

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

<u>Board Members</u>	<u>Attendance</u>	<u>Cumulative Attendance 6/2008 through 5/2009</u>	
		<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
Nolan Haan, Chair	P	1	0
Daryl Jolly, Vice Chair [5:09]	P	1	0
Jay Adams	A	0	1
Andy Cole	A	0	1
Beauregard Cummings	P	1	0
Joyce Gardner	P	1	0
Mary-Jane Graff	P	1	0
Marie Harrison	P	1	0
Susan Jordan	P	1	0
Susan McClellan	P	1	0
Robert Prager	P	1	0

**City Staff**

Assistant City Attorney Carrie Sarver  
Pat Garbe Morillo, Staff Liaison to the HPB  
Michael Ciesielski, Planner II, Planning and Zoning Department  
Merrilyn Rathbun, Fort Lauderdale Historical Society, Consultant to HPB  
B. Chiapetta, ProtoType Recording Secretary

**Index**

	<u>Case Number</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Page</u>
1.	Case No. 19-H-07	Broward Trust for Historic Preservation	<a href="#">2</a>
2.	Case No. 15-H-07 (SB)	Art Bengochea	<a href="#">2</a>
3.	Case No. 5-H-08 (SB)	Annette Akerstrom	<a href="#">3</a>
4.	Case No. 7-H-04	Alice Sakhnovsky	<a href="#">6</a>
5.	Case No.13-H-07	City of Fort Lauderdale	<a href="#">10</a>
	Review & Comment	El-Ad North Tower Development	<a href="#">10</a>
	Review & Comment	Cabi New River, LLC	<a href="#">13</a>
	For the Good of the City		<a href="#">15</a>
	Board Elections		<a href="#">17</a>

### **Call to Order**

Chair Haan called the meeting of the Historic Preservation Board to order at 5:06 p.m. Chair Haan welcomed new Board members Robert Prager and Beau Cummings.

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

### **Approval of Minutes of May 2008 Meeting**

**Motion** made by Ms. Graff, seconded by Ms. McClellan, to approve the minutes of the Board's May 2008 meeting. In a roll call vote, Board unanimously approved.

[Mr. Jolly arrived at 5:09]

The Board agreed to elect new officers at the end of their meeting.

#### **I. Cases**

[Index](#)

##### **1) Case No. 19-H-07**

**Applicant:** Broward Trust for Historic Preservation  
**Owners:** Starwood Asset Management (Building), and Carol, Timothy Patrick Alber (Land)  
**Address:** 1140 Seabreeze Blvd.  
**Request:** Historic Designation of the Yankee Clipper Hotel  
**Zoned:** RMH-25  
**Legal:** Subdivision of Harbor Beach Portion of Unit One Plat Book 26 Page 32 B Parcel X.

Ms. Morillo reported that the applicant had requested deferral of this item to September 15, 2008.

Mr. Jolly recused himself, stating he was a member of the Broward Trust for Historic Preservation.

**Motion** made by Ms. McClellan, seconded by Ms. Jordan, to defer this case to the Board's September 15, 2008 meeting. In a voice vote, with Mr. Jolly abstaining, motion passed 8 – 0.

[Index](#)

##### **2) Case No. 15-H-07 (SB)**

**Applicant:** Art Bengochea  
**Owner:** John Francavilla

**Address:** 1009 SW 4 Street  
**Request:** Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition:

- 1 house

Certificate of Appropriateness for New Construction:

- Six, 2 story townhomes
- Request for yard modification
  - Front yard reduction from 25 ft. to 15 ft.
  - Rear Yard reduction from 20 ft. to 15 ft.
  - Two Side yard reductions from 10 ft. to 5 ft.

**Zoned:** RML-25  
**Legal:** Lots 1, 3, and 5, Block 107, "Waverly Place," P.B. 2, P. 19.

Ms. Morillo announced that this item was deferred from the April 7, 2008 meeting and the applicant had since provided a written request to withdraw the application.

[Index](#)

**3) Case No. 5-H-08 (SB)**

**Applicant:** Annette Akerstrom  
**Owner:** Annette Akerstrom  
**Location:** 824 Tequesta St., SW 4 St.  
**Request:** Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration:

- Addition to House
- Addition (Front Porch)
- Front yard reduction from 25 ft. to 15 ft. 1 inch.

**Zoned:** RMM 25  
**Legal:** Lot 31, Block 64, Bryan Subdivision, P.B 1, and P.29.

Ms. Morillo stated this was a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for Alteration for 1) a small addition to the façade and 2) a front porch which would require the granting of a front yard reduction from 25' to 15 ft. 1 inch.

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, they should consider the General Criteria for a COA in Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.i, as well as the additional criteria for alterations in Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.ii, and Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.i.a-f. when deciding whether to grant a COA for the Alterations. When deciding whether to grant the yard reduction, the Board should consider the criteria in Section 47-17.5.A.1 through 4, and Section 47-17.5.C.2 for its consideration of a front yard setback.

Ms. Rathbun reported that the house was not shown on either the 1928 or the 1937 Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps for the City of Fort Lauderdale, and was not listed on the FMSF. The house was built out of the period of significance for the SBHD (1913 to 1940-41).

Ms. Rathbun explained the applicant was requesting a COA to enlarge the porch and incorporate it into the main structure of the house. The applicant intended to build a new open porch across the full width of the new façade. The new porch and the newly enlarged portion of the house would be covered with a front facing gable roof that would be significantly higher than the roof of the remaining portion of the house, but she noted that this discrepancy in roof heights would not be visible from the street.

Ms. Rathbun said the applicant was requesting the following materials for the new addition to the front of the house:

Section 47-17.7 Material and design guidelines

B. Materials and designs

1. Exterior building walls
  - a. Materials and finish
    - ii. wood – clapboard,
2. Windows and doors
  - a. Materials
    - i. glass
    - v. aluminum.
  - b. Configurations
    - ii. windows rectangular,
  - c. Operations
    - i. windows; casement;
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. Shed roofs attached to a higher wall, pitch no less than 3:12.
6. Arcades and porches
  - a. Material and finish
    - ii. Wood; posts and columns

Ms. Rathbun informed the Board that the applicant's architect had enclosed a narrative with an explanation of the requested front yard setback reduction. The applicant was requesting a reduction of the 25-foot principal structure front yard setback to 15'1" in order to accommodate the new covered porch. She noted that photographs of nearby structures with similar setbacks had been provided in the applicant's packet.

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: fifteen (15) feet, side yard: five (5) feet, rear yard: fifteen (15) feet.

Ms. Rathbun informed the Board that the materials requested by the applicant were appropriate and should be approved because open front porches were a desired and compatible feature in the district. Therefore, the porch was appropriate.

Ms. Annette Akerstrom, applicant, offered to answer any questions.

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. Jolly disclosed that he owned the property to the west of this address.

Ms. Rathbun believed this property was not historic, and did not know the construction date.

Chair Haan said the changes might be off-putting if the property were historic, but since it was not, he felt the porch would be a great addition to the neighborhood. Mr. Jolly agreed.

**Motion** made by Ms. McClellan, seconded by Mr. Jolly, to approve the certificate of appropriateness for alteration per Section 47-17.7.B.1.a.ii; 2.a, b and c; 3.a, b and c; and 6.a.ii. In a roll call vote, motion passed 9 - 0.

**Motion** made by Ms. Jordan, seconded by Mr. Jolly, to approve the certificate of appropriateness for the yard and minimum distance separation reduction per 47-17.5.A.1-4 and B.2. In a roll call vote, motion passed 9 - 0.

Ms. Sarver advised Board members that they need not cite the specific ULDR codes in their motions.

**Motion** made by Ms. McClellan, seconded by Mr. Jolly, to approve the certificate of appropriateness for new construction of the front porch. In a roll call vote, motion passed 9 - 0.

[Index](#)

4) **Case No. 7-H-04**

**Applicant:** Alice Sakhnovsky

**Owner:** Fort Lauderdale Woman's Club

**Location:** 15 SE 1 St.

**Request:** Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition:

- Demolition of portions of 1949 South Addition
- Partial Demolition of Handicapped ramp on East Side of Building.

Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration:

- Replacement of 17 (seventeen) windows with double-hung Wood/Aluminum Clad Windows
- Replacement of 4 (four) wood and metal doors
- Addition of 153 sq. ft. Storage Closet on South Side
- Build an ADA Ramp with Decorative Railing on the East Side of the Building
- Rebuild the Original Entrance Way and Façade on West Side of Building

**Zoned:** RAC-CC

**Legal:** Stranahan Sub. Lots 13-18, Block 14, Ft Lauderdale 3-10 D, 100 by 135 E & W, less part described in Ordinance 8304/556 for RD R/W.

Ms. Morillo reported that this was a request for 3 Certificates of Appropriateness: 1) a COA for partial demolition of 1949 south addition and partial demolition of a

handicapped ramp on east side of the building; 2) a COA for alteration for replacement of 17 windows and 4 doors. and 3) a COA for alteration to build a handicap ramp and rebuild the original entrance way and façade.

Ms. Morillo advised the Board that regarding the request for demolition, they should consider the criteria for demolition listed in Section 47-24.11.C.4.c.i. through iii. She stated the Board should consider General criteria for a COA in Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.i. as well as the additional criteria for alterations in Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.ii, and Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.i.a-f when deciding whether to grant a COA for the requested alterations.

Ms. Rathbun informed the Board that the clubhouse for the Fort Lauderdale Woman's Club, built in 1916, designed by Miami architect August Geiger, was a designated property in the City of Fort Lauderdale. The clubhouse was now undergoing a renovation intended to return the building to its 1916 appearance. She explained that in 1949, a large addition was added to the south side of the historic building, which included a new entrance. Ms. Rathbun stated in 1949 the intent had been to "modernize" the building, and many of the original details of the building were covered over or removed altogether.

Ms. Rathbun explained that the applicant did not intend to remove the addition, but did wish to open the original porch and entryway and restore as much of the original building as was possible. The applicant was asking for a partial demolition of the 1949 addition, i.e. the south entryway and porch, and a portion of an existing ramp.

#### Section 47-24.11.C

##### 4. Demolition

##### c. Criteria—Demolition

- i. The designated property no longer contributes to a Historic District
- ii. The property or building no longer has significance as an historic architectural or archeological landmark; or
- iii. The demolition or redevelopment project is of major benefit to a historic district

Ms. Rathbun verified that the parts to be demolished did not have historic significance.

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;
- 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;
- f) Whether the plans comply with the "United States Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings."

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of historic Properties – with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring & Reconstructing Historic Buildings:

#### **Remove Existing Features from Other Historic Periods**

Most buildings represent continuing occupancies and change over time, but in Restoration, the goal is to depict the building, as it appeared at the most significant time in its history. Thus, work is included to remove or alter existing historic features that do not represent the restoration period. This could include features such as windows, entrances and doors, roof dormers, or landscape features. Prior to altering or removing materials features, spaces, and finishes that characterize other historical periods, they should be documented to guide future research and treatment.

Ms. Rathbun stated the demolition was appropriate.

Ms. Rathbun continued that the applicant was requesting a COA to replace seventeen non-historic windows with period appropriate double-hung wood/aluminum clad windows, and to replace four doors, and remarked that these were appropriate replacements.

Ms. Rathbun said the plans called for the construction of an ADA ramp for the building. The applicant's packet included documentation of the decorative ironwork and tiles that would be used in the construction. She added that a small plaza with a fountain of compatible design would also be built and the original porch and entry would be restored

Section 47-24.11C.3.c.i.

- f) Whether the plans comply with the "United States Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings."

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of historic Properties – with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring & Reconstructing Historic Buildings:  
**Re-Create Missing Features from the Restoration Period**

Most restoration projects involve re-creating features that were significant to the building at a particular time, but are now missing...each missing feature should be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence...

Ms. Rathbun stated the applicant's plans for restoration were appropriate and approval of the restoration and demolition was recommended.

Ms. McClellan recused herself from voting on this item.

Mr. Leo Hanson, architect, stated the plans for this building accomplished two important things: they preserved the use of the building and increased community awareness of the building. He believed this building, when complete, would "take its place among the important buildings in the City of Fort Lauderdale." He pointed out that the building was rare in the fact that it had a continued use since 1916.

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.

**Motion** made by Ms. Gardner, seconded by Mr. Cummings, to accept the application with great pleasure. In a roll call vote, with Ms. McClellan abstaining, motion passed 8 - 0.

Ms. Rathbun remarked that the alterations would restore the building close to its original state, and would emphasize the original part of the building. Mr. Hanson said the windows would be in the original style, but would be impact resistant.

Ms. Jordan said the plans were "perfectly beautiful...a tremendous improvement."

Ms. Graff said it was very important to restore the building to its original state, noting what an improvement this would be.

Ms. Sarver advised the Board that their motion on this item had been a "blank motion." It should have been more specific and there should have been two motions, since there was one request for a Demolition COA and one request for an Alteration COA.

Ms. Gardner said, "My motion was to accept the proposal as proposed, not limiting to one thing or another; the whole proposal, which included both things."

Chair Haan recommended amending the motion to include the Certificates of Appropriateness for the Demolition and Alteration. In a roll call vote, with Ms. McClellan abstaining, motion passed 8 - 0.

[Index](#)

5) **Case No.13-H-07**

**Applicant:** City of Fort Lauderdale

**Owner:** City of Fort Lauderdale

**Location:** SW 11th Ave. Swing Bridge

**Historic Name:** Snow-Reed Swing Bridge

**Request:** Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration:

- Replacement of windows and door of existing tender house.
- Replacement of some steel elements of truss bridge
- Replacement of some wooden timbers on cat walk and fender system
- Replacement of existing retaining walls at the NE & SW Approaches

Certificate of Appropriateness for New Construction

- New Bridge tender house

**Zoned:** RS-8

**Legal:** An easement/lease area on sovereignty submerged lands being a portion of the North Fork of the New River, City of Fort Lauderdale, Broward County, Florida lying within Section 9, Township 50 South, Range 42 east.

Ms. Morillo announced that this Item had been deferred to the Board's August 4, 2008 Meeting.

**II. Other Business**

**Review and Comment**

[Index](#)

**El-Ad North Tower Development**

DRC Case No. 43-R-08

Zoned: PRD

Location: 2939 Banyan St.

**The impacts of the proposed re-development of the El-Ad Development North Tower to the historic Lauderdale Beach Hotel and other nearby resources listed in the FMSF.**

Ms. Morillo stated the HPB should Review and Comment regarding the proposed 19-story mixed-use project including hotel rooms, condominium units and first floor commercial space, and any potential impacts the development may have on the historic Lauderdale Beach Hotel located to the north east of the subject site. This Review and Comment was being conducted pursuant to Objective 11, Policy 11.3 of the Historic Preservation Element of the Comprehensive Plan, requiring that all proposed impacts to historic resources shall be reported to the Historic Preservation Board for review and comment.

Mr. Ralph Johnson, Director of the FAU Center for the Conservation of Architectural and Cultural Heritage, said the EI-Ad building would be a welcome addition to the site.

Mr. Johnson said they had followed the lead of the National Register of Historic Places and the National Park Service. He said he had considered the elements of design, materials, setting, workmanship, feeling and association and determined there would be no negative impact on the Lauderdale Beach Hotel, and in fact there would be positive impact in some cases.

Mr. Johnson presented renderings and photos of the site, and noted that some of the design mimicked the design of the Lauderdale Beach Hotel. He determined that regarding the location, "there will be no adverse affects on proposed development of the historic resource; the proposed development does not involve the relocation or reconfiguration of the historic resource and will have, therefore, neutral impact."

Regarding the design, Mr. Johnson noted that the building had design elements of Miami's South Beach Art Deco district and was the only such building left in Fort Lauderdale. The building would therefore have a positive impact on the historic resource.

Regarding the setting, Mr. Johnson noted that the proposed development was adjacent to the rear of the Lauderdale Beach Hotel, and would be a welcome adjunct.

Regarding the materials and workmanship, Mr. Johnson said the proposed development would have a neutral impact on the materials and workmanship aspect of the historic resource and would have no adverse effect.

Regarding the feeling and association, Mr. Johnson explained that the Hotel had a long history dating to the 1930s and had continued as a resort and contributed to establishing Fort Lauderdale Beach as a resort area. He stated the development would not impact any of this history.

Mr. Johnson stated that the development was to be 20 stories, significantly lower than the Las Olas Beach Club tower behind the Lauderdale Beach Hotel. The site of the proposed tower is now a parking lot.

Ms. McClellan asked for a rendering of the north façade. Mr. Robert Lochrie, representative of the developer, explained that this façade would have the same design as the east side, with glass balconies. At ground level, there were shade structures along the active retail spaces. Mr. Jira Yates, the architect, explained that there would be outdoor dining on the northeast and southwest corners.

Mr. Lochrie informed the Board that all of the parking for this building would be below ground level; there were two small parking lots to the south and east that would be unaffected by this project.

Mr. Jolly disclosed that he was a member of the Broward Trust for Historic Preservation, who held the easement on the Lauderdale Beach Hotel's façade.

Ms. Rathbun stated the developer, El-Ad FL Beach LLC, proposed to build a 19-story mixed-use hotel/condo located between Banyan and Poinsettia Streets, two blocks east of A1A. She informed the Board that the consultant for the developer, Ralph B. Johnson & Associates, had submitted a report of possible impacts on the nearby locally designated historic resource: the Lauderdale Beach Hotel. She stated the historic resource was located one block to the northeast of the proposed El-Ad Development North Tower.

Ms. Rathbun continued that the developer's consultant had evaluated possible impacts the proposed tower would have on the historic resource in accordance with the steps utilized to evaluate the integrity of an historic property under the National Register criteria. She noted that the Lauderdale Beach Hotel was designated under criteria meeting the National Register standards. The developer's consultant evaluated impacts on the building according to location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association and had concluded that there would be no impact on the historic resource. He also stated that he had evaluated the project vis-a-vis the City of Fort Lauderdale Code of Ordinances, Chapter 47, Sections 47-25.2 and 47-24.11.C3.c and had concluded that the project met these requirements. Ms. Rathbun agreed with the developer's consultant's conclusions.

Ms. Rathbun pointed out that the consultant had not considered the impact of the project on the building at 2926 Cortez Street, located on the site of the proposed development. This Art Deco multi-family building was built in 1939 and was listed on the Florida Master Site File (BD1762). It was surveyed by the City in 1988 and at that time the surveyors determined that it was probably eligible for historic designation, but no designation was ever actually considered for this building and it would be demolished if the El-Ad project was approved. She reported that recently, a City building inspector discovered significant structural damage to this building and the property owner had agreed to demolish it. Ms. Rathbun explained that because the building was never designated, a "review and comment" on possible impacts on the

building was not required, but because of its listing on FMSF, the fate of the building has been brought to the Board's attention.

Mr. Lochrie confirmed that the building to which Ms. Rathbun referred had already been demolished, and was never on this property; it was located a block north.

Ms. Graff and Chair Haan stated they liked the design of the building.

**Cabi New River, LLC**

[Index](#)

DRC Case No. R-38-07 & R-39-07

Zoned: RACC

Location: South Bank of New River, West Side of the Florida East Coast Railway

**The Impacts of the proposed Cabi New River Boat Storage Project to the Historic Resources in the H-1 Historic District**

Ms. Morillo stated the HPB should Review and Comment regarding the proposed two structures housing mixed use office/retail/restaurant /parking and boat storage facility, and any potential impacts the development may have on the historic resources located in the H-1 Historic District on the north side of the New River from the subject site. This Review and Comment was being conducted pursuant to Objective 11, Policy 11.3 of the Historic Preservation Element of the Comprehensive Plan, requiring that all proposed impacts to historic resources shall be reported to the Historic Preservation Board for review and comment.

Mr. Ralph Johnson, Director of the FAU Center for the Conservation of Architectural and Cultural Heritage, said the developer's intent was to redevelop the site into a multi-use structure with residential, retail, office, restaurant and parking. Mr. Johnson presented renderings and photos of the site and noted that the project would incorporate the New River walkway.

Mr. Johnson stated this would be adjacent to the boundary of Fort Lauderdale's first settlement bordered by the FBC Railroad and reported there would be no adverse impacts from the proposed project.

Mr. Johnson described buildings located in the historic district such as the King-Cromartie House, the 1899 School House replica, the Bryant Houses and the Heritage Center, and remarked that one felt "enveloped and enclosed" inside the district. Mr. Johnson stated there would be no adverse affect or negative impact on the historic district.

Finally, Mr. Johnson felt there would be a positive impact on the historically protected Raintree because it would become part of the landscaped area and would be maintained.

Mr. Jolly asked if the Riverwalk would be accessible at all hours. Mr. Lochrie explained that the gate on the north side was closed at the park entrance. Mr. Lochrie said, "It's our proposal that we make this connection...and it's being designed to be open 24 hours a day." He acknowledged that the City would still have the right to close it because it was part of the City park system.

Ms. Gardner felt this was a magnificent building, but that it had "no relevancy at all to these lovely historic places we saw that are wood, CBS and brick." She did not feel the building fit in. Mr. Johnson noted that the building fit in with the environment of the south side of the river, which was industrial. It also integrated with the river because the front entrance was transparent.

Ms. Graff was bothered by the sheer mass of the building, despite its beauty. She felt it overwhelmed the entire landscape. Ms. Jordan agreed. Ms. McClellan was disturbed by the mass of the building as well, and did not believe the rendering was true to the delicacy of the original sketches. She recommended a 60-foot setback instead of a 30-foot setback. Mr. Johnson said they were mitigating the mass with landscaping.

Mr. Anthony Abbate, architect and professor at the School of Architecture at FAU, said he was under contract with the City to evaluate this project. Mr. Abbate showed photos and maps of the area and noted that the site was a significant archeological zone. Because of this, a Phase 1 archeological survey was required for DRC approval.

Mr. Abbate explained that his assessment of the impacts followed the Secretary of the Interior's criteria for seven aspects of integrity: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association. He explained there were three values for impacts: positive, neutral and negative.

Regarding location, Mr. Abbate said the redevelopment did not entail relocations or reconfigurations of the historic district; therefore, the development would have a neutral impact.

Regarding design, Mr. Abbate stated this was "high tech modern." He said this design was a product of its time and did not diminish the uniqueness and integrity of the existing historic resources in the vicinity. It therefore would have a neutral impact.

Regarding materials and workmanship, Mr. Abbate said this was not adjacent to any historic structures in such a way that it would impact the integrity of the existing materials or workmanship. Therefore, it would have a neutral impact.

Regarding setting, Mr. Abbate described the surrounding historic district as a "time capsule" within the urban environment. He said that in this case, setting was related to the last two criteria: feeling and association. He remarked that the proposed

landscaping was consistent with the Riverwalk theme. Mr. Abbate explained that feeling was defined as “a property’s expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time.” Association was “the link between an historic event and an historic resource.” Mr. Abbate stated, “The aesthetic and historic sense of time at the Fort Lauderdale Historic District, particularly along the New River, are perhaps the most important characteristics as well as being significant elements of historic integrity for this district and for the nationally and locally designated sites within it.”

Mr. Abbate agreed that the proposed setback did not seem sufficient, noting that trees would be shaded by the buildings most of the year. Therefore, as to the aspects of setting, feeling and association, “the proposed development, with an additional setback, would provide a positive impact on local and national historic resources, and to ensure no adverse affects, we recommend an additional setback.” Mr. Abbate said he recommended a 60-foot setback [instead of the proposed 30 feet].

Chair Haan agreed the setback should be at least 60 feet.

Ms. Graf asked about the archeological impact to the riverbank. Mr. Abbate said these questions would be answered by the archeological survey. He had discovered that the entire island was archeologically significant, and was a possible shipwreck location. Mr. Abbate informed Ms. Graff that if there were archeological impacts, there would be mitigation.

Ms. Gardner was disappointed the building could not be constructed in a spot farther down the river where it would fit in better.

Mr. Lochrie acknowledged they would not know the archeological impacts until the study was complete, but they would follow the proper procedures during construction.

### **III. For the Good of the City**

[Index](#)

#### **Continuation of Discussion on “Demolition by Neglect”**

[Board packet included a draft document from Chairman Haan that was composed at the direction of the Board.]

Chair Haan informed the Board he had requested a presentation date to address the City Commission. He said his presentation would include homes they had already lost to demolition by neglect, and homes presently in danger.

Ms. Jordan noted that there were no penalties for demolition by neglect, even though the ordinance specifically required owners of historic properties or landmark sites to maintain interiors and exteriors of structures to prevent deterioration. Chair Haan agreed that Ms. Jordan had identified the issue: there was no mechanism for rectifying the problem. He believed the City must consider following up on these structures,

issuing code violations, interceding to save properties and imposing liens, which he discussed in his document.

Ms. Graff agreed there should be penalties incorporated into the ordinance. Ms. McClellan suggested creating incentives for maintaining historic properties. Mr. Ciesielski said the only current benefit was an ad valorem tax incentive, which only benefited a property owner making a substantial alteration. Chair Haan did not believe an owner whose motive was demolition would respond to incentives. He felt the Board must concentrate on creating language for the ordinance that would prevent demolition by neglect.

Chair Haan reminded the Board that the HPB Chair had approached the City Commission in 2001 about this very issue but no action had been taken. He said they had lost three buildings since then and five more were in danger and he would push the City Commission for action.

The Board discussed the possibility of requiring an owner to rebuild a replica of a structure that was demolished.

Ms. Harrison was concerned about the Dixie Court Project, and asked if the exterior could be preserved while the interior was refurbished. Mr. Jolly said this was possible. Chair Haan informed Ms. Harrison that the building should be presented to the HPB for designation. Mr. Ciesielski informed the Board that a site plan including demolition had already been filed for Dixie Court. He reminded the Board that a project including Dixie Court had been presented to the Board for review and comment twice. He advised the Board that “the problem here is getting ahead of the curve” and suggested Board members contact Ms. Morillo, Ms. Rathbun or himself regarding buildings they felt were worth preserving. Ms. Harrison felt the black areas of the City were being “pushed to the point that they’re getting things they don’t need” in terms of development.

Mr. Ciesielski said he had been contacted by Code Enforcement, who informed him this issue would be put on the City Commission agenda as soon as possible.

Ms. Sarver advised Chair Haan to be specific about their requests for action. Chair Haan stated his documents included nine recommendations.

Ms. Sarver advised the Board to approve the draft Chair Haan had created, and authorize him to present it to the City Commission on behalf of the Board.

**Motion** made by Ms. McClellan, seconded by Ms. Graff, to approve the draft document Chair Haan had created and to authorize him to present his specific recommendations to the City Commission on their behalf. In a voice vote, motion passed 9 – 0.

**Election of HPB Chair and Vice-Chair**

[Index](#)

**Motion** made by Mr. Haan, seconded by Ms. McClellan, to elect Ms. Jordan as Chair. In a voice vote, motion passed 9 – 0.

**Motion** made by Ms. McClellan, seconded by Ms. Harrison, to elect Mr. Haan as Vice Chair. In a voice vote, motion passed 9 – 0.

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 7:23 p.m.

Chairman,

---

Nolan Haan, Chair

Attest:

---

ProtoTYPE Inc, Recording Secretary

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

Minutes prepared by: J. Opperlee, ProtoType Services