

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE
MONDAY, JANUARY 7, 2008 - 5:00 P.M.
FIRST FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE
FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA**

<u>Board Members</u>	<u>Attendance</u>	Cumulative Attendance 6/2007 – 5/2008	
		<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
Nolan Haan, Chair	P	7	0
Daryl Jolly, Vice Chair	P	5	2
Jay Adams	P	5	2
Andy Cole	P	5	1
Carolyn Dandy	P	7	0
Joyce Gardner	P	1	1
Mary-Jane Graff	P	5	2
Klaron Grigsby	A	1	1
Marie Harrison	A	3	2
Susan Jordan	A	5	2
Susan Massey McClellan	P	2	0

City Staff

Assistant City Attorney Carrie Sarver
Deborah Rutkowski, Planning Assistant
Stacey Hines-Ramsey, Board Secretary
Michael Ciesielski, Planner II
Merrilyn Rathbun, Fort Lauderdale Historical Society, Consultant to HPB
Brigitte Chiappetta, Prototype Recording Secretary

Guests

Richard Steiner
Natalie Anderson

Index

	<u>Case Number</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Page</u>
1.	7-H-07	Richard Steiner and Natalie Anderson	2
	For the Good of the City		6

Call to Order

Chair Haan called the meeting of the Historic Preservation Board to order at 5:00 p.m.
It was determined a quorum was present.

Approval of Minutes of December 2007 Meeting

Motion made by Ms. Graff, seconded by Mr. Jolly, to approve the minutes of the Board's December 2007 meeting.

All members of the public wishing to address the Board on any item were sworn in.

I. Cases

[Index](#)

1. **Applicant:** **Richard Steiner and Natalie Anderson** **Case No. 7-H-07**
 Owner: **Richard Steiner and Natalie Anderson**
 Location: **809 SW 4th Court**

Request: Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration:

- Alteration to previously approved plan; expansion of family room by two feet on each side (no change of materials)

Zoned: RMM-25

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

Mr. Ciesielski advised the Board that this was a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for alterations to a previously approved plan.

Mr. Ciesielski explained that the applicants had come before the Board in April 2007, for alterations, including 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. These were previously approved by the Board and a Certificate of Appropriateness was granted at the April 2007 meeting.

Mr. Ciesielski further informed the Board that the current request for a COA was in order to alter (re-build) the walls on the east and west sides of the residence, moving the walls out two feet in each direction. The applicant will use the same materials (aluminum French door, aluminum single-hung windows, porch/deck railing) that were previously approved by the Board in April 2007.

Mr. Ciesielski requested the Board to consider the *General criteria* for a COA (Sec. 47-24.11.C.3.c.i.) and the *Additional criteria* for alterations (Sec. 47-24.11.C.3.c.ii, in addition to considering the SBHD *Material and Design Guidelines* as indicated in Sec. 47-17.7. of the ULDR, when considering whether to allow a COA for alterations.

Ms. Rathbun reiterated to the Board that the applicants had previously come before the HPB in April of 2007 to request alterations to an historically significant house in the SBHD. The following is from the April 2007 consultant's memo:

"The stucco over wood frame house at 809 SW 4th Court is a front-facing gable folk house with a rectangular foot print; it has an enclosed front porch with a centered entry. The house is 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 ca. 1925 to 1926 in the period of significance for the SBHD. The property is listed in the 1985 Original Town Survey and on the FMSF as BD1171."

Ms. Rathbun further reported that at the April 2007 meeting, the applicant asked to put a second story addition, with balcony, on the rear portion of the house. The applicant said that the new addition would be built over what appears to be an earlier flat roofed first floor addition to the rear of the historic house. On investigation the applicants found that the flat roofed addition was in such poor condition as to require the removal of all of the exterior material at the rear of the house in order to meet code requirements.

Ms. Rathbun stated that In the applicant's original plan the second story addition would have been built with a two foot overhang on either side of the original first floor. Now, as the original first floor walls must be removed, the applicants propose to build the new first floor sidewalls two feet out, east and west; which would eliminate the two-foot overhang of the new second story addition.

Ms. Rathbun further informed the Board that the materials for this project were previously approved by the HPB.

Ms. Rathbun then advised the Board to consider Sec. 47-24.11 regarding the historic designation of landmarks, landmark site or building and certificate of appropriateness.

Ms. Rathbun further informed the Board that the proposed change to the plans will only affect the rear of the property and will not be visible from the street. Ms. Rathbun advised the Board that since the walls to be demolished and replaced with new construction were not original but most likely part of a later addition, this is an appropriate change.

Chair Haan then called the applicant to address the Board. The property owner, Richard Steiner, explained to the Board that after the Board had previously granted the applicant the ability to perform the second story addition, when it came time to do the construction and while going through the permitting process with the City of Fort Lauderdale Building Department, the owners were being required to remove all the stucco on the exterior portion of the house where the addition was to constructed.

Mr. Steiner further explained that plywood was going to have to be installed to make the walls stronger. Because the roof was already going to be removed, the only existing construction remaining would be some very poorly built walls, with insufficient foundation. Mr. Steiner advised the Board that the cost to repair the original walls would be greater than to build new walls. Mr. Steiner stated that a benefit of building new walls would result in the house being slightly wider in that area of the home.

Mr. Steiner requested that the Board allow the applicant to make the back of the house slightly wider, just to the rear (going east and west), which would not affect the view of any neighbors.

Ms. McClellan addressed the applicant as to the previously approved north elevation, nos. 1 and 3, that it appeared that the overhangs are not extending beyond the house and that it still shows the old overhangs. This would have the appearance of the roof ending at the side of the wall.

Mr. Steiner explained that the architect should have shown the roofline extending out 18 inches from the house to match the eaves on the remainder of the house, and this was an error in the drawing.

Ms. McClellan further suggested to the applicant, when adding the new portion of the house to the old that attention be paid to the detailing of the stucco in order to avoid cracks from settling.

Mr. Steiner stated that he appreciated Ms. McClellan's observations and that he would address this with the architect and builder.

Chair Haan asked Mr. Steiner if the new addition would be decipherable from the old.

Mr. Steiner advised that the new addition is clearly distinguishable; it is clearly taller than the rest of the house; and the change being proposed is not impacted by the new addition, just slightly wider from the rear.

Chair Haan informed Mr. Steiner that there should be a distinction from the old and new so people can see what has been added on.

Mr. Steiner said that it would be very distinct, and that with this new change, it will even more distinguishable than previously approved.

Chair Haan then 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.

Chair Haan felt this would be a good addition.

Ms. McClellan suggested that Mr. Steiner speak with his architect as to flexibility of change in materials in keeping with character of neighborhood, and to explore the idea as an opportunity to see if there are materials to express the joint between the old and new.

Chair Haan advised that the Board would be approving the materials now, so that the applicant would be required to use the materials before them at this time.

Motion made by Ms. McClellan, and seconded by Ms. Graff, to approve the certificate of appropriateness for alteration based on the *General criteria* in Sec. 47-24.11.C.3.c.i., and also on the *Additional criteria* for alterations (Sec. 47-24.11.C.3.c.ii. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Mr. Cole, yes; Ms. Dandy, yes; Mr. Jolly, yes; Mr. Adams, yes; Ms. Gardner, yes; Ms. Graff, yes; Ms. McClellan, yes; Chair Haan, yes. Motion passed 8-0.

II. Good of the City

Upcoming Cases

Mr. Ciesielski advised the Board that the historic designation for the Jolly Roger will be on the City Commission Agenda for January 15, 2008.

Mr. Ciesielski also informed the Board that the appeal on 11 SW 11th Avenue will not be on the City Commission Agenda for January 15th, but that it is likely to go on the Agenda for February 5, 2008 because the applicants will be meeting with the Sailboat Bend Civic Association on January 15, 2008.

Chair Haan stated that he will go to the meeting to defend the Board's vote where the Board denied the demolition of three historic cottages, as the applicants are going to appeal that decision.

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 5:21 p.m.

Chairman

Nolan Haan, Chair

Attest:

Prototype, Inc, Recording Secretary