

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 2009 - 4:00 P.M.
CITY HALL FIRST FLOOR COMMISSION CHAMBER
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE
FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA**

<u>Board Members</u>	<u>Attendance</u>	Cumulative Attendance 6/2009 through 5/2010	
		<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
Nolan Haan, Chair	P	3	0
Susan McClellan, Vice Chair	P	3	0
Jay Adams [4:10]	P	1	2
Beauregard Cummings	P	2	1
Joyce Gardner	P	2	1
Marie Harrison	A	2	1
Daryl Jolly	A	1	2
Robert Prager	P	2	1
Robert Rojas	P	1	0

City Staff

Assistant City Attorney Carrie Sarver
 Assistant City Attorney Sharon Miller
 Pat Garbe-Morillo, Planning and Zoning Department
 Merrilyn Rathbun, Fort Lauderdale Historical Society, Consultant to HPB
 Michael Ciesielski, Planner II, Planning and Zoning Department
 Yvonne Blackman, secretary
 J. Opperlee, ProtoType Recording Secretary

Communication to the City Commission

None

Index

	Case Number	Applicant	Page
1.	2-H-09 [SB]	Stephen Tilbrook, Dr. Kennedy Homes	<u>2</u>
2.	4-H- 09 [SB]	Nolan Haan	<u>22</u>
		For the Good of the City	<u>23</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

Mr. Haan called the meeting of the Historic Preservation Board to order at 4:04 p.m.

Approval of Minutes of August 2009 Meeting

Motion made by Mr. Prager, seconded by Mr. Cummings, to approve the minutes of the Board's August 2009 meeting. Board approved unanimously.

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

[Index](#)

1. Applicant: Stephen Tilbrook, Dr. Kennedy Homes 2 H 09 (SB)

Owner: Housing Authority of the City of Fort Lauderdale

Request: **	Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Demolition of forty-two (42) structures
Deferred from August 3, 2009 to September 14, 2009	Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Rehabilitation of three (3) structures Certificate of Appropriateness for New Construction <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Construct eight (8) new two to four (2-5) story buildings with a total of one hundred and thirty two (132) residential units.

Legal Description Block 1 of the Dr. Kennedy Homes Project, PB 15, P 70.

Address: 1004 West Broward Blvd.

General Location: South side of W. Broward Blvd. between SW 11th and SW 9th Avenues

District: 4

Chair Haan presented correspondence he had received into evidence and presented copies to Mr. Tilbrook:

- Cultural Resource Assessment Survey created by Janus Research, which was requested by the Broward County Historic Commission and paid for by HUD.
- A letter from James Archer
- Drawings by Charles Jordan
- Photos by Alysa Plummer

Chair Haan stated because of the nature of this case, he would be amenable to allowing speakers additional time.

Motion made by Ms McClellan, seconded by Ms. Gardner, to allow speakers additional time. Board unanimously approved.

[Mr. Adams arrived at 4:10]

Ms. Morillo stated this was a request for three Certificates of Appropriateness. One was for Demolition of 42 structures; the second was a COA for Alteration of three historic buildings, and the third was a COA for New Construction of eight two to five-story buildings with 132 residential units.

Ms. Morillo advised the Board to consider whether the request met one or more of the three criteria for demolition listed in Section 47-24.11.C.4.c. i.-iii. and also the General Criteria for a Certificate of Appropriateness listed in Section 47-24.11. C.3.c.i. a. thru f. of the ULDR when considering whether to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition. Ms. Morillo added that General criteria for a COA for Alteration included Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.I. a through f and the additional guidelines in Section 47-24.11.C.3.ii.a-h and iii a-j for alterations and new construction.

Ms. Rathbun stated the Historic Preservation Board, in determining the appropriateness of the requested demolition of 42 structures in the Dr. Kennedy Homes project, had a specific task to perform. The applicant and his consultant had raised a number of issues concerning the suitability of the inclusion of the Dr. Kennedy Homes in the Sailboat Bend Historic District [SBHD]. Ms. Rathbun stated this was not pertinent to the Board's task today, but she agreed some clarification might be necessary, since the questions had been raised.

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 a historic architectural or archeological landmark; or
- iii . The demolition or redevelopment project is of major benefit to a historic district

Ms. Rathbun explained that in 1988 the Fort Lauderdale City Commission voted to designate the Sailboat Bend Historic District per Case# 63-R-88; in 1992 the Fort Lauderdale City Commission unanimously approved the designation of an expanded Sailboat Bend Historic District per Case# 5-Z-92, and this latter designation was still in effect today. Ms. Rathbun stated the boundary of the original 1988 Sailboat Bend Historic District was based on a portion of the survey for the Architectural and Historical Survey of Fort Lauderdale: Original Town Limits, by Historic Property Associates, St. Augustine, Florida completed in November 1985.

Ms. Rathbun stated the 1985 survey report contained a recommendation that the existing H-1 District be expanded to include the area west to SW 9th Avenue. The identified section covered the area from SW 7th Avenue west to SW 9th Avenue and south from SW 1st Street to the New River. Another section, outside the original City limits, from SW 9th Avenue west to SW 11th Avenue, south from SW 1st Street to the river was added to the proposed district. The Historic Preservation Board subsequently approved this area as a new historic district in lieu of an addition to the existing H-1 District.

Ms. Rathbun acknowledged that the Dr. Kennedy Homes were not included in the 1988 district designation, nor was anything west of SW 11th Avenue and south of SW 1st Street, including such resources as the 1923 West Side School, and the 1924 Harmon Monument. In 1989 the Sailboat Bend Civic Association, under the Fort Lauderdale Master Plan initiative, hired Andres Duany and Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk to analyze the neighborhood, including the then existing district, [the 1988 district], the Sailboat Bend Historic Village, and to recommend new zoning. After many meetings with the civic association, the consultants' recommendations were included in the historic district study. A statistical analysis was included in the study, which said:

The Buffer Area:

Of the 76 buildings in the buffer area, only 2 are historic, although the 47 Kennedy Homes (62%) are contributing structures, having been built in the style of the 1940s.

Ms. Rathbun said this was the rationale for including the Dr. Kennedy Homes in the expanded, historic district, but the study's terminology raised another problem. The National Trust for Historic Preservation defined a contributing structure as: "Building or structure in historic district that generally has historic, architectural, culture, or archeological significance." The City of Fort Lauderdale's ULDR Section 47-24.11 did

not include the terms “contributing”, “complementary” or even “historic” in its list of definitions. Ms. Rathbun quoted from the ULDR definitions:

10. Historic district. An area designated as a "historic district" by ordinance of the City Commission and which may contain within definable geographic boundaries, one (1) or more landmarks and which may have within its boundaries other properties or structures that, while not of such historic significance, architectural significance, or both, to be designated as landmarks, nevertheless contribute to the overall visual characteristics of the landmark or landmarks located within the historic district.

Ms. Rathbun noted that this definition did not exclude the word “contribute” and in its own way it described the characteristics of those properties which, while not landmarks, were still of value within the district. The National Trust did not define complementary or historic. In the case of the latter, Ms. Rathbun felt that perhaps both the Trust and the City believed that definitions of words such as “historic” or “history” were readily available to the public.

Ms. Rathbun advised that the Board should consider the following at this meeting:
Section 47-24.11.C. 5.d.

- i. The designated property no longer contributes to a Historic District

Ms. Rathbun stated the Dr. Kennedy Homes retained their original historic character. As to what that character might be, and to how it might affect the historic district, the Board should consider the following from the ULDR definitions:

11. Historically worthy. To have a special historical interest or value because it represents one or more periods of styles of architecture typical of the City or because it has value as a part of the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the City.

In the case of the Kennedy Homes, Ms. Rathbun stated according to the Schimberg Center for Housing Studies at the University of Florida, Gainesville, the project was the twentieth out of thirty public housing projects built in the state between 1939 and 1945. The permit for the Kennedy project was pulled in 1941, but by that time the U.S. Congress had refused to extend funding for the United States Housing Authority; with the imminence of WW II, attention turned to the necessity of “defense housing”.

Ms. Rathbun stated a common definition for the word history was a tale or a story. The Dr. Kennedy Homes in their original intent and their use today helped tell the story of Fort Lauderdale. Criterion Section 47-24.11.C. 5.d.i. did not apply

Section 47-24.11.C. 5.d.

- ii. The property or building no longer has significance as a historic architectural or archeological landmark.

Ms. Rathbun said as stated above, the homes and the site did retain their original architectural character, so Criterion ii. did not apply.

Section 47-24.11.C. 5.d

iii The demolition or redevelopment project is of major benefit to a historic district

Ms. Rathbun remarked that the removal of 42 historically worthy structures from an historic district could not be considered of major benefit to the district. The applicant had submitted an application for a COA for alteration to rehabilitate three original structures. Ms. Rathbun said this was not an appropriate mitigation for the loss of 42 historic homes. The project as presented by the applicant could not be built without the demolition of the 42 structures. Demolition of the 42 homes was not recommended.

Ms. Rathbun stated the Dr. Kennedy Homes complex was designed by prominent architects Harold Steward and Steward and Robert Jahelka for the Fort Lauderdale Housing Authority and was the second project built by the Housing Authority. The project was located in the Waverly Place Subdivision on available lots on the south side of Broward Boulevard. Waverly Place was platted in 1911 and by 1939-40 the area was well developed. The West Side School was built in 1923 and the West Side Fire station in 1927. However, building was concentrated in the southern portion of the subdivision along the North Fork of the New River and the vicinity of West Las Olas Boulevard.

Ms. Rathbun said the applicant had also requested a COA for new construction of 134 residential units, in eight buildings that would be two, three and five stories in height. The five-story buildings, at 51 feet, would be built in the Buffer Area along Broward Boulevard. Ms. Rathbun noted the tallest building currently in the buffer area was the City of Fort Lauderdale Police Department Headquarters, at three stories, which was located on Broward Boulevard, west of SW 12th Avenue. The only other building taller than one-story in the Buffer Area was the Salvation Army Worship Center, which rose to 30 feet. Ms. Rathbun stated buildings 51 feet in height were not appropriate in the buffer area. She pointed out that building heights needed to be restricted in the buffer area to avoid an adverse impact on the low-rise structures of the historic district.

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

Ms. Rathbun explained that the applicant's attorney, at the request of Broward County, had commissioned a Cultural Resource Assessment Survey for the Dr. Kennedy Homes. The author of the survey had concluded that the complex was potentially eligible for listing in the National Register as an historic district.

United States Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings.

2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Setting (District/Neighborhood)

Recommended

Identifying, retaining and preserving building and landscape features which are important in defining the historic character of the setting. Such features can include roads and streets, furnishings such as lights or benches, vegetation, gardens and yards,

adjacent open space such as fields, parks, commons or woodlands, and important views or visual relationships.

Retaining the historic relationship between buildings and landscape features of the setting. For example preserving the relationship between a town common and its adjacent historic houses, municipal buildings, historic roads, and landscape features.

Not recommended

Altering those features of the setting that are important in defining the historic character. Altering the relationship between the buildings and landscape features within the setting by widening existing streets, changing landscape materials, or constructing inappropriately located new streets or parking.

Ms. Rathbun explained that the Dr. Kennedy complex had forty-five houses, of one or two stories, arranged in a grid pattern on an 8.5-acre parcel. The grid, which was formed by interior pathways, separated the houses into groups of two, three, four or seven buildings. Within the house groups were common back yards forming individual compounds within the larger complex. The Kennedy Homes grid was compatible with the larger grid formed by the streets of the neighborhood.

Ms. Rathbun reported the applicant was requesting a COA for a site plan that had no reference to the SBHD neighborhood street grid. She described the site plan of the project: eight multi-story apartment buildings were clustered in an asymmetric pattern with two large interior parking lots having 149 spaces in total. Curvilinear paths ran from the buildings to the surrounding streets and the interior parking lots.

Ms. Rathbun described building number 1 as a five-story L-shaped structure to be built at the northeast corner on what was now an empty lot. The building would be 163 feet, 7 inches in length on the north elevation and 174 feet, 1 inch on the east elevation. There would be 42 one-bedroom apartments for seniors in this building, it would have an elevator and such amenities as a first floor community room and a laundry room on four of the floors. On the west, building number 1 faced one of the two proposed interior parking lots, which would have 89 spaces.

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.

a. The height of the proposed building shall be visually compatible with adjacent buildings to relationship with the buildings to the heights of the front elevation should be visually compatible.

Ms. Rathbun said the applicant had stated that 57% of the site would be left as open space in the proposed plan. On the site plan green space was described as “park & recreation space, community space, and community open space”. Aside from a fenced playground near the western parking lot, some benches and bike racks near the pathways, there were no park facilities and no indication of how the community might use this open space.

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.

e. The relationship of a building to open space between it and adjoining buildings shall be visually compatible to buildings and places to which it is visually related.

Ms. Rathbun stated building number 2 would be sited to the west of the aforementioned parking lot and has a compound plan that was basically an L shape with projections. This would be an elevator building, five stories in height with 28 units of either two or three bedrooms. The remaining six structures proposed for the site were walk-up buildings of either two or three stories, having 62 units in total. Ms. Rathbun explained the project architects had proposed a cross shaped footprint for buildings 3, 4 and 6, 7 and 8; these buildings were arranged about the 60-space western parking lot, which would have vehicular access to Palm Avenue.

Ms. Rathbun stated Building number 5 would be a three-story building located to the south of the eastern parking lot at the corner of SW 9th Terrace and SW 2nd Street. Building 5 would be 200 feet long on the eastern elevation. Buildings 5, 6, 7 and 8 were sited on the lot canted to the northeast.

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.

iii. General

J. A building shall be visually compatible with the buildings and places to which it is visually related and its directional character, whether this be vertical character, horizontal character or non-directional character.

Ms. Rathbun stated the applicant proposed to retain three of the original cottages, called in the plan buildings 9, 10 and 11. They would remain on their original sites along Palm Avenue. Building 9 would be reconfigured as offices and a mailroom. The

other two cottages would be reconfigured to serve as a break room, library, computer area and small kitchen in building 10, and an exercise room and a small laundry in building 11. Aside from the amenities to be offered in building 1 to senior residents, these would be the only community facilities on site.

Ms. Rathbun stated the former director of the Fort Lauderdale Housing Authority, William "Bill" Lindsey had a formula for dealing with urban blight. In a 1982 article the Miami Herald reported that Lindsey's ideas were, "...use what's already there. If it's an old building it's cheaper to repair it than tear it down", and... "Don't let any building, new or old revert to a slum."

Ms. Rathbun reported the buffer zone for the SBHD was essentially those lots from the North Fork of the New River east to SW 7th Avenue between W Broward Boulevard and SW 1st Street. The northern portion of the Dr. Kennedy Homes parcel was in the buffer zone, but the southern portion of the parcel extended south to SW 2nd Street. She said the site was physically within the historic district, and that would not change.

Ms. Rathbun stated that unlike the side gabled, masonry vernacular Dr. Kennedy homes, which were compatible in size and mass with the vernacular homes of the SBHD; the proposed project would lead to an increased and detrimental structural mass in a designated historic district, a sensitive cultural resource, which the City, by ordinance, was pledged to protect. The original grid pattern of the Dr. Kennedy complex, which was compatible with the grid pattern of the SBHD, would be destroyed if the applicant's plan were implemented. The proposed site plan, if implemented, would create an intrusion in the neighborhood that was not compatible with the SBHD. The Certificates of Appropriateness for Alteration and New Construction should be denied.

Mr. Steve Tilbrook, attorney for the applicant, introduced the members of the applicant's team. He explained the Housing Authority of the City of Fort Lauderdale was the developer, in partnership with Carlisle Development Group. The designer was the Glavovic Studio.

Mr. Tilbrook gave a PowerPoint presentation on the project, a copy of which is attached to the minutes for the public record.

Mr. Tilbrook stated the Housing Authority of the City of Fort Lauderdale had been established in 1936 by the City Commission pursuant to Florida statutes and federal law to solve the problem of providing better living standards during the 30s and 40s when living standards were considered poor in many of the communities. The Housing Authority was governed by a board of commissioners and was a quasi-public entity. The Housing Authority's mission was to assist low-income families with safe, decent and affordable housing opportunities as they strove to achieve self-sufficiency and improve their lives.

Mr. Tilbrook agreed there were many interests involved in this project, and he thought they had done a good job of balancing these interests.

Existing conditions

Mr. Tilbrook informed the Board that Dr. Kennedy Homes were built in the early 1940s and it represented a partnership between the City of Fort Lauderdale, the Housing Authority and the federal government to solve the problem of substandard housing. They believed this project continued to recognize this partnership and revitalized the purpose of providing better housing.

Mr. Tilbrook described the site, and stated it was zoned RMM-25, which permitted 25 units per acre and 55 feet of building height. He explained there were currently 132 units on the site, and limited parking. The income target for the site was low to very low income, and this same population would be served by the new project.

Mr. Tilbrook noted the setbacks were substandard on the site; Broward Boulevard, 11th Avenue and 9th Avenue setbacks were 5 to 7 feet. He stated the existing units were very small, and one of the challenges of this project was to provide better living standards and bigger units, particularly in the kitchen areas.

Mr. Tilbrook said the Housing Authority recognized that the 1940s World War II era housing was substandard and they had taken a policy direction to improve that housing. In order to do this, they had considered all opportunities including funding sources. The Authority had undertaken an engineering/builder's assessment of the existing facilities on the site and Mr. Tilbrook entered into evidence the engineering report from HSQ Engineering and a report from Blue Stream Builders regarding code deficiencies and challenges at the site. Mr. Tilbrook summarized these challenges: set backs were approximately 5 feet, where 25 feet was required; there was no access for fire and emergency vehicles; there were ADA compatibility issues; there was drastically insufficient parking and loading opportunities on site; hurricane protection was substandard; electrical/plumbing/structural systems were insufficient, as well as fire prevention and life safety systems; lighting, landscaping and drainage were below flood elevation.

Mr. Tilbrook stated it was practically impossible to remodel the existing facilities and to comply with code; even if it were possible, the cost would be astounding. The Housing Authority had found a private developer/partner, the Carlisle Group, to help them seek funding and manage the redevelopment process.

Mr. Tilbrook said other goals of the redevelopment were: to achieve historic compatibility with the Sailboat Bend historic district, to provide sufficient parking and

amenities to improve the quality of people's lives, to preserve green space and trees, to increase setbacks and create a safe environment for residents. Mr. Tilbrook said their intent was to replace the 132 units with 132 units, to significantly increase the amount of parking and to provide significant open space.

Mr. Tilbrook stated all current residents would have an opportunity to return to Dr. Kennedy homes when it was completed at the same rent they were currently paying, and they would also be provided temporary housing during redevelopment.

Mr. Tilbrook said they had gone through the development review committee process, and after the project was presented to the Historic Preservation Board, the next step was the Board of Adjustment for a variance for adaptive reuse and a parking reduction.

Architectural Plan and Design

Ms. Margi Nothard, Glavovic Studio, referred to the guidelines in Section 47-17.2, that stated projects would be reviewed for harmony, compatibility and appropriateness, and that the guidelines' purpose was not to require particular architectural features or dictate architectural styles. The guidelines also permitted the use of contemporary designs and materials, if used in a manner compatible with a sense of the past being preserved. Economic feasibility and durability of the proposed improvements along with visual harmony were primary concerns. Ms. Nothard stated these ideas had been taken into consideration during the design process.

Ms. Nothard showed photos of the existing project and noted to the north was the Broward Boulevard corridor with commercial buildings; to the west was a range of commercial two and three-story multi-family and single-family buildings; to the south was a range of institutional and residential buildings from one to three-story; to the east were mostly institutional buildings ranging from one to three stories in height.

Ms. Nothard acknowledged it was a challenge to meet the intent and purpose of the guidelines to relate with harmony, compatibility and appropriateness to the context of this area.

Ms. Nothard said the project aimed to be quality-sensitive, design oriented, affordable housing with the following goals: provide links to the history and social fabric of Sailboat Bend; provide pedestrian transit connections; create a gateway connection; create a strong urban edge to Broward Boulevard; create discrete communities within the community: the family court yard community, the urban family community and the senior community; maintain an open space priority.

Ms. Nothard stated they sought to integrate the multifamily housing community and the historic district of Sailboat Bend by enhancing both communities in the larger context of a gateway, which was evident on the corner of Broward Boulevard and Palm Avenue.

Ms. Nothard described the proposed site plan, and noted that the promenade was a way to integrate the new buildings, the existing buildings and the Sailboat Bend community.

Ms. Nothard described the proposed project and pointed out design components such as: the walkways and promenade leading to the bus stop, front porches; canopies and overhangs to modulate and reduce the scale of the architecture; single-depth design allowing for cross ventilation; inclusion of a central space for families to gather. She noted how the site incorporated different design components in order to integrate with the adjacent communities.

Adaptive Reuse

Mr. Terence O'Connor, Glavovic Studio, explained that three of the units would be maintained to provide common services for the residents. This was done in order to maintain a representation of the "place" of Dr. Kennedy Homes as they were at the entrance to Sailboat Bend; to maintain the characteristic intimacy of scale and site planning of the original project; to strengthen the link between the new and old and to imbue the buildings of obsolete functional limitations with new program, permitting contemporary standards of use and occupation.

Mr. O'Connor explained the buildings would have new impact-resistant windows installed and the stucco would be repaired. The railings would be removed and proper ADA access would be incorporated into the existing buildings using grading. The roofs would be replaced with cement tile, which was their original material.

Landscape

Mr. Fred Stresau, Landscape Architect, explained that they would remove 117 of the 250 existing trees, and 98% of those would be replaced one-for-one or would not be replaced because they were graded Class C or D. Code required 250 trees on the site and the landscape plan included over 400 trees. Mr. Stresau had selected approximately 23 of the larger trees on site that were worth saving and would be used in the pedestrian areas or along Broward Boulevard.

Certificates of Appropriateness Guidelines/Criteria

Mr. Tilbrook stated they had undertaken a Cultural Resource Assessment Survey at the request of Broward County, which had helped them to understand the site's value. He

believed the issue was how this value was perceived and how the value was managed to come forward with a meaningful project, which respected the value of the site and accomplished the mission to provide better housing. Mr. Tilbrook said the value of this site was attributed to the way this community historically solved the problem of providing better housing at the time it was built. At this point the homes were past their useful life and no longer accomplished their original objective. Mr. Tilbrook said they intended to respect the history of this site by solving the housing problem in a new era.

Mr. Tilbrook read from the criteria for a Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition: the designated landmark, landmark site or property within historic district no longer or does not contribute to an historic district. He stated their Historic Preservation Consultant would testify that the Dr. Kennedy Homes were not part of the Sailboat Bend neighborhood, but were a distinct neighborhood unto themselves. They were not connected architecturally or by use, and therefore were not contributing to the distinct neighborhood that was Sailboat Bend.

Mr. Tilbrook entered the resume of their Historic Preservation Consultant, Ellen Uguccione, into the record and stated she was an architectural historian, with the qualifications to look at resources, identify cultural value and determine the best way to recognize and preserve cultural value. Mr. Tilbrook entered Ms. Uguccione's report regarding the Kennedy Homes contributing status into evidence.

Ms. Uguccione said one thing that was very important to her was to look at the end results of the objective. She felt the question of whether or not the Kennedy Homes were part of Sailboat Bend Historic District was the seminal question in this argument. Ms. Uguccione stated in the code of federal regulations, a district was defined as "geographically definable, possessing concentration, linkage continuity and are united." She said Sailboat Bend Historic District comprised mostly single-family homes, and the period of significance was 1890 to 1940, and she wondered how a group of affordable housing projects that were basically the same could be linked to Sailboat Bend.

Ms. Uguccione said the City's ordinance did not address "contributing buildings," but the federal criteria considered contributing buildings as those that were present during the period of significance. Non-contributing buildings were those that did not have anything to do with the basic district. Ms. Uguccione stated the Kennedy Homes were not mentioned much in reports regarding Sailboat Bend, and Andres Duany and Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk had determined in the Master Plan for the area that the Kennedy Homes should be a buffer. Ms. Uguccione agreed this made sense, in order to protect Sailboat Bend from the Broward Boulevard commercial corridor.

Ms. Uguccione said she did not take the word demolition lightly, and this was an opportunity to look at what they wanted to achieve against what was being proposed for the community.

Ms. Uguccione admitted that when she had first seen the Kennedy Homes, she recognized that they were quaint, despite the fact that she had “wanted to hate them.” She pointed out that these were not owner-occupied houses; they were rentals for lower to moderate-income people which they would continue to be in the new project.

Ms. Uguccione concluded that Kennedy Homes should not be included in Sailboat Bend. She quoted from the Sailboat Bend Historic District Report, “We have chosen 1940 as the terminal year because World War II interrupted development and the structures built during the postwar development are markedly different from those of the prewar years.” She stated this indicated an acknowledgment that the Kennedy Homes were very different.

Mr. Tilbrook concluded that the Kennedy Homes were not contributing to the historic district for four reasons: they were built after the Sailboat Bend Historic District period of significance that ended in 1940; they were located outside the original historic district boundaries as defined by the historic survey; they had repetitive design, which was not consistent with the diverse and eclectic styles of the district, and Sailboat Bend was a working-class single-family oriented neighborhood, whereas Kennedy Homes was a multifamily public housing development oriented to a commercial Boulevard corridor.

Mr. Tilbrook said the request was for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration for the three buildings along 11th Ave that would be adapted for re-use. The code indicated that the Board shall consider: the relationship between such work and other structures and property in the historic district; the historic significance, architectural style, textures, materials and colors of the landmark or property and how they will be affected by the alteration; the distinguishing original qualities or character of a structure and all buildings structures etc. shall be recognized as a product of their own time.

Ms. Uguccione said the fact that the architects were leaving three of the original buildings indicated their recognition that this was a complex and the buildings had a relationship to one another. She noted the back of the buildings would have larger openings after rehabilitation, and she believed that the changes were small enough not to affect the basic integrity of the buildings.

Mr. Tilbrook concluded that the Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration should be granted because: the restoration was consistent with the Secretary of the Interior standards for restoration; the restored buildings maintained their relationship with the original structured in the historic district and the distinguishing architectural quality of these buildings would not be destroyed.

Mr. Tilbrook stated the third request was for a Certificate of Appropriateness for new construction. He read from the criteria: the Board should consider the relationship of a

building to open space between it and adjoining buildings, which shall be visually compatible to the building and places to which it is related; the relationship of the materials, textures and color of the façade of a building shall be visually compatible with the predominant materials in the buildings to which it is visually related; the size of the building, the mass of the building in relation to open spaces; windows, doors openings porches and balconies shall be visually compatible with buildings and places to which it is visually related, and a building shall be visually compatible with the buildings to which it is visually related in directional character, whether this be vertical character, horizontal character or non-directional character.

Ms. Uguccione said the certificate was necessary for buildings within historic districts and concerned the relationships between buildings that had some common characteristics. She remarked that Sailboat Bend was an eclectic area with designs that expressed Sailboat Bend's growth and evolution. Ms. Uguccione stated Sailboat Bend was a representation of the working-class neighborhood that put Fort Lauderdale on the map and it was significant to memorialize them. Ms. Uguccione remarked that the new Kennedy homes complex would relate to Sailboat Bend because the designs included that same eclectic approach to design.

Mr. Tilbrook concluded that the Certificate of Appropriateness for new construction should be granted because the new construction would be visually and architecturally compatible with the adjacent structures in the Sailboat Bend Historic District. Plans for the new construction complied with the Secretary of the Interior standards, which dictated the old design should not be copied, the new design should interpret and build upon the materials in order to create a new looking project which related to the old; and the architecture should comply with the Sailboat Bend Historic District guidelines.

Redevelopment of Historic Public Housing Sites

Mr. Tilbrook presented into the record a resume and the cover letter from the Cultural Resource Assessment Survey from Ken Hardin, President of Janus Research, and explained Mr. Hardin was a cultural resource management professional.

Mr. Hardin announced that Janus' job in this project was to perform the Cultural Resource Assessment Survey, to look for any archaeological sites or significant historical resources. They had found no archaeological site, and had concluded that in the context of historic public housing projects, the Dr. Kennedy Homes site was national Register eligible. Mr. Hardin continued that they had done a lot of work on this type of cultural resource, and the process began with a determination of whether there was an architectural or historic site that met the eligibility criteria for the National Register of Historic Places. If this was the case, they must determine appropriate treatment of the resource, evaluate the public good and develop possible mitigation options if avoidance was not prudent or feasible.

Mr. Hardin informed the Board that other public housing projects throughout the state were experiencing the same challenges, and they had worked with the City of Tampa Housing Authority in the City of Orlando Housing Authority to evaluate their resources in the context of National Register eligibility and to help them develop mitigation options to conform to federal and state law. Mr. Hardin showed before and after photos of projects in Tampa and Orlando

Mitigation measures

Mr. Hardin stated in their mitigation plans they had included educational videos with interviews with some of the older residents, and had installed markers so people remembered how the sites had been used. He added that rehabilitating some of the structures was a mitigation option.

Mr. Tilbrook read the mitigation they were offering at this site:

- preservation of the site as affordable housing
- preservation of the link to the Housing Authority of the City of Fort Lauderdale
- preservation and restoration of three represented structures on the site in their existing orientation
- inclusion of an historical marker recognizing the value in the history of the site and its residents
- display of an ongoing photographic exhibit of the history of Kennedy Homes in the Sailboat Bend Historic District

Mr. Hardin agreed these mitigation measures were consistent with the way other communities had addressed this question and were appropriate for the site.

Mr. Hardin confirmed that his staff architectural historian had looked at this site and determined the Dr. Kennedy Homes were not contributing structures within the Sailboat Bend Historic District,

Mr. Tilbrook summarized that the mission of the Housing Authority of the City of Fort Lauderdale was to provide better housing and balancing that against the interpretation of preservation guidelines presented a challenge that they believe they had addressed. He stated their mission had been to provide improved housing; to maintain compatibility with the Sailboat Bend Historic district; to preserve green space in a park like setting and to establish a safe and engaging residential community.

Mr. Tilbrook reminded the Board of the standard of review according to Brevard County versus Snyder, that the Board's actions must be confined to the facts and supported by competent, substantial evidence regarding whether or not the applicant had met the burden for the requests.

Chair Haan addressed Ms. Uguccione and said it seemed in her report that she had a conclusion she wanted to reach - that the buildings were not contributing - and she had massaged all of the information to bolster that conclusion. When she mentioned earlier that she "wanted to hate" the buildings, Chair Haan felt this indicated her state of mind.

Ms. Uguccione stated for her report, the first thing she had done was to establish whether or not she felt the Kennedy Homes complex met the criteria to be considered part of the Sailboat Bend Historic District. She agreed the Kennedy Homes complex had character, and was perhaps national register eligible, but she had concluded that it should not be considered part of Sailboat Bend.

Ms. Uguccione agreed that the Kennedy Homes had been included when the historic district was enacted in 1992. Since Ms. Uguccione had argued that the Kennedy homes were not included in early drafts, Chair Haan asked her if it was not the final draft that was important. Ms. Uguccione stated she did not feel it had stood up through the drafts, and there was no defense for having included Kennedy Homes.

Chair Haan pointed out that the civic association, the consultants and the City Commission had spent four years determining the appropriate boundaries, and asked if Ms. Uguccione felt "they all had it wrong." Ms. Uguccione stated they did. Ms. Uguccione informed Chair Haan that the Carlisle Group had paid for her opinion.

Chair Haan felt the project was pre-World War II because the design was begun in the late 30s and the project was completed in 1941. Ms. Uguccione felt it had no relationship to conventions in 1930s designs.

Mr. Tilbrook wanted the Board to ask him their questions and he would determine how they would be answered. Chair Haan stated he had questions for the witnesses. Ms. Sarver informed the Board that the applicant could choose not to respond to the Board's questions. It was acceptable for Mr. Tilbrook to advise how a question should be answered. Chair Haan pointed out that his questions were based upon Mr. Uguccione's report.

Chair Haan asked if Ms. Uguccione was implying that the Kennedy Homes multifamily rented properties were less historically significant than the Sailboat Bend single-family residences. Mr. Tilbrook stated the purpose of Ms. Uguccione's report was to indicate that the Kennedy Homes were not consistent with or contributing to the Sailboat Bend Historic District. Mr. Tilbrook said Ms. Uguccione had distinguished the Sailboat Bend Historic District single-family homes from a public housing complex with repetitive design and a different purpose, in order to demonstrate that Kennedy Homes was not contributing to the Sailboat Bend Historic District. Chair Haan stated he believed that

an historic district should include large expensive historic houses middle-class houses and the low-income rental properties.

Chair Haan quoted from Ms. Uguccione's report, "they are designed without regard for its surroundings, as a self-contained project." He asked if Ms. Uguccione would consider his multifamily apartment building located in the Sailboat Bend a self-contained unit. Mr. Tilbrook said Ms. Uguccione had no knowledge of that building. Regarding this site, Mr. Tilbrook said the Kennedy Homes was a self-contained site oriented toward its own community. He noted that the Sailboat Bend neighborhood had erected roadblocks to control access between Kennedy Homes and the rest of Sailboat Bend.

Chair Haan said Ms. Uguccione had described the style of the Kennedy Homes as "not built for an aesthetic appeal... cookie-cutter, simplistic, stripped down and un-ornamental" and noted that the CRA's Report described buildings as "lacking extraneous aesthetic embellishment, yet they still exemplify the modern architectural trends of the time." Mr. Tilbrook stated the purpose of the description was to bolster the conclusion in both the Janus report and in Ms. Uguccione's report that these buildings were not architecturally significant.

Chair Haan asked if Ms. Uguccione would consider 44 of these buildings in a neighborhood to be statistically significant. He felt because there were 44, this was a style that was as valid as Mediterranean Revival, Cracker style or Art Deco. Ms. Uguccione stated in her opinion they Kennedy Homes were a type, not a style. She felt what was significant about the Sailboat Bend Historic District was the diversity of types. In the case of Kennedy Homes they were all the same. She said the relationship must be more than numbers; it must be an integral relationship, which she did not believe Kennedy Homes shared with Sailboat Bend.

Chair Haan stated according to the CRS report, the value of the Kennedy Homes was its entirety, the fact that 44 still existed as they had in 1941. Mr. Tilbrook said his interpretation was that the homes were not individually significant or valuable; their value was in their relationship to the Housing Authority of the City of Fort Lauderdale and what they represented: that community's joint solution for solving the problem of providing safe, clean, decent housing for people who could not afford other housing.

Ms. McClellan remarked the project was beautiful. For the Board, it was a fact that this was a part of the Sailboat Bend Historic District. It was also true that the owner would remain the same. Ms. McClellan said the most interesting part of the project to her was the manipulations of the historic buildings to bring out their character. Ms. McClellan asked how the Board could believe that what was shown on the renderings would remain. Mr. Tilbrook stated the project's past was as public housing, owned and operated as a federal public housing project by the Housing Authority. The future of the project was that it would be the product of a redevelopment partnership between the

Housing Authority and the Carlisle Development Group, and that it would be financed by tax credit financing. The underwriters of the tax credit financing required that professional management manage these facilities at a higher level than the standard public housing project.

Mr. Tilbrook said one condition of the underwriting was that there would be a capital fund set aside for maintenance and capital upgrades. He pointed out that the capital cost of maintaining this facility was a drain on the Housing Authority budget; it did not generate sufficient revenue through subsidies or rent to cover operational costs. There must be a change in model, or the project could no longer continue to serve this purpose because the federal government did not allow the Housing Authority to subsidize the operation of Dr. Kennedy Homes through other projects any longer.

Ms. McClellan asked if any studies have been done of the existing buildings to determine if anything could be done with the existing grid to create something new with parts of the project. Mr. Tilbrook said there had been a thorough analysis of the existing buildings to determine whether they could be preserved and brought up to current housing standards. Mr. Tilbrook stated their analysis had determined that they could only achieve approximately 91 new apartments within the existing buildings, and the costs would be significant. They had not analyzed how the buildings could be re-oriented.

Mr. Adams remarked it was a shame that there was not federal funding available for rehabilitating existing structures. Mr. Tilbrook said there was some money available, but their analysis had determined there was not enough money available to fix up the Housing at this site to achieve what they felt these residents are entitled to.

Ms. McClellan remembered this area from her childhood because it was such a change from the surrounding commercial development. Ms. McClellan felt the building that would be located on the northeast corner for seniors would be on the noisiest section of the site. Mr. Tilbrook said this building would not be exclusively for seniors, but noted that elderly residents preferred being in a their own community. They would also have access to their own amenities and clubhouse.

Mr. Cummings remarked that Fort Lauderdale did not have an excellent history of providing affordable housing for blacks. He remembered as a child being excited when Dixie Court was being built because he had nothing with which to compare it. He said the Dr. Kennedy Homes was no different from any project anywhere in the country, but he felt the proposed project had some architectural vision and consideration for the aesthetics of the community.

Mr. Cummings asked his fellow Board members, what historic value the Kennedy Homes provided. Chair Haan said Kennedy Homes provided a snapshot of the City in

the early 1940s. He said the Board's job was to determine whether or not this request satisfied the criteria for demolition and construction, regardless of whether or not Board members liked the old version or the new version.

Mr. Tilbrook reminded the Board that they must vacate the room soon, and asked if public comment would take place before then.

Chair Haan remarked that this was "probably the most important case that the Historic Preservation Board has ever heard in its existence."

Chair Haan pointed out that when Ms. Nothard had addressed the criteria for Certificates of Appropriateness in her report, she had left out a critical sentence: "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." Chair Haan reminded Ms. Nothard that one could not use new construction as a basis to compare a proposed building, and noted that every one of her references and photos referenced new construction.

Chair Haan drew Ms. Nothard's attention to the graphic provided by Mr. Jordan and asked if she believed the new construction was compatible in size, mass and scale with even the largest residential building in Sailboat Bend.

Ms. Sarver stated a Board member could not enter items into evidence. Chair Haan said this was one of the documents that had been sent to him from neighborhood residents that he had submitted into evidence at the beginning of the meeting. Chair Haan reminded Ms. Sarver that he had solicited her opinion on this the previous week and he had never received a reply. Ms. Sarver said during a resident's presentation, he or she could submit something into evidence, but a Board member could not present this into evidence on his or her behalf. Ms. Sarver stated evidence should be submitted by a resident to the liaison to present to the Board, it should not be presented to a Board member to submit into the record. Board members were present to render a decision based upon evidence presented to them. Chair Haan said this was the way it had been done for years. Mr. Tilbrook stated, "I'll observe that there appears to be more of a party status on behalf of one of the Board members and that they don't have an impartial perspective and I consider it questionable whether they're able to sit as a trier of fact on this particular case."

Chair Haan said his question was to ask Ms. Nothard how she justified a five-story building when the highest historic building in the neighborhood was only two stories. Mr. Tilbrook said along Broward Boulevard, all adjacent properties were commercial businesses or B-1 zoning category with a 150-foot height restriction. The height limit in the RMM-25 district was 55 feet. In the Sailboat Bend neighborhood master plan, this

buffer zone was identified as two blocks deep, and it indicated that 50 feet was the appropriate building height in this buffer zone.

Chair Haan said even though the RMM-25 zoning allowed 55-foot building heights, the historic overlay took precedence. The overlay dictated new construction must be compatible in size, scale and mass with other historic buildings in the neighborhood.

Mr. Rojas said if everyone in Mr. Tilbrook's group expressed an opinion that the buildings were insignificant, why did they feel compelled to save any of the buildings. Mr. Tilbrook explained it was their position that the Dr. Kennedy Homes were not contributing structures in the Sailboat Bend Historic District, but they acknowledge that the complex had certain value within the City's cultural history. He said one of the mitigation factors that was typically requested when a National Register eligible site was impacted was to try to incorporate one or more of the buildings into the larger project. This was their intention with this application. Mr. Rojas said leaving the three structures did not support the applicant's case for creating a new properly designed development. They were trying to incorporate something they were saying was not worthwhile. Mr. Rojas felt this project would separate the residents by putting them into a typical project again. He believed they should start thinking about incorporating low-income people into their communities instead of isolating them.

Ms. Nothard pointed out that the promenade space in between the rehabilitated buildings and the new buildings was a great urban space that would link the rehabilitated buildings. They anticipated that the Sailboat Bend community and the Kennedy Homes residents would find each other and spend time together. Ms. Nothard saw this is a "positive creation that looks towards the future and hearkens back to a past."

Ms. McClellan said the Kennedy Homes was a part of the history of growing up in Fort Lauderdale. Mr. Cummings said to him this was a representation of segregated housing. He said he had been forced to move out of Fort Lauderdale because there was no available housing for him and his children.

Ms. McClellan felt there was a danger in falling in love with the renderings. She wondered if this would become the new definition of affordable housing and if it would become a piece of history for residents.

Mr. Prager said this was not just affordable housing; it was a very nice complex. He remarked that Dixie Court was as pretty as this rendering. Mr. Prager felt this would be a real asset to the historic district. He believed that Kennedy Holmes was historic, but pointed out that one of their criteria was they could consider the project's benefit to the community.

Ms. Morillo announced the meeting would continue on October 5 at 5 p.m.

The meeting ended at 6:58 because another meeting was scheduled in the Commission chamber.

[Index](#)

2. Applicant: Nolan Haan

4 H 09 (SB)

Owner: Nolan Haan

Request: * * * Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition

- **To demolish a single family residence**

Legal Description: Bryant Subdivision, Block 22, Lot 14, PB 1, P. 29.

Address: 725 SW 2nd Court

General Location: Between SW 7th and 8th Avenues

District: 4

Case automatically deferred to the Board's next meeting.

II. For the Good of the City

[Index](#)

III. Communication to the City Commission

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