HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE
MONDAY, MAY 6, 2013 - 5:00 P.M.
CITY HALL FIRST FLOOR COMMISSION CHAMBER
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE
FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA

		Cumulative Attendance 6/2012 through 5/2013	
Board Members	**Attendance**	**Present**	**Absent**
Matthew DeFelice, Chair	P	**11**	**1**
David Kyner, Vice Chair	P	**12**	**0**
Brenda Flowers [arr 5:08]	P	**11**	**1**
Marie Harrison	P	**9**	**3**
Richard Heidelberger	P	**11**	**1**
Phillip Morgan [arr 5:28]	P	**12**	**0**
Richard Schulze	P	**9**	**3**
Jackie Scott	P	**7**	**1**
Gretchen Thompson	P	**11**	**1**

City Staff
Merrilyn Rathbun, Fort Lauderdale Historical Society, Consultant to HPB
Anthony Fajardo, Historic Preservation Board Liaison
Lynda Crase, Board Liaison
Linda Mia Franco, Board Liaison
Carrie Sarver, Assistant City Attorney
Lisa Edmondson, Recording Secretary, Prototype Inc.

Communication to the City Commission
Motion made by Ms. Thompson, seconded by Mr. Morgan, to send the following communication to the City Commission: The intent of the HPB is not to jeopardize the adaptive reuse of Southside School by NOVA University, however, the HPB would like the City to explore designating the other physical structures on the site. In a voice vote, motion passed unanimously.

Index

		Owner	Page
1	6-H-13	Bernard Petreccia, 11SW 11 LLC	2
2	8-H-13	Cormona Apartments	7
3	10-H-3	Richard & Shawn Simone	10
4	11-H-3	Tiffany House LP	13

		Old Business	19
		New Business	19
		Good of the City	21
		Communication to the City Commission	21

Call to Order
Chair DeFelice called the meeting of the Historic Preservation Board to order at 5:05 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.

Board members disclosed communications they had concerning cases on their agenda.

Approval of Minutes of April 2013 Meeting

Motion made by Ms. Thompson, seconded by Mr. Schulze, to approve the minutes of the Board's April 2013 meeting. In a voice vote, motion passed unanimously.

Cases:

Index

1.

	6 H 13	**FMSF #**	
Applicant	**Bernard Petreccia**		
Owner	11 SW 11, LLC		
Address	11 Palm Avenue (SW 11th Avenue)		
General Location	Corner of SW 11th Avenue and NW corner of SW 1st Street		
Legal Description	Waverly P12-19D LOTS 1thru5, and 5' of LOT 6E & S ½ vacated alley abutting said property, BLK 124		
Existing Use	Residential		
Proposed Use	Residential		
Applicable ULDR Sections	47-24.11.C.3.c.i; 47-17.7.B		
Request(s)	**1. Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration** • Rehabilitate two (2) separate structures = Building #1 – main house and Building #2 - efficiency. **2. Ad Valorem Tax Exemption Application**		

Ms. Rathbun gave her report:

Property Background:
The applicant came before the Board in July 2011 to ask for a COA for Demolition of a CBS structure on his site in the SBHD. There are three houses on the site, all of which appear on the 1937 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map for Fort Lauderdale. The applicant stated that the condition of the CBS duplex is poor. He further stated that the building is prone to flooding as the first floor is built below the crest of the road. The applicant requested demolition under criterion iii The demolition or redevelopment project is of major benefit to a historic district.
The Board was informed that the condition of the structure was not to be considered.

At the same meeting, the applicant asked to relocate the two wood frame cottages on the site. He proposed to rotate the smaller cottage so that the gable ends face east and west rather than north and south and then move the cottage east on the site so that it is in line with the larger cottage. He then proposed to move the larger cottage 24 feet south to allow for a drive and parking at the north side of the site. The two relocated cottages will then be connected with a new addition.

The applicant then asked approval for a Certificate of Appropriateness for alterations and additions to two historic wood frame vernacular buildings on his site. Both one-story cottages are shown on the 1928 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map for the City of Fort Lauderdale and are considered contributing structures in the SBHD. The larger cottage, which is sited at the northeast corner of the site, has a complex footprint consisting of a square principal mass with a room sized projection facing Palm Avenue (SW 11th Avenue). The other, smaller, cottage located near the south west portion of the site, near Arpekia Street (SW 1st Street) has a rectangular footprint with a room sized projection on the west side. The larger structure has a hipped roof with a clipped gable facing Palm Avenue; the other cottage has a gable roof. Both cottages have horizontal wood siding.

All three requests were approved at the July 2011 HPB Meeting. The appropriate COAs were issued August 12, 2011. According to the applicant's narrative with this packet, phase one work is on schedule. Permits for the demolition of the CBS building were issued in January 2013. All phase one work is to be done by March 2013. According to the applicant's narrative, phase two - relocation, construction and additions - is scheduled to begin in May.

Description of Proposal:
The applicant is asking for a modification of his approved proposal. He states that the project now consists of two separate buildings rather than combining them into one building.

The applicant is before the Board today to request HPB recommendation to the City of Fort Lauderdale and Broward County to approve the applicant's HISTORIC PRESERVATION PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION APPLICATION for this contributing property in the designated Sailboat Bend Historic District.

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

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: eliminating the connection between the buildings and leaving them as stand-alone buildings is in line with their historic use.
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: see below:

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

1. A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.

The project meets this criterion.

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.

The project meets this criterion

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.

Consultant response: wood is the appropriate choice for wall cladding

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; limed 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 non-reflective tinted glass and wood – aluminum clad window frame materials. Window frame configuration is rectangular; double hung operation and approved impact glass. All are approved materials.

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 response: Requested roofing material is copper shingles; roof configuration is simple gable. Gutters are galvanized steel. The requests are appropriate.

4. 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 response: the requested material is vertical wood board an approved material.

5. 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 approval of existing enclosed wood, which is appropriate.

Summary Conclusion: The applicant's request for a COA should be approved.

Bernie Petreccia, applicant, reported demolition was complete so the architect could draw the plans. He requested a modification of his original COA to not connect the two buildings with an addition but to restore each building separately. Mr. Petreccia also

requested the ad valorem tax abatement. He remarked it was costing him $200,000 to renovate the buildings that were now valued at $100,000.

Chair DeFelice opened the public hearing portion of the meeting.

Dave Baber, representing the Sailboat Bend Civic Association, said they had worked with Mr. Petreccia regarding joining the buildings and they were pleased he had requested the modification.

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

Chair DeFelice asked about the original COA and Mr. Petreccia referred to his submission packet. Chair DeFelice wanted to know the language used for the motion when it was originally approved. He said the intent of the rehabilitation was to retain as much of the original fabric as possible.

Mr. Petreccia confirmed for Ms. Flowers that he no longer planned to move the buildings; he would only renovate them.

Motion made by Mr. Schulze, seconded by Mr. Heidelberger, to approve the modification to the original COA. In a roll call vote, motion passed 9-0.

Motion made by Mr. Schulze, seconded by Ms. Thompson, to recommend to the City Commission that favorable consideration be passed on to the County for the ad valorem tax exemption for the property. In a voice vote, motion passed 9-0.

2. Index

Case	8 H 13	**FMSF #**	
Applicant	***David Berlin***		
Owner	**Cormona Apartments Inc.**		
Address	323 & 333 N Birch Road		
General Location	Approximately 140 feet northwest of the N. Birch Road and Granada Street intersection		
Legal Description	CORMONA APTS CO-OP UNITS 1 THROUGH 7		
Existing Use	Multi-family residential		
Proposed Use	Multi-family residential		
Applicable ULDR Sections	**47-24.11.B.6.**		
Request(s)	**1. Historic Designation**		

This case was heard out of order - first.

Ms. Rathbun gave her report:

Property Background:
Miami architect Russell Thorn Pancoast first opened an office in Fort Lauderdale in 1938. In 1939, the City of Fort Lauderdale hired Pancoast as the lead architect for its first public housing project, Dixie Court; he worked with Dixie Court associate architects Courtney Stewart, Jr. and Robert Little. Pancoast had come to Miami as a fourteen year old; He was the grandson of Miami Beach founder John Collins. He attended the Cornell University College of Architecture, graduating in 1922. Pancoast opened his Miami office in 1927. The Miami firm, Pancoast, Ferendino, Grafton and Skeets later evolved into the well-known firm of Spillis, Candela and Partners.

Once his Las Olas Boulevard office was established, Pancoast and his associates took on many private and commercial projects in the City. Notable among his projects was the Coral Sands Hotel (later The Westminster Manor), built in 1941 as the first project in Fort Lauderdale for developer James S. Hunt. Mr. Hunt later went on to develop Coral Ridge and the Galt Ocean Mile. Pancoast designed the 1953 master plan for the City of Plantation, Florida Among Pancoast's Miami projects are the Art Deco Bass Museum of Art (formerly the Miami Beach Public Library) The Surf Club of Miami Beach, the Mercury Hotel on South Beach.

Pancoast designed the Cormona Apartments for Cornelius/Moninger in 1941. The Cormona Apartments are located in Lauder-del-Mar, just south of Birch Estates. The two apartment buildings are 2 stories and have rectangular footprints with irregularities. The buildings are oriented west to east on the lot, with Birch Road to the east and the Intracoastal Waterway to the west. Both buildings have glassed in porches, on both floors, on the west elevations. The roofs are barrel tiled, hipped with gable ends on the east and west elevations and have overhanging eaves with exposed rafter ends. The original metal work of the hand rails of the exterior stairs and second floor balconies has been preserved. There are original small metal canopies over some of the apartment entries. In his design for the buildings Pancoast used elements from different styles; he anticipated the later Mid-century Modern style in his use of many corner windows. New impact resistant windows replaced the originals a few years ago.

Description of Proposal:
The applicants are asking for local designation of the Cormona Apartments.

Criteria for Historic Designation
ULDR Section 47-24.11.B.6.
d. Its identification as the work of a master builder, designer, or architect whose individual work has influenced the development of the city, state or nation.
Consultant response: The Cormona Apartments is the work of a significant South Florida architect, Russell Thorn Pancoast.

Summary Conclusion:
Russell Pancoast was primarily known as a Miami based architect. By the late 1930s, Pancoast, along with a number of other architects, was beginning to take an interest in Fort Lauderdale and its improving economy. Although there were a few large projects, such as the Lauderdale Beach, the Riverside and Governor's Club Hotels and Dixie Court, most projects were relatively small scale. The Cormona Apartments, which were intended as upscale seasonal rentals for winter visitors, is typical of the sort work available. Cormona Courts is representative of Pancoast's work in Fort Lauderdale at this time. The buildings also show distinctive design elements characteristic of Pancoast's work, such as the decorative metal work of balconies and stair rails. The Cormona is worthy of designation as the work of a master architect.

David Berlin, applicant, said the units started as rentals. He distributed photos taken of the property in the 1940s, an advertisement from the co-op offering and the blueprints. He stated they had restored the building between 2004 and 2006.

Chair DeFelice opened the public hearing portion of the meeting.

Dave Baber commended the owners for pursuing designation. He remarked that the architect, Russell Pancoast, was renowned throughout the state of Florida.

Jeff Snook, seasonal resident of the building, said he loved the building because it represented "Old Florida."

Charles Jordan, President of the Trust for Historic Sailboat Bend, said there were benefits to historic designation. He was pleased to see a Russell Pancoast building saved.

Tim Goligoski, building resident, said it was exciting to see this application. He was happy they had restored the building. Mr. Goligoski thanked Ms. Rathbun for her help.

Anthony Abbate, DoCoMoMo (Documentation and Conservation of buildings site and neighborhoods of the Modern Movement) board member, stated they were very excited about this application to preserve the work of Russell Pancoast.

Fred Carlson, representing the Central Beach Alliance, said they had worked to restrict the size of adjacent development to help protect and aid the survival of this building. He thanked Mr. Berlin for preserving the past for the future.

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

Mr. Heidelberger said the restoration work was admirable, and remarked on how the building was changed during the restoration. He asked why Mr. Berlin desired

designation. Mr. Berlin said the members had agreed to seek designation to protect the property from redevelopment.

Ms. Scott thanked Mr. Berlin for requesting the designation, and noted this would retain the property's value.

Mr. Schulze said pride of ownership had been his motivation for getting his own two properties designated.

Chair DeFelice thanked Mr. Berlin for seeking designation.

Motion made by Mr. Schulze, seconded by Mr. Kyner, to grant the request for designation. In a roll call vote, motion passed 9-0.

3. Index

Case	10 H 13	**FMSF #**	
Applicant	***Shelby Smith, Fitzgerald Property Management***		
Owner	**Richard & Shawn Simone**		
Address	201-207 SW 7 Avenue		
General Location	Southwest corner of SW 7th Avenue and SW 2nd Street (Himmarshee Street)		
Legal Description	BRYANS SUB OF BLK 22 FT LAUD 1-29 D LOT 1 LESS ST, 3 LESS ST, 5		
Existing Use	Commercial		
Proposed Use	Commercial		
Applicable ULDR Sections	47-24.11.C.3.c.i; 47-17.7.B		
Request(s)	**1.** Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration • Re-stucco band on 8" overhang		

Ms. Rathbun gave her report:

Description of Proposed Site Plan:
The ca. 1950s store building at 201-207 SW 7th Avenue is in the commercial buffer zone of the Sailboat Bend Historic District. The building has a rectangular foot print with a chamfered corner at the 2nd street and 7th Avenue intersection. The roof is flat with a parapet; there is an overhang positioned some feet below the parapet on the north and east elevations of the building. When 2nd Street was widened the 2nd street (north) facing overhang was cut back to 8 inches in width. The wall cladding above and on the overhang is rough stucco with Chattahoochee gravel mix. The stucco began to fall from the overhang and the owner removed the cladding. There was some concern that the overhang had been cut back to 8 inches at that time, but the owner states that this was

not the case. The applicant now requests a COA to restore the cladding to the overhang.

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 response: The building will be restored to its original appearance

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: See below

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

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.

The applicant's request meets this criterion.

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.

In each of the following sections below, relevant to the specific request being made, a description of the architectural features corresponding to the material & design guidelines as outlined in the ULDR (47-17.7.B), is provided for both the existing buildings and the proposed new construction.

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

6. 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 response: The applicant requests coarse stucco, which is appropriate; however the applicant needs to state if he intends to mix the Chattahoochee gravel in with the stucco.

Request No. 2 - COA for Alterations:
The applicant is requesting a certificate of appropriateness for alterations to one structure.

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 building will be restored to its original appearance.

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: The applicant is repairing the building using the appropriate materials.

Summary Conclusion:
The applicants request is appropriate but he needs to specify exactly what material he is using.

Shelby Smith, applicant, stated they removed the Chattahoochee with the intent of replacing it with stucco to match the rest of the building.

Chair DeFelice was concerned that they did not intend to restore the overhang to 2.5 feet. Mr. Smith stated he was unsure it could be rebuilt to withstand a person's weight.

Chair DeFelice opened the public hearing portion of the meeting.

Charles Jordan, President of the Trust for Historic Sailboat Bend and the Sailboat Bend Civic Association Architectural Review Committee, explained that when the County

widened the intersection, they had removed a portion of the building. The stucco restoration was an appropriate response to this circumstance and the Civic Association recommended approval.
There being no other members of the public wishing to address the Board on this matter, Chair DeFelice closed the public hearing and brought the discussion back to the Board.

Motion made by Mr. Schulze, seconded by Mr. Heidelberger, to approve the application as presented. In a roll call vote, motion passed 9-0.

4. Index

Case	11 H 13	**FMSF #**	BD04487
Applicant	*Damon-Ricks, Flynn, Engineering, Services, P.A.*		
Owner	**Tiffany House LP**		
Address	2900 Riomar Street		
General Location	Southeast corner of Riomar Street and Bayshore Drive		
Legal Description	BIRCH OCEAN FRONT SUB 19-26 B LOT 1 TO 4 BLK 8		
Existing Use	Unoccupied		
Proposed Use	Hotel and proposed condo		
Applicable ULDR Sections	47-24.11.C.3.c.i; 47-24.11.C.4.c; 47-24.11.C.3.c.ii		
Request(s)	1. Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition • Interior spaces of historic structures 2. Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration • New canopy at the front entrance of the historic resource 3. Certificate of Appropriateness for new Construction • Proposed condominium (12 & 8 story sections) 249,287 SF behind historic structure		

Ms. Rathbun gave her report:

Property Background:.
Shortly before taking up his duties as a naval officer, for the duration of WW II, the young George Gill, Jr. visited Fort Lauderdale on vacation. In the 1940s, Fort Lauderdale was a smallish resort city surrounded by farms and large swaths of undeveloped land. The town was something of a backwater compared to such holiday Meccas as Palm Beach and Miami.

After the war, on his demobilization, George, Jr., with his father, George Gill, Sr., as entrepreneurs, looked to invest in the post war boom. At that time the country was undergoing a housing shortage. Bob (George, Jr.) Gill, from his earlier visit to Fort

Lauderdale, knew that there were platted subdivisions in the area, with some utilities, that were left undeveloped by the collapse of the 1920s Florida construction boom. The Gills understood that with the purchase of the relatively inexpensive, partially developed lands, construction could start almost immediately. This was the beginning of the construction of over three thousand "Gill" homes built, in the late forties, in fourteen subdivisions in Fort Lauderdale. By 1948, Bob Gill was bored with home building and decided to investigate Fort Lauderdale's other economy, tourism.

In 1951, Gill built the first of his hotel projects on the beach, the Mid-century Modern Escape Hotel. The hotel is located in the then new subdivision on the barrier island, the Birch Ocean Front Estates. Gill promoted the hotel as an informal "island" style resort. The Escape was the first of Gill's tropical style resorts, featuring amenities such as tennis courts, the first hotel swimming pool, nine-hole pitch and putt golf and "name" entertainment.

Architects for the hotel were Theo Meyer and Lester Avery. Avery was the designer for many homes built by the Gills. Some years later the hotel was sold to new owners, renamed the Tiffany House and repurposed as an ACLF. The building was designated as an historic resource in the City of Fort Lauderdale in 2004.

Description of Proposed Site Plan:
The applicant is before the Board today requesting a COA for Minor Alteration; i.e. the addition of a drop off porte-cochere to the main entry and the replacement of windows, doors, stucco repair as applicable, paint, roof to match original appearance. The applicant also requests a COA for New Construction; i.e. the Interior renovation of the existing building to restore it to hotel use (96 rooms), construction of a new pool, pool deck & associated pathways; permission to build a new building, having a 12-story maximum height and an 8-story section, with 74 condominium units overall, a 245 parking space, 4 level parking deck, and 2000sf commercial retail space.

The new additions will be built south of the existing historic resource in a large open space that was formerly used for tennis courts. The historic buildings, the Escape is a complex of a number of stand- alone buildings connected by elevated walkways, are to be used for their original purpose, as a hotel. A former owner had requested demolition of a number of elevated walkways that connected the historic buildings. The applicant tonight wishes to void the COA for demolition of the walkways and restore them to their original use. The original hotel had only 46 units. The applicant plans to reconfigure the building to 96 units. Interior demolition and construction will be necessary. The applicant requests a COA for Alteration to build what he refers to as a "drop-off porte cochere" at the front entrance to the hotel; this will be a cantilevered canopy extending over the driveway at the Riomar Street entrance to the hotel lobby. The canopy is the only exterior alteration to the historic structure.

The historic buildings are two stories in height, approximately twenty-three feet from the ground to the top of the roof parapet. The adjacent new construction will be one hundred and twenty feet from the ground to the roof top. There will be some shadow

effect on the historic resource during winter months. There is already a shadow effect from an existing building to the east of the resource.

The historic Escape Hotel is sited on the north portion of a trapezoid shaped lot; the southern portion of the lot is the site of the new garage and condo project. A four story parking facility, which follows the shape of the trapezoidal lot, forms the base of the new construction. The applicant has included proportion and massing studies of the new construction on page 20 to 22 of a consultant's report included in his packet. The largest mass of the new construction is visible behind the north façade of the historic resource. The elevations of the new building, as seen from Riomar Street facing south, rise to varying heights behind the Escape. The 8-story new construction is sited very close to the back of the historic resource. As well as different heights, the new building elevation is broken into sections that are recessed to differing depths behind the plane of the historic 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 response: The only change, visible from the exterior, to the landmark is the addition of the canopy to the front entrance.

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

Consultant response: The eight story addition is sited very close to the historic resource and may have some adverse visual impact on the resource.

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: See below:

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

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.

The related new construction is differentiated from the old. The new construction is separated from the old; however the new condo and one section is sited very close to the historic resource and could have an adverse visual impact on the resource.

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.

The new construction could be removed without damage to the historic resource.

Request No. 1 - COA for Demolition:
The applicant is requesting a certificate of appropriateness to demolish a cabana building, a one story meter room and the roof, windows, doors and interiors of the historic buildings. The applicant intends to return the historic resource to its original purpose as a hotel. The applicant intends to increase the number of hotel rooms from the original 47 rooms to 96 rooms, which necessitates the requested interior demolition of the historic buildings. Windows and doors are to be upgraded, although the applicant should make sure that the modern replacements match the historic elements as closely as possible.

Pursuant to ULDR Section 47-24.11.C.4.c, the Board must consider the following additional criteria specific to demolition, taking into account the analysis of the materials and design guidelines above:

ULDR Section 47-24.11.C.4.c

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

Consultant response: The cabana building and the meter room are non-contributing to the historic resource.

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

Consultant response: The return of the hotel to its original purpose is of major benefit to the district.

Request No. 2 - COA for Alterations:
The applicant is requesting a certificate of appropriateness for alterations to XX structures.

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."

Request No. 3 - COA for New Construction:
The applicant is requesting a certificate of appropriateness for new construction of a new building with 12 and 8 story sections, which will be sited near the historic resource.

"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 height of the proposed new construction, at 12 and 8 stories, is significantly higher than the 2 story historic resource. The 12 story section is sited at a distance behind the plane of the historic buildings and will not have a major adverse visual effect on the resource; but, the 8 story section is sited immediately behind the historic resource and could have an adverse visual effect on the historic buildings.

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 proposed new construction is compatible with other large scale buildings in the immediate vicinity. The neighborhood is a mixture of mainly low rise buildings interspersed with high rise construction.

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 proposed new construction is compatible in its directional character.

Summary Conclusion:
The only change to the historic structure is the construction of the new canopy; the applicant needs to present his argument of the necessity for this new construction. The requested demolition of the interiors is necessary for the use and is appropriate. The 12 story section of the new building will probably have little impact on the historic resource but the applicant and the Board need to consider if there is some way to modify the impact of the height of the 8 story section.

Robert Lochrie, attorney for the applicant, displayed photos of the hotel and provided a brief history of the property. The new proposal was to return the front of the property to its former use as a hotel. Mr. Lochrie said this was a reason the Central Beach alliance and the Broward Trust for Historic Preservation endorsed this plan. They intended to

build residential units on the south side. Mr. Lochrie presented a site plan view of the project.

Dev Motwani, owner, had researched all documentation regarding the property's designation and understood why it had been designated: the property's architecture and place in history on the beach, tied to its use as a hotel. They had worked with those involved in the restoration to ensure they produced something true to its original form.

Roger Grove DePeralta, architect, said it was important to maintain the hotel use elements. He said they had received feedback from the neighborhood for the design.

Mr. Lochrie confirmed for Mr. Schulze that the height of the new construction would be approximately 135 feet, including the decorative element. He stared the cabana room and meter room were on the south side of the pool area. Mr. Lochrie showed a rendering of the project and explained where the different building heights were located. Mr. Lochrie explained that the streets in the areas were too wide; they intended to narrow the street to create sidewalks, additional landscaping and a crosswalk.

Mr. DePeralta said they would restore the stucco on the façade. New construction was a mixture of stucco, stone and glass. Mr. Kyner suggested the entryway canopy be semicircular glass to reflect the entrance. Mr. DePeralta said they were considering a structure that could hold a glass or light metal roof. Chair DeFelice pointed out that the awning would obscure the second floor, which was the historic elevation. If the awning were transparent, it would be less important. Mr. Morgan stated if the awning were flattened, it would not obscure the second floor. Mr. DePeralta agreed they could lower the angle and make it of glass.

Chair DeFelice opened the public hearing portion of the meeting.

Frank Carlson, nearby resident, said a previous design had maximized floor space at the expense of charm. He was pleased that the new design included the three-story structures that kept the idea of a village alive. He stated the Central Beach Alliance approved this design because the revenue from the tower structure would subsidized the lower revenue three-story buildings in the area. Mr. Carlson asked the Board to approve the request.

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

Motion made by Ms. Thompson, seconded by Mr. Heidelberger, to approve the COA for demolition. In a roll call vote, motion passed 9-0.

Motion made by Mr. Morgan, seconded by Ms. Thompson, to approve the COA for new construction. In a roll call vote, motion passed 9-0.

The Board discussed configurations for the awning structure. George Garcia, architect, stated they could lower the angle to 2 ½ and 12, lighten the canopy holding structure and use a transparent canopy. This would be unobtrusive and lighter.

Motion made by Mr. Schulze, seconded by Ms. Scott, to approve the COA for alteration, with the condition that the canopy angle be lowered to 2 ½ and 12, the canopy support structure be lighter and the canopy be made of transparent material. In a voice vote, with Mr. Kyner out of the room, motion passed 8-0.

2. Old Business Index

Preservation Awards

Ms. Franco reported two outside submissions: The Westside School and the Chimney House Grill. Ms. Thompson had also submitted the following: Helen Landers for her historic preservation leadership; Progresso Plaza for adaptive reuse; Mt. Herman Church for historic preservation leadership and Williams House for adaptive reuse. Ms. Franco said Ms. Rathbun had done research on other structures that they could use.

Ms. Thompson remarked that the nomination from was very difficult to complete and perhaps staff could assist people with the research. She suggested the form be simplified.

Ms. Franco confirmed for Ms. Scott that a building need not be designated to receive an award. Ms. Scott felt there should be better participation from the City Commission and more outreach about the awards. Ms. Franco agreed to conduct better outreach next year. Ms. Scott suggested sending email to neighborhood association presidents.

Pat Morillo, former staff member and Board Liaison, stated the way the awards worked was to solicit "prize projects." She said staff should be doing most of the work for the nominations. The awards were a way to promote the HPB's work and to get politicians involved.

Mr. Fajardo agreed to simplify the form and to ask the Public Information Office to send out another email.

Ms. Franco informed the Board that the City had agreed to pay for the awards and the refreshments for the event.

3. New Business Index

Options for Designating Remaining Structures at Southside Hardy Park

Mr. Fajardo explained that the designated portion of the site was the east side of the property: the school building. Per an agreement with the County, any development on the site must also be monitored, but this was unrelated to the designated school building. Mr. Fajardo explained that the Board did not have approving powers over non-designated parts of the site.

Dave Baber recalled that work had been done at the site without the approval of the

HPB or the County or State, who had management plans due to providing funds for purchase of the historic site. Some of the mitigation requirements that resulted had not been fulfilled and Mr. Baber said the work approved last month must also be approved by the County. Additionally, a report was required after a professional historian performed archival research on "the full extent of Florence Hardy Park, to include the ball fields, lawn bowling court, lawn bowling clubhouse and all the other amenities" to determine which of these would be eligible for inclusion in the National Register. Now, work was being done without complying with this condition. The funding management plan also indicated that the croquet and lawn area would be rehabilitated, but this area would now be paved for parking for the Southside School project. Mr. Baber feared the project would be stopped for not following procedure. Mr. Fajardo replied that the process was still ongoing. The City was not ignoring the conditions, and Mr. Fajardo added the conditions could be modified.

Chair DeFelice had researched structures on the site, and reported that the large building was the Town and Tennis Club and had been built in the late 1930s; the smaller building had been built in the late 1920s or early 1930s, just after the school; the baseball fields [and grandstands that no longer existed] had been constructed in the 1920s and a portion of the property had been a tent city site for people purchasing property in the City. Chair DeFelice felt it was negligent of the City to ignore this. He agreed to send photos he had taken of the buildings' interiors to staff.

Motion made by Mr. Kyner, seconded by Ms. Scott, to request the City take steps to designate remaining structures, the pump house, the tennis courts and the clubhouse at Southside/Hardy park. In a voice vote, motion passed 8-1 with Ms. Thompson opposed.

Mr. Heidelberger did not want to interfere with the Southside School being used in an appropriate way. He noted this included parking to make the use work. Mr. Fajardo pointed out that this could conflict with what had already been approved and agreed to bring the Southside School plan for the Board to examine. The Board agreed it was not their intent to interfere.

Motion made by Ms. Thompson, seconded by Mr. Morgan, to send the following communication to the City Commission: The intent of the HPB is not to jeopardize the adaptive reuse of Southside School by NOVA University, however, the HPB would like the City to explore designating the other physical structures on the site. In a voice vote, motion passed unanimously.

4. Good of the City Index

Chair DeFelice reported that the following evening, the City Commission would hear an appeal to demolish the Widling House. Mr. Fajardo explained that the Unsafe Structures Board had ordered the demolition in 2007 but legal action against the property had taken precedence to any City action. The legal action had been settled, there was now a new owner and the City was proceeding. Mr. Fajardo recalled that the HPB had already recommended the demolition be denied. Chair DeFelice felt this was

a slap in the face from the Unsafe Structures Board; he thought they had made progress with them during the ordinance re-write.

Mr. Fajardo displayed photos of the property and said the home had been lifted off its foundation with the intention of repositioning it on the property and building an addition. Chair DeFelice suggested a new engineer's report be requested for the Board to review.

Mr. Fajardo said the City Commission would examine the record and the findings, as well as the prior recommendation from the HPB, when hearing the appeal.

Mr. Baber said one criterion for demolition was that the structure was no longer a landmark, and the whole Sailboat Bend Historic District was a landmark, so any building in it was a landmark. If the Commission approved the demolition, there was a condition in the demolition criteria to allow a 90-day "stay of execution" for alternatives to be presented. Mr. Baber added that it was not difficult to move a masonry building such as this one. He was certain that if a preservation-oriented engineer reviewed this building, he/she would indicate it was safe.

Ms. Scott reported volunteers would hold a painting party for the Shippey House on June 8. They were still awaiting final plans, which would include the rebuilt porch. She said the building had been enclosed with a 6-foot fence for security.

Mr. Fajardo informed the Board that Dominique Hawkins' historic preservation design guidelines for the City would be receiving an award from the Florida Trust for Historic Preservation. The ceremony would be on May 17 during the Trust's annual meeting. Mr. Fajardo reported the design guidelines were available on the City's website.

Charles Jordan encouraged everyone to attend the Trust's annual conference from May 16 through 18 where tours and workshops would be offered. He said it was a very valuable event for a preservation advocate.

5. Communication to the City Commission Index

[Discussed earlier]

Motion made by Ms. Thompson, seconded by Mr. Morgan, to send the following communication to the City Commission: The intent of the HPB is not to jeopardize the adaptive reuse of Southside School by NOVA University, however, the HPB would like the City to explore designating the other physical structures on the site. In a voice vote, motion passed unanimously. He encouraged the City to budget funds to send staff to the conference.

Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 8:15.

Next Meeting
The Board's next regular meeting was scheduled for June 3, 2013.

Chairman,

Matthew DeFelice, 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.