

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE
TUESDAY, JANUARY 10, 2012 - 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 | 7 | 1 |
| Matthew DeFelice, Vice Chair [arrived 5:27] | P | 7 | 1 |
| Brenda Flowers | P | 7 | 0 |
| Mary Jane Graff | P | 7 | 1 |
| Marie Harrison | P | 5 | 3 |
| Richard Heidelbergberger | P | 8 | 0 |
| David Kyner | A | 7 | 1 |
| Phillip Morgan | P | 8 | 0 |
| Gretchen Thompson | P | 6 | 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
 Frank Snedaker, City Architect
 Amanda Lebofsky, Prototype Inc.

Communication to the City Commission

None.

| Index | | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------|
| <u>Case number</u> | <u>Applicant</u> | | <u>Page</u> |
| 1. | 25-H-11 | City of Fort Lauderdale | 2 |
| 2. | 1-H-12 | James Archer, architect | 7 |
| 3. | 4-H-12 | Legacy Development of Broward, LLC | 17 |
| | | Good of the City | 23 |
| | | Communication to the City Commission | 23 |

Call to Order

Chair McClellan called the meeting of the Historic Preservation Board to order at 5:00 p.m. Roll was called and it was determined a quorum was present.

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

Approval of Minutes of December 2011 Meetings

Motion made by Ms. Graff, seconded by Mr. Morgan, to approve the minutes of the Board's December 5, 2011 meeting. In a voice vote, motion passed unanimously.

Motion made by Mr. Morgan, seconded by Ms. Thompson, to approve the minutes of the Board's December 15, 2011 special meeting. In a voice vote, motion passed unanimously.

[Index](#)

ITEM 1

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------|--|----------------------|------------------|---------|
| <u>Case Number</u> | 25H11 | Master Number | Site File | Unknown |
| <u>Applicant</u> | City of Fort Lauderdale | | | |
| <u>Owner</u> | City of Fort Lauderdale | | | |
| <u>Address</u> | 450 SW 7 th (Cooley) Avenue | | | |
| <u>General Location</u> | North side of the New River west of the SW 7 th (Marshall) Avenue Bridge | | | |
| <u>Legal Description</u> | Lots 3,4, 5, 17, and a portion of Block 32, L.H. Bryan's Subdivision Block 32, P.B. 3, P. 78, of the Public Records of Dade County, Florida | | | |
| <u>Request</u> | <p>Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction of maintenance building at Cooley's Landing Marina <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> | | | |

Description of Proposed Site Plan:

Ms. Rathbun stated the applicant was requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of a new one-story maintenance building at Cooley's Landing Park in the SBHD. The applicant indicated that the building would be built in a masonry vernacular style compatible with the style of other buildings in the park environment. Ms. Rathbun said none of the other buildings in the park was considered historic or contributing in the historic district although they were compatible with the historic architecture of the district. The applicant requests principal structure yard setbacks, i.e. front, 60 feet, rear 33 feet, left side 19' and right side 42 feet.

Section 47-17.5 Application for yard and minimum distance separation reduction.

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; or
3. A reduction in the required yard is necessary to preserve a structural or landscaping feature found by the historic preservation board to contribute to the historical character of the SBHD; or
4. In other residential zoning districts within the SBHD, the board may authorize yard reductions subject to criteria in subsections A.1 through 3 if the proposed use and dimensions of a development are the same as those permitted in the RS-8 and RML-25 zoning districts. Once a yard reduction or minimum distance separation requirement is approved, uses and structures in these zoning districts may not be altered without the issuance of a certificate of appropriateness.

B. Reduction of yards may be permitted as follows:

2. RML-25 zoning district. Principal residential structures: Front yard: fifteen (15) feet, side yard: five (5) feet, rear yard: fifteen (15) feet.

Consultant's Response: The applicant's request is appropriate.

Criteria for Certificate of Appropriateness:

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's Response: There will be no adverse effect on any nearby historic resources

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

Consultant's Response: The design of the new structure is compatible with other park structure

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. 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.

2. 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's Response: The applicant's specifications are appropriate.

Materials and finish: Stucco to match existing buildings finish

Windows and doors: Glass, Aluminum, Rectangular, Fixed with frame

3. 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's Response: The applicant's specifications are appropriate.

Roof materials: Cement tiles, hip roof

Request No. 2 - COA for Alterations:

Ms. Rathbun stated 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's Response: The maintenance building is necessary for the operations of the park and care has taken to cause minimal impact on the park and the district.

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

- a) The height of the proposed building shall be visually compatible with adjacent buildings.
- 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.
- c) The relationship of the width of the windows to height of windows in a building shall be visually compatible with buildings and places to which the building is visually related.
- d) The relationship of solids to voids in the front facade of a building shall be visually compatible with buildings and places to which it is visually related.
- e) The relationship of a building to open space between it and adjoining buildings shall be visually compatible to the buildings and places to which it is visually related.
- 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.

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

Consultant's Response: The project meets all above criteria

Summary Conclusion:

Ms. Rathbun stated the proposed maintenance building is appropriate in the park and in the SBHD.

Frank Snedaker, City Architect, stated the City's Marine Services maintained the facility for use by the public. The building was needed for storage and a workshop. He said it would match the existing building.

Chair McClellan opened the public hearing portion of the meeting.

Dave Baber, representing the Sailboat Bend Civic Association, said they supported the project.

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.

Motion made by Mr. Heidelberger, seconded by Ms. Thompson, to approve the request. In a roll call vote, motion passed 7-0.

[Index](#)

ITEM 2

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------|--|----------------------|------------------|---------|
| <u>Case Number</u> | 1H12 | Master Number | Site File | Unknown |
| <u>Applicant</u> | James Archer, Architect | | | |
| <u>Owner</u> | Lawrence and Russell Johnson | | | |
| <u>Address</u> | 1001 SW 4 th Street | | | |
| <u>General Location</u> | North side of SW 4 th St. and west side of SW 10 th Avenue, Sailboat Bend Historic District. | | | |
| <u>Legal Description</u> | Lots 1, 3, 5, Block 107, Waverly Place, P.B. 2, P. 19, of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida. | | | |
| <u>Request</u> | Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration | | | |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Rehabilitation of two buildings• Front yard modification from 25 feet to 17 feet for porch <p>Certificate of Appropriateness for Relocation and Partial Demolition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Relocation of Building #2 to front of subject site <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> <p>For a Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration, ULDR Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.iv., <i>Additional Guidelines; Relocation;</i> and,</p> <p>For a Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration, ULDR Section 47-24.11.C.4., <i>Demolition.</i></p> |
|--|--|

Property Background:

Ms. Rathbun stated the applicant was asking for two Certificates of Appropriateness for two contributing buildings in the Sailboat Bend Historic District. The two buildings were building #1, a c. 1925 two story frame vernacular building (BD2851) at 1001 SW 4th Street, and located on the same lot to the east of building #1, building #2 a c. 1925 one story frame vernacular cottage (BD2851)

Description of Proposed Site Plan:

Ms. Rathbun said the applicant was requesting a front yard modification for building #2 from 25 feet to 17 feet to accommodate the construction of a front porch.

Section 47-17.5 Application for yard and minimum distance separation reduction.

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; or

3. A reduction in the required yard is necessary to preserve a structural or landscaping feature found by the historic preservation board to contribute to the historical character of the SBHD; or
 4. In other residential zoning districts within the SBHD, the board may authorize yard reductions subject to criteria in subsections A.1 through 3 if the proposed use and dimensions of a development are the same as those permitted in the RS-8 and RML-25 zoning districts. Once a yard reduction or minimum distance separation requirement is approved, uses and structures in these zoning districts may not be altered without the issuance of a certificate of appropriateness.
- C. Reduction of yards may be permitted as follows:
2. RML-25 zoning district. Principal residential structures: Front yard: fifteen (15) feet, side yard: five (5) feet, rear yard: fifteen (15) feet.

Consultant's Response: The applicant's request is appropriate.

Ms. Rathbun stated the applicant planned to move the two-story building #2 forward (south) on the lot to the 25-foot front yard setback. As the framework of the first floor of this building is in a deteriorated condition, the applicant planned to move the second story to a temporary frame in the new location and reconstruct the first floor underneath. In addition the applicant would demolish a flat roof addition, which is on the west side of the building.

Criteria for Certificate of Appropriateness:

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's Response: The proposed porch for building #1 is appropriate in the district.

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

Consultant's Response: The relocation of building #2 will bring it in line with the setbacks of the other houses on the streetscape

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

Consultant's Response: in reference to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards...

6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

Ms. Rathbun said in the construction of the new ground floor for building #2 the applicant has modified the design by including an incised front porch. She stated this type of porch is appropriate in the SBHD, however it is a new design element.

Request No. 1 - COA for Demolition:

This is a request for the demolition of the first floor of building #2 and demolition of the flat roofed addition on the west side of building #2

ULDR Section 47-24.11.C.4.c

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

Consultant's Response: the requested demolition is of benefit to the district.

Request No. 2 - COA for Relocation:

ULDR Section 47-24.11.C.3.c

iv. Additional guidelines; relocation. When an applicant seeks a certificate of appropriateness for the relocation of a landmark, a building or structure on a landmark site, or a building or structure in a historic district, or wishes to relocate a building or a structure to a landmark site or to a property in a historic district, the board shall consider the following:

1. The contribution the building or structure makes to its present setting
2. Whether there are definite plans for the site to be vacated;
3. Whether the building or structure can be moved without significant damage to its physical integrity; and
4. The compatibility of the building or structure to its proposed site and adjacent properties

Consultant's Response: The applicant's plan for building #2 meets the criteria for relocation.

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

4. Exterior building walls.

- a. Materials and finish.
 - j. 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's Response: The applicant's specifications are appropriate.

Wood: clapboard

Masonry: other stucco

5. Windows and doors.

- a. Materials.
 - j. 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.
 - j. 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.
 - j. Windows: single and double hung; casement; fixed with frame; awning; sliders (rear and side only); jalousies and louvers.
- d. General.
 - j. 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's Response: The applicant's specifications are appropriate.

Windows and doors materials: Glass, clear; Aluminum and vinyl clad wood;
configuration: windows rectangular, casement

6. 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's Response: The applicant's specifications are appropriate.

Roof materials: 5-V crimp; Hip, pitch no less than 3:12 and no more than 8:12.

7. Garden walls and fences.

- a. Materials and style.
 - i. Stucco: float finish, smooth or coarse, machine spray, dashed or troweled.
 - ii. Wood: picket, lattice, vertical wood board.
 - iii. Masonry: coral, keystone or split face block; truncated or stacked bond block.
 - iv. Metal: wrought iron, ESP aluminum, green vinyl coated chain link.
- b. Configurations.
 - i. Front: spacing between pickets maximum six (6) inches clear.

Consultant's Response: The applicant's specifications are appropriate.

Material: Wood vertical wood board.

8. 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.

Material and finish: Stucco (at piers and arches only) smooth troweled; Wood: posts and columns

Consultant's Response: The applicant's specifications are appropriate.

Request No. 3 - COA for Alterations:

Ms. Rathbun stated 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's Response: the original use of the buildings remains unchanged.

- 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's Response: The applicant's plan meets this guideline

- c) All buildings, structures, and sites shall be recognized as products of their own time. Alterations which have no historical basis and which seek to create an earlier appearance shall be discouraged;

Consultant's Response: The applicant's plan meets this guideline

- d) Changes which may have taken place in the course of time are evidence of the history and development of a building, structure, or site and its environment. These

changes may have acquired significance in their own right, and this significance shall be recognized and respected;

Consultant's Response: The applicant's plan meets this guideline

e) Distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship which characterize a building, structure, or site, shall be treated with sensitivity;

Consultant's Response: The applicant's plan meets this guideline

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's Response: See ULDR Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.i f) above

Summary Conclusion:

Ms. Rathbun stated the applicant's requests for COAS for Alteration, Relocation and Demolition are appropriate.

Russ Johnson, owner, said he planned to rehabilitate the house that had already been moved and to move the other house and then rehabilitate it. He stated the first story must be reconstructed; then they would re-set the second story onto the new first story. He also planned to add a porch to the one-story house.

Mr. Heidelberger noted this would restore the property to three residential parcels, the third of which would be an empty, buildable lot. Jay Archer, architect, said their intention was to restore the original three platted lots.

Mr. Archer said the in-sized porch was a "reclamation of the original garage entry...on the two story." They would use the original garage door line to define the exterior wall on the ground floor and reconstruct the columns according to the original configuration.

Chair McClellan opened the public hearing portion of the meeting.

Dave Baber, Sailboat Bend Civic Association, said they were excited about the restoration of these resources and supported it. Representatives had met with the owner to discuss any concerns they had. Their first concern was the replacement windows on the east building, which should be done to match the existing windows. Mr. Baber said they were also concerned about enclosing the porch and putting an addition

on with a new porch; he stated this was not consistent with the criteria, which specified the addition should be to the rear of the building.

On the second building, Mr. Baber said these windows should also be replaced with like windows. On the side of the front porch, he was unsure if the swinging windows were original, and he said they would support replacing these with casement windows.

Mr. Baber said the Civic Association's other issue was the addition of off-street parking in front of the buildings, and noted there was plenty of room to put parking behind the buildings.

Mr. DeFelice arrived at 5:27.

Charles Jordan, Trust for Historic Sailboat Bend, agreed with Mr. Baber's points, and noted that wood clad window replacements would be appropriate and had previously been approved by the Board.

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.

Mr. Johnson informed Ms. Flowers that he did not want to install wood windows now for financial reasons, but said this might come later if he found he had the budget. He said the aluminum windows had already been approved for these in the one-story house in 2007 by a previous Historic Preservation Board. Mr. Johnson said one parking space was allotted in the front, consistent with the current street pattern.

Mr. Johnson explained to Chair McClellan that the previous owner had begun enclosing the porch and they felt this would be consistent with the design of the neighborhood. Mr. Archer agreed the window replacements were a "budget-driven decision." He said the framing openings would be the same size. Mr. Archer stated the front parking for the one-story was a convenience and parking in the rear for the two-story was to accommodate a rental unit in the rear. He described the proposed parking and driveway for the two-story building.

Mr. DeFelice asked about use of the vacant lot, and asked if it would be possible to restore the two-story house where it was. Mr. Archer said this was possible, but they wanted to restore the character of the neighborhood. He believed he was moving the house back to its original location. Mr. DeFelice asked if they would monitor the adjacent archeological site during construction and Mr. Archer said the site had been reviewed already for archeological artifacts. They did not have an archeological plan, but he noted the new foundation would be stem wall. Mr. Johnson said he would not

object to having an archeological consultant, but said the site across the street had already been dealt with by many people and nothing had been found.

Chair McClellan felt the window replacements should be wood, and pointed out there were nice options in impact windows. She also advised that building #1 [on her site plan] should have rear parking only.

Mr. Heidelberger agreed with Chair McClellan regarding the windows, and also thought parking for both buildings should not be in the front.

Mr. DeFelice was concerned about moving the building in order to create buildable land without a plan for that vacated lot. Mr. DeFelice said there was the possibility of discovering archeological materials associated with the site across the street and suggested the applicant have a consultant conduct a site visit. Mr. DeFelice was also concerned about the addition of a porch located farther into the right-of-way.

Mr. Heidelberger pointed out that any future development of the vacated site would need to be presented to the Board. He wanted to accommodate this owner, who was willing to restore the existing properties. Mr. Heidelberger questioned the difference between a wooden, metal-clad window and an aluminum window that met code. He wanted to give this owner the opportunity to restore the property.

1. Certificate of Appropriateness for Relocation and Partial Demolition for Relocation of Building #2 to front of subject site

Motion made by Ms. Flowers, seconded by Mr. Heidelberger, to approve.

Mr. DeFelice requested amending the motion to include the condition that a consultant would evaluate the property after ground work was done to see if any archeological materials had been disturbed. Ms. Flowers and Mr. Heidelberger accepted this amendment.

In a roll call vote, **motion** passed 7-1 with Mr. DeFelice opposed.

2. Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration for Rehabilitation of two buildings

3. Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration for Front yard modification from 25 feet to 17 feet for porch

Motion made by Mr. Heidelberger, seconded by Ms. Flowers, to approve both requests for COAs for Alteration, with the conditions that there be no front street parking, and that there be wood-clad windows. In a roll call vote, motion passed 7-1 with Mr. DeFelice opposed.

[Index](#)

ITEM 3

| | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|--------|
| <u>Case Number</u> | 2H12 | Master Site File Number | 8BD150 |
| <u>Applicant</u> | Legacy Development of Broward, LLC | | |
| <u>Owner</u> | Legacy Development of Broward, LLC | | |
| <u>Address</u> | 612 South Andrews Avenue | | |
| <u>General Location</u> | East side of S. Andrews Ave. from SE 6 th Street to SE 7 th Street and north side of SE 7 th Street approximately 200' east of S. Andrews Ave. | | |
| <u>Legal Description</u> | All of Parcel 4, Coca Cola Subdivision, P.B. 71. P.2, of the Public Records of Broward County, Florida. | | |
| <u>Request</u> | <p>Review and Comment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed parking garage adjacent to the Coca Cola Bottling Plant and across the street from the former South Side Fire Station (now Tolber Law Offices) and South Side School (all three sites being locally designated landmark sites) <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> | | |

Mr. DeFelice recused himself from hearing this item because he had been involved with this project in his capacity as a County employee - notice filed as required.

Property Background:

Ms. Rathbun stated this was a Review and Comment process under the City of Fort Lauderdale's Comprehensive Plan; Historic Preservation Element, for the proposed parking garage to be built adjacent to the historic Coca Cola Bottling Plant. She explained there were three sites, which are designated historic by the City in the immediate vicinity of the proposed project. One of those sites, the South Side School, is on the National Register of Historic Places (NR 2006, designated 1996, FMSF BD176). The third site is the South Side Fire Station, now the Tolber Law Firm (designated 2005, FMSF BD1327).

Ms. Rathbun continued that the three historic resources were located at an important crossroads in the City: South Andrews Avenue and SE/SW 7th Street, with the Coca Cola Plant at the northeast corner, the fire station/law firm at the southeast corner and the school at southwest corner of the crossroads.

Description of Proposed Site Plan:

Ms. Rathbun explained that the developer proposed to build a six-story parking garage on his lot immediately to the north and east of the historic Coca Cola Bottling Plant, located at the southwest corner of his lot. Because of their distance from the building site, there should be no adverse physical impact of the construction of the new parking garage on the school and fire station sites; however, she said there would be a strong visual impact on the three resources and a potential for adverse physical impact on the Coca Cola building.

Ms. Rathbun said the developer had provided a broad narrative, written by his architect and consultant for this project. The consultant has keyed his recommendations for the project to the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings*. The consultant stated that *Standards 2, 3, 5, 7, 9, and 10* apply in this case, with an explanation of how the standard would apply to the developer's project and why the standards not chosen would not apply. The architect/consultant's explanation showed consideration for the protection for the resource

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards...

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.
3. Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken
5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.
7. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible
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.

Ms. Rathbun stated in the Evaluation section, page 11 of his report, the consultant discussed the demolition plan for non-historic features of the site and stated how the plan meets the stated *Secretary of the Interior's Standards*. The consultant paid particular attention to the protection of historic elements of the Coca Cola building, an

original pilaster and rusticated corner detail in the demolition and construction processes.

Ms. Rathbun said starting on page 15 of the report, in reference to Standard 9, the consultant addressed the compatibility of the proposed project's massing, size, scale and architectural design with the historic resource. He addressed major design elements of the proposed project's elevations, which were largely located on floor levels one through four, in reference to major elements of the resource, in terms of rhythm and proportion, and a massing study of levels one through six also in reference to the historic building.

Ms. Rathbun stated the architect had visually divided the lower floors into sections through the use of different wall treatments. She noted there was a distinct difference in the surface treatment of the lower and upper floor sections; the fifth and sixth levels were covered with a wall-hung trellis which served to distinguish it from stucco cladding of the floor sections immediately below, a planned visual illusion. The lower floors had a similar wall cladding and height to the historic building. The open work trellis of the upper floors of the new building would have a less weighty appearance; it should appear to recede and give an illusion of less overall mass to the parking garage. She noted the lower four floors of the proposed building were approximately the height of the Coca Cola building. The architect alternated a section of stuccoed wall treatment with a section of revealed structural spandrels. This technique suggested that this was a grouping of buildings rather than one large structure

Ms. Rathbun advised that some members of the community had expressed a concern that the developer had not addressed the preferred wider sidewalks for designated image streets such as South Andrews Avenue. Although in planning new construction to retain the integrity of the historic streetscape it was recommended that the historic setback should be maintained. She pointed out that the historic sidewalks surrounding the Coca Cola Plant were 11 feet in width. The developer originally sited his project at the historic setback (11 feet). Community members stated that the garage project should be built to the image street setback (15 feet). The developer said that meeting that request would cause him to lose too many parking spaces on the upper floors and he would not be able to meet his buyer's stated needs. The developer did say that he might be able to push back the ground floor retail space while leaving the upper floors at the historic setback.

Ms. Rathbun continued that the developer's architect/consultant's solution was to push back the upper floors of the parking garage, adding an additional two feet four inches to the historic eleven foot setback. On the ground floor he staggered retail space facades allowing an additional, elevated, three to five foot width to the sidewalk, which would allow compliance with the image street setback requirement.

Ms. Rathbun informed the Board that the other major concern of the community for the safety of the Coca Cola Plant was the need for a buffer zone between the historic resource and the proposed garage. The community wanted the original loading docks preserved, failing the preservation of the entire, original Coca Cola site. The developer countered that he could not give up that much land and meet his space needs, but he stated that he would allow a 13-foot buffer between the north and east elevations of the resource and the new building.

Ms. Rathbun noted the developer's architect had carved out a little more visual and practical space for the north courtyard by pushing back the south wall of the ground floor retail space for an additional eight feet. She remarked that this was an artful solution that would increase public pedestrian area at ground level.

Ms. Rathbun said there had been a few development projects in the City that have placed new construction of modern design, and large scale, next to an historic resource; a successful example of this was the Lauderdale Beach Hotel (Las Olas Beach Resort). The parking garage project has the potential to be another good example of this trend.

Summary Conclusion:

Ms. Rathbun advised that in planning this project, the developer had been tasked with meeting the demands of three entities with a direct interest in the project: the buyer, who has a need for a specific number of parking spaces; the developer who has a specific lot on which to build and meet his customer's needs and the community, which is under the directive of the City of Fort Lauderdale's Comprehensive Plan, Historic Preservation Element protects the City's historic resources.

Ms. Rathbun stated in the consideration of the impacts that this new construction might have on the nearby historic resources the developer had properly referenced the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings*. In the architectural design of this very large building, the developer had made use of small practical adjustments and visual illusion to mitigate the impact of his project. Keep in mind, in 1938, when Courtney Stewart had to meet the bottling company's need for a big box factory building; through his architectural design, including the use of illusion, he gave the community a palace.

In Ms. Rathbun, opinion the developer had made a good faith effort to meet the community requirement to protect the important resource, the Coca Cola Bottling Plant and the two nearby historic resources, the South Side School and the South Side Fire Station, and at the same time, he had satisfied his own, and his buyer's expressed needs.

Jeff Lis, Stiles Corporation, said they had been contracted by Broward County to develop this facility. He explained that a site plan had been sent to the DRC for approval. He clarified that the County would find a user for the Coca-Cola building in

the future and that project would be presented to the HPB then. This was not part of the DRC application currently submitted.

Ian Nestler, PGAL Architects, said they needed to provide parking for a minimum of 1,000 cars. He said they had tried to minimize the height and mass of the garage, and designed it to appear as a series of buildings, not as a garage. He presented renderings of the project. Mr. Lis stated they had left 13 and 15 feet on the east and north sides respectively, between this structure and the Coca-Cola building.

Anthony Abbate, architect, stated he had reviewed the project and made recommendations regarding the impact on historic sites. His evaluation had been based on the Secretary of the Interior's standards and the National Historic Preservation Act.

Chair McClellan asked about the gateways between the new and old structures. Mr. Abbate said they wanted to keep the garage away from the Coca-Cola building to create a courtyard that had been part of the City's historic urban pattern. The arches were pre-cast concrete and stucco and the gate was metal. On the south elevation, there was just a gate.

Mr. Abbate stated that had conducted a shadow study, and determined the shadow impact would be virtually nil.

Ms. Harrison asked about access points and Mr. Nestler replied that these were located on South Andrews Avenue and First Avenue, which they considered the primary access point.

Mr. Heidelberger recalled the Board's previous discussions on this project, and that their motion had included wing walls. Mr. Fajardo said the City Commission's later motion had included the pilaster and the façade of the building, but not wing walls.

Ms. Flowers asked how the Coca-Cola building would be protected during demolition; Mr. Abate said this was included in his report. Mr. Lis explained that Stiles Corporation was responsible for the demolition, and they would perform hand demolition when they were within 15 feet of the building. They would also patch existing openings in the north and east walls and simulate the building finish on those facades. During construction, they would perform vibration monitoring to protect the building, and they may need to reinforce the soils under the existing foundation. Mr. Abbate would monitor the demolition and construction processes.

Mr. Heidelberger asked about traffic impact at critical traffic times. Mr. Lis said all impacts had been reviewed by their and the City's traffic consultants and no issues had

been identified. Mr. Heidelberger noted that lighting from the garage could become intrusive in the neighborhood, and pointed out that these lights had been set back to minimize this effect. Mr. Lis stated they tried to make the light as unobtrusive as possible.

Chair McClellan opened the public hearing portion of the meeting.

Charles Jordan, Trust for Historic Sailboat Bend, opposed the project. He stated this was taking "a size 12 foot, jamming it into a size 6 shoe" because they had promised the county 1,000 parking spaces. He said this plan did not respect the historic building and would envelop the resource. Mr. Jordan said the City had adopted a Downtown Master Plan in 2007 and this project was "blowing off that guideline." The triple curb cut into the Andrews Avenue corridor was specifically opposed in the Master Plan. Mr. Jordan said this was an inappropriate project and urged them the Board to ask the City to reject this plan.

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.

Chair McClellan said this design was an improvement and she appreciated the fact that they had stepped the garage away from the Coca-Cola building.

Ms. Thompson felt they had gone as far as possible in getting extra space around the Coca-Cola building and she appreciated the efforts that would be made to protect it during construction.

Mr. Heidelberger said he was more concerned about the urban planning issues. He noted they had broken up the massing and set back the ground floor and done work to hide the fact that this was a parking garage. He was worried about the traffic impact and stated, "The traffic's going to be unbelievable." Mr. Fajardo reiterated that the traffic had already been addressed during the site plan process.

Ms. Flowers wondered where parking would be located for the Coca-Cola building when it was leased. She asked about the Master Plan, and Mr. Fajardo said the Master Plan was "intent driven" and gave examples of intent. He said there was "a little bit of push and pull there, when you come to the intent of the Master Plan." He added that there was no parking requirement downtown.

Chair McClellan wanted to acknowledge the work the developer had done. She noted that this was still not the "perfect project" but she would reluctantly accept it.

Motion made by Ms. Thompson, seconded by Ms. Graff to approve the project, provided the Coca-Cola building was protected. In a roll call vote, motion passed 6-1 with Mr. DeFelice abstaining and Ms. Harrison opposed.

4. For the Good of the City

[Index](#)

Scott Bakos, project manager, gave a Power Point presentation regarding the rehabilitation of the train station west of I-95, a copy of which is attached to these minutes for the public record.

Mr. DeFelice asked if the design would be altered and Mr. Bakos said this was basically maintenance work. On the interior, Mr. Bakos said they would remove the dropped ceiling to reveal some crown molding and raise the height of the ceiling; they would also add decorative lighting more appropriate to the architecture.

Mr. Bakos said the only original interior component was the terrazzo floor. Only two windows might be original. There were no plans to restore the interior to its original condition.

Mr. DeFelice asked if the fact that the Deerfield Beach station was on the National Register had affected FDOT's ability to maintain it. Lynn Kelly, DOT, stated they would not pursue designation of the Fort Lauderdale station. She said they would not renovate the building to bring back its original elements but they wanted to preserve the current elements.

5. Communication to the City Commission

None.

Other Discussion Items

Chair McClellan said there had been an administrative approval for roofing in Sailboat Bend at 925 West Las Olas the previous month that the Board had not seen. Mr. Fajardo said the repair was "like for like," so the Board had not been notified.

Mr. Fajardo reported the ordinance re-write was progressing with regular meetings.

Ms. Thompson asked about the surveys. Mr. Fajardo said if the City Commission wanted to accept them as they were, notice must be sent to every resident in the areas surveyed, or they could change some of the language in the surveys. He recalled that they had agreed to wait until the ordinance change was completed to adjust the language and/or send out notice.

Mr. Fajardo invited Board members to attend the January 17 Design Guidelines meeting at 3:00 pm at the Westside School.

Mr. DeFelice asked about digitizing documents and Mr. Fajardo explained that the City was working on digitally storing the supplemental documentation.

Chair McClellan asked about the Historic Preservation awards program. Mr. Fajardo said the document had been edited by staff and he felt it was ready to submit. He said they would have the Public Information Office send out announcements. Mr. Fajardo agreed to put the information out within the next few weeks.

Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned 7:55

Next Meeting

The Board's next regular meeting was scheduled for February 6, 2012.

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.