jordan – yes; Ms. McClellan – yes; Chair Haan - yes. Motion passed 8 - 0.

II. Good of the City

2008 Meeting Dates for the HPB

Ms. Morillo explained that September 15 was the Board's only meeting date that would not be the first Monday of the month in 2008.

Discussion of Sunshine Laws with the City Attorney

Assistant City Attorney Carrie Sarver introduced herself and gave a brief presentation regarding Florida's Sunshine Law requirements.

Ms. Jordan confirmed with Ms. Miller that it was not a violation of Sunshine Law for a member of the HPB to meet with a member of the City Commission. She asked Ms. Miller if it was appropriate for two Board members to discuss a decision already made by the HPB. Ms. Miller replied that this was “dangerous.”

Other Items

Ms. Morillo agreed to e-mail Board members a link to the latest version of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment and Rehabilitation of Historic Properties. This now included issues of landscape, site, and setting issues.

Ms. Morillo announced that she and her intern had photographed landmark buildings and the historic districts, and had started creating the web page. She distributed printouts of a prototype web page.

Ms. Jordan stated that at the previous meeting when Dr. Francavilla was requesting permission to relocate his houses, she sensed that he was threatening that if he were not permitted to move his houses he would allow them to deteriorate. She wished the City ordinance had “more teeth” to provide better protection for historic structures.

Mr. Ciesielski reported that the appeal for the demolition of the three homes at 11 Southwest 11th Avenue would be heard at the January 15, 2008 City Commission meeting. Chair Haan asked if Board members would be permitted to speak at that City Commission meeting. Ms. Sarver informed him that Board members could speak as private citizens at that meeting or refer to specifics in the HPB minutes.

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 6:50 p.m.

Chairman,

Nolan Haan, Chair

Attest:

ProtoTYPE Inc, Recording Secretary

The City of Fort Lauderdale maintains a Website for the Historic Preservation Board Meeting Agendas and Results: <http://ci.ftlaud.fl.us/documents/hpb/hpbagenda.htm>