HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE MONDAY, OCTOBER 6, 2008 - 5:00 P.M. CITY HALL FIRST FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM 100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA

Cumulative Attendance 6/2008 through 5/2009

	0,=000 000	
Attendance	<u>Present</u>	Absent
Р	4	0
Р	4	0
Α	1	3
Α	2	2
Α	3	1
Р	4	0
Р	3	1
Р	4	0
Р	3	1
Р	3	1
Р	4	0
	P P A A	P 4 P 4 A 1 A 2

City Staff

Assistant City Attorney Ginger Wald
Pat Garbe Morillo, Staff Liaison to the HPB
Merrilyn Rathbun, Fort Lauderdale Historical Society, Consultant to HPB
Jonda Joseph, City Clerk
John Herbst, City Auditor
B. Chiapetta, ProtoType Recording Secretary

Index

	Case Number	Applicant	Page
1.	6-H-08	Jessica Orndoff, Paterson Fence	<u>2</u>
2.	8-H-08 (SB)	Anthony Chiaravalloti	<u>3</u>
3.	9-H-08 (SB)	Oliver Danan	<u>5</u>
		For the Good of the City	<u>8</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 5:00 p.m.

Approval of Minutes of September 2008 Meeting

Motion made by Ms. Harrison, seconded by Mr. Prager, to approve the minutes of the Board's September 2008 meeting. In a roll call vote, Board approved 8 - 0.

Motion made by Ms. Graff, seconded by Mr. Prager, to hear the presentation from the City Clerk and City Auditor first. In a voice vote, Board unanimously approved.

Board members disclosed communications they had regarding cases.

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

I. Cases

1) <u>Case No. 6-H-08</u>

Index

Applicant: Jessica Orndoff, Paterson Fence Owner: Mc Victoria, LLC/ Daniel J. McCarty

Location: 711 NE 17 Road

Request: Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration

Remove Existing Fence on West Side of PropertyInstallation of New Fence on West Side of Property

Zoned: RCS-15

Legal: Victoria Courts, Lot 9, Block 2 and part of the east 1/1 of Vacated

Walk and Park Abutting on the West, P.B. 9, P49.

Deferred from September 15, 2008, to October 6, 2008

Chair Jordan recused herself from this case and Vice Chair Haan took her place as Chair.

Ms. Morillo reported the owner had informed her that the court case had not yet been resolved and the Board could decide whether to defer the item again.

Motion made by Ms. McClellan, seconded by Mr. Prager, to defer this case to the Board's November 3, 2008 the meeting. In a roll call vote, with Chair Jordan abstaining, motion passed 7 - 0.

2) <u>Case No. 8-H-08-SB</u>

<u>Index</u>

Applicant: Anthony Chiaravalloti
Owners: Beverly Belinsky

Address: 1515 SW 1st St. (Arygle)

Request: Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration

• Replace 9 single-hung aluminum windows

Install sliding glass doors

Repair existing clapboard siding

Renovate front porch

Zoned: RML-25

Legal: Amended Plat of River Highlands, Lot 22, Block 6, PB 15, P.69

Ms. Morillo announced this was a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration to install windows and sliding glass doors, repair existing clapboard siding and renovate the front porch.

Ms. Morillo advised the Board that in addition to considering the SBHD Material and Design Guidelines in Section 47-17.7. of the ULDR, they should also consider the General Criteria for a COA in Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.i. a through f as well as the Additional criteria for alterations in Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.ii, when deciding whether to grant the COA for the Alterations.

Ms. Rathbun stated the house was located in the River Highlands, which remained largely undeveloped until the late 1940s or 1950s and noted that most properties in this subdivision were not considered historic in the district.

Ms. Rathbun informed the Board that the applicant had requested a COA for alteration that included replacement of all windows, installation of hurricane shutters, replacement and relocation of front entry, installation of sliding glass doors at the rear of the property, restoration of existent siding and stuccoing of one elevation wall. The applicant also wanted to increase the parking area to accommodate two cars.

Ms. Rathbun said the applicant had requested the following materials:

Section 47-17.7 Material and design guidelines

- B. Materials and designs
 - 1. Exterior building walls
 - a. Materials and finish.
 - i. Stucco: float finish, smooth
 - ii. Wood clapboard, three and one-half (3 ½) inches to (7) inches to the weather:
 - 2. Windows and doors
 - a. Materials

- i. glass (...non-reflective, tinted
- ii. translucent glass
- iv. aluminum
- b. Configurations
 - ii. windows square, rectangular,;
- c. Operations
 - i. windows; single hung; fixed with frame; sliders (rear and side only):
- d. General
 - i. wood shutters
 - vi. Screened windows
- 3. Roofs and gutters
 - 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.

Ms. Rathbun stated the requested materials were appropriate in the SBHD.

Mr. Anthony Chiaravalloti, architect, explained this was a renovation of the front porch area that would be more appropriate in the neighborhood. They would also replace the windows and repair the siding. He remarked that they would not change any walls; they would only repair and replace materials.

Mr. Haan asked why the siding would not be consistent. Ms. Beverly Belinsky, owner, explained that this was a cost issue and stucco was less expensive. She informed Mr. Haan that the total cost of the project was approximately \$90,000 and Mr. Haan remarked that the wood siding could be obtained for just a few hundred dollars at Home Depot.

Ms. Graff felt the stucco would detract from the charm of the house. Ms. McClellan explained that it would be less obvious if the change did not occur right at the corner. She favored installing the wood siding all around. Ms. Belinsky agreed to use the wood siding all around.

Ms. McClellan pointed out that the east and west elevations were named improperly on the plans and they also indicated the driveway would be gravel, not pavers. Mr. Chiaravalloti clarified that the driveway would be gravel and the walkway to the driveway would be pavers.

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. Haan, seconded by Ms. McClellan, to approve the COA for alteration including the condition that wood siding [not stucco] be used all around the building. In a roll call vote, motion passed 8 – 0.

3) <u>Case No. 9-H-08-SB</u>

Index

Applicant: Oliver Danan Owner: Jean Duaiv

Location: 1528 SW 1st St. (Arygle)

Request: Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration

• Alterations to existing single family house and construction

of 3 story addition

Zoned: RML-25

Legal: Amended Plat of River Highlands, Lot 14, Block 1, PB15, P. 69.

Ms. Morillo advised that this was a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration to the existing house and for a three-story addition.

Ms. Morillo advised the Board that in addition to considering the SBHD Material and Design Guidelines 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. a through f as well as the Additional criteria for alterations in Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.ii, when deciding whether to grant a COA for the Alterations.

Ms. Rathbun stated the house was located in River Highlands, which was part of the SBHD, but noted that there was relatively little building in that subdivision prior to 1940. This house was first listed in the Fort Lauderdale City Directory in 1970 and was not considered historic in the district.

Ms. Rathbun explained that the applicant planned to add a three-story addition to the existing house and to modify the house elevations to complement the new addition. The applicant had specified the following materials:

Section 47-17.7 Material and design guidelines

- B. Materials and designs
 - 1. Exterior building walls
 - a. Materials and finish.
 - i. stucco: float finish, smooth
 - 2. Windows and doors
 - a. Materials
 - i. glass
 - b. Configurations
 - i. doors: garage nine (9) feet maximum width. Other;
 - ii. windows square, rectangular,

- c. Operations
 - i. windows; fixed with frame; awning; sliders (rear and side only)
- 3. Roofs and gutters
 - a. Roof materials
 - viii. Built-up roof behind parapets
- c. Configurations
 - i. Roof: Flat with parapet

Ms. Rathbun stated the architect/applicant proposed a three-story addition to the rear of the house. The height of the planned addition was just under the maximum allowed in the neighborhood.

Ms. Rathbun informed the Board that the architect described the style of the new addition as "early modernist design of the 1930s". She described the addition features: rounded corners with floor to ceiling plate glass windows, smooth wall surfaces, ribbon windows and a flat roof and noted that the design appeared to be an updated version of the International style.

Ms. Rathbun pointed out that there was a vast difference in style between the original house and the proposed addition and to address this the architect wished to alter the exterior of the old house by extending the existing walls to build a new parapet wall to conceal the existing gable roof. The plans also called for modifying the entry with what was described as a "concrete beam arcade with Plexiglas covering".

Ms. Rathbun remarked that the elevation drawings provided were not very clear. She stated most of the nearby houses in the neighborhood could be described as Modern Minimal Traditional, which included ranch house style.

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.

iii. Additional guidelines; new construction. Review of new construction and alterations to designated buildings and structures shall be limited to exterior features of the structure, except for designated interior portions. In approving or denying applications for certificates of appropriateness for new construction, the board shall also use the following additional guidelines. Where new construction is required to be visually related to or compatible with adjacent buildings, adjacent buildings shall mean buildings, which exhibit the character, and features of designated or identified historic structures on the site or in the designated historic district where the site is located.

i) The size of a building, the mass of a building in relation to open spaces, the windows, door openings, porches and balconies shall be visually compatible with the buildings and places to which it is visually related.

Ms. Rathbun stated this property was not considered historic, and that there were no nearby history properties, but it was located in the SBHD, therefore, it was left to the Board's discretion to approve the application as presented; approve the application with modification or deny the application.

Mr. Oliver Danan, architect, displayed photos of the surrounding buildings. He explained that the addition would be attached to the rear of the house and there was plenty of room on the lot for the addition.

Chair Jordan stated she could not understand the plans regarding what would happen to the existing home. Mr. Danan explained that the existing home would not be altered on the interior, but the gable roof endings would be cut off and the new parapet wall would be installed.

Mr. Danan explained to Ms. McClellan that the new parapet would line up with the roof next door. Ms. McClellan was concerned about the massing in relation to the nearby buildings. Mr. Haan said he found the drawings unintelligible and confusing.

Mr. Haan asked if neighbors were aware of this request. Mr. Jean Duaiv, owner, said he had not spoken to neighbors regarding his plan. Mr. Danan remarked that the massing in the neighborhood was varied, and Mr. Haan said his home was the tallest historic house in the neighborhood at 28 feet, but this request was for 36 feet of visual height. Mr. Danan felt the building was set back far enough from the road that it would have a minimal impact on the neighborhood.

Mr. Haan said he was not comfortable approving projects such as this because there was no historic precedent. The only justification offered for the height was the nearby townhouses. Chair Jordan felt the mass of the project was "way, way too big, way too large for that space."

Mr. Haan remarked that this was a "very interesting building" but said he was not sure it was right for this neighborhood. He explained to Mr. Duaiv that building in the area was governed by the zoning code and also by the historic overlay. Ms. McClellan said this plan was "a little too massive and over scaled, to me, for this neighborhood." Mr. Haan pointed out that the street was "predominantly single-story buildings" and the over 35-foot parapet would be seen from the river and the street.

Ms. Graff agreed that the plan was not appropriate for this location, and felt the neighbors would be upset with it.

Mr. Duaiv asked the Board for suggestions to revise the project. Ms. McClellan advised him to follow the code and to be sensitive to the rest of the neighborhood. Mr. Danan asked if the Board would object to demolishing the house, since it was not historic. Mr. Haan said the Board was concerned with how the house would look in relation to the character of other homes in the area.

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. Danan said they had been unaware the house was in an historic district until they applied for permits, so the design had not that into account. He thought the City should consider ways to make owners aware their homes were in the historic district before plans were developed.

Mr. Duaiv said he had already spent \$30,000 on this project and asked the Board for guidance. Mr. Haan referred Mr. Duaiv to the criteria the Board used to approve projects. He informed him that the neighborhood civic association had a review committee that could advise him as well.

Motion made by Mr. Haan, seconded by Mr. Prager, to approve. In a roll call vote, motion **failed** 0 - 8.

III. For the Good of the City

Index

<u>Charter Amendment Question on City Nov. 4, 2008 Ballot. (City Clerk and City Auditor)</u> [This item was heard out of order]

Ms. Joseph explained that there would be a Charter Amendment question on the November Ballot to allow the City Clerk and City Auditor to hire and supervise their own staff. She encouraged Board members to vote on this item.

Mr. John Herbst explained that he reported directly to the City Commission, allowing independent oversight. He stated his staff must be approved by the City Manager, which hampered his ability to provide total independent oversight. Mr. Herbst said this change would affect management and hiring/firing.

Annie Beck House

Ms. Morillo announced that the Annie Beck house was coming before the City Commission on November 4 for designation. She invited Board members to attend and support the designation.

Historic Preservation Board
October 5, 2008
Page 9

Heritage Tourism Conference

Ms. Morillo informed the Board that there would be a conference regarding Cultural and Historical Preservation Tourism in Delray Beach.

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at **6:12 p.m**.

	Chairman,
Attest:	Susan Jordan, Chair
ProtoTYPE Inc, Recording Secretary	

The City of Fort Lauderdale maintains a <u>Website</u> 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