

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE
MONDAY, DECEMBER 5 2011 - 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 6/2011 through 5/2012	
		<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
Susan McClellan, Chair	P	6	1
Matthew DeFelice, Vice Chair	A	7	1
Brenda Flowers	P	6	0
Mary Jane Graff	P	5	1
Marie Harrison	P	4	3
Richard Heidelberger [5:09]	P	7	0
David Kyner	P	7	0
Phillip Morgan	P	7	0
Gretchen Thompson	P	5	2

City Staff

Merrilyn Rathbun, Fort Lauderdale Historical Society, Consultant to HPB
 Anthony Fajardo, Historic Preservation Board Liaison
 Pat Garbe-Morillo, Planning and Zoning Department
 Carrie Sarver, Assistant City Attorney
 Mike Ciesielski, Planner II
 Jamie Opperee, Prototype Inc.

Communication to the City Commission

None.

Index			
<u>Case number</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Page</u>	
1.	17-H-11	FSMY Architects and Planners	2
2.	18-H-11	Erlich Investments of South Florida, LLC	4
3.	24-H-11	Stephanie Patten	8
		Good of the City	14
		Communication to the City Commission	15

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 October and November 2011 Meetings

Ms. Graff noted a correction to the October 3, 2011 minutes.

Motion made by Ms. Thompson, seconded by Mr. Kyner, to approve the minutes for the Board's October 3, 2011 meeting as amended. In a voice vote, motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Flowers noted a correction to the October 20, 2011 minutes.

Motion made by Ms. Graff, seconded by Ms. Thompson, to approve the minutes for the Board's October 20, 2011 meeting as amended. In a voice vote, motion passed unanimously.

Motion made by Ms. Harrison, seconded by Ms. Thompson, to approve the minutes for the Board's November 7, 2011 meeting. In a voice vote, motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Flowers noted a correction to the November 17, 2011 minutes.

Motion made by Ms. Thompson, seconded by Mr. Kyner, to approve the minutes for the Board's November 17, 2011 meeting as amended. In a voice vote, motion passed unanimously.

[Index](#)

ITEM 1

<u>Case Number</u>	17H11	<i>Master Site File Number</i>	<i>Unknown</i>
<u>Applicant</u>	<i>FSMY Architects and Planners</i>		
<u>Owner</u>	<i>Narain Lalwani</i>		
<u>Address</u>	3132 NE 9 th Street		
<u>General Location</u>	Approximately 220 feet west of the intersection of NE 9 th Street and A1A on the south side of NE 9 th Street		
<u>Legal Description</u>	LAWANI PLAT (SEC 504306) 179-184 B, PARCEL A, BROWARD COUNT FLORIDA		

Request	Review and Comment <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Proposed Mixed-use development (ground floor commercial with one (1) residential unit above) adjacent to the Bonnet House (a locally designated landmark site) <p>Pursuant to the Historic Preservation Element, Goal 1, Objective 1.11, Policy 1.11.3, of the City of Fort Lauderdale Comprehensive Plan, <i>All proposed impacts to historic resources shall be reported to the Historic Preservation Board for review and comment</i></p>
----------------	---

Property Background:

Ms. Rathbun stated the applicant proposed to construct a mixed-use building on a lot north of the historic Bonnet House Museum and Gardens. The project was located in the Sunrise Lane District architectural resource area, which shares a property line with the Bonnet House complex. She informed the Board that Bonnet House was named to the National Register of Historic Places on July 5, 1984 with areas of significance in art, architecture and history (associations with Hugh Taylor Birch and the Bartletts). In 2002, the City of Fort Lauderdale gave the property local landmark site status. Ms. Rathbun said the site surrounding the house compound was a pristine, native barrier island habitat .

Description of Proposed Site Plan:

Ms. Rathbun stated the proposed Lalwani project was a four-story commercial and residential building. The ground floor, which would contain a mezzanine, was 17.5 feet in height and the fourth floor would rise 14 feet to the roof. The overall height of the proposed building was 55 feet.

Ms. Rathbun said the main concern was whether the height of the proposed project would have an adverse effect on the nearby historic resource. As the Lalwani site was located north of the historic site, she said there should be no shadow effect on the historic property. The nearest contributing building on the Bonnet House site was the Theatre, located approximately 60 feet south of the property line and over 100 feet west of the Lalwani site. Ms. Rathbun stated the Lalwani building could be visible from the Theatre, but there should be no adverse effect on the resource. The Lalwani building may be visible from some part of the historic grounds but the effect should be minimal.

Summary Conclusion:

Ms. Rathbun stated there should be no adverse effect from the proposed Lalwani project on the Bonnet House Museum and Gardens.

Jiro Yates, architect, displayed an aerial rendering of the north side of the Bonnet House property, and of the proposed project. He explained that the new project ground floor would be commercial and the top two floors would be a single-family residential

unit approximately a total of 54-feet tall. Mr. Yates showed additional renderings of the property and the proposed project.

Mr. Yates stated the project had been through the Development Review Committee, which had suggested presenting the project to the Bonnet House, which had been done in May 2010. The Bonnet House Board had requested seeing the views that could be affected by the project. Mr. Yates showed renderings of these views with the project.

Mr. Yates informed Chair McClellan that the primary material would be smooth white stucco, but in the rear they would use a simulated wood product. He showed on a rendering where the mechanical equipment would be located and screened. Mr. Yates stated the new building would be 22 feet taller than the existing structure.

Chair McClellan opened the public hearing portion of the meeting. There being no members of the public wished to address the Board on this matter, Chair McClellan closed the public hearing and brought the discussion back to the Board.

Chair McClellan appreciated the addition of the simulated wood to help the structure fit in with the Bonnet House.

Mr. Yates informed the Board that the Bonnet House Board of Directors had indicated they had no objection to the plan.

Mr. Yates said any signage for the commercial property would face Northeast 9 Street on the north side of the building, not Bonnet House.

Motion made by Ms. Thompson, seconded by Mr. Morgan, to give a favorable recommendation to the project. In a voice vote, Board unanimously agreed.

ITEM 2

<u>Case Number</u>	18H11	<i>Master Site File Number</i>	<i>Unknown</i>
<u>Applicant</u>	<i>Erlich Investments of South Florida, LLC</i>		
<u>Owner</u>	<i>Eyal Halni</i>		
<u>Address</u>	1000 West Las Olas Boulevard		
<u>General Location</u>	Southwest corner of West Las Olas Boulevard and SW 10 th Avenue		
<u>Legal Description</u>	WAVERLY PLACE 2-19 D, LOT 2 BLOCK 107		
<u>Request</u>	Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration:		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Replace existing concrete tile roof with 3 tab asphalt shingle roof <p>When determining whether to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration, New Construction, Demolition or Relocation, the HPB shall consider ULDR Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.i., <i>Criteria; General</i></p> <p>For this request and in addition to the above the following shall also be considered:</p> <p>For a Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration, ULDR Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.ii., <i>Additional Guidelines; Alterations</i>.</p>
--	---

Property Background:

Ms. Rathbun stated there were two structures on this lot in the Sailboat Bend Historic District (SBHD). The northernmost building was a one-story residence with a rectangular footprint with a centered curved projection facing SW 10 Avenue. She stated the house was designed by architect Courtney Stewart, Jr. in 1946 for Mr. and Mrs. Simon Kopfhammer. In 1971, the Kopfhammers commissioned architect Joseph Phillips, Jr. to design a one-story duplex apartment, which was built just south of their residence facing SW 10 Avenue. Both buildings have flat, white, concrete tile roofs.

Description of Proposed Site Plan:

Ms. Rathbun said the applicant was requesting a COA to replace the original concrete tile roofing material with asphalt shingles. The applicant has included drawings for both buildings on the lot, indicating that both buildings would be reroofed.

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: Replacing the original cement tiles with fiberglass/asphalt shingles will have affect the original character of the buildings

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;

Consultant Response: Cement tiles were a significant element in the design of these post war buildings

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:

RECOMMENDED

- Identifying, retaining, and preserving roofs--and their functional and decorative features that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building. This includes the roof's shape, such as hipped, gambrel, and mansard; decorative features, such as cupolas, cresting chimneys, and weathervanes; and roofing material such as slate, wood, clay tile, and metal, as well as its size, color, and patterning.

NOT RECOMMENDED

- Radically changing, damaging, or destroying roofs which are important in defining the overall historic character of the building so that, as a result, the character is diminished.
- Removing a major portion of the roof or roofing material that is repairable, then reconstructing it with new material in order to create a uniform, or "improved" appearance.
- Changing the configuration of a roof by adding new features such as dormer windows, vents, or skylights so that the historic character is diminished.
- Stripping the roof of sound historic material such as slate, clay tile, wood, and architectural metal.
- Applying paint or other coatings to roofing material which has been historically uncoated.
-

RECOMMENDED

- If using the same kind of material is not technically or economically feasible, then a compatible substitute material may be considered.

Comment: The applicant should consider using a material that is "like" as possible to the original material, i.e. white flat cement tile.

Ms. Rathbun stated in addition to the General Criteria for obtaining a COA, as outlined above, pursuant to ULDR Section 47-17.7.A, the Board must consider the following material and design guidelines to identify existing features of a structure which conform to the guidelines and determine the feasibility of alternatives to the demolition of a structure:

ULDR Section 47-17.7.B

1. Roofs and gutters.
 - a. Roof--materials.
 - i. Terra cotta.

- ii. Cement tiles.
 - iii. Cedar shingles.
 - iv. Steel standing seam.
 - v. 5-V crimp.
 - vi. Galvanized metal or copper shingles (Victorian or diamond pattern).
 - vii. Fiberglass/asphalt shingles.
 - viii. Built up roof behind parapets.
- b. Gutters.
- i. Exposed half-round.
 - ii. Copper.
 - iii. ESP aluminum.
 - iv. Galvanized steel.
 - v. Wood lined with metal.
- c. Configurations.
- i. Roof: The pitch of new roofs may be matched to the pitch of the roof of existing structures on the lot. Simple gable and hip, pitch no less than 3:12 and no more than 8:12. Shed roofs attached to a higher wall, pitch no less than 3:12. Tower roofs may be any slope. Rafters in overhangs to be exposed. Flat with railings and parapets, where permitted, solar collectors and turbine fans at rear port.

Consultant Response:

- vi. Fiberglass/asphalt shingles is an appropriate material under Sec. 47-17.7.B

Comment: Fiberglass/asphalt shingle is unlike the original roofing material and in this case does not meet ULDR Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.i (f) with the "United States Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings."

Request No. 1 - COA for Alterations:

Ms. Rathbun stated the applicant was requesting a certificate of appropriateness for alterations to 2 structures. She explained that 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.ii, the Board must consider the following additional criteria specific to alterations, taking into account the analysis of the materials and design guidelines above:

"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

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: The white cement tile roofing material is a distinguishing Historic material for houses of this period (i.e. post WW II construction)

f) Deteriorated architectural features shall be repaired rather than replaced, wherever possible. In the event replacement is necessary, the new material should match the material being replaced in composition, design, color, texture, and other visual qualities. Repair or replacement of missing architectural features should be based on accurate duplications of features, substantiated by historical, physical, or pictorial evidence, rather than on conjectural designs or the availability or different architectural elements from other buildings or structures;

Consultant Response: If the original material cannot, for some reason be replaced, the new material should closely match in color and design the old material.

Summary Conclusion:

Ms. Rathbun stated the applicant should state why it was necessary to replace the original material with this new and unlike material. Although fiberglass/asphalt shingles are an approved material for use in the SBHD, in this case their use did not meet the "United States Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings" to replace "like" with "like" or a close substitute.

The applicant was not present and the Board agreed to defer the application to their next meeting.

Motion made by Mr. Heidelberger, seconded by Ms. Graff, to defer the application to the Board's next meeting. In a voice vote, motion passed unanimously.

ITEM 3

<u>Case Number</u>	24H11	<i>Master Site File Number</i>	BD02785
<u>Applicant</u>	<i>Stephanie Patten</i>		
<u>Owner</u>	<i>Stephanie Patten</i>		
<u>Address</u>	304 SW 12 th Avenue		
<u>General Location</u>	East side of SW 12 th Avenue and south of SW 3 rd Street		
<u>Legal</u>	Lots 11 and 12, Block 108, WAVERLY PLACE, P.M. 2, P. 19 , of the		

Description	Public Records of Dade County, Florida
Request	<p>Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of one-story room on 1st floor under previously approved deck <p>When determining whether to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration, New Construction, Demolition or Relocation, the HPB shall consider ULDR Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.i., <i>Criteria; General</i></p> <p>For this request and in addition to the above the following shall also be considered:</p> <p>For a Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration, ULDR Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.ii., <i>Additional Guidelines; Alterations.</i></p>

Property Background:

Ms. Rathbun stated the residence (formerly a duplex) at 304 SW 12 Avenue appeared on the 1928 Sanborn Fire Insurance map and was considered a contributing property in the Sailboat Bend Historic District. She said it was a Frame Vernacular style, of balloon wood frame construction with a rectangular footprint and (originally) stucco wall cladding. The house was two stories with a simple gable roof, and there was an exterior stair and second floor deck.

Description of Proposed Site Plan:

Ms. Rathbun said originally, the house was used as a duplex with separate living quarters on both floors; the exterior stair and deck accessed the second floor apartment. The owner received an approval for a COA for Alteration in June of 2002 but apparently these alterations were not carried out. In August of 2009 the owner made an application (7 H 09) to rehabilitate the house as a single-family residence. Ms. Rathbun explained that a COA for Demolition of an existing shed and rear deck and a COA for a new addition to be built on the south side of the house to provide space for the installation of an elevator for interior access to the second floor. The new two-story addition, with an inset entry porch, is set back over twelve feet from the front of the historic structure. A second floor exterior wood deck with a stair would be built at the rear of the house. The original interior first floor would be reconfigured to house two bedrooms, a bath and closet space. Ms. Rathbun stated the August 2009 application (7 H 09) was approved by the Board.

Ms. Rathbun informed the Board that at this point, the approved demolition was complete and the two-story addition to accommodate the elevator had been built but not finished. The second floor exterior deck had not been constructed. Ms. Rathbun said the applicant was before the Board to request a modification to her approved COA to construct a master bedroom addition at the rear of the house, underneath the proposed deck.

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 proposed addition is at the rear of the house and will not be visible from the street.

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

Consultant Response: There will be no adverse effect on 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;

Consultant Response: Changes to the property have already been approved.

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

Consultant Response: The applicant should give some sort of estimate as to how much time it will take to complete this requested addition and the rest of the project.

Ms. Rathbun said 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.

Ms. Rathbun noted that in addition to the General Criteria for obtaining a COA, as outlined above, pursuant to ULDR Section 47-17.7.A, the Board must consider the following material and design guidelines to identify existing features of a structure which conform to the guidelines and determine the feasibility of alternatives to the demolition of a structure:

ULDR Section 47-17.7.B

2. Exterior building walls

a. Materials and finish.

i. Stucco: float finish, smooth or coarse, machine spray, dashed or troweled.

ii. Wood: clapboard, three and one-half (3 1/2) inches to seven (7) inches to the weather; shingles, seven (7) inches to the weather; board and batten, eight (8) inches to twelve (12) inches; shiplap siding smooth face, four (4) inches to eight (8) inches to the weather.

iii. Masonry: coral, keystone or split face block; truncated or stacked bond block.

Consultant Response: The applicant requests:

- ii. Other: James J. Hardie Shiplap Siding

3. Windows and doors.

- a. Materials.
 - i. Glass (clear, stained, leaded, beveled and non-reflective tinted).
 - ii. Translucent glass (rear and side elevations only).
 - iii. Painted and stained wood.
 - iv. Aluminum and vinyl clad wood.
 - v. Steel and aluminum.
 - vi. Glass block.
 - vii. Flat skylights in sloped roofs.
 - viii. Domed skylights on flat roofs behind parapets.
- b. Configurations.
 - i. Doors: garage nine (9) feet maximum width.
 - ii. Windows: square; rectangular; circular; semi-circular; semi-ellipse; octagonal; diamond; triangular; lited only to gable ends.
- c. Operations.
 - i. Windows: single and double hung; casement; fixed with frame; awning; sliders (rear and side only); jalousies and louvers.
- d. General.
 - i. Wood shutters sized to match openings (preferably operable).
 - ii. Wood and metal jalousies.
 - iii. Interior security grills.
 - iv. Awnings.
 - v. Bahama shutters.
 - vi. Screened windows and doors.

Consultant Response: The applicant requests:

- a.
 - i. non-reflective tinted
 - iv. aluminum
- b.
 - ii. rectangular
- c.
 - i. single and double hung
- d.
 - i. non operable shutters
 - vi. screened windows

4. Roofs and gutters.

- a. Roof--materials.
 - j. Terra cotta.
 - ii. Cement tiles.

- iii. Cedar shingles.
- iv. Steel standing seam.
- v. 5-V crimp.
- vi. Galvanized metal or copper shingles (Victorian or diamond pattern).
- vii. Fiberglass/asphalt shingles.
- viii. Built up roof behind parapets.
- b. Gutters.
 - j. Exposed half-round.
 - ii. Copper.
 - iii. ESP aluminum.
 - iv. Galvanized steel.
 - v. Wood lined with metal.
- c. Configurations.
 - i. Roof: The pitch of new roofs may be matched to the pitch of the roof of existing structures on the lot. Simple gable and hip, pitch no less than 3:12 and no more than 8:12. Shed roofs attached to a higher wall, pitch no less than 3:12. Tower roofs may be any slope. Rafters in overhangs to be exposed. Flat with railings and parapets, where permitted, solar collectors and turbine fans at rear port.

Consultant Response: The applicant requests:

- a.
- ix. other; on roof deck GAF Plaza Deck
- b.
- iii. ESP aluminum

7. Arcades and porches.

- a. Materials and finish.
 - i. Stucco (at piers and arches only): float finish, smooth or coarse, machine spray, dashed or troweled.
 - ii. Wood: posts and columns.
 - iii. Masonry (at piers and arches only): coral, keystone or split face block; truncated or stacked bond block.
 - iv. Metal (at railings only): wrought iron, ESP aluminum.

Consultant Response: The applicant requests:

- a.
- ii. wood posts and columns

Ms. Rathbun stated the requested materials are appropriate.

Request No. 1 - COA for Alterations:

Ms. Rathbun stated the applicant was requesting a certificate of appropriateness for alterations to one structure. 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.ii, the Board must consider the following additional criteria specific to alterations, taking into account the analysis of the materials and design guidelines above:

“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 request meets this criterion

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: The request meets this criterion.

Summary Conclusion:

Ms. Rathbun stated the applicant's request for a modification of the previously approved COA is appropriate.

Stephanie Patten, applicant, explained that the garage on the south side of the property would remain for now.

Chair McClellan opened the public hearing portion of the meeting.

Dave Baber, Sailboat Bend Civic Association Board (SBCAB) and Sailboat Bend Historic Preservation Committee (SBHPC), stated the committee liked requests to come to them before being presented to the HPB. In his opinion, he felt the concept was fine, but suggested the addition be stepped back from the original building so it would be seen as an addition.

Ms. Patten said she had never been informed she needed to go to the Sailboat Bend committee with her proposal. She noted she was paying \$1,300 per month rent while waiting for the addition to be built, so deferring her request for another month was not acceptable.

Ms. Sarver said there was no requirement for an application to be presented to the SBHPC.

Charles Jordan, SBHPC, agreed with Mr. Baber regarding differentiating the addition from the original building. He asked the Board to make approval of the application contingent upon stepping the addition back from the building.

Ms. Sarver stated it was up to the Board to decide whether or not this application met the requirements.

Ms. Rathbun said it was true that the Secretary of the Interior's guidelines recommended distinguishing an addition from the original building. She felt a small step-back would be appropriate for this application.

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

Ms. Patten stated the addition on the south side had already been built and was flush with the house.

Mr. Heidelberger noted that the addition was clearly differentiated by the trim board. It was also not two stories high, and the siding broke at that point. He did not feel anyone would ever confuse this with the original building. Mr. Heidelberger thought it would be foolish to require Ms. Patten to step the addition back from the original building.

Motion made by Ms. Thompson, seconded by Ms. Flowers, to approve the application as presented. In a voice vote, Board unanimously agreed.

Ms. Graff felt it was unfair that Ms. Patten was not informed that she should bring her request to the SBHPC. Chair McClellan stated this was a community effort, and the SBHPC should perform outreach to community members. Mr. Fajardo agreed this was not a requirement, but said they encouraged people to present plans to local boards.

Ms. Patten said it should "be the law" that purchasers of homes in historic districts should be warned when purchasing properties that there were additional requirements when they wanted to make changes.

4. For the Good of the City

[Index](#)

Jim Stump discussed the dangers of lead-based paint, and noted federal rules regarding how to deal with lead-based paint had dramatically changed in the past few years. He stated the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) had devised a new renovation and repair rule for dealing with lead-based paint that made it very easy to address the problem. He said 50% of Broward contractors were trained in how to deal with lead-based paint.

Chair McClellan said the building code referred to lead-based paint. Mr. Stump said the Building Department had indicated to him that they could only enforce the Building Code. He said he had appealed to the City Commission and County Commission and he hoped they would both issue resolutions that their departments would obey the law.

5. Communication to the City Commission

None.

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned 5:56

Next Meeting

Mr. Fajardo announced the next Special Meeting would be held on December 15 at 5 p.m. in the 8th floor conference room. He distributed revised documents.

The Board's next regular meeting was scheduled for January 2, 2012.

Ms. Morillo announced the next design guidelines meeting would be on January 17 from 3 p.m. until 5 p.m.

Chairman,

Susan McClellan, 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.