

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE
MONDAY, JULY 12, 2010 - 5:00 P.M.
CITY HALL FIRST FLOOR COMMISSION CHAMBER
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE
FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA**

<u>Board Members</u>	<u>Attendance</u>	Cumulative Attendance 6/2010 through 5/2011	
		<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
Susan McClellan, Chair	P	2	0
Matthew DeFelice, Vice Chair	P	2	0
Beauregard Cummings [5:03 – 5:48]	P	1	1
Joyce Gardner	A	0	2
Mary Jane Graff	P	1	0
Marie Harrison	P	1	1
Daryl Jolly	A	0	2
David Kyner	P	2	0
Phillip Morgan	P	1	0
Robert Prager	P	2	0
Scott Strawbridge	P	1	1

City Staff

Assistant City Attorney Carrie Sarver
Merrilyn Rathbun, Fort Lauderdale Historical Society, Consultant to HPB
Jenni Morejon, Principal Planner
Mike Ciesielski, Planner II
J. Opperee, ProtoType Inc.

Guests

David Baber, Broward County Historical Commission Administrator
Marc Sever, architect
Kenneth Powell, applicant
James Paras, applicant
Dave Parker, President, Sailboat Bend Civic Association
Alyssa Plummer, Sailboat Bend resident

Communication to the City Commission

By a 7 – 1 voice vote, with Mr. Strawbridge opposed, the Board agreed to recommend that the City Commission approve all currently completed historic resource surveys.

Index

<u>Case number</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. 3 H 10 (SB)	Tiffany Burns, Florida Bearings	3
2. 4 H 10 (SB)	Marc Sever and Kenneth Powell	5
3. 5 H 10 (SB)	West Side School	14
4.	Proposed Amendments to the Historic Ordinance	16
5.	Good of the City	16
6.	Communication to the City Commission	17

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 McClellan called the meeting of the Historic Preservation Board to order at 5:00 p.m.

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

Approval of Minutes of May and June 2010 Meetings

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

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

Board members agreed to hear the items concerning signage first.

Mr. Cummings arrived at 5:03.

Ms. Jenni Morejon, Principal Planner, explained she was filling in this evening for Ms. Morillo and Mr. Fajardo.

1.

[Index](#)

<u>Case Number</u>	3 H 10 (SB)
<u>Applicant</u>	Tiffany Burns, Florida Bearings
<u>Owner</u>	Bruce A. Macchetti
<u>Address</u>	1430 W. Broward Boulevard
<u>General Location</u>	South side of W. Broward Boulevard between SW 2 Street and SW 14 Avenue
<u>Legal Description</u>	<u>Riverland Highlands Amended</u> , Block 6, Lots 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 & 10. Less the North 5 feet for road right-of-way, PB 15, P.29.
<u>Request</u>	Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for Alteration for the installation of one painted wall sign. In addition to considering the SBHD <i>Material and Design Guidelines</i> as indicated in Sec. 47-17.7 of the ULDR, the HPB shall consider both the <i>General criteria</i> for a COA (Sec. 47-24.11.C.3.c.i. a-f) and the additional guidelines for alterations (Sec. 47-24.11.C.3.c.ii.a-h) when deciding whether to grant a COA for Alteration.

Description of Proposed Site Plan:

Ms. Rathbun stated this was an application for a painted wall sign to be installed on a commercial building located on three lots fronting on the south side of West Broward Boulevard. She stated the building was set back on the site with an area of asphalt paving on the front and more asphalt paving to the west of the building. The proposed non-lighted wall sign would be centered on the street-facing wall.

Criteria for Certificate of Appropriateness:

Ms. Rathbun advised that pursuant to ULDR Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.i, in approving or denying applications for COAs for alterations, new construction, demolition or relocation, the HPB shall use the following general criteria:

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

- a) The effect of the proposed work on the landmark or the property upon which such work is to be done.

Consultant Response: This is a modern commercial building that is not historic (contributing) in the Sailboat Bend Historic District (SBHD). This signage is appropriate for the applicant's business.

Ms. Rathbun remarked that the SBHD Materials and Design Guidelines did not specifically address signage; therefore ULDR Section 47-17.7.A was not applicable. In this case, the HPB shall use the following additional guidelines regarding alterations:

Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.ii: Additional guidelines; alterations.

Ms. Rathbun stated in approving or denying applications for certificates of appropriateness for alterations, the Board shall also consider whether and the extent to which the following additional guidelines, which are based on the United States Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, would be met:

ULDR Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.ii

- a) Every reasonable effort shall be made to provide a compatible use for a property that requires minimal alteration of the building, structure, or site and its environment, or to use a property for its originally intended purpose.

Consultant Response: The building use will not change.

ULDR Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.ii

- b) The distinguishing original qualities or character of a building, structure, or site and its environment shall not be destroyed. The removal or alteration of any historic material or distinctive architectural features should be avoided when possible.

Consultant Response: No historic material will be removed.

Ms. Rathbun concluded that the requested sign was less than the allowed maximum signage of 300 square feet. She stated the requested sign was appropriate and should be allowed.

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

Ms. Rathbun informed Mr. Strawbridge that she believed the building was constructed in the 1950s; she had not researched the age of the building. Mr. Strawbridge stated he was "puzzled" that the Board did not have the age research on the building and did not know if it was contributing or not. He felt they should be certain of this prior to granting this application. Chair McClellan disagreed because the building had been used the same way for many years. Mr. Strawbridge remarked that without this information, they were making a subjective decision, which he felt was inappropriate.

Ms. Rathbun stated all buildings in Sailboat Bend had been researched, but this survey had not been approved by the Commission, so the research could not be used at the HPB meetings.

Motion made by Mr. Strawbridge, seconded by Mr. Prager, to approve the request, per ULDR Section 47-17.7, the General criteria for a COA in Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.i. a-f and the additional guidelines in Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.ii.a-h. In a roll call vote, Board approved 9 – 0.

2.

[Index](#)

<u>Case Number</u>	4 H 10 (SB)
<u>Applicant</u>	Kenneth Powell
<u>Owner</u>	Kenneth Powell & James C. Paras
<u>Address</u>	1216 SW 4 Court
<u>General Location</u>	North side of New River between SW 13 th and 12 th Avenues
<u>Legal Description</u>	<u>Waverly Place.</u> Block 103, Lots 7 & 8, PB 2, P. 19.
<u>Request</u>	Certificate of Appropriateness for new construction and a modification to front yard setbacks.

The HPB shall consider the General Criteria for granting Certificates of Appropriateness as listed in Sec. 47-24.3.c.i.a-f, and the criteria for new construction as listed in Sec. 47-24.11.C.3.iii. With respect to the applicant's request for yard modifications, the Board shall consider whether the request for yard reductions will interfere with the light, air, and view of adjacent properties. Additionally, the Board shall consider whether the applicant's request for yard modifications meets at least one of the criteria as listed in Sec. 47-17.5.A.1-4. Since this application is in the Sailboat Bend Historic District (SBHD), the Board shall also consider whether the proposed new construction is compatible with the Material and Design Guidelines for the SBHD as listed in Sec. 47-17.7.

Property Background:

Ms. Rathbun explained that the property was a vacant waterfront lot at 1216 SW 4th Court, located in the Sailboat Bend Historic District. She noted the applicant had submitted a narrative with his application in which he referenced a similar proposal for New Construction on this lot that was approved by the HPB in 2003.

Ms. Rathbun informed the Board that in 2003, a previous owner had come before the HPB with a request for a COA to demolish an existing one-story house on the property. As the house was not considered historic in the district, the Board had approved the request for demolition and the lot was subsequently cleared. At the same 2003 HPB meeting, the previous owner of the property had requested a COA for New Construction of a 2½ story single-family home on the lot.

Ms. Rathbun stated that according to the minutes of that July 7, 2003 HPB meeting, there was concern over the proposed height of the building and an issue of the possible requirement of a one to one stepback for every foot of height over 22 feet. After considerable discussion, Board members had decided that the ordinance was unclear as to whether the stepback was required in the SBHD. Ms. Rathbun reported that the

Board had voted to approve the application with one opposing vote. The 2003 project had not been built and the lot remained vacant.

Description of Proposed Site Plan:

Ms. Rathbun explained that the present applicant had submitted an application asking for a COA for a two-story single-family residence to be built on this vacant waterfront lot. He was requesting a front yard setback reduction to 20 feet from the required 25 feet.

ULDR Section 47-17.5

A. Yards. The Historic Preservation Board may authorize a reduction in yards and minimum distance separation requirements for residences located in RS-8, RML-25 and other residential zoning districts located within the SBHD when the Historic Preservation Board finds a reduction in yards does not interfere with the light, air, and view of adjacent properties and:

1. Reducing the required yard is compatible with the yards or abutting properties and yards across from the yard proposed for reduction.
2. The yards proposed to be reduced are consistent with the yards existing in connection with contributing structures in SBHD

Consultant Response: The lot to the east of this property has a front yard setback of 19.71 feet and the lot to the west of the property has a front yard setback of 22.97 feet. The applicant's request for a reduction to a 20-foot front yard setback is appropriate. This setback in itself will not interfere with the light air and view of the adjacent properties.

Criteria for Certificate of Appropriateness:

Ms. Rathbun stated pursuant to ULDR Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.i, in approving or denying applications for certificates of appropriateness for alterations, new construction, demolition or relocation, the HPB shall use the following general criteria:

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

- a) The effect of the proposed work on the landmark or the property upon which such work is to be done.

Consultant Response: The Board needs to consider the impact of the new construction on the surrounding (adjacent) properties. The Board can consider the effect of the new construction in relation to other historic (contributing) properties in the SBHD. The applicant has submitted photos of historic single-family residences in the district that he believes have similar mass, height and scale to his proposed project.

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

Consultant Response: The proposed house at 32 feet in height is significantly taller than any of the adjacent properties and properties across the street. The side elevations of the proposed building will be 62 feet in length and the wall will rise to a shear height of 22 feet to the eaves, with a further 10 feet in height to the roof ridge. The proposed

structure will significantly interfere with the light and air of the adjacent properties, especially that of the property to the west. In addition, the change in height and the change in the low-rise to medium-rise pattern of the streetscape, will significantly impact the view from the houses on the opposite side of the street.

- d) Whether the denial of a certificate of appropriateness would deprive the property owner of all reasonable beneficial use of his property

Consultant Response: The applicant has the option to build a house that is appropriate, i.e. visually compatible, in size, scale mass and height to the adjacent and surrounding houses on the street and other historic (contributing) properties in the SBHD.

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

Consultant Response: The United States Secretary of the interior's Standards for Rehabilitation:

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

In the context of this application, the Board should consider the impact of the new construction on the spatial relationship to the adjacent properties on the east and west sides of the building lot and those three properties immediately across the street. In addition, the Board should consider the size, scale, proportion and massing of the new construction and its impact on the character of the immediate environment, i.e. the size, scale, proportion and massing of the adjacent properties. The applicant's project is significantly taller and larger in scale than any of the homes on that portion of SW 4th Court; it is also significantly larger in mass and scale than any of the contributing single-family houses of the neighborhood cited by the applicant in his packet.

Ms. Rathbun stated in addition, pursuant to ULDR Section 47-17.7.A, the Sailboat Bend Historic District material and design guidelines shall be read in conjunction with the existing guidelines provided in this section and shall be utilized as additional criteria for the consideration of an application for a certificate of appropriateness for new construction, alterations, relocation, and demolition.

ULDR Section 47-17.7.B

1. Exterior building walls.
 - a. Materials and finish.

Consultant Response: The requested troweled stucco meets the SBHD guidelines.

2. Windows and doors.

a. Materials

Consultant Response: Clear glass and wood-vinyl clad window frame materials meet the SBHD guidelines. 9-foot wide garage doors meet the guidelines. The requested square, rectangular and circular windows meet the guidelines. Single hung, double hung, fixed with frame, sliders at rear and sides only and other French Doors meet the guidelines. Non-operable shutters, screened windows and doors meet guidelines.

3. Roofs and gutters.

a. Materials

Consultant Response: 5- v crimp roof material meets the guidelines. ESP aluminum for gutters meets the guidelines. The applicant needs to specify the exact pitch ratio of the hip roof.

5. Garden walls and fences.

a. Materials and style

Consultant Response: ESP aluminum meets the SBHD guidelines

6. Arcades and porches.

a. Materials and finish.

Consultant Response: Troweled stucco finish meets the SBHD guidelines. ESP aluminum for railings meets the SBHD guidelines.

COA for New Construction:

Ms. Rathbun reported that the applicant was requesting a COA for new construction of a two-story single-family home. In addition to the General Criteria for obtaining a COA and the Material and Design Guidelines, as previously outlined, pursuant to ULDR Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.iii, the Board must consider the following additional criteria specific to new construction, taking into account the analysis of the materials and design guidelines above:

“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.”

ULDR Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.iii

a) The height of the proposed building shall be visually compatible with adjacent buildings

Consultant Response: The 32-foot height of the proposed building is significantly higher than that of the adjacent buildings on the street. The applicant has included

photographs of historic (contributing) houses in the SBHD that are two-stories in height. Of the historic houses cited by the applicant, all have varying façade widths. The historic Oliver House at 231 8th Avenue is probably the tallest single-family residence in the SBHD; the house was moved to a built-up site in the district from another neighborhood. According to the present owner of the house, the height from street level to the gable peak of the two story street facing pavilion is less than 24 feet; the owner said that the height to the ridge of the hip roof was more than 24 feet, but that the overall height of the house was less than 28 feet.

The proposed building does not match any of the specified historic buildings in scale and mass and all of the historic houses are less in height than the proposed project.

- b) The relationship of the width of the building to the height of the front elevation shall be visually compatible to buildings and places to which it is visually related.

Consultant Response: The proposed building width is similar to that of the visually related adjacent buildings; however the height of the adjacent one and a half story building is unknown to this author but it is probably less than twenty-two feet at the roof ridge and the other adjacent houses are all one story. The width and height relationship of the proposed building is visually incompatible to adjacent buildings.

- f) The relationship of the materials, texture and color of the facade of a building shall be visually compatible with the predominant materials used in the buildings to which it is visually related.

Consultant Response: The applicant's project meets the SBHD Materials and Design Guidelines.

- g) The roof and shape of a building shall be visually compatible with the buildings to which it is visually related.

Consultant Response: The applicant has proposed a moderate pitch hipped roof that is ten feet in height from the roof deck (base) to the ridge; this space appears to be attic rather than living space. The overall height of the proposed building is thirty-two feet, with a wall height of twenty-two feet from ground to eaves. Of the four adjacent buildings, the house to the east of the building site is one-story with a low pitched hipped roof, the house to the west is one and a half stories with a moderate pitch gable and gable on hip roof and the two one story houses immediately across SW 4th Court from the applicant's lot have low pitch gable roofs. The pitch of the roof of the proposed building coupled with the two-story height of the building is visually incompatible with the adjacent buildings on the street. Of the two-story historic single-family houses chosen by the applicant (photos included with his packet) all have low pitch hip, gable or gable on hip roofs; the proposed new construction is not visually compatible with these houses.

- 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

Consultant Response: The new construction is not visually compatible as to size, mass in relation to open spaces to immediately adjacent buildings or historic single-family residences, referenced by the applicant in his application. It should be mentioned that the applicant's project has two garage doors, taking up more than half of the ground floor façade of this house; this design element is not visually compatible with the visually related buildings

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

Consultant Response: The new construction is visually compatible to the adjacent buildings as to directional character, i.e. orientation on the lot, but it is not visually compatible as to vertical character.

Ms. Rathbun concluded that single-family homes in the Sailboat Bend Historic District, like homes in most of the older neighborhoods of the City, were a mixture of architectural styles. The iconic style of the district has been thought to be the small one-story vernacular or folk cottage, but other styles ranging from Spanish Eclectic to Modern Minimal Traditional were also well represented. Ms. Rathbun pointed out that the City of Fort Lauderdale Historic Preservation ordinance did not address styles as such in determining the compatibility of new construction within the neighborhood. Ms. Rathbun explained that the ordinance addressed the characteristics of size, mass, scale and height of the new construction in relation to those same characteristics in the houses adjacent to and surrounding the proposed project, and the contributing (historic) single-family houses of the district.

Ms. Rathbun stated there were eight residences on this section of SW 4th Court. One house on a large corner lot at SW 4th Court and 12th Avenue had a two-story addition; all of the other seven buildings were one-story, including one home that was one and a half stories in height. Ms. Rathbun said the applicant's proposed building was a radical alteration in scale, mass and height to this characteristic low-rise streetscape. She stated the project as presented was inappropriate infill in the SBHD and was not recommended.

Mr. Marc Sever, architect, distributed to Board members photos of other houses in the area and three letters of support from homeowners in the area.

Mr. Sever stated the lot coverage was 42%; maximum allowed was 50%. The maximum building height was 35 feet; the proposed building height was 32 feet. The Floor Area Ratio was under 75%.

Mr. Sever showed a diagram of the proposed house and two adjacent houses and described the proposed house. He referred to the site plan, and said they met the side and rear setbacks and were requesting a 20-foot front yard setback where 25 feet was required.

Mr. Sever referred to the house that had been approved by the HPB in 2003, which was 2 ½ stories and had a 16'9" front setback, and noted that the same two adjacent houses existed at that time. Mr. Sever said there were three houses in the neighborhood that were similar in massing to the proposed house and were adjacent to one-story homes. Mr. Sever felt that this house was in harmony with the street and was appropriate.

Mr. Prager read from one of the letters of support, which indicated the neighbor would miss the view of the river once the house was built, but acknowledged the house would be an enhancement to the street and the SBHD. Mr. Prager said he believed the house would be an asset to the community.

Mr. Strawbridge noted this was old Tequesta ground that had been occupied between 800 and 1,100 AD.

Ms. Rathbun informed Mr. Strawbridge that the adjacent houses were not covered in the older survey. The house to the east had been built in the 1960s; she did not know when the house to the west had been built. Mr. Kenneth Powell, applicant, stated the house to the west had been built in 1994.

Ms. Rathbun said under the existing study, none of the houses on the block were contributing.

Chair McClellan asked about landscaping on the lot, and how they would create canopy. Mr. Sever said they could plant taller trees with smaller canopies on the side of the house and canopy trees in the front.

Chair McClellan stated two-thirds of the front façade was garage doors, which was very different from other homes in the neighborhood. Mr. Sever said a one-car garage would not work for "today's needs." Chair McClellan noted that the house also lacked the large front porch that most other homes in the area had.

Mr. Strawbridge asked if there was a provision in the code for a 17.5-foot front setback for a porch that was open on three sides in RS-8 zoning. Ms. Morejon read 47-19.2 Accessory uses, which indicated porches that were open on at least two sides in RS-8 zoning districts could be no more than 17 feet from the front property line. She did not know if Sailboat Bend had any pertinent code. Mr. Strawbridge said the Board had the ability to make yard modifications.

Chair McClellan opened the public hearing.

Mr. Dave Parker, President of the Sailboat Bend Civic Association, distributed a letter from the Association. He said the Association liked to meet with new owners to educate them about Sailboat Bend, clarify development guidelines and help facilitate the development process, but this had not occurred with this owner. He stated there were concerns about compatibility and mass and scale that would alter the character of the entire block. The Association asked the HPB to deny this request. Mr. Parker said the Association was willing to open dialog with the owners.

Mr. Parker said the Association discouraged the double garage door concept facing the street and they were trying to preserve porches that provided a welcoming feeling in the neighborhood.

Ms. Alyssa Plummer, Sailboat Bend resident, felt this could be done better, and the mass and scale should be re-examined. She stated this was a "maxed-out footprint with two huge garage doors." Ms. Plummer was also concerned about the tree canopy and wished to see something that was more substantial than palm trees and that had the character of the old growth canopy of Sailboat Bend.

Ms. Morejon clarified that the SBHD did allow principal residential structures to be located up to 15 feet from the front property line; porches could be no closer than 17 feet from the front property line.

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

Mr. Strawbridge said the façade was "reminiscent of some of Glenn Wright's work." He did not feel the mass or height were deal breakers, but he wanted to see "more edge" on the street side.

Chair McClellan said the biggest problem she saw was visual compatibility. She said this was an historic, unique neighborhood, and she felt the owners needed to "apply 'unique' to your definition of what the house needs to be." She thought this design was something that could be seen in any new development in the County.

Chair McClellan was also concerned about the relationship of the width of the building to the height of the front elevation. She said the garage doors were "just overkill" and the design should be more sensitive to the unique neighborhood of which this would be a part.

Mr. Prager said this was not competing with "wonderful, historic" homes on this street and they should consider what would be built here in the future. He believed many of the houses in this neighborhood would be torn down and replaced with homes more like Mr. Sever's design. Mr. Prager added that the two-car garage would help avoid the "junky look" of cars parked in the street and driveway.

Mr. James Paras, applicant, suggested using carriage doors on the garage. Mr. Prager said he would like an amendment to require that carriage doors be used on the garage. Mr. Strawbridge did not believe there were carriage doors that satisfied the South Florida Building code. Chair McClellan said simply changing the look of the door would not satisfy her. Mr. Morgan did not feel the general appearance of the front façade was in keeping with the look of Sailboat Bend.

Chair McClellan was concerned that allowing this would encourage other owner on this street to level their lots and the neighborhood would lose the canopy. Mr. Morgan was concerned that the applicants had not met with the Civic Association. Mr. Powell said they were not aware they should have met with the Association. They had assumed they could get approved because he thought this design was similar to the project that had been approved in 2003. Mr. Powell said if they had known there were limitations for what they could build on the lot, they probably would not have purchased it.

Mr. Powell stated if the setbacks were the issue, he would like to request modification of the setbacks rather than having the application denied. He said they could possibly move the house back one foot. Mr. Strawbridge said the Board could defer the item to allow the owners to meet with the Association. Mr. Prager asked what impact there would be on the owner if the application were denied. Ms. Morejon stated if the Board denied the application, the applicant could appeal to the City Commission within 30 days or begin the application process again with a modified project.

Ms. Morejon suggested that any changes the Board recommended be very clear, or that the applicant could return the following month with the revisions shown graphically. Mr. Powell said this was the project they wanted to build, and modifying it would be to meet the Board's needs, not the owners' needs. He believed their project was visually compatible. Mr. Strawbridge stated the National Register guidelines concerned adjacent, contributing resources, but the City code concerned any adjacent buildings. Mr. Powell said this had confused them as well.

Motion made by Mr. Prager, seconded by Ms. Graff to approve the request as presented. In a roll call vote, the vote was 4 - 4 with Mr. Kyner, Mr. DeFelice, Mr. Morgan and Chair McClellan opposed.

Ms. Sarver stated for a quasi-judicial development item, the request could not fail with a tie vote.

Motion made by Mr. Prager to bring the item back for discussion and a new vote this evening. Motion died for lack of a second.

Mr. Powell informed Ms. Graff that they were not attached to any garage door style, but wished to keep the two smaller doors. He said they might propose modifying the roof to a 4:12, which would lower the roof by three feet.

Mr. Prager asked if any Board member would change his or her vote if the applicant agreed to a specific modification. Mr. Morgan said more than one Board member had mentioned the lack of a front porch, which was not compatible with the neighborhood. Mr. Powell argued that the design was compatible with newer construction in Sailboat Bend.

Mr. Sever said he could extend the roof and put columns to create a front porch. He said it was also possible to use a louver-style garage door, which was common in a Key West style home. Mr. Sever said the front door wall could also be brought back one foot, and two columns installed for a four-foot front porch. He assured the Board that the landscaping would be attractive, but he worried about using canopy trees because of the hurricane danger.

Mr. Prager suggested the owner return the following month with a new rendering and perhaps a landscape plan.

Motion made by Mr. Prager, seconded by Mr. Morgan, to defer this until the Board's September meeting. In a roll call vote, Board approved 8 – 0.

Mr. Kyner advised the applicants to meet with the Civic Association in the interim.

3.

[Index](#)

<u>Case Number</u>	5 H 10 (SB)
<u>Applicant</u>	West Side School, Dave Baber, Broward County Historical Commission
<u>Owner</u>	Historic West Side School, LLC
<u>Address</u>	301 SW 13 Avenue
<u>General Location</u>	West side of 13 th Ave. between SW 2 nd Ct. and SW 3 rd Ct.
<u>Legal Description</u>	A portion of Parcel A, <u>Administrative Facility</u> , PB 137, P. 19, Broward County.
<u>Request</u>	Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration to install two wall signs. In addition to considering the SBHD Material and Design Guidelines as indicated in Sec. 47-17.7 of the ULDR, the HPB shall consider both the General criteria for a COA (Sec. 47-24.11.C.3.c.i. a-f) and the additional guidelines for alterations (Sec. 47-24.11.C.3.c.ii.a-h) when deciding whether to grant a COA for Alteration.

[This item was heard out of order]

Property Background:

Ms. Rathbun stated the property was located in the SBHD.

Description of Proposed Site Plan:

Ms. Rathbun explained this was an application for two signs to be installed on the historic West Side School building located in the SBHD. One sign would be located over the front entrance to the school building and the second sign would be located over the entrance to the one-story wing at the rear of the building.

Criteria for Certificate of Appropriateness:

Ms. Rathbun stated pursuant to ULDR Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.i, in approving or denying applications for certificates of appropriateness for alterations, new construction, demolition or relocation, the HPB shall use the following general criteria:

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

- a) The effect of the proposed work on the landmark or the property upon which such work is to be done.

Consultant Response: The new signage will have minimal effect on the historic resource. The applicant plans to use letters of a similar size, color and font to that of the original historic school sign.

Ms. Rathbun explained that the SBHD Materials and Design Guidelines did not specifically address signage; therefore ULDR Section 47-17.7.A was not applicable. In this case, the HPB shall use the following additional guidelines regarding alterations:

Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.ii Additional guidelines; alterations. In approving or denying applications for certificates of appropriateness for alterations, the Board shall also consider whether and the extent to which the following additional guidelines, which are based on the United States Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, will be met:

ULDR Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.ii

- a) Every reasonable effort shall be made to provide a compatible use for a property that requires minimal alteration of the building, structure, or site and its environment, or to use a property for its originally intended purpose

Consultant Response: The applicant plans to install wall signs with the new name of the facility using the same style of block letter that was previously used to identify the school. The request is appropriate.

Ms. Rathbun concluded that the applicant's request for a COA was appropriate and should be granted.

Chair McClellan opened the public hearing.

Mr. David Baber, Broward County Historical Commission Administrator, showed photos of the building with the original signage and the proposed sign design for the new facility. The new sign letters would be 8" tall cast aluminum, painted black on the building front and 6" tall cast aluminum, painted black on the building rear. Mr. Baber said this was best design to meet the Secretary of the Interior standards while providing the needed signage.

Mr. Strawbridge asked if it would be possible to use a monument sign for the Broward County Historical Commission and put a new "West Side School" sign on the building. Mr. Baber explained that the surrounding land was owned by the condominium and they would need an alteration to the PUD to build a monument sign. He also felt this would be confusing, since this was no longer a school. Mr. Baber added that the original sign had been removed in 1961.

Mr. DeFelice disclosed that he was a consultant for the Broward County Historical Commission, and said he had spoken with the Assistant City Attorney about this, and it did not present a voting conflict.

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

Motion made by Mr. Prager, seconded by Mr. Kyner, to approve the signs as presented per ULDR Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.i. In a roll call vote, Board approved 9 – 0.

4. **Proposed Amendments to the Historic Preservation Ordinance** [Index](#)

Ms. Morejon said this would be discussed at the Board's next meeting, time permitting.

5. **For the Good of the City** [Index](#)

Ms. Morejon reminded the Board that at a recent HPB meeting, Diane Smart, President of the Broward Trust for Historic Preservation, had expressed concerns regarding "The Tiffany House" property, located on the Central Beach Barrier Island. The applicant was proceeding with the approved Planned Unit Development, utilizing the Certificates of Appropriateness for demolition of portions of the existing structures.

Ms. Morejon stated recently, the third floor of Building 12 had collapsed, requiring the applicant to temporarily stabilize the building, but she noted this would ultimately require removal and replacement. She stated this work would occur consistent with the HPB's approval of the COA for alteration.

6. Communication to the City Commission

Chair McClellan requested that the City Commission approve the recent resource survey so it could be used. Mr. Strawbridge referred to the minutes of the previous meeting, and noted that Mr. Ciesielski had indicated that the City had conducted five surveys in different parts of the City and in 2003 a consultant had updated the survey, which had been approved by the Commission. Mr. Strawbridge asked about this study. Mr. Ciesielski explained that five surveys had been conducted between 1976 and 1989. The City Commission had retained two consultants to update the Florida Master Site File and a survey. Staff had then updated Master Site File list. Recently, a more in-depth study had been conducted by Ms. Morillo in Sailboat Bend and the Central Beach districts. Mr. Strawbridge remarked that there were 150,000 properties in the Florida Master Site File and this “means very little.”

Ms. Rathbun explained that the Sailboat Bend and Central Beach survey were complete; Colee Hammock was almost complete and Rio Vista was in the works. They would move on to other historic neighborhoods.

By a 7 – 1 voice vote, with Mr. Strawbridge opposed, the Board agreed to recommend that the City Commission approve all currently completed historic resource surveys.

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 6:57 p.m.

Chairman,

Susan McClellan, Vice Chair

Attest:

ProtoType Inc, Recording Secretary

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 Inc.