



CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 2020 - 5:00 P.M.
CITY HALL COMMISSION CHAMBERS
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE
FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA

Table with columns: Board Members, Attendance, Cumulative Attendance (Present, Absent) for 6/2019 through 5/2020. Rows include George Figler, Jason Blank, Caldwell Cooper, Marilyn Mammano, Arthur Marcus, David Parker, Richard Rosa, and Tim Schiavone.

City Staff

Shari Wallen, Assistant City Attorney
Trisha Logan, Urban Planner III
Yvonne Redding, Urban Planner III
Jamie Opperee, Recording Secretary, Prototype Inc.

Communication to the City Commission

None

Table with columns: Index, Owner/Applicant, Page. Includes items 1 and 2 with corresponding page numbers.

I. Call to Order/Pledge of Allegiance

The meeting of the Historic Preservation Board was called to order at 5:00 p.m.

II. Determination of Quorum/Approval of Minutes

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

Motion made by Mr. Cooper, seconded by Mr. Schiavone to approve the minutes of the Board's January 2020 meeting. In a voice vote, motion passed 8-0.

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 for each agenda item.

IV. Agenda Items:

1.

[Index](#)

REQUEST:

Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition

- Complete Demolition of Two-Story Accessory Structure in Southwest Corner of Lot.

Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Alteration

- Rehabilitation of Historic Landmark and Modifications to Site Including New Windows and Doors Throughout; Rehabilitation of Existing Main Entryway; Addition of Two Covered Entrances; Removal of Existing 3-Story Elevator Tower (West Elevation) and Construction of a New 3-Story Elevator Tower and Walkway in Same Location; Removal of Tile Screen on Porches Facing Inner Courtyard; Removal of Existing 1-Story Boiler Room (South Elevation); Removal of Existing Landscaping and Paving and Installation of New Landscaping and Paving Throughout Site; Addition of Parking Spaces; Construction of In-Ground Pool in Rear; Placement of Fence at Side and Rear Perimeter; New Exterior Light Fixtures Throughout; Construction of New Trash Enclosure.

Certificate of Appropriateness for New Construction

- Construction of New 4-Story Multi-Family Structure in Southwest Corner of Lot.

Case Number	PLN-HP-COA-20010001	FMSF#	BD01504
Owner	Towers Retirement Home Inc		
Applicant	Andrew J. Schein, Esq., Lochrie & Chakas, P.A.		
Address	824 SE 2 nd Street		
General Location	Southwest corner of the intersection of SE 2 nd Street and SE 9 th Avenue		
Legal Description	BEVERLY HEIGHTS 1-30 B LOT 1 TO 4 BLK 8		
Existing Use	Social Service Residential Facility (SSRF)		
Proposed Use	Multi-Family Residential		
Zoning	RMM-25		
Applicable ULDR Sections	47-24.11.D.3.c.i; 47-24.11.D.3.c.ii		
Landmark/Historic District	Towers Apartments		
Authored By	Trisha Logan, Urban Planner III		

Ms. Logan's review of the staff report concluded with:

In accordance with Sections 47-24.11.D.3.c.i, and 47-24.11.D.4. of the ULDR, staff finds that the application for a **COA for Demolition** under case number PLN-HP-20010001 located at 824 SE 2nd Street meets the criteria as outlined in Section 47-24.11.D.3.c.i. of the ULDR and meets the criteria as outlined in Sections 47-24.11.D.4. of the ULDR.

Historic Preservation Board

February 3, 2020

Page 3

The following conditions for the COA for Demolition are provided for consideration by the HPB if the application is to be approved:

1. The demolition of the accessory structure shall not negatively impact the adjacent historic landmark and protection from construction debris and construction equipment shall be provided, as necessary. A protection plan must be submitted to the Historic Preservation Board Liaison prior to applying for building permits.
2. This application is subject to the approval by Building, Zoning, and all ULDR requirements.

In accordance with Sections 47-24.11.D.3.c.i. and 47-24.11.D.3.c.ii. of the ULDR, staff finds that the application for a COA for **Major Alterations** under case number PLN-HP-20010001 located at 824 SE 2nd Street meets the criteria as outlined in Section 47-24.11.D.3.c.i. of the ULDR and partially meets the criteria as outlined in Sections 47-24.11.D.3.c.ii. of the ULDR.

The following conditions for the COA for Major Alterations are provided for consideration by the HPB if the application is to be approved:

1. All glass must be clear with an option of Low-e.
2. All muntins must have a raised profile.
3. The impact of the amount of parking immediately in front of the structure should be mitigated through a reduction in the number of spaces.
4. The use of a Corinthian column must not be used at each covered entrance and a more simplified column should be used to differentiate between the rehabilitated historic building and the new construction.
5. Openings above the entrance on the east elevation along SE 9th Avenue must use single-hung windows or windows that appear to be single-hung windows, if a fixed window is needed in the stairwell.
6. This application is subject to the approval by Building, Zoning, and all ULDR requirements.

In accordance with Sections 47-24.11.D.3.c.i. and 47-24.11.D.3.c.ii. of the ULDR, staff finds that the application for a COA for **New Construction** under case number PLN-HP-20010001 located at 824 SE 2nd Street meets the criteria as outlined in Section 47-24.11.D.3.c.i. of the ULDR and partially meets the criteria as outlined in Sections 47-24.11.D.3.c.iii. of the ULDR.

The following conditions for the COA for New Construction are provided for consideration by the HPB if the application is to be approved:

1. All glass shall be clear with an option of Low-e.
2. All muntins must have a raised profile.
3. Details were not provided of the proposed outriggers on the new structure, but these details must be more simplified in comparison to the original architectural element found on the historic landmark as to not create a false sense of history.
4. The use of a Corinthian column must not be used at each covered entrance and a more simplified column should be used to differentiate between the rehabilitated historic building and the new construction.
5. Staging for the new construction project shall not negatively impact the adjacent historic structure and protection from construction debris and construction equipment shall be provided, as necessary. A protection plan must be submitted to the Historic Preservation Board Liaison prior to applying for building permits.

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

Robert Lochrie, attorney, recalled that the City had designated the property in 2015. He said the owner had worked with several developers over the years and they believed this plan would maintain the property's integrity, return it to its original use as a residential property, and allow it to be economically viable.

Mr. Lochrie displayed aerial photos of the property and photos of the buildings in their current state. He referred to a site plan and rendering and described the proposed changes.

Mr. Lochrie said they agreed with all of the conditions in the staff report, with the exception of one concerning the parking. He said they did need to maintain the parking spaces in front of the building to meet their needs and that the proposed 39 parking spaces included the on-street parking.

Staci Kushner, architect, described changes to the design in response to the staff conditions: replacement of the originally proposed louvers with single-hung windows on the 9th Avenue entrance; the alternate Doric style column and the change to a more simplified outrigger.

Mr. Lochrie stated that in addition the Development Review Committee, they had already conducted public outreach including meeting with the neighborhood association and neighbors directly adjacent to the property. He said this plan would also need to be approved by the Planning and Zoning Board and the City Commission.

Chair Figler opened the public input portion of the meeting.

Marla Dumas, author of the report used for the Tower Apartments historic designation, said some of the original units had hotel rooms as well as apartments, which is why there are 39 units. She noted that the annex building had not been intended to be part of the designated landmark. She asked the Board to ensure that all methods of protecting the historic building be used during the demolition of the accessory structure. Ms. Dumas reminded the Board that per the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, the new development should be distinguishable from the original architecture.

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

Mr. Marcus felt this was a great project. Regarding differentiating the new and old architecture, he thought there should be more difference in material and detail in the windows, color and texture of walls and roof material.

Ms. Mammano asked about the staff condition to remove the on-street parking on front of the building; she felt landscaping and different paving could mitigate the visual effect of the white walkway, which would also address staff's concern about the parking. Board members and Mr. Lochrie discussed ways to address Ms. Mammano's concerns about the walkway in the front entry area; she felt the ramp was too wide and too white. She explained that she felt the ramp detracted from the historic nature of the property. Mr. Lochrie agreed to add more landscaping south of the two parking spaces in the front courtyard.

Mr. Marcus asked Board members if they felt the new building would be different enough from the old building. Chair Figler said the new construction should be different enough that the average person could distinguish between the new and old.

Regarding the protection of the historical portion of the site during demolition, Chair Figler discussed an infrared method for monitoring. Ms. Dumas said it was also possible to buttress the old elements prior to demolition to protect them. Ms. Logan stated as part of the permitting process, the developer would provide a plan for protecting the historic structure during demolition utilizing best practices. Mr. Lochrie confirmed they had agreed to this condition. Regarding distinguishing the historic structure from the new structure, Mr. Lochrie stated they had worked with staff to achieve this.

Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition

Motion made by Mr. Blank, seconded by Ms. Mammano:

To approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition under case number PLN-HP-20010001 located at 824 SE 2 Street based on the findings of fact as outlined in the staff report with the following conditions:

1. The demolition of the accessory structure shall not negatively impact the adjacent historic landmark and protection from construction debris and construction equipment shall be provided as necessary. A protection plan must be submitted to the Historic Preservation Board Liaison prior to applying for building permits.
2. Demolition must impart any recommendations by the city to protect existing historic structure.
3. The application is subject to the approval by Building, Zoning, and all ULDR requirements.

In a roll call vote, motion passed 8-0.

Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Alterations

Motion made by Mr. Blank, seconded by Mr. Parker:

To approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Alterations under case number PLN-HP-20010001 located at 824 SE 2 Street based on the findings of fact as discussed on the dais and outlined in the staff report with the following conditions:

1. All glass shall be clear with an option of Low-e.
2. All muntins must have a raised profile.
3. Details were not provided of the proposed outriggers on the new structure, but these details must be more simplified in comparison to the original architectural element found on the historic landmark as to not create a false sense of history.
4. The use of a Corinthian column must not be used at each covered entrance and a more simplified column should be used to differentiate between the rehabilitated historic building and the new construction.
5. Staging for the new construction project shall not negatively impact the adjacent historic structure and protection from construction debris and construction equipment shall be provided, as necessary. A protection plan must be submitted to the Historic Preservation Board Liaison prior to applying for building permits.
6. This application is subject to the approval by Building, Zoning, and all ULDR requirements.

After discussion regarding Ms. Mammano's concern about the front entranceway ramp, Mr. Blank withdrew this motion and made another

Motion made by Mr. Blank, seconded by Ms. Mammano:

To approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Alterations under case number PLN-HP-20010001 located at 824 SE 2 Street based on the findings of fact discussed on the dais and outlined in the staff report with the following conditions:

1. All glass must be clear with the option of Low-e.
2. All muntins must have a raised profile.
3. The impact of the parking immediately in front of the structure should be mitigated for its effect on the historic structure through modifications to the design of the courtyard entryway.
4. Openings above the entrance on the east elevation along SE 9th Avenue must use single-hung windows or windows that appear to be single-hung windows, if a fixed window is needed in the stairway.
5. Details were not provided of the proposed outriggers on the new structure, but these details must be more simplified in comparison to the original architectural element found on the historic landmark as to not create a false sense of history.
6. The use of a Corinthian column must not be used at each covered entrance and a more simplified column should be used to differentiate between the rehabilitated historic building and the new construction.
7. The application is subject to the approval by Building, Zoning, and all ULDR requirements.

In a roll call vote, motion passed 8-0.

Mr. Marcus discussed possible ways to better differentiate the new construction from the old; changing the muntin pattern to two-over-two; changing the color; changing the scoring. He would also like to see a different window pattern. Chair Figler felt the plantings, color schemes and window color treatments would create confusion in the future. Mr. Lochrie said they had worked with input from several sources to create this project and they believed there was sufficient differentiation.

Certificate of Appropriateness for New Construction

Motion made by Mr. Blank, seconded by Ms. Mammano:

To approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for New Construction under case number PLN-HP-20010001 located at 824 SE 2 Street based on the findings of fact discussed on the dais and contained in the staff report, subject to the following conditions:

1. All glass must be clear with the option of Low-e.
2. All muntins must have a raised profile.
3. Details were not provided of the proposed outriggers on the new structure, but these details must be more simplified in comparison to the original architectural element found on the historic landmark as to not create a false sense of history.
4. The use of a Corinthian column must not be used at each covered entrance and a more simplified column should be used to differentiate between the rehabilitated historic building and the new construction.
5. Staging for the new construction project shall not negatively impact the adjacent historic structure and protection from construction debris and construction equipment shall be provided, as necessary. A protection plan must be submitted to the Historic Preservation Board Liaison prior to applying for building permits.
6. The application is subject to the approval by Building, Zoning, and all ULDR requirements.

In a roll call vote, motion passed 6-2 with Mr. Marcus and Chair Figler opposed.

2.

[Index](#)

REQUEST: **Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Alteration**
• **Modification to Previously Approved Certificate of Appropriateness for New Construction of a Two-Story Duplex (HPB Case No. H18030) to Change Styles of Windows, Doors, and Garage Doors on the Front Façade; Revision of the Stucco Scoring Detail on the Front Façade; and Change of Driveway Paving Material.**

Case Number	PLN-HP-20010002	FMSF#	BD2797
Owner	SB 1010, LLC		
Applicant	SB 1010, LLC		
Address	1010 SW 2nd Court		
General Location	Approximately 160'-0" feet west of the SW 10th Avenue and SW 2nd Street intersection on the south side of street.		
Legal Description	WAVERLY PLACE 2-19 D LOT 26,27 & N1/2 OF VAC ALLEY ABUTTING SAID LOTS BLK 112		
Existing Use	Residential (Duplex)		
Proposed Use	Residential (Duplex)		
Zoning	RML-25		
Applicable ULDR Sections	47-24.11.D.3.c.i, 47-17.7.B		
Authored By	Trisha Logan, Urban Planner III		

Mr. Rosa recused himself from this item as the applicant.

Ms. Logan's staff report concluded with:

Staff finds that the application for a COA for Major Alterations under case number PLN-HP-20010002 located at 1010 SW 2nd Court partially meets the criteria as outlined in Section 47-24.11.D.3.c.i. of the ULDR, and partially meets the criteria for consideration of materials as listed under 47-17.7.B. of the ULDR. She pointed out that the Sailboat Bend Material and Design Guidelines stated that horizontal slider windows were not permitted on the front façade.

Mr. Rosa explained that an administrative application that was approved last year allowed the side and rear elevations to use horizontal slider windows. The contractor had mistakenly ordered the horizontal sliders for the front elevation. Mr. Rosa said he had a muntin that would make the slider look like a single-hung window, as was originally approved. He stated the cost to replace the four windows would be approximately \$5,000.

Regarding the stucco detail scoring, Mr. Rosa said in his opinion, the ULDR did not address spacing in stucco, only in wood.

Regarding the driveway finish, Mr. Rosa explained that the existing pavers installed at his home nearby were coming loose because of how busy SW 2 Court was and how one was forced to enter and exit the property. He said a troweled concrete would last much longer.

Mr. Blank asked staff about windows that were previously approved by the board that had been altered to make it appear like another window style, Ms. Logan confirmed that this had previously been done

Ms. Mammano and Mr. Schiavone wished Mr. Rosa had brought the muntin with him so the Board could assess if it would address the window issue. Mr. Rosa stated the muntin was equal in size and dimension to the center frame that ran vertically through the horizontal slider and the exterior framing of the window so that it would have the appearance of a single-hung window.

Ms. Mammano agreed with Mr. Rosa that the design guidelines referred to spacing of wood siding but not stucco. Mr. Marcus suggested narrower scoring to blend in with the neighborhood better.

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

Motion made by Ms. Mammano, seconded by Mr. Cooper:

To approve the resolution for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Alterations under case number PLN-HP-20010002 located at 1010 SW 2nd Court based on facts and findings as outlined in the staff memorandum and subject to the following conditions:

1. Horizontal scoring must be reduced to be consistent with the regulating lines at the top, middle, and bottom of the windows with equal spacing.
2. Horizontal slider windows on front façade must be modified with raised muntins on the outside with size and color be consistent with the existing window and the profile of the muntin to be accepted by staff.

Mr. Blank suggested that since the stucco scoring spacing was not specified in the guidelines, they should indicate that the applicant would change to a narrower width that was approved by staff.

Chair Figler referred to the "regulating lines" that topped the window, bisected the window and wrapped the entire structure at the bottom of the window. Rather than specifying the width of the scoring, he felt it should relate to those regulating lines.

Ms. Mammano amended her first condition to indicate that the width of the scoring be reduced and aligned with the top, middle and bottom regulating lines of the windows. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0 with Mr. Rosa abstaining.

V. Communication to the City Commission

[Index](#)

None

VI. Good of the City

3. Continued Discussion of Bonnet House Museum and Gardens

[Index](#)

There had been no developments but the Board wanted to keep it on their agenda. Board members explained to Ms. Wallen why they wanted to keep track of this issue.

4. Review of Proposed Updates to the Unified Land Development Regulations (ULDR):

Amend City of Fort Lauderdale Unified Land Development Regulations (ULDR) to

Historic Preservation Board

February 3, 2020

Page 9

Create Article XII., - Transfer of Development Rights (TDRs), Section 47-36; to Add Transfer of Development Rights Process and Criteria Intended to Encourage Preservation of Historic Resources - removed

Ms. Logan said this item was being deferred to the March meeting.

Other Items

Chair Figler asked about the Board's Communication to the City Commission regarding the Board's decision to not recommend the proposed modifications to Sailboat Bend. Ms. Logan said the Commission had discussed this at their January 21, 2020, conference meeting. Commissioner Glassman wanted to follow the Board's recommendation and not pursue the boundary adjustment but to pursue the contributing and non-contributing aspect of the proposal first and this direction had been given to staff.

Regarding the Board's Communication to the City Commission about the informational brochure, Ms. Logan reported there had been no discussion.

Ms. Mammano said the federal government was deciding between three sites for a new federal courthouse and would hold public workshops. She recalled that the Board had already expressed concern about the existing building and asked if they wanted to take any additional action. Chair Figler wanted the Board to take a strong position to support the City influencing the federal government to consider the importance of the structure. Ms. Mammano agreed to attend the public workshop and report back to the Board.

Adjournment


There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 7:17. p.m.

Attest:



ProtoType Inc. Recording Secretary

Chairman:



George Figler, Chair

The City of Fort Lauderdale maintains a website for the Historic Preservation Board Meeting Agendas and Results:

<http://www.fortlauderdale.gov/departments/city-clerk-s-office/board-and-committee-agendas-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.

APPOINTED OFFICERS (continued)

- A copy of the form must be provided immediately to the other members of the agency.
- The form must be read publicly at the next meeting after the form is filed.

IF YOU MAKE NO ATTEMPT TO INFLUENCE THE DECISION EXCEPT BY DISCUSSION AT THE MEETING:

- You must disclose orally the nature of your conflict in the measure before participating.
- You must complete the form and file it within 15 days after the vote occurs with the person responsible for recording the minutes of the meeting, who must incorporate the form in the minutes. A copy of the form must be provided immediately to the other members of the agency, and the form must be read publicly at the next meeting after the form is filed.

DISCLOSURE OF LOCAL OFFICER'S INTEREST

I, Richard Rosa, as a member of SB 1010, LLC , hereby disclose that on February 3rd , 20 20 :

(a) A measure came or will come before my agency which (check one or more)

- inured to my special private gain or loss;
- inured to the special gain or loss of my business associate, _____ ;
- inured to the special gain or loss of my relative, _____ ;
- inured to the special gain or loss of _____ , by whom I am retained; or
- inured to the special gain or loss of _____ , which is the parent subsidiary, or sibling organization or subsidiary of a principal which has retained me.

(b) The measure before my agency and the nature of my conflicting interest in the measure is as follows:

I hold a controlling interest SB 1010, LLC, an entity developing new construction for sale in the Sailboat Bend Historic District.

If disclosure of specific information would violate confidentiality or privilege pursuant to law or rules governing attorneys, a public officer, who is also an attorney, may comply with the disclosure requirements of this section by disclosing the nature of the interest in such a way as to provide the public with notice of the conflict.

Richard Rosa

Date Filed

Signature

NOTICE: UNDER PROVISIONS OF FLORIDA STATUTES §112.317, A FAILURE TO MAKE ANY REQUIRED DISCLOSURE CONSTITUTES GROUNDS FOR AND MAY BE PUNISHED BY ONE OR MORE OF THE FOLLOWING: IMPEACHMENT, REMOVAL OR SUSPENSION FROM OFFICE OR EMPLOYMENT, DEMOTION, REDUCTION IN SALARY, REPRIMAND, OR A CIVIL PENALTY NOT TO EXCEED \$10,000.