

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE
MONDAY, AUGUST 4, 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>
Susan Jordan, Chair	P	2	0
Nolan Haan, Vice Chair	P	2	0
Jay Adams [5:09 – 6:05]	P	1	1
Andy Cole [5:09]	P	1	1
Beauregard Cummings	P	2	0
Joyce Gardner	P	2	0
Mary-Jane Graff	P	2	0
Marie Harrison	P	2	0
Daryl Jolly	P	2	0
Susan McClellan	A	1	1
Robert Prager	P	2	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

	Case Number	Applicant	Page
1.	13-H-07	City of Fort Lauderdale	<u>2</u>
2.	3-H-08- (H-1)	Art Bengochea	<u>5</u>
3.	7-H-08- (SB)	John & Terry Behal	<u>7</u>
		For the Good of the City	<u>9</u>

Purpose: Implement the City's historic preservation regulations, which promote the cultural, economic, educational and general welfare of the people of the City and of the public generally through the preservation and protection of historically or architecturally worthy structures.

Call to Order

Chair Jordan called the meeting of the Historic Preservation Board to order at 5:02 p.m.

Approval of Minutes of July 2008 Meeting

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

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

Chair Jordan advised Board members to make motions after the Board discussed an item, the applicant and public had spoken and rebuttal offered. Ms. Sarver explained that this diverged from the formal Robert's Rules of Order for meetings, but the Board could agree to make motions after discussion. She noted that it was permissible for a Board member to make a motion at any time. Ms. Sarver reminded the Board that motions were always made in the affirmative.

I. Cases

[Index](#)

1) Case No.13-H-07

Applicant: City of Fort Lauderdale

Owner: City of Fort Lauderdale

Location: SW 11 th 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 Bridgetender 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 reported this was a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness [COA] for Alteration and a COA for New Construction for a Bridge Tender House.

Ms. Morillo advised the Board that in addition to considering the SBHD Material and Design Guidelines as 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., 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 Alteration. Regarding the Bridge Tender House, Ms. Morillo advised the Board to also consider the General Criteria for a COA in Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.i., as well as the Criteria for New Construction in Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.iii.a-j.

Ms. Rathbun stated the applicant was asking for a COA to make needed repairs to the historic Snow-Reed Swing Bridge and to construct a new tender house. The bridge was erected in 1925 to serve the Waverly Place (Sailboat Bend) and Riverside Park neighborhoods.

Ms. Rathbun continued that the applicant was asking to replace some steel members of the truss bridge and swing span because of corrosion, localized cracking, heavy section loss, fatigue and pitting. In addition, the applicant reported the existing retaining walls at the northeast and southwest approaches must be replaced because of heavy deterioration and the existing wooden fender system and catwalk also had deteriorated to the point where they had become unsafe and must be replaced.

Ms. Rathbun said the applicant had requested a COA to upgrade the windows and frames of the existing tender house to meet new code standards. The windows would be replaced with hurricane resistant windows. Because the existing tender house had no room for controls to operate the bridge, the applicant was also requesting approval for construction of a new tender house to enclose the new controls. Mr. Rathbun noted the following specified materials for the new construction:

Section 47-17.7 Material and design guidelines

B. Materials and designs

1. Exterior building walls
 - a. Materials and finish.
 - ii. wood – clapboard,
 - iv. Other – Hardiplank for new construction
2. Windows and doors
 - a. Materials
 - i. glass
 - iv. aluminum
 - b. Configurations
 - ii. windows rectangular,;
 - c. Operations

- i. windows; single and double hung;
- 3. Roofs and gutters
 - a. Roof materials
 - vii. Fiberglass and asphalt shingles.
 - 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.

Ms. Rathbun stated the requested materials were appropriate, and recommended approval of the applicant's requests.

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

Mr. Henry Sinson, architectural consultant, explained they would rebuild the tender house on the same footprint and add another structure for the control room. Mr. Sinson stated he did not have a view looking north but he had a site plan describing the relationship between the existing house and the new structure.

Mr. Jaime Barreto, City Engineering Division, explained the new structure would have a better view of boat traffic. Ms. Rathbun did not believe the changes would have a negative impact on the existing, historic building.

Mr. Jolly suggested the Board require the tender house roof to be restored to its original form. Mr. Barreto said the roof replacement had been approved by the HPB at the time. Mr. Barreto said there were no records indicating the original roof construction.

Mr. Haan did not feel the Board should make this a condition of approval and impose the responsibility on the applicant. Mr. Jolly said he agreed with this opinion only in the case of private development, but this was a City project.

Mr. Prager did not feel the construction of the new control building was appropriate and thought it ruined the charm of the existing tender house.

Mr. Barreto did not object to installing whatever type of roof the Board deemed appropriate. Mr. Rathbun reported a standing-seam metal roof, as specified in the Sailboat Bend guidelines, would be acceptable.

Motion made by Mr. Jolly, seconded by Mr. Prager, to approve the COA for alteration, on condition that a standing seam metal roof be installed on the existing tender building to make it compatible with other neighborhood structures. In a roll call vote, motion passed 10 – 0.

Mr. Sinson described the components of the new building, and Mr. Barreto explained the new building was designed to reflect the existing building.

Chair Jordan asked why the existing tender house could not be enlarged instead of constructing a new control house. Mr. Barreto said they had done this to preserve the existing tender house as an historical structure. Mr. Sinson reiterated that the new building would house the control equipment and allow the tender to operate the bridge from an indoor, safe environment instead of having to go outside to open the bridge.

Mr. Cummings felt enlarging the existing building would detract from the historical value, and building a control building next to it would distort the value and the Board must decide between the two.

Ms. Rathbun said there had been discussions regarding preservation of the bridge. If the City wanted to preserve the bridge, they must upgrade it, and the Board should consider this. Mr. Barreto said most of the project involved mechanical and electrical work on the bridge. Mr. Sinson stated there were serious safety, structural and mechanical issues the project would address.

Motion made by Mr. Haan, seconded by Mr. Jolly, to approve the COA for new construction, on condition that a standing seam metal roof be installed on the control room building to make it compatible with other neighborhood structures. In a roll call vote, motion passed 10 – 0.

[Index](#)

2) **Case No. 3-H-08-(H-1)**

Applicant: Art Bengochea

Owner: Martin L. Zisholts

Location: 327-333 SW 2nd St.

Request: Certificate of Appropriateness for Alterations

- Installation of New Windows and Doors
- Addition of a Pizza Oven with Exterior Chimney
- Installation of Awnings

Zoned: H-1, Historic District

Legal: Town of Fort Lauderdale, PB B, 40. Block 17, the south 32 feet of Lot 11, and Lot 12, less the south 20 feet of the most easterly two thirds.

Ms. Morillo announced this was a request for a COA for 1) Installation of new windows and doors and 2) Addition of a Pizza Oven and Exterior Chimney and 3) Installation of new awnings.

Ms. Morillo advised the Board to consider Section 47-16.H-1 and Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.i.a. through f. and 47.24.11.C.3.c.ii. a, when considering whether to grant a COA. She advised the Board to also consider the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Rehabilitation of Historic Buildings when deciding whether to grant a COA for Alterations.

Ms. Rathbun stated the applicant requested a COA for Alterations to a circa 1925 two-story commercial building in the Himmarshee (H-1) Historic District. She noted the building was shown on the 1928 Sanborn fire Insurance Map for the City of Fort Lauderdale as a concrete structure housing two stores, having a wood frame porch extension on the street side. Ms. Rathbun pointed out that the porch no longer existed and a one-story addition had been built on the east side of the building at a later date.

Ms. Rathbun informed the Board that the building had housed a hair salon on the first floor, and the applicant wished to convert the first floor to a restaurant. The conversion would necessitate the redesign of the interior to accommodate the new use. The applicant had asked for a COA to install a chimney for a pizza oven at the rear of the one-story addition, and an exterior door would need to be blocked to accommodate this. A new single-hung window would replace the blocked exterior door and this window would be used as a pass through. On the two-story portion of the building, a first story blocked exterior door on the street elevation would be reopened and a single light French door would be installed. A matching French door would replace one half of an existing storefront window to the right of the first door. Another French door of the same design would be installed on the street façade of the one story addition.

Ms. Rathbun stated that in order to accommodate outdoor dining the applicant planned to install a canvas awning in front of the one-story addition and to the right side of the addition. New eyebrow canvas awnings would also be installed over the storefront windows and at the rear elevation.

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;

Ms. Rathbun stated the construction of the new pizza oven and chimney would not have an impact on the important street façade of the historic building because it would not be visible from the street. She said the oven and new canvas awnings spoke to the adaptive re-use of the building, which was appropriate. Ms. Rathbun noted that doors similar to the requested single light French doors were used in buildings in the 1920s, so the new doors were appropriate. She stated the COA should be approved.

Mr. Art Bengochea, architect, explained the changes to the windows and doors, and agreed to change the style of French door if the Board desired. He stated they also intended to install awnings to provide shade and allow outdoor dining. He presented photos of the existing structure and pointed out the area to be blocked for the chimney, and where the awnings would be added.

Mr. Bengochea informed Mr. Cummings that the awning would enhance the look of the building, and noted Ms. Rathbun had indicated these would be appropriate. Mr. Rathbun agreed that awnings had been used in the 1920s.

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

Motion made by Mr. Adams, seconded by Mr. Jolly, to approve the COA for alteration. In a roll call vote, motion passed 10 – 0.

[Index](#)

3) Case No. 7-H-08-(SB)

Applicant: John and Terry Behal

Owner: John and Terry Behal

Location: 1008 SW 2nd Court

Request: Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration

- Remove Existing Aluminum Siding
- Cover Narrow Gage wood with Stucco

Zoned: RML-25

Legal: Waverly Place 2-19 D, Lots 28 to 30, 31, W 5.30 of N 50 & N ½ of Vacant Alley Abutting above Lot of Block 112.

Ms. Morillo stated this was a request for a COA for Alteration for 1) Removal of existing aluminum siding and 2) Installation of stucco siding.

Ms. Morillo advised the Board to consider the SBHD Material and Design Guidelines as indicated in Section 47-17.7. of the ULDR, 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 47-4.11.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.

Ms. Rathbun stated the house was shown on the 1928 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map for the City of Fort Lauderdale. It was not listed on the Florida Master Site File, but it was considered historic within the SBHD.

Ms. Rathbun informed the Board that the applicants were requesting a COA to remove existing aluminum siding, which was a type of siding not approved in the SBHD, and to cover the original wood siding with stucco. She noted that the applicants had not addressed the possibility of restoring the original siding.

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;

e) Whether the plans may be reasonably carried out by the applicant;

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

United States Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation

Not Recommended

Removing or radically changing wood features which are important in defining the overall historic character of the building so that, as a result, the character is diminished.

Ms. Rathbun remarked that this type of 1920s building with a flat roof and parapet often had original stucco cladding; however examples of this type with original wood siding were built. The applicant did not plan to change the wood siding of the two porches.

Section 47-17.7 Material and design guidelines

B. Materials and designs

1. Exterior building walls

a. Materials and finish.

i. stucco: smooth

Ms. Rathbun advised that stucco was an approved material in the SBHD, but the Board should consider whether this was an appropriate application.

[Mr. Adams left the meeting at 6:05]

Mr. Brian Kitchens, representative of the owners, explained to Chair Jordan that the owners did not want to restore the wood siding under the aluminum because of costs and maintenance. The owners believed the stucco would be historically appropriate and cost effective. Mr. Haan pointed out that the house had been built with the wood siding, and the Board sought restoration.

Chair Jordan believed that they must refer to the Secretary of the Interior Guidelines, which indicated the historic character would be diminished by radically altering features that defined the historic character of the building.

Mr. Kitchens requested the item be tabled until the applicants could be present.

Motion made by Mr. Jolly, seconded by Mr. Cummings, to table this item to September 15, 2008. In a roll call vote, motion passed 9 – 0.

III. For the Good of the City

[Index](#)

Designation of bridge and tender house

Mr. Jolly asked how the Board should proceed to seek designation for the bridge and tender house in Item 1. Ms. Sarver stated the City Manager must approve this.

Mr. Ciesielski and Ms. Morillo confirmed that the bridge was eligible for the National Register and the bridge had local designation. Ms. Morillo stated it was listed in the State Master Site File as the 11th Avenue Bridge and tender house. Mr. Ciesielski and Ms. Morillo agreed to investigate this.

Mr. Haan asked if the City could carve out part of Sailboat Bend and change the zoning so it would no longer be historic. Ms. Sarver said this could be done and would be up to the City Commission to pursue as a zoning change. She was unsure if this would need to be presented to the HPB. She agreed to discuss this with the Planning and Zoning attorney and report back to the Board.

Dixie Court Project

Ms. Harrison was concerned about the Dixie Court project and asked if the exterior could be retained. Ms. Rathbun had investigated this and said there had been a Section 106 review done at the property, which determined there was nothing of significance there. Ms. Rathbun noted there was significance, including the architect who designed the buildings.

Mr. Jolly asked how the Board could intervene in cases such as this. Ms. Morillo said a complete survey of buildings was needed. She explained that the Florida Master Site file was usually consulted first. Since Dixie Court was a public housing complex, it should have been picked up.

Mr. Haan asked about the Section 106 review. Ms. Morillo explained that any project involving public funding or federal licensing triggered a Section 106 review, which was conducted by the Department of the Interior. Privately-funded projects were not subject to Section 106 review. Regarding the Kennedy Homes project, Ms. Morillo stated this was located in the historic district and was on the Florida Master Site File, and should therefore "trigger something." Ms. Sarver cautioned the Board about discussing a case [Kennedy Homes] that would be presented to the HPB.

Mr. Ciesielski clarified page 16, paragraph 5 of the Board's July minutes. Mr. Ciesielski explained that he had been contacted by Code Enforcement, notifying him that the Mayor had received Mr. Haan's letter dated May 23, and that staff would work to get the matter placed on the City Commission agenda after Mr. Haan consulted with the HPB again and the Board reached a consensus. Mr. Ciesielski hoped Mr. Haan could address the City Commission in September. Mr. Ciesielski agreed to send notification to HPB members notifying them of Mr. Haan's appearance at a City Commission conference meeting if this occurred prior to the HPB's September meeting.

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

Chairman,

Susan Jordan, Chair

Attest:

ProtoTYPE Inc, Recording Secretary

Historic Preservation Board
August 4, 2008
Page 11

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>

Minutes prepared by: J. Opperlee, ProtoType Services