

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 5, 2018 - 5:00 P.M. FIRST FLOOR COMMISSION CHAMBER 100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA

		Attendance	
		<u>6/2018 through 5/2019</u>	
Board Members	Attendance	Present	Absent
David Kyner, Chair	Р	4	0
George Figler, Vice Chair	Р	4	0
Jason Blank [until 7:08]	Р	2	2
Brenda Flowers	А	3	1
Marilyn Mammano [until 6:25]	Р	4	0
Donna Mergenhagen	Р	3	1
Arthur Marcus	Р	4	0
David Parker	Р	4	0
Richard Rosa	Р	4	0
Jason Wetherington	Р	3	0

City Staff

Shari Wallen, Assistant City Attorney Trisha Logan, Planner III Suellen Robertson, Administrative Assistant Jamie Opperlee and Nancy Krakower, Recording Secretaries, Prototype Inc.

Communication to the City Commission

None

Ind	ndex Applicant/Owner		Page	
1.	H-18-010	House of Hope Inc./ Tomas Gonzalez	2	
2.	H-18-015	Broward County Board of County Commissioners/ Ruel Miles, Pioneer Construction Management Inc.	4	
3.	H-18-016	Ruth Clarke	7	
		Good of the City	8	
		Communication to the City Commission	9	

1. Call to Order/Pledge of Allegiance

Chair Kyner called the meeting of the Historic Preservation Board to order at 5:02 p.m.

II. Determination of Quorum/Approval of Minutes

Roll was called and it was determined a quorum was present.

Motion made by Mr. Figler, seconded by Mr. Marcus, to approve the minutes of the Board's September 2018 meeting. In a voice vote, motion passed unanimously.

III. Public Sign-in/Swearing-In

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

Board members disclosed communications and site visits they had regarding each case.

1.		a designed and the	Index
Case	H18010	FMSF#	
Owner	House of Hope, Inc.		
Applicant	Tomas Gonzalez		
Address	908 SW 1 st Street		
General Location	Bounded by SW 1 st Street on the north, SW 2 nd Street on the south, SW 9 th Terrace on the west, and SW 9 th Avenue on the east.		
Legal Description	WAVERLY PLACE 2-19 D LOT 1 LESS E 5 FOR ST,2 TO 8, 25 THRU 31,32 LESS E 5 FOR ST & VAC 10' ALLEYWAY AS DESC IN ORD NO C-84-56 BLK 121		
Existing Use	Institutional		
Proposed Use	Institutional		
Zoning	RMM-25		
Applicable ULDR Sections	47-24.11.C.3.c.i, 47-17.7.B		
Request	 Certificate of Appropriateness for Minor Alteration Replace the existing fence with a new 6'-0" high metal picket fence and 6'-0" high opaque metal gates, with landscaping along the fence perimeter. 		

IV. Agenda Items:

[See staff report attached hereto]

Ms. Logan reviewed the staff report and concluded with:

In accordance with Sections 47-17.7.B and 47-24.11.C.3.c.i of the ULDR, staff recommends that the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for minor alterations to replace the existing fence with a new 6'-0" high metal picket fence with a 2'-6" high opaque metal fence along the base of the picket fence and 6'-0" high opaque metal gates be **denied**.

If the board were to approve the application, the following condition should be applied:

1. This application is subject to the approval by Building, Zoning, and all ULDR requirements.

Tomas Gonzalez, applicant, provided a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which is attached to these minutes for the public record.

Mr. Gonzalez explained that the solid metal blocking the lower portion of the fence was intended to prevent contraband from being passed through from outside. He noted that the shrubbery was less dense closer to the ground.

Ms. Logan confirmed for Ms. Mammano that vertical wood was an acceptable material for a fence but a wood fence in a front yard, in front of a structure must be no taller than 36". Mr. Gonzalez said they wanted the galvanized metal because it was cost effective, low-maintenance and durable.

Chair Kyner opened the public input portion of the meeting. There being no one present wishing to address the Board on this matter, Chair Kyner closed the public hearing and brought the discussion back to the Board.

Ms. Logan said staff had not discussed vertical wood with Mr. Gonzalez.

Mr. Figler felt that landscaping could accomplish the same thing that the solid galvanized metal would. Ms. Logan informed Mr. Wetherington that the Board had no control over landscaping.

Ms. Mammano did not object to the applicant wanting an opaque base for added security. She also did not object to a six-foot fence because the important building on the property would not be obstructed by it.

Mr. Wetherington did not see how the two-foot solid section would prevent people passing contraband from the outside and Mr. Gonzalez reiterated that the landscaping was least dense there.

Motion made by Mr. Blank, seconded by Mr. Wetherington to deny the request for a Certificate of Appropriateness under case number H18010 located at 908 SW 1st Street for minor alterations to replace the existing metal picket fence with a new 6'-0" high metal picket fence with a 2'-6" high opaque metal fence along the base of the picket fence and 6'-0" high opaque metal gates, based on a finding these requests are not consistent with the purpose and intent of the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Historic Preservation and do not comply with the Historic Design Guidelines. In a roll call vote, motion passed 7-2 with Ms. Mammano and Mr. Marcus opposed.

2.			<u>Index</u>
Case	H18015	FMSF#	
Owner	Broward County Board of Country	nty Commis	sioners
Applicant	Ruel Miles, Pioneer Construction Management Inc		
Address	1000 SW 2 nd Street		
General Location	Approximately 100'-0" east of the intersection of SW 11 Avenue and SW 2 nd Street, on through-street lot between SW 2 nd Street and SW 2 nd Court.		
Legal Description	WAVERLY PLACE REPLAT POR OF BLK 115 66-8 B PARCEL 1 & W1/2 OF VAC'D SW 10 AVE LYING E OF & ADJ TO PARCEL 1,TOGETHER WITH PARCEL 2		
Existing Use	Government		
Proposed Use	Government		
Zoning	RMM-25		
Applicable ULDR Sections	47-24.11.C.3.c.i; 47-24.11.C.4	l.c	
Request	Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition Total demolition of all structures on site. 		

[See staff report attached hereto]

Ms. Logan reviewed the staff report and concluded with:

In accordance with Sections 47-24.11.C.3.c.i and 47-24.11.C.3.c. of the ULDR staff recommends that the application for a COA for Demolition to amend the original COA issued under HPB case number H18015 to address proposed modifications made to the original concept including select demolition as presented before the HPB be **Approved with the Following Conditions:**

1. This application is subject to the approval of building, zoning, and all other ULDR requirements.

Ms. Logan said there were three possible criteria for demolition and the applicant had cited criterion 3: The demolition or redevelopment project is of major benefit to a historic

district because it would allow for additional development opportunities. Ms. Logan had also cited criterion 1: The designated landmark site or property no longer contributes to a historic district. This property had been determined to be compatible, not contributing in previous surveys.

Ariadna Musarra, Director of Construction Management/County Architect for Broward County, invited questions.

Ms. Musarra said they did not want a vacant building left standing in a residential area due to safety concerns. The structure did not meet building codes and there was asbestos in the building. They had no development plans at present and the property was not for sale.

Mr. Parker said the neighborhood would not encourage public housing on this site. He urged Ms. Musarra to consult with the neighborhood about any future development plans and she agreed to.

Chair Kyner recalled that the Board had been surprised in the past by applicants demolishing a structure with promises of development but then the vacant lot became a problem property. He said the developer should also consider any project to be part of the community and participate in that community.

Mr. Marcus asked if the Board could request the County come back to the Board in a certain period of time with redevelopment plans. Ms. Wallen explained they could not; this was just a request for demolition, per the criteria.

Ms. Mammano said the Board just needed to rule on whether the request met any of the three criteria and she was confident the Board would have the opportunity to review any future development.

Ms. Mergenhagen said the demolition of a building with such a large footprint would have a tremendous impact on the neighborhood and asked if any alternative had been considered. She felt the Moorish wall design was iconic in the neighborhood and removing it would have an impact. Ms. Musarra said saving any portion of the building would entail significant structural work and she did not know if the architecture could be maintained. She said no structural assessment had been done, but the building did not meet any building code requirements.

Chair Kyner had received an email from Commissioner Glassman and entered a copy of it into the record. In number 4, the author stated a concern that there was no information provided indicating what church group built and originally utilized the structure and perhaps the founders had been important members of Fort Lauderdale community. The author asked if City staff should require documentation pursuant to this. Ms. Logan had researched this but not discovered significant information or

substantial documentation. She explained that when considering any property for designation as contributing to a historic district or as an individual landmark the first thing you would want to do is assess a property's integrity.

Chair Kyner opened the public input portion of the meeting.

Yolisa Colon, Sailboat Bend resident, supported this application and said se had concerns abut the safety of the building, since it was unoccupied.

John Atkinson, adjacent neighbor, said an empty building was very difficult to monitor and he was concerned about transients.

Scott Strawbridge, Development Director for Housing Authority of the City of Fort Lauderdale, said they had been trying to communicate with the County about this property for a year but had received no response. He felt the County did not feel accountable to the community they were supposed to serve.

There being no one else present wishing to address the Board on this matter, Chair Kyner closed the public hearing and brought the discussion back to the Board.

Mr. Blank pointed out that the email had been forwarded by Commissioner Glassman, it was not written by him.

Motion made by Mr. Blank, seconded by Ms. Mammano to approve the request for a COA under case number H18015 located at 1000 SW 2nd Street application for a COA for Demolition for total demolition of all structures on the site as presented before the HPB, finding these requests are consistent with the purpose and intent of the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Historic Preservation and comply with the Historic Design Guidelines with the following conditions:

1. This application is subject to the approval of building, zoning, and all other ULDR requirements.

In a roll call vote, motion passed 8-1 with Chair Kyner opposed.

Mr. Wetherington was concerned that the Board did not know who authored the original email to Commissioner Glassman. Staff agreed to ask Commissioner Glassman who sent him the email.

Ms. Mammano left the meeting at 6:25 and left a copy of her comments for the next item with the Board.

3.			Index
Case	H18016	FMSF#	
Owner	Ruth Clarke		
Applicant	Ruth Clarke		
Address	1504 Argyle Drive		
General Location	Approximately 230 feet southwest of the SW 2 nd Terrace and Argyle Drive intersection.		
Legal Description	RIVER HIGHLANDS AMEN PLAT 15-69 B LOT 20 BLK 1		
Existing Use	Residential		
Proposed Use	Residential		
Zoning	RS-8		
Applicable ULDR Sections	47-24.11.C.3.c.i, 47-24.11.C.3.c.ii, 47-17.7.B		
Request	 Certificate of Appropriateness for Minor Alteration: Construction of a new porch overhang on the rear elevation. 		

[See staff report attached hereto]

Ms. Logan reviewed the staff report and concluded with:

In accordance with Sections 47-17.7.B and 47-24.11.C.3.c.ii of the ULDR staff recommends that the application for a COA for a new porch overhang to the rear of the structure for the property located at 1504 Argyle Drive to be **Approved with the following Condition**:

1. This application is subject to the approval by Zoning, Building, and all other ULDR requirements.

James Archer, architect, said they would replace the awning with a permanent porch. In keeping with the previous additions to the house, he would repeat the details of the metal column, wooden beams and single-slop roof.

Mr. Parker said the changes would not be visible from the street. Ms. Mergenhagen pointed out that the changes could be seen from across the canal in the back yard. She believed property owners there should be notified of these requests. She said it was required for properties along the Intracoastal waterway and perhaps they should be consistent.

Chair Kyner opened the public input portion of the meeting. There being no one present wishing to address the Board on this matter, Chair Kyner closed the public hearing and brought the discussion back to the Board.

Motion made by Mr. Blank, seconded by Ms. Mergenhagen to approve the request for a Certificate of Appropriateness under case number H18016 for a new porch overhang to the rear of the structure for the property located at 1504 Argyle Drive based on a finding these requests are consistent with the purpose and intent of the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Historic Preservation and comply with the Historic Design Guidelines, as outlined in the above staff memorandum, with the following condition:

1. This application is subject to the approval by Zoning, Building, and all other ULDR requirements.

In a voice vote, motion passed 8-0.

VI. Good of the City

Index

4. Review of Proposed Updates to Section 47-24.11 of the Unified Land Development Regulations (ULDR) - Historic designation of landmarks, landmark site or buildings and certificate of appropriateness

Ms. Logan provided a Power Point presentation, a copy of which is attached to these minutes for the public record.

Ms. Mergenhagen noted there was no consequence for violating the interim protection measures. Ms. Logan said there was not, and perhaps they should consider a fine for violating the requirement. Demolition does require an owner to pull a permit and there are code enforcement consequences for violating that requirement.

Ms. Logan said the changes in administrative review would result in a decrease in her workload because she would no longer need to draft a staff memorandum for small requests.

Ms. Logan explained the timing requirements in the application process and Mr. Marcus recommended the amount of time for neighborhood notice be increased somewhat.

Mr. Marcus asked how much specificity would be required for "proposed future use." He suggested some commitment such as a site plan, as well as a time frame should be required.

Ms. Logan and Board members reviewed the comments Ms. Mammano had provided.

Ms. Logan explained how she had come up with 25% for administrative approvals. Staff had looked at other municipalities' codes. She stated the determination was left to staff to present a smaller alteration to the Board.

Ms. Mergenhagen noted there had been two or three public workshops regarding the changes and suggested additional workshops for public education. Ms. Logan stated public outreach with HOAs was planned.

Mr. Blank left the meeting at 7:08.

Michaela Conca, President of the Broward Trust for Historic Preservation, said she was encouraged that the City was creating improved language and streamlining the process. She asked about reducing the application fee for individual designation and Ms. Logan said the City occasionally conducted fee studies to determine an appropriate cost.

Ms. Conca suggested an educational workshop for the real estate community regarding the benefits of designation.

V. Communication to the City Commission None

Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 7:23 p.m.

Chairman, David Kyner, Chair

Index

Attest: ProtoType Inc. Re cording Secretary

The City of Fort Lauderdale maintains a <u>Website</u> for the Historic Preservation Board Meeting Agendas and Results:

http://www.fortlauderdale.gov/departments/city-clerk-s-office/board-and-committeeagendas-and-minutes/historic-preservation-board

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