

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE
MONDAY, APRIL 7, 2014 - 5:00 P.M.
FIRST FLOOR COMMISSION CHAMBER
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE
FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA**

<u>Board Members</u>	<u>Attendance</u>	<u>Cumulative Attendance 6/2013 through 5/2014</u>	
		<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
David Kyner, Chair	P	9	0
Gretchen Thompson, Vice Chair	P	8	1
George Figler	P	1	0
Brenda Flowers [from 5:15 until 7:39]	P	8	1
Marie Harrison	A	4	5
Richard Heidelberg	P	6	3
Timothy Lyons	P	1	0
Phillip Morgan [arrived 5:07]	P	9	0
Carol Lee Ortman	P	6	1
Alexandria Scherer	P	7	1

City Staff

Merrilyn Rathbun, Fort Lauderdale Historical Society, Consultant to HPB
Lynda Crase, Board Liaison
Linda Mia Franco, AICP, Historic Preservation Board Liaison
D'Wayne Spence, Assistant City Attorney
Anthony Fajardo, Zoning Administrator
Jamie Opperee, Recording Secretary, Prototype Inc.

Communication to the City Commission

Motion made by Ms. Ortman, seconded by Ms. Thompson to ask the City to review and reconsider its stance regarding the removal of the dormers during roof rehabilitation at the property leased by the Fort Lauderdale Historical Society. In a voice vote, motion passed 8-1 with Mr. Morgan opposed.

<u>Index</u>	<u>Applicant/Owner</u>	<u>Page</u>
H-14-002	Joel Pierce/ B Russel A S Janzan	<u>2</u>
H-14-003	Andrew M. Defeo, Defeo Design Group/304 LLC	<u>7</u>
H-14-001	Bonny M. Flynn/City of Fort Lauderdale	<u>13</u>
	Old Business	<u>17</u>
	New Business	<u>20</u>
	Good of the City	<u>20</u>
	Communication to the City Commission	<u>20</u>

Call to Order

Chair Kyner called the meeting of the Historic Preservation Board to order at 5:01 p.m. Roll was called and it was determined a quorum was present.

New Board members Mr. Lyons and Mr. Figler introduced themselves to Board members and the public.

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.

Items were discussed out of order.

Approval of Minutes of March 2014 Meeting

Motion made by Ms. Thompson, seconded by Ms. Ortman, to approve the minutes of the Board's March 2014 meeting. In a voice vote, motion passed unanimously.

Cases:

1.	<u>Index</u>		
	Case	H14002	FMSF #
	Applicant	Joel Pierce	
	Owner	B Russel A S Janzan	
	Address	808 Himmarshee (SW 2nd) Street	
	General Location	Approximately 102 feet west of the SW 8th Avenue and SW 2nd Street intersection.	
	Legal Description	FOLIO: 504210280030 BRYANS SUB OF BLK 21 FT LAUD 1-29 D LOT 5 LESS N 5 FOR ST	
	Request(s)	1. Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration (Addition to Existing) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• After the Fact – Adding a Master Bedroom addition at the rear side of the residence.• Add new open porch to rear of new addition 2. Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demolish one back-yard shed	
	District	4	

Deferred from March 3, 2014)

Mr. Morgan arrived at 5:07.

Ms. Rathbun read from her memo:

Property Background:

The house at 800 SW 2nd Street (Himmarshee Street) is a one story wood frame vernacular cottage built ca. 1930. The historic house has a gable roof, a hipped roof front porch a side porch on the west elevation and a rectangular footprint; the historic wall cladding is shiplap.

Description of Proposed Site Plan:

The applicant is before the board today to request an After-the-fact Certificate of Appropriateness for a bedroom addition to the house. The new room was added to the rear of the historic cottage and is not visible from the street. The addition has a shed roof and stucco wall cladding. The addition needs to be rebuilt to conform to the Fla. Building Code 2010; windows and door of the addition will be removed and reinstalled in a new 6" framed wall. A new open porch is to be built at the rear of the addition. The applicant proposes to demolish a back yard shed.

Criteria for Certificate of Appropriateness:

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 design of the new addition is appropriate; it is not visible from the street and the roof and materials are differentiated from the historic materials.

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

Consultant Response: There is no adverse effect. The new open porch will not have any adverse effect.

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

Consultant Response: The plan does comply; see below.

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

2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The replacement of intact or repairable historic materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

Request No. 1 - COA for Demolition:

The applicant is requesting a certificate of appropriateness to demolish one existing structure. The applicant plans to demolish a small backyard shed.

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 shed is not significant in the SBHD

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

Consultant Response: Demolition of the shed would be of benefit to the project and to the SBHD. Criteria 2 and 3 apply in this case; the shed should be demolished.

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: The applicant requests:

i. Stucco: smooth

iii. Masonry: (footing)

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; lined only to gable ends.

c. Operations.

- i. Windows: single and double hung; casement; fixed with frame; awning; sliders (rear and side only); jalousies and louvers.

d. General.

- i. Wood shutters sized to match openings (preferably operable).
- ii. Wood and metal jalousies.
- iii. Interior security grills.
- iv. Awnings.

- v. Bahama shutters.
- vi. Screened windows and doors.

Consultant Response: The applicant requests

- a. Materials.
 - i. Glass (clear)
- b. ~~Window Operations~~
 - i. Windows: single hung
- d. General.
 - i. Wood shutters sized to match openings (preferably operable).

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: The applicant requests

- a. Roof--materials
5K Plywood (see applicant's sheet.
- a. Configuration

The applicant has specified a flat roof with parapets. However there are no parapets and the photos show a roof that resembles a low pitched shed roof..

4. Arcades and porches.

- a. Materials and finish.
 - i. Stucco (at piers and arches only): float finish, smooth or coarse, machine spray, dashed or troweled.

- ii. Wood: posts and columns.
- iii. Masonry (at piers and arches only): coral, keystone or split face block; truncated or stacked bond block.
- iv. Metal (at railings only): wrought iron, ESP aluminum.

Consultant Response: The applicant requests

- a. ~~Materials and finish~~
- i. Wood: posts and columns

With the exception of the roof configuration (which should be explained) the applicant's requests meet the SBHD Materials and Design Guidelines.

The City of Fort Lauderdale Historic Preservation Design Guidelines recommends that additions to existing buildings conform the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation by being located in a subordinate position to the historic building and should be clearly identified as a new addition by the use of materials and details (p.7 New Construction & Additions). The new addition is located at the rear of the house and is not visible from the street; the wall cladding for the addition is differentiated from the historic house as are the new window sizes of the addition.

Under the heading "Principles for Additions" the City of Fort Lauderdale Historic Preservation Design Guidelines states that it is "generally appropriate" to construct an addition that is smaller or similar in scale to the historic building (p.7 New Construction & Additions). The new addition meets this recommendation.

Request No. 2 - COA for Alterations:

The applicant is requesting a certificate of appropriateness for alterations to one structure.

In addition to the General Criteria for obtaining a COA and the Material and Design Guidelines, as previously outlined, pursuant to ULDR Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.ii, the Board must consider the following additional criteria specific to alterations, taking into account the analysis of the materials and design guidelines above:

"Additional guidelines; alterations. In approving or denying applications for certificates of appropriateness for alterations, the board shall also consider whether and the extent to which the following additional guidelines, which are based on the United States Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, will be met."

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

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

Consultant Response: The new addition is placed at the rear of the historic house and is not visible from the street. The use of the property is not changed

- 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: There is minimal impact to the historic material of the house.

Summary Conclusion:

The applicant is required to rebuild the existing walls to meet the Florida Building Code. The requested COA should be approved.

Joel Pierce, applicant, explained that he was a tenant in the house and they were taking responsibility for the problems. The owner was a sea captain and was away from the City much of the time. A contractor would pull the permits and oversee the work. Mr. Pierce intended to do whatever was needed to bring the building up to code.

Ms. Flowers arrived at 5:15.

Mr. Pierce said he was working with Code Enforcement and the contractors to correct violations for which the property had been cited. Mr. Spence clarified that the citation involved performing work without permits. Part of the work had already been done and Mr. Pierce needed the COAs to apply for the after the fact and the new permits. Mr. Pierce had not done the work that had already been done without permits.

Motion made by Mr. Heidelberger, seconded by Mr. Figler, to approve the COA for alteration as presented. In a voice vote, motion passed 9-0.

Motion made by Ms. Thompson, seconded by Ms. Ortman, to approve the COA for demolition as presented. In a voice vote, motion passed 8-1 with Mr. Figler opposed.

2.

Index

Case	H14003	FMSF #	
Applicant	Andrew M. Defeo, Defeo Design Group		
Owner	304 LLC		
Address	304 SW 12th Avenue		
General Location	Approximately 60 feet south of the southeast corner intersection of SW 12th Avenue and W. Las Olas Boulevard.		
Legal Description	FOLIO: 504209090780: LOTS 11 AND 12, BLOCK 108 OF "SUBDIVISION OF WAVERLY PLACE AN ADDITION TO FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA", ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF, AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 2, PAGE 19 OF		

	THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA. SAID LANDS SITUATE, LYING AND BEING IN BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA.
Request(s)	Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration (Addition to Existing) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A new 688 sq. ft. two-story frame addition comprised of a previously approved 149 sq. ft. addition (Case 7-H-09) and added 539 sq. ft. footprint.
District	4

(Deferred from March 3, 2014)

Ms. Rathbun read from her memo:

Property Background:

In August of 2009 the applicant, acting for a former owner of the property, came to the board with a proposal (case # 7-H-09) for a new addition to the house at 304 SW 12th Avenue to house an elevator, construction of a breakfast nook and construction of a new deck and stairs. The application was approved by the board and a COA was awarded on September 3, 2009. From the Consultant's memo August 2009:

- "The residence (duplex) at 304 SW 12th Avenue appears on the 1928 Sanborn Fire Insurance map and is considered a contributing property in the Sailboat Bend Historic District. The house is two stories with a simple gable roof; there is an exterior stair and second floor deck. A small shed is located to the rear of the house. This shed does not appear on any of the Sanborn Maps and is considered non-contributing.

Description of Proposed Site Plan:

The applicant, now acting for a new owner, is before the board with a proposal for a new one and two story addition with a combined 536 sq. ft. footprint to be added to the previously approved 149 sq. ft. addition to the historic two story house. The new design reconfigures the house from a duplex to a three bedroom single family residence; the elevator and breakfast nook have been eliminated. There is an entry porch with a balcony above. The balcony is accessed from the second floor master bedroom. The new addition at the rear of the property has a dining area with an eight foot ceiling; the adjacent living room has a seventeen foot ceiling open to the second floor. The second bedroom on the second floor, which is located over part of the dining area, has access to an open deck that is built over the remainder of the dining area.

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 previous COA (7-H-09) approved a new addition to be built on the south side of the house. The new two story addition, with an inset entry porch, will be set back over twelve feet from the front of the historic structure. The 12 foot setback minimizes the impact of the new addition on the historic façade. The second floor balcony, which is supported by wood posts and covers the setback area is in line with the façade; the impact of the balcony is relatively small. The requested new addition (536 sq. ft.) is located at the rear of the previously approved addition and will have minimal impact of the historic house and the streetscape.

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

Consultant Response: No adverse impact.

- 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: The design, arrangement, texture materials and color of the new addition are appropriate. No adverse impact.

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

Consultant Response: The applicant's plans meet this criterion. See Below

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

2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The replacement of intact or repairable historic materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided. .

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

5. Exterior building walls.

a. Materials and finish.

- i. Stucco: float finish, smooth or coarse, machine spray, dashed or troweled.
- ii. Wood: clapboard, three and one-half (3 1/2) inches to seven (7) inches to the weather; shingles, seven (7) inches to the weather; board and batten, eight

(8) inches to twelve (12) inches; shiplap siding smooth face, four (4) inches to eight (8) inches to the weather.

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

Consultant Response: The applicant requests:

Exterior building walls.

a. Materials and finish.

ii. Wood: ...shiplap siding smooth face, four (4) inches to eight (8) inches to the weather.

6. 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.

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 Response: The applicant requests:

Windows and doors.

a. Materials.

i. Glass non-reflective tinted

b. Configurations.

i. Windows: rectangular

c. Operations.

i. Windows: single hung

d. General.

i. Wood shutters sized to match openings (preferably operable).*

- vi. Screened windows and doors.

* The applicant shows shutters on his elevation plan

7. 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: The applicant requests:

a. Roof--materials.

- vii. Fiberglass/asphalt shingles.

c. Configurations.

- i. Simple gable and hip, pitch no less than 3:12 and no more than 8:12.

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.

Consultant Response: The applicant requests:

a. Materials and style.

Wood: posts and columns

The applicant's requests for materials meet the SBHD Materials and Design Guidelines. The City of Fort Lauderdale Historic Preservation Design Guidelines recommends.

Request No. 2 - COA for Alterations:

The applicant is requesting a certificate of appropriateness for alterations to one structure.

"Additional guidelines; alterations. In approving or denying applications for certificates of appropriateness for alterations, the board shall also consider whether and the extent to which the following additional guidelines, which are based on the United States Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, will be met."

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

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

Consultant Response: n/a the use will not change.

- 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 new addition is at the rear of the previously approved addition to the historic house. There will be minimal impact to the historic house.

Summary Conclusion:

The new addition is appropriate in the SBHD. The request for the COA should be approved.

Andrew DeFeo, applicant, explained that the previous owner had never completed the work for which she had been granted COAs. The new owner would install a new staircase instead of the elevator planned by the prior owner. The new owner also wished to extend the rear addition farther into the rear yard than the prior owner had planned.

Chair Kyner noted that the original plan had four windows on the upper floor of the front of the house and Mr. DeFeo planned to replace these with two windows. Mr. DeFeo stated the two windows and removal of the front door had been approved for the previous owner's plans. He displayed plan sets from the 2009 application showing those changes.

The Board noted that the photos were of the building before the previous owner had done the approved work. Mr. DeFeo said the building had been a skeleton since the previous owner stopped doing work.

Chair Kyner recalled that the previous approval had indicated that the vertical boards at the corners should be maintained to differentiate where the old house ended and the new house began. Mr. DeFeo agreed to maintain this when the boards were replaced.

Chair Kyner opened the public hearing portion of the meeting. As no one spoke, Chair Kyner closed the public hearing and brought discussion back to the Board.

Motion made by Ms. Thompson, seconded by Ms. Scherer, to approve the COA for alteration, with the inclusion of the vertical boards as discussed. In a voice vote, motion passed 9-0.

3.

Index

Case	H14001	FMSF #	
Applicant	Bonnie M. Flynn		
Owner	City of Fort Lauderdale		
Address	219 SW 2 nd Avenue		
General Location	Approximately 120 feet south of Himmarshee Street on the west side of SW 2 nd Avenue		
Legal Description	FOLIO: 504210010080 FT LAUDERDALE B-40 D LOTS 4,10 THRU 13,15 N 15,16 BLK C		
Request(s)	Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Alteration <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Replace existing metal shingle with standing seam metal roof		
District	2		

Ms. Rathbun read from her memo:

Property Background:

The first structure built on this site at the turn of the 20th century was a two story wood frame residence and boarding house called the Bryan Hotel. In 1905, Philemon Bryan the owner and his contractor Edwin King salvaged part of this wood frame structure moved it west on the lot and built the present concrete block hotel in its place. King designed a two and a half story structure with a rectangular footprint. The hotel has a hip roof, which was originally clad in standing seam metal. There are four dormers on both the east and west slopes of the roof and originally there was one dormer each on the north and south slopes. At a later time extra dormers were added to the north and south slopes. Thirteen concrete columns support a two story porch that wraps around

the south and east sides of the building; the second story of the porch has wood rails and balusters. All windows are 2/2 light sash set in cypress frames.

King and Bryan had sand barged from the beach to form the rusticated concrete blocks in detachable iron molds. Similar molds were available at the time from Sears Roebuck, but it is not known where the men obtained their molds. With the exception of a belt course of smooth blocks at the second floor level all blocks are rusticated, i.e., they mimic natural stone.

The hotel was called the New River Hotel until 1940. The adjacent portion of the original wood frame boarding house was used as an annex to the hotel. In the 1950s the hotel was used as a private home for the Bryan family. The property was later acquired by the City of Fort Lauderdale and housed the Planning Department for the city. The Inn was the first home of the Discovery Center (MODS) and is presently the Museum of History for the Fort Lauderdale Historical Society.

Description of Proposed Site Plan:

At some point in its history the original standing seam metal roof was replaced with metal shingles. The shingle roof has deteriorated and needs to be replaced. The applicant proposes to replace the existing shingle roof with standing seam metal, which will be a return to the original cladding.

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 existing roof has deteriorated and needs to be replaced

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

Consultant Response: There is no adverse impact on the relationship between the proposed work and other structures on the landmark site

- 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: The existing roofing material, i.e. metal shingles, was a replacement material. The original roof was standing metal seam (see the copy of a photo of the New River Inn when first built) as is the proposed material for the new roof.

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

Consultant Response: The proposed roofing material is the same as the original roof (see historic photo included in the applicant's placket). The proposal meets this criterion (see 6. 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.

Request No. 1 - COA for Alterations:

The applicant is requesting a certificate of appropriateness for alterations to one structure.

In addition to the General Criteria for obtaining a COA and the Material and Design Guidelines, as previously outlined, pursuant to ULDR Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.ii, the Board must consider the following additional criteria specific to alterations, taking into account the analysis of the materials and design guidelines above:

"Additional guidelines; alterations. In approving or denying applications for certificates of appropriateness for alterations, the board shall also consider whether and the extent to which the following additional guidelines, which are based on the United States Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, will be met."

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

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

Consultant Response: The building use will not change.

- 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: By using the proposed standing seam metal roofing the building is being returned to its original appearance.

- 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 Response: The proposed roofing material is historically accurate.

- 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 proposed roofing material matches the original standing seam roof (see historic photo in the applicant's placket).

Mr. Spence pointed out that Ms. Rathbun worked for the Fort Lauderdale Historical Society and had therefore not made a recommendation.

Ms. Thompson disclosed that she was a former board member of the Historical Society, and Mr. Spence informed her that this was not grounds to recuse herself from hearing the application.

Art Bengochea, architect, stated they wished to replace this roof with one that was as close to the original as possible. They would also replace any existing architectural details and features as closely as possible. He explained that they had originally intended to remove some of the dormers to bring the roof back to its original style but City management had declared they did not want this done.

Mr. Bengochea said they had chosen a wire railing on the upper story because it was the least intrusive to the view. The original railings did not meet life safety requirements.

Chair Kyner opened the public hearing portion of the meeting.

Susan McClellan, architect and former Chair of the HPB, said she had written the grant report for the Historical Society and she had noted that to re-roof the building true to history, the dormers should be removed. She added that the additional dormers were contributing to roof leaks. She was disappointed the City wanted the dormers to be maintained. Ms. Franco informed the Board that the dormers had been added when the building was changed to a public use to enclose a stairwell as a form of egress. Only one dormer was needed to hide the stairwell, but the other dormer had been added to be proportional.

Mr. Bengochea confirmed that the staircase door was in the center dormer and the two side dormers were decorative only. He said there was also an issue with pigeons roosting in the dormers. He asked the Board to approve the project this evening because they must meet a deadline regarding the grants.

Chair Kyner wondered if the dormers were now part of the history of the building as it had been in the 1940s. Ms. McClellan reiterated that the dormers were increasing water infiltration and damage to the building and this was more important than maintaining symmetry or history.

Dave Baber, Broward County Historical Commission Administrator, was pleased that this roof system would resemble the original as closely as possible. He said he was "really disturbed" about the dormer issue and felt they detracted from the original character of the building, which had one dormer at each end. Since they were not needed for life safety, it was appropriate to remove them. He urged the Board to approve the application, including removal of the dormers.

Ms. Franco informed the Board that the building had been accepted into the National Register of Historic Places with the dormers in place. Removal of the dormers would require approval of the owner, the City. Mr. Baber said removal of an inappropriate addition would not affect the building's inclusion in the National Register.

As no one else spoke, Chair Kyner closed the public hearing and brought discussion back to the Board.

Ms. Thompson suggested approving the request as submitted and asking the City to reconsider the dormer removal. Chair Kyner noted that if the Board denied the request, the City Commission would hear an appeal and the applicant would explain the reason for the Board's denial. Ms. Scherer stated this would not allow them time to utilize the grant money. Mr. Spence added that the Board could send a communication to the City Commission and contact their commissioners individually.

Mr. Heidelberger was certain that the existing leaks would be cured by the roof rehabilitation.

Motion made by Ms. Ortman, seconded by Ms. Scherer, to approve the COA for major alteration as submitted. In a voice vote, motion passed 9-0.

4. Old Business

[Index](#)

Historic Preservation Ordinance

Mr. Fajardo referred to the list of six pending items and distributed it to Board members.

Regarding item 1, Mr. Fajardo said staff agreed that 300 feet was an appropriate distance.

Regarding item 2, staff had consulted with the City Attorney's office, who advised that 365 days would be too long and could raise due process issues. The working group had indicated this was a CLG standard or recommendation but Michael Zimny, Florida CLG Program Coordinator, Florida Department of State, had recommended 90-120 days and informed Mr. Fajardo that the 365 days was not tied to a CLG standard. Staff therefore still recommended 120 days.

Mr. Baber said the CLG standards stated that the delay could be a period not to exceed one year and most ordinances the working group had reviewed used this language. He felt 90-120 days was not sufficient time to find an alternative to demolition. Mr. Spence said the City did not want to be in a situation when an action it could be considered an illegal taking of private property.

Motion made by Mr. Figler, seconded by Ms. Ortman, to recommend the language on item 2 indicate that a certificate of appropriateness for demolition contain a delayed effective date of up to 180 days. In a voice vote, motion passed 9-0.

Regarding item 3, Mr. Fajardo said Assistant City Attorney Ginger Wald had informed him that if the City wished a structural engineer to inspect the property, the City would need permission from the property owner or must file for administrative warrant. Staff's opinion was that this was a policy decision on the part of the City Commission.

Mr. Baber suggested that if the City obtained the administrative warrant, a structural engineer should accompany a building inspector when reviewing a property being considered for demolition. Mr. Fajardo noted that the building inspector's inspection was geared toward determining whether a structure was unsafe, not whether it should be maintained for historic purposes. If the City Commission wished to include an analysis of a historic structure and what should be done to rehabilitate it, staff would be willing to do that.

Mr. Baber explained that this issue had come up because in the past, the Unsafe Structures Board had determined historic building was unsafe just because it had been sitting on cribbing waiting to be moved; it was not structurally unsafe. The working group had wanted a way to ensure that a building deemed unsafe was "legitimately not salvageable." Mr. Heidelberger remarked that "anything can be salvageable; it's just, is it economically feasible for the use that it could be put to."

Mr. Heidelberger wished to recommend to the City Commission that when the Unsafe Structures Board reviewed a property they also engaged a structural engineer to confirm or provide a second opinion. Ms. Flowers wondered what would occur if the engineer determined the property could be rehabilitated. Mr. Spence pointed out that there would be a question of where the funding would come from to rehabilitate a building that an engineer had determined could be saved. This also must be balanced against the public safety issue the Unsafe Structures Board inspectors addressed.

Mr. Spence clarified that the HPB wanted someone to determine if there was historic significance to a structure that should be considered as part of the Unsafe Structures process, and they could consider recommending this additional review criterion instead of another inspector.

Mr. Fajardo confirmed for Ms. Scherer that staff would inform the Board of any historic property that was slated for demolition or Code Enforcement action, but noted that the HPB had no jurisdiction until an item was presented to them for a COA.

Ms. Thompson remarked that until City departments were mindful of historic preservation, the HPB would not be made aware of these cases.

Ms. Flowers left the meeting at 7:39.

Chair Kyner summarized that the HPB would like Code Enforcement and Unsafe Structures to be responsible to automatically check if a property they were reviewing was historic and communicate that to staff so they could report it to the HPB. The HPB could conduct research and determine if a case could be made to save the property from demolition.

Regarding item 4, Mr. Spence explained that he had examined the Sarasota ordinance providing for a \$200 fee for a demolition permit for any building, \$100 of which, plus \$0.10 per gross square foot would be put in a trust fund. This was an action strategy in their Historic Preservation Plan and was adopted by ordinance in 2008. It was Mr. Spence's opinion that this fee could be considered a tax, and as such, the City must seek authorization from the State via statute. He had found no statute that would authorize this and felt it could be subject to challenge.

Regarding item 5, Mr. Fajardo said he had consulted with Mr. Zimny, who indicated he did not believe the change in the language in the definition of a contributing property recommended by staff would interfere with applications for property tax exemptions. Mr. Fajardo had not yet researched the state language requirements the working group had referenced.

Mr. Baber said the States administrative rules were very specific about the language that could be used. Mr. Fajardo recommended they move forward, and staff would ensure the language met the requirements.

Regarding item 6, Mr. Fajardo said staff felt this was a policy decision by the City Commission and they should decide how to proceed.

Mr. Fajardo stated the next joint workshop with the Commission would be on April 29 at 7 pm in the 8th floor conference room.

5. New Business

HPB Awards (see attached letter)

[This item was discussed out of order]

Index

Laura Gambino, Business Development Coordinator, Department of Sustainable Development, described the Community Appearance Awards event, with which the Historic Preservation Recognition Awards would be combined on May 8 at the Riverside Hotel.

Ms. Franco said this year, there would only be a couple of Historic Preservation Recognition Awards, but they hoped to add more awards next year. She noted that combining the events would guarantee greater attendance at the ceremony. Ms. Franco would provide Ms. Gambino with the information on the Historic Preservation Recognition Awards. Ms. Gambino described the process for selecting Community Appearance Award recipients. Ms. Franco stated the two Historic Preservation Recognition Awards would be presented to two properties that had been submitted for the Community Appearance Award. There was no time for the Board to review and recommend any additional awards. Ms. Gambino stressed that the Community Appearance Award recipients were not announced prior to the event.

6. Good of the City

Index

No discussion.

7. Communication to the City Commission

Index

Motion made by Ms. Ortman, seconded by Ms. Thompson to ask the City to review and reconsider its stance regarding the removal of the dormers during roof rehabilitation at the property leased by the Fort Lauderdale Historical Society. In a voice vote, motion passed 8-1 with Mr. Morgan opposed.

Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 7:54.

Next Meeting

The Board's next regular meeting was scheduled for May 5, 2014.

Chairman,



~~David Kyner, Chair~~

Gretchen Thompson, Vice Chair

Attest:

Historic Preservation Board

April 7, 2014

Page 21



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>

Any written public comments made 48 hours prior to the meeting regarding items discussed during the proceedings have been attached hereto.