HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE
MONDAY, MAY 1, 2017 - 5:00 P.M.
FIRST FLOOR COMMISSION CHAMBER
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE
FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA

		Cumulative Attendance 6/2016 through 5/2017	
Board Members	**Attendance**	**Present**	**Absent**
David Kyner, Chair	P	6	2
George Figler, Vice Chair	P	7	1
Ginger Coffey	A	5	3
Brenda Flowers	P	6	2
Marilyn Mammano	A	4	4
Donna Mergenhagen	P	8	0
Phillip Morgan	P	8	0
Drew Melville	P	7	0
Arthur Marcus	P	6	0

City Staff
Lynda Crase, Administrative Aide
D'Wayne Spence, Assistant City Attorney
Trisha Logan, Planner III
Mona Laventure, Recording Secretary, Prototype Inc.

Communication to the City Commission
None

Index		Applicant/Owner	Page
1.	H-17-003	Steven L. Cohen and Associates, P.A./Paul Vigil	6
2.	H-17-006	Patrick Shavloske, CEO Bonnet House, Inc./ Florida Trust for Historic Preservation	2
		Communication to the City Commission	26
		Good of the City	27

I. Call to Order/Pledge of Allegiance

Chair Kyner called the meeting of the Historic Preservation Board 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. Figler, seconded by Ms. Flowers, to approve the minutes of the Board's April 2017 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.

Motion by Mr. Figler, seconded by Mr. Morgan to hear Case H17006 first. In a voice vote motion passed unanimously.

IV. Agenda Items:

2.

Index

Case	**H17006**
Owner	**Florida Trust for Historic Preservation**
Applicant	**Patrick Shavloske, CEO Bonnet House, Inc.**
Address	900 N Birch Road
General Location	Approximately 533 feet south of the Sunrise Boulevard and N. Birch Road intersection. The property is located on both the east and west sides of N. Birch Road
Legal Description	FOLIO: 504201000050: 1-50-42 & 6-50-43 TR OF LAND BOUNDED ON W INTRA W/W,ON N BY S/L OF TWN 49, ON E BY OCEAN,ON S BY N/L OF BIRCH OCEAN FRONT SUB #2 & N/L OF BLK 10 OF SAID SUB EXT E TO OCEAN, LESS PT INC IN SEABRIDGE & LESS PT IN DB 716/574 & LESS PT K/A PARS 1 & 3 ON SURV REC IN DB 689/635 & LESS RDS,LESS BCH ESMT IN DB 372/360 AS MODIFIED BY OR 1213/643 & LESS DB 773/630 & LESS OR 11311/856 FOLIO: 504201000052 1-50-42 & 6-50-43 GOV LOT 1 OF SEC 1,LESS PTS P/A

	SEABRIDGE & ATLANTIC BCH DEV & LESS N 572.5,& PT GOV LOT 1 OF SEC 6 LYING W OF SR A-1-A,LESS N 572.5,& PT GOV LOT 7 OF SEC 1 LYING N OF BIRCH OCEAN FRONT SUB #2,& PT GOV LOT 2 OF SEC 6 LYING W OF SR A-1-A & N OF BIRCH OCEAN FRONT SUB #2,ALL LESS DBS 716/574 & 773/630 & ALL LESS PT NOT WITHIN E 750 THEREOF,TOGETHR WITH S 300 OF N 1201.25 OF PT SEC 6 LYING BET SR A-1-A & OCEAN
Zoning	RMM-25 - Residential Multifamily Mid Rise/Medium High Density District
Existing Use	Museum and Gardens
Proposed Use	Museum and Gardens
Applicable ULDR Sections	ULDR Section 47-22.3; Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.i ; Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.ii; Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.iii
Request(s)	**1. Certificate of Appropriateness for minor alteration.** • Installation of a new gathering area near the south gate entrance.

Ms. Logan read from the report:

Property Background:

The original entrance to Bonnet House, built in 1920, was located at the south boundary of the property at the north end of Breakers Avenue. That entrance was closed in 1940 when Sunrise Boulevard was opened; however, the original gate piers remain in place. The new northern gate, which was opened at the end of a short drive that connected to Sunrise Boulevard, matched the design of the original having two tall square piers with stepped stone caps and onion shaped finials. In the 1950s the land between Bonnet House and Sunrise Boulevard was sold for development. A new gate, now called the East Gate, was built on the northern boundary of the property. In 1987 a wider gate for vehicular access was built west of the east gate. The design for all of these entrances was based on the design of the original 1920 south gate.

Description of Proposed Site Plan:

Proposed plans show the construction of a new landscaped, open air gathering area near the south gate of the Bonnet House Museum and Gardens. The new gathering area will allow visitors to assemble for tours and hear presentations without interfering with the pedestrian traffic entering and existing through the existing the south gate. Included in the scope of work is the construction of a new pathway that will alternate paving materials between concrete and coral rock, a concrete seat wall with coral stone columns that will hold planting pots of the same material, concrete columns that will display interpretive signage, a donors wall showing the names of benefactors, new landscaping, path lighting, and uplighting.

This scope of work is tied into a project that went before the Historic Preservation Board ("HPB") on November 4, 2013, under Case Number 21H13. At the hearing a Certificate of Appropriateness for the new construction of a ticket booth which was approved without conditions and a Certificate of Appropriateness for the alteration of the existing wall for the creation of a south gate entryway to the Bonnet House Museum and Gardens was approved with the following conditions:

1. Existing wall opening will be moved approximately 20 feet to create a new pedestrian walkway to the Bonnet House.
2. Signage will be added on the gate and walls per plan.

Criteria for Certificate of Appropriateness:

Pursuant to ULDR Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.i, in approving or denying applications for certificates of appropriateness for alterations, new construction, demolition or relocation, the HPB shall use the following general criteria:

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

a) *The effect of the proposed work on the landmark or the property upon which such work is to be done;*

Consultant's response:

There is no impact on the historic buildings

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

Consultant's response:

The new installation is primarily low in profile with the highest point of the installation measuring 7'-8". The location of work is approximately 225'-0" away from the southern edge of the historic house.

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

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

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

Consultant's response:

There is no impact on the historic buildings

b) *The distinguishing original qualities or character of a building, structure, or site and its environment shall not be destroyed. The removal or alteration of any historic material or distinctive architectural features should be avoided when possible;*

Consultant's response:

As per the National Register Nomination Report, it states: "The estate is lushly landscaped with many tropical exotics and palms, but is without any formal program of landscaping." Plans are proposing the removal of one tree, a Sea Grape, and will be

adding a new tree, a Simpson Stopper, as well as several other plants and shrubs to the project area.

h) Every reasonable effort shall be made to protect and preserve archeological resources affected by, or adjacent to, any acquisition, protection, stabilization, preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, or reconstruction project.

Consultant's response:
The site is a designated archeological site and will require a Phase I archeological survey and monitoring of the site during ground disturbing work.

Summary Conclusion:
Staff recommends that the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for minor alterations for the installation of a new gathering area near the south gate entrance and in accordance with Sections 47-17.7.A and 47-24.11.C.3.c.ii of the Unified and Land Development Regulations ("UDLR") be approved with the following conditions:

1. The applicant is required to contract with an archeologist to provide a Phase I (reconnaissance level) archeological survey that will include a shovel test and soil boring that includes samples from throughout the project site. The archeologist must state within the report if further testing on the site is required and/or if monitoring by the archeologist is required during ground disturbing activity once construction commences. The Phase I report and any further preliminary testing recommended by the archeologist must be provided prior to permitting and a final report must be submitted to the Urban Design and Planning Division, Historic Preservation Board Liaison, within 45 days following the completion of the ground disturbing work.
2. All proposed landscape work, including tree removal, is subject to the approval of a separate landscape review.

Chair Kyner opened the public input portion of the meeting.

Tim Hernandez, member of the Bonnet House board of directors, provided a Power Point presentation, a copy of which is attached to these minutes for the public record.

Ms. Mergenhagen asked who would perform the secondary landscaping review and when. Ms. Logan explained that this would be part of the permitting process.

Mr. Marcus asked if any shade would be included and Mr. Hernandez said a ficus would provide shade for the gathering area.

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.

Motion by Mr. Marcus, seconded by Mr. Figler, to approve the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Minor Alteration, including staff conditions:

1. The applicant is required to contract with an archeologist to provide a Phase I (reconnaissance level) archeological survey that will include a shovel test and soil boring that includes samples from throughout the project site. The archeologist must state within the report if further testing on the site is required and/or if monitoring by the archeologist is required during ground disturbing activity once construction commences. The Phase I report and any further preliminary testing recommended by the archeologist must be provided prior to permitting and a final report must be submitted to the Urban Design and Planning Division, Historic Preservation Board Liaison, within 45 days following the completion of the ground disturbing work.
2. All proposed landscape work, including tree removal, is subject to the approval of a separate landscape review.

In a roll call vote, motion passed 7-0.

Chair Kyner recommended that Board members receive electronic copies of the archeologist's report.

1.

Index

Case	H17003	**FMSF#**	BD2809
Owner	Paul Vigil		
Applicant	**Steven L. Cohen and Associates, P.A.**		
Address	1017 SW 4 Street		
General Location	Approximately 150 feet east of the northeast corner of the SW 4 Street and SW 11 Avenue intersection (north side).		
Legal Description	WAVERLY PLACE 2-19 D LOT 7,9 BLK 107		
Existing Use	Multi-Family Residential		
Proposed Use	Multi-Family Residential		
Zoning	RML-25		
Applicable ULDR Sections	47-24.11.C.3.c.i, 47-24.11.C.4.c, 47-17.7.B, 47-24.11.C.3.c.iii		
Request(s)	**1.** Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition • Demolition of accessory one-story garage structure and shed addition on rear of main house. **2.** Certificate of Appropriateness for New Construction> 2000 SF GFA: • Construction of cluster development including (3) new three-story buildings, each containing (2) units. Project site contains (2) existing historic structures including a single-family residence and accessory cottage structure, to remain.		

Ms. Logan read from the memo:

Property Background:

1017 SW 4 Street, located in the Sailboat Bend Historic District encompasses two lots with a total width of 100'-0" and a depth of 175'-0". The site contains a two-story main house, a one-story cottage, and a one-story garage structure. The property is listed on the Florida Master Site File ("FMSF") and the following documentation is as per the Historical Structure Form that was completed in 1993:

Architectural Description: This two-story wood, balloon frame residential building is located at 1017 SW 4 Street. It is an example of the Colonial Revival style of architecture. The building features a gable roof and a symmetrical façade. Fenestration consists of double-hung sash windows with 4/1 lights. A prominent brick chimney rises from the center of the roof ridge. The foundation is continuous concrete block. The house has been altered from its original appearance by the application of aluminum siding.

Historical Statement: The building at 1017 SW 4 Street first appears on the 1924 Sanborn Map. The area in which it is located was not previously mapped. The building, located in the Waverly Place Subdivision, platted in 1911, was probably constructed about 1920. The first resident at this address found in city directories is a veterinarian, Daniel L. Campbell.

From looking at the 1928 plat map, you can see the outline of the main house in its current location, however the two structures in the rear do not match the location or outline as indicated. In 1998, the one-story cottage structure was moved to this location from its original site at 713 SW 1 Street; however a record could not be located to determine when the original building shown on Lot 7 was removed. A permit from May of 1939 has a description of "complete garage", which may be the date of the existing one-story garage structure, but a record was not found to determine the timing of the removal for smaller structure as seen on the plat map located at the rear of Lot 9.

This project has undergone review by the City of Fort Lauderdale's Design Review Committee ("DRC") and was presented to the Sailboat Bend Development Review Committee on January 25, 2017, and to the members of the Sailboat Bend Civic Association on February 11, 2017. President of the Sailboat Bend Civic Association, David Parker, submitted a letter dated February 22, 2017, expressing support of the project (attached herein as Exhibit 1). The project is scheduled to appear before the Planning and Zoning Board ("PZB") on May 17, 2017.

The site is also located within an Archeologically Significant Zone and will require the engagement of an archeologist to provide a preliminary shovel test and potentially monitoring during ground disturbing work.

Description of Proposed Site Plan:
Proposed plans are to construct a cluster development including (3) new three-story residential buildings, each containing (2) units individually measuring to an overall height of 35'-0". On the site plan, each building is labeled "A", "B", and "C". The existing project site contains (2) existing historic structures including a single-family residence and accessory cottage structure, each to remain. Both existing historic structures on site appear to be in good condition, no work will be performed to the one-story cottage structure; however there is a request to remove a one-story shed addition on the rear of the main house.

New structures on the site are staggered throughout the lot and the orientation of their entrances is varied. The entrances for the unit in the front of the lot, set closest to SW 4 Street, are oriented towards the main street and the setback aligns with the neighboring main house. The development site sits between (2) two-story residential structures. The residence to the west is a single-family home built in 1923 and the residence to the east is a single-family home with an accessory unit in the rear built in 1938. Side setbacks along the street vary, however plans propose setbacks that are greater than code requirements for all sides.
Front Setback: 28'-0"
East Side Setback: 10'-0"
West Side Setback: 10'-0"
Rear Setback: 18'-0"

Also included in the site plan are wood decks and soaking pools that are provided for each unit and new decorative vertical-slated picket wood fencing and gates located throughout the site. Commons areas are also provided in two different locations on the site, each with an outdoor grille area. Care and maintenance of these common areas will be provided through a recorded maintenance plan.

New parking will be located on-site with (4) parking spaces provided on SW 4 Street with a landscaped island placed in between each set of two stalls. An additional (8) parking spaces will be provided in the rear and will be accessible through a 10'-0" alley way, these will also provide a landscaped island in between each set of two stalls. Within a new garage structure attached to the rear of "Building C", there will be an additional two spaces provided.

REQUEST No. 1 - COA FOR DEMOLITION:
The applicant is asking for the demolition of the one-story garage structure and of the shed roofed addition attached to the rear of the main house. The applicant is requesting this demolition under criterion iii. under Section 47-24.11.C.4.c of the Unified and Land Development Regulations (ULDR). By removing these elements on the site, the applicant will be able to proceed with their proposed residential redevelopment, and as stated within the Demolition Rider, "*...will preserve and enhance the existing historic structures while adding new residential units in townhouse style buildings...*"

The one-story garage structure in the rear of the house may have been constructed in 1939, according the permit history. Constructed with a stucco exterior and a flat roof, this building does not appear to have been built to have a stylistic relationship with the main house. According to the 1928 plat map, a smaller structure located to the east of the current garage was originally on the site.

Additionally, the applicant is requesting to remove a portion of a rear addition on the main house that was permitted and constructed in 1959. Plans for this rear addition show a larger expanse than what exists today.

It appears that a portion of this rear addition was removed and divided the addition into two remaining parts. The section under the porch on the right hand side of the photo is sealed from the exterior with siding to match the historic house. The other portion of the addition on the left hand side of the photo appears to have been re-built or altered and remains in an unfinished state as of the date of this photo. There are no permits on file for these alterations to the addition. The architect has indicated that after the removal of this addition, the rear of the house will be finished to match the existing siding.

Criteria for Certificate of Appropriateness ("COA"):

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 Historic Preservation Board ("HPB") shall use the following general criteria:

ULDR, Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.i

a) *The effect of the proposed work on the landmark or the property upon which such work is to be done;*

Consultant's response:

The removal of the one-story garage structure and the rear addition do not take away from the significance of the main house or the existing one-story cottage. *b) The relationship between such work and other structures on the landmark site or other property in the historic district;*

Consultant's response:

The one-story garage structure sits at the rear of the property and does not have an architectural relationship to the main house or the one-story cottage.

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's response:

It is determined through review of the permit history that both requests for demolitions are for structures that are not original to the site and were constructed after the main house.

d) *Whether the denial of a certificate of appropriateness would deprive the property owner of all reasonable beneficial use of his property;*

Consultant's response:

Denial of a Certificate of Appropriateness would result in a reduction of the intended new construction project.

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

Consultant's response:
The applicant's proposed plans comply.

<u>Sailboat Bend Historic District material and design guidelines</u>

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.

ULDR Section 47-17.7.B

1. **Exterior building walls.**
   a. Materials and finish.
      i. Stucco: float finish, smooth or coarse, machine spray, dashed or troweled.
      ii. Wood: clapboard, three and one-half (3 1/2) inches to seven (7) inches to the weather; shingles, seven (7) inches to the weather; board and batten, eight (8) inches to twelve (12) inches; shiplap siding smooth face, four (4) inches to eight (8) inches to the weather.
      iii. Masonry: coral, keystone or split face block; truncated or stacked bond block.
2. Consultant's response:

Exterior building walls (Garage)

a. Materials and finish.
   i. Stucco: smooth finish

Exterior building walls (Addition)

a. Materials and finish.
   i. Stucco: smooth finish
   ii. Wood; plywood and plank

3. **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.

4. Consultant's response:

Windows (Garage)

a. Window openings appear to be boarded.

Doors (Garage)

b. Configurations.
   i. Garage doors are wooden and are currently be inoperable due to location of privacy fence.
   ii. Entry door may either be removed or boarded.

Windows (Addition)

a. No windows are present.

Doors (Addition)

b. Configurations.
   iii. Sliding glass doors

5. 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.

6. Consultant's response:

Roofs and gutters (Garage)

a. Roof--materials.
   viii. Built up roof behind parapets.
c. Configurations.
   i. Roof: Flat with low parapet

Roofs and gutters (Addition)

a. Roof--materials.
   vii. Fiberglass/asphalt shingles.
c. Configurations.
   i. Roof: Shed Roof

Summary Conclusion:

It is determined through review of the permit history that both requests for demolitions are for structures that are not original to the site and were constructed after the main house. Staff recommends that the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of the one-story garage and one-story rear addition on the main house in accordance with criterion iii. under Section 47-24.11.C.4.c of the Unified and Land Development Regulations ("UDLR") is approved with the following conditions:

1. All siding materials installed on the rear of the main house shall match the existing.
2. The applicant is required to contract with an archeologist to provide a shovel test survey that includes samples from throughout the project site and states whether the development site holds archeological significance. The archeologist must state within the report if further testing on the site is required and/or if monitoring by the archeologist is required during ground disturbing activity once construction commences. The shovel test survey and any further preliminary testing recommended by the archeologist must be provided prior to permitting and if monitoring is required, a final report must be submitted to the Urban Design and Planning Division, Historic Preservation Board Liaison within 45 days following the completion of the ground disturbing work.

REQUEST No 2: COA FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION:

The applicant is requesting a COA for new construction of (3) new three-story residential cluster buildings, each containing (2) units per building. Each new structure is rectangular in plan, is three stories in height, with a white stucco finish on the lower two levels, HardiePlank siding on the third level, and a standing seam metal roof. The following setbacks are allowed for between the existing historic structures on the site and the new construction project:

- Approximately 11'-8" setback between the main house and the new townhouse to the east
- Approximately 25'-0" separation between the rear of the "Building B" and the cottage structure to the north.

- Approximately 17'-0" separation between the west elevation of "Building C" and the cottage structure to the east.
- Approximately 35'-0" separation between the south elevation of the main house and "Building C" to the north.

In considering a new construction project within a Historic District it is important to make sure that the historic structures remain the central focus of the district and it is discouraged to create any sense of false historicism with the new design.

Within the narrative submitted by the architect it states, "*the architectural style of the new cluster buildings is similar to that of the existing historic structures, which is of a natural South Florida vernacular, but with a more contemporary articulation".* There are a variety of styles that are represented throughout the Sailboat Bend Historic District, however the one-story cottage on site is in the Frame Vernacular Style, and the main house on the site is in the Colonial Revival Style.

Creating a design that is compatible with the surrounding architecture is necessary in a successful design; however the decorative and architectural elements that are displayed as part of the new construction project should be harmonious in their own right. The design should also take into consideration the Historic Design Guidelines, which states; "the specific styles and types of compatible new construction or additions will vary at each site depending on its specific context. Recognizing that what might be appropriate at one property is not appropriate at another, no specific design "solutions" for new construction or additions are mandated." Within this project, there are several decorative elements that compete with one another as well as various roofing types. These elements include a mixture of inoperable shutters, Bahamian shutters, and decorative louvers which together create confusion to the overall design intent.

Criteria for Certificate of Appropriateness ("COA"):
Pursuant to ULDR, Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.i, in approving or denying applications for COAs for alterations, new construction, demolition or relocation, the HPB shall use the following general criteria:

ULDR, Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.i

a) *The effect of the proposed work on the landmark or the property upon which such work is to be done;*

Consultant's response:
The proposed work will reduce the amount of open space surrounding the existing structures on site.

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

Consultant's response:

The new structures to be placed within the district are visually incompatible with the use of a mixture of decorative elements that are not expressed cohesively on the façade and the varied roof types that do not complement the existing structures on the site.

d) Whether the denial of a certificate of appropriateness would deprive the property owner of all reasonable beneficial use of his property;

Consultant's response:

Denial of a COA would result in a reduction of the intended new construction project.

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

Consultant's response:

The applicant's proposed plans comply; 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.

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.

<u>Sailboat Bend Historic District material and design guidelines</u>

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 COA for new construction, alterations, relocation, and demolition.

ULDR Section 47-17.7.B

9. Exterior building walls.

a. Materials and finish.

j. Stucco: float finish, smooth or coarse, machine spray, dashed or troweled.

ii. Wood: clapboard, three and one-half (3 1/2) inches to seven (7) inches to the weather; shingles, seven (7) inches to the weather; board and batten, eight (8) inches to twelve (12) inches; shiplap siding smooth face, four (4) inches to eight (8) inches to the weather.

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

Consultant's response:

Exterior building walls.

a. Materials and finish.

i. Stucco: smooth; HardiePlank Lap Siding (Hardie Plank is not a true wood siding, it is fiber cement.)

10. 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's response:

Windows and doors.

a. Materials.
   i. Tinted Glass
   v. Steel and aluminum.

b. Configurations.
   i. Doors: garage eight (8) feet
   ii. Windows: rectangular;

c. Operations.
   i. Windows: single hung; casements; sliders

d. General.
   i. Shutters on side elevations that are not operable and do not match the size of the opening (material is unknown).
   ii. Aluminum Bahama shutters
   iii. Decorative custom aluminum louver over entryways

11. Roofs and gutters.

a. Roof--materials.
   i. Terra cotta.
   ii. Cement tiles.
   iii. Cedar shingles.
   iv. Steel standing seam.
   v. 5-V crimp.

vi. Galvanized metal or copper shingles (Victorian or diamond pattern).
vii. Fiberglass/asphalt shingles.
viii. Built up roof behind parapets.

b. Gutters.
   i. Exposed half-round.
   ii. Copper.
   iii. ESP aluminum.
   iv. Galvanized steel.
   v. Wood lined with metal.

c. Configurations.
   i. Roof: The pitch of new roofs may be matched to the pitch of the roof of existing structures on the lot. Simple gable and hip, pitch no less than 3:12 and no more than 8:12. Shed roofs attached to a higher wall, pitch no less than 3:12. Tower roofs may be any slope. Rafters in overhangs to be exposed. Flat with railings and parapets, where permitted, solar collectors and turbine fans at rear port.

Consultant's response: **Roofs and gutters.**

d. Roof--materials.
   iv. Steel standing seam.

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

b. 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's response: **Arcades and porches.**

a. Materials and finish.
   i. Wood: posts and columns with front gabled roof over each balcony
   iv. Aluminum metal railings

The applicant's request for materials is not appropriate for the following reasons:

1. Plans show a mixture of inoperable shutters, Bahamian shutters, and decorative louvers. The mixtures of styles within these details are confusing to the overall design intent and compatibility to the context of the Sailboat Bend Historic District; and,
2. Sliding doors are not allowed on the front façade; it appears that the applicant removed this functionality from the plans that are presented to the HPB; however the windows at the porches on the second and third floor do not have an alternative operation type shown.

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.iii, the Board must consider the following additional criteria specific to new construction, taking into account the analysis of the materials and design guidelines above:

"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's response:

The applicant is proposing a three-story structure to be placed on the site with the two existing historic structures. The existing main house located on the site is two-stories in height, while the cottage structure is one-story. Overall massing of the new structures are one continuous rectangular box without much division in height or width to aid in breaking up the building mass that will be imposed on the neighboring one-story structures. The side setbacks between each structure do allow for relief in height. The height differentiation between the roof peak of the main house and the new construction is minimal. The height difference between the cottage structure and the new construction is greater, but it is relieved by the placement of the new garage structure that gradually increases from 1 to 2 stories, and then ultimately to the three-story building beyond.

b) *The relationship of the width of the building to the height of the front elevation shall be visually compatible to buildings and places to which it is visually related.*

Consultant's response:

The width to height ratio appears to be visually compatible.

c) *The relationship of the width of the windows to height of windows in a building shall be visually compatible with buildings and places to which the building is visually related.*

Consultant's response:

The design uses a mixture of window types including single-hung, casements, and sliders.

d) *The relationship of solids to voids in the front facade of a building shall be visually compatible with buildings and places to which it is visually related.*

Consultant's response:

There is a mixture of solids to voids on the façade. The appearance of the primary street facing façade has a solid area in the center of the third floor that seems to offset the balance of the façade.

e) *The relationship of a building to open space between it and adjoining buildings shall be visually compatible to the buildings and places to which it is visually related.*

Consultant's response:

Along SW 4 Street, the visual open space reads as another single-family home as the side setbacks that are allowed for provide enough space so that the visual rhythm along street is retained.

f) *The relationship of the materials, texture and color of the facade of a building shall be visually compatible with the predominant materials used in the buildings to which it is visually related.*

Consultant's response:

The applicant is proposing both smooth stucco and HardiePlank as the exterior surface material. The roofing material is to be metal standing seam roof.

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

Consultant's response:

The proposed shape of the roof line for buildings "A" and "B" are a hipped roof, while building "C" has a front gabled roof. The main house on the site has a side gabled roof and the one-story cottage has a cross-gabled roof. The visual appearance of the various roofs, specifically between the side gabled roof on the main house and the front gabled roof of building "C" that is situated behind the historic structure, creates a visual incompatibility. The roof overhang of the second floor balconies also creates a visual disruption that could be corrected with a variation of the shape.

h) *Appurtenances of a building such as walls, wrought iron, fences, evergreen, landscape masses and, building facades, shall, if necessary, form cohesive walls of enclosures along a street, to insure visual compatibility of the building to the buildings and places to which it is visually related.*

Consultant's response:

Decorative vertical slatted fencing, 36" in height, is proposed at various points throughout the site. New decorative pavers are proposed for the parking spaces provided as part of the new construction project which differs from the gravel material that exists on the site of the main home.

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's response:

The relationship of the openings on the front façade creates a rhythm that partially relates to the neighboring structures. The pattern created on the first and second floor of the front façade with the two sets of casement windows that are centered on the front elevation, almost mimics that which is found on the main house. This rhythm is interrupted with the placement of the entry doors on the far side of each corner of the structure.

j) A building shall be visually compatible with the buildings and places to which it is visually related in its directional character, whether this be vertical character, horizontal character or non-directional character.

Consultant's response:
The neighboring street-facing structures are oriented vertically rather than horizontally, which is repeated in the design of the new construction.

Summary Conclusion:
In reference to new construction, *The City of Fort Lauderdale Historic Preservation Design Guidelines* states:
In Fort Lauderdale's residential neighborhoods the following is encouraged:

- Preservation of the cohesive ambiance of historic properties and neighborhoods with compatible, sympathetic, and contemporary construction that is not visually overwhelming
- Matching setbacks (distances to property lines) of adjacent buildings on a streetscape
- Compatible siting, proportion, scale, form, materials, fenestration, roof configuration, details and finishes to adjacent and nearby properties

In accordance with Sections 47-17.7.A and 47-24.11.C.3.c.iii of the Unified and Land Development Regulations ("UDLR") staff recommends that the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for new construction of (3) new three-story residential cluster buildings, each containing (2) units per building be continued in order for the applicant to address the following concerns:

1. Due to the relationship between the new construction project to the existing historic buildings, all glass shall be clear with the option of a low-e coating.
2. Adjust the roof plans on the new construction throughout the project to create visual compatibility with the existing historic structures on site.
3. Re-evaluate the decorative elements on the façade, to create a more cohesive design.
4. Specify operation type for second and third floor balcony street-facing windows on Building "A".

If the HPB determines that approval is the appropriate course of action, staff would recommend that the following conditions, at a minimum, are provided:

1. Applicant shall provide a protection plan for the historic structures located on site during construction activity to be submitted to the Office of Historic Preservation prior to pulling permits;
2. The applicant is required to contract with an archeologist to provide a shovel test survey that includes samples from throughout the project site and states whether the development site holds archeological significance. The archeologist must state within the report if further testing on the site is required and/or if monitoring by the archeologist is required during ground disturbing activity once construction commences. The shovel test survey and

any further preliminary testing recommended by the archeologist must be provided prior to permitting and if monitoring is required, a final report must be submitted to the Urban Design and Planning Division, Historic Preservation Board Liaison within 45 days following the completion of the ground disturbing work; and,

3. This application is subject to the approval by Zoning and all ULDR requirements.

The Board agreed to discuss the demolition only first.

Seth Yeslow, architect, explained that they wished to remove the existing garage, which was not historic and was contaminated with mold, as well as the addition to the historic structure (the main house), which was also not historic.

Chair Kyner opened the public input portion of the meeting.

Brad Banta, neighbor, said the garage was an eyesore with no historical significance.

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. Yeslow confirmed that after removing the addition, siding would be applied to match the original siding and there would be no new windows or doors. Mr. Yeslow said the owner had improved the interior over the years and it would remain a single-family home.

Paul Vigil, owner and developer, said the development would be an association with "very strict covenants" and by-laws. The maintenance plan would apply to seven owner-occupied units, including the main, historic house. The cottage would be a common area, and its maintenance would be paid for through HOA fees.

Mr. Yeslow referred to page A-03 showing the addition that would be removed. Chair Kyner pointed out that on sheet A-1.1, it appeared that the addition was on the side of the house, not the rear. Mr. Spence stated the addition was on the east side of the house.

Motion made by Ms. Flowers, seconded by Mr. Morgan, to approve the application for the Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition, including the two conditions cited in the consultant's report summary conclusion:

1. All siding materials installed on the rear of the main house shall match the existing.
2. The applicant is required to contract with an archeologist to provide a shovel test survey that includes samples from throughout the project site and states whether the development site holds archeological significance. The archeologist must state within the report if further testing on the site is required and/or if monitoring by the archeologist

is required during ground disturbing activity once construction commences. The shovel test survey and any further preliminary testing recommended by the archeologist must be provided prior to permitting and if monitoring is required, a final report must be submitted to the Urban Design and Planning Division, Historic Preservation Board Liaison within 45 days following the completion of the ground disturbing work.
In a roll call vote, motion passed 7-0.

Ms. Logan continued with the presentation regarding the COA for new construction.

Mr. Yeslow provided a Power Point presentation, a copy of which is attached to these minutes for the public record. He confirmed that the glazing would be clear glass with Low-E film. Also, only the terraces on the third floors on buildings B and C would have sliding doors. All other windows would be fixed glazing or casement.

Mr. Yeslow stated they had made presentations to the Sailboat Bend Development Committee and the Sailboat Bend Neighborhood Association and received overwhelming support.

Chair Kyner opened the public input portion of the meeting.

Michael Ritzo said the style of the cluster homes would fit in with and enhance the neighborhood.

Jim Chaplin stated the project would do a lot for the neighborhood. He felt the neighborhood needed a "shot in the arm to get going."

Brad Banta said the development would be an asset to the community.

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.

Chair Kyner advised the Board to discuss the consultant's report in sections, beginning with:

ULDR, Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.i

a) The effect of the proposed work on the landmark or the property upon which such work is to be done;

Consultant's response:
The proposed work will reduce the amount of open space surrounding the existing structures on site.

Mr. Marcus agreed that the open space would be reduced, but felt that the applicant had done a good job clustering the buildings to create as much open space as possible. Chair Kyner noted that some of the oldest trees on the site were slated to be replaced with palm trees, which he felt was a net loss for shade. He was also discouraged about

the loss of open space in order to "max out" density on the site. He believed the taller homes would also put other homes, including the historic home, in shadow.

Mr. Morgan thought the historic home would be lost in this development.

Ms. Mergenhagen asked if the tree removal required City review or if the Board would approve it if they voted in favor of the request for the CoA. Ms. Logan said the landscape reviewer would have commented on this during the DRC process. The plan must also be presented to the Planning and Zoning Board after the HPB.

The Board moved on to the next citation in the consultant's report:
ULDR, Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.i

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

Consultant's response:
The new structures to be placed within the district are visually incompatible with the use of a mixture of decorative elements that are not expressed cohesively on the façade and the varied roof types that do not complement the existing structures on the site.

Mr. Marcus agreed that the varied design elements could be visually confusing and suggested that everything but the original structure could have Bahama shutters to differentiate them. He said making the façade of the new building "less busy" could allow the older house to be more prominent.

Ms. Logan felt that using a hip roof for building C would make it more consistent with new construction. Also, she thought the gabled structure, porch overhang and Bahama shutters "read differently on the façade."

Ms. Flowers liked the visual diversity.

Mr. Figler thought that there were confusing architectural design elements which were inappropriate regarding the fenestrations on the main façade. He agreed with Ms. Logan about the hip roof.

Chair Kyner noted several unusual design elements and said they took the eye away from the historic structure in "a cheap way, showing a slapstick way of throwing a lot of ornaments on the front of a building." He remarked on the way the historic structure would be enveloped by the new buildings and remarked that it was a beautifully proportioned building with a great view shed through the adjacent park. Chair Kyner would like to see the "tarting up" of the building adjacent to the historic structure toned down.

Chair Kyner cited the consultant's report again:
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.

Chair Kyner said he did not feel this criterion was met and he was particularly concerned about the new structures' massing and scale.

Regarding the next citation from United States Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings:
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.

Chair Kyner said the loss of the environment created by the trees' removal could not be restored.

Regarding the Sailboat Bend Historic District material and design guidelines:
Exterior building walls

a. Materials and finish.
    i. Stucco: smooth; HardiePlank Lap Siding (Hardie Plank is not a true wood siding, it is fiber cement.)

Chair Kyner recalled that in the past, the Board had only approved HardiePlank to be applied to the rear of buildings because it was not real wood. Mr. Figler stated HardiePlank was a great material for Florida and was indistinguishable when painted, but it could not be stained like wood.

Mr. Yeslow explained that the "fake balconies" had fixed glazing, not sliding glass doors, satisfying the code requirement for the modulation of the façade.

Chair Kyner asked Ms. Logan about the French doors on the cottage and she said she was unsure about modifications to that house over time and this could be a modification. Mr. Marcus thought that the doors in the cottage appeared to have been altered and making them more historically accurate would help the building.

Mr. Yeslow reiterated that when the addition was removed from the house, siding would be put over the area to match the other siding. Ms. Mergenhagen was distressed by this because there was boarding on windows and an opening where the shed joined the house. Mr. Yeslow stated the request focused on removing the shed and replacing it with siding to match. The boarded windows were an existing condition on the house.

Mr. Marcus felt the windows should be restored and Mr. Vigil explained that they could restore them but pointed out that there would be an adjacent wall that would present a privacy issue. Chair Kyner felt they should take this opportunity to restore the windows to their former state. Ms. Mergenhagen stated there were three boarded windows and a boarded door on that façade but Mr. Vigil replied there was no boarded door; this was the plumbing wall for the kitchen. He agreed he could restore the windows and reverse the window configuration on the adjacent house to ensure privacy. Mr. Marcus suggested Mr. Vigil look for records of plans for the house to determine what windows were original and Mr. Vigil agreed.

Mr. Vigil stated he had hired an arborist who determined that the large mango tree was rotting and needed to be removed. The other tree has lost a large limb and damaged the cottage, but Mr. Vigil intended to trim it and save it.

Continuing with the consultant's report:
ULDR Section 47-17.7.B
Windows and doors

d. General.
   i. Shutters on side elevations that are not operable and do not match the size of the opening (material is unknown).
   ii. Aluminum Bahama shutters
   iii. Decorative custom aluminum louver over entryways

Consultant's response:
The applicant's request for materials is not appropriate for the following reasons:

1. Plans show a mixture of inoperable shutters, Bahamian shutters, and decorative louvers. The mixtures of styles within these details are confusing to the overall design intent and compatibility to the context of the Sailboat Bend Historic District; and,

Mr. Cohen said the shutters for the new construction matched the historic house's shutters but did not match the openings. Mr. Marcus suggested the shutters *not* match to differentiate from the historic structure. Ms. Flowers felt there were enough differences between the new and old construction to differentiate.

Mr. Figler stated he liked the concept of the cluster and the proportions were nicely done but that they did not maintain historical precedent and had "missed the mark completely" regarding finish. Mr. Vigil stated he appreciated minimalistic design but thought he needed to "dress up" the design to increase the sale-ability and satisfy his price point. He offered to bring the Board's input back to his architects, rework the design and bring it back to the Board.

Chair Kyner referred to the consultant's second objection:

2. Sliding doors are not allowed on the front façade; it appears that the applicant removed this functionality from the plans that are presented to the HPB; however the windows at the porches on the second and third floor do not have an alternative operation type shown.

Mr. Yeslow indicated that the front façades had fixed elements on the ground and third floors and operable windows on the second floor for ventilation. The balconies were not accessible.

Chair Kyner then discussed the following:

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

a) The height of the proposed building shall be visually compatible with adjacent buildings.

Chair Kyner stated there was a building to the east that had been moved forward on the lot a few years ago at the Board's request to continue the line. He said they must consider the relative proportion of that property and the three new buildings to the historic structure. Mr. Marcus thought a three-story house next to a two-story was acceptable and he liked the elevation on the rear because it showed a nice mixing of heights. Mr. Morgan said he could "not get by" the massing of the three-story buildings. Mr. Vigil stated there was only an eight-foot difference between the heights. Mr. Yeslow said the increased setbacks and landscaping, as well as how they had articulated the facade made them compatible.

The Board discussed:

d) The relationship of solids to voids in the front facade of a building shall be visually compatible with buildings and places to which it is visually related.

Consultant's response:

There is a mixture of solids to voids on the façade. The appearance of the primary street facing façade has a solid area in the center of the third floor that seems to offset the balance of the façade.

Mr. Figler and Chair Kyner asked about the darker color between the recessed balconies and Mr. Yeslow stated they had done this to avoid monotony and break up the mass and scale on the façade. Chair Kyner suggested making a slight setback like a blind window on the center element of the third floor to let the shadow create visual movement. Mr. Yeslow stated they could consider that.

The Board took a brief break.

Chair Kyner asked about parking in front of the existing house and Mr. Vigil stated there would be two gravel parking spaces, as it was now.

The Board then considered:

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's response:

The relationship of the openings on the front façade creates a rhythm that partially relates to the neighboring structures. The pattern created on the first and second floor of the front façade with the two sets of casement windows that are centered on the front elevation, almost mimics that which is found on the main house. This rhythm is interrupted with the placement of the entry doors on the far side of each corner of the structure.

Ms. Logan stated she had been concerned about how close the doors were to the corners. Mr. Yeslow stated the code required a separation of entrances which moving them toward the center could violate. Mr. Logan said, "I think some movement over could help...with the rhythm of the façade and the placement of the openings and the fenestration."

Chair Kyner reviewed the following staff recommendations with Mr. Yeslow:

2. Adjust the roof plans on the new construction throughout the project to create visual compatibility with the existing historic structures on site.

Mr. Yeslow recalled the Board had indicated they preferred hip roofs on the new buildings to differentiate from the historic structures' gables. Mr. Marcus felt the different roof styles contributed to the "village" concept.

The Board and Mr. Spence discussed whether the applicant should consider withdrawing, continuing or deferring the request to alter it to reflect the discussions with the Board.

Ms. Flowers said she liked the village concept and the fact that the applicant had consulted with staff and the neighborhood association. She also liked the setbacks, design and the archeological monitoring proposed.

Motion made by Mr. Figler, seconded by Mr. Morgan to continue the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for New Construction until the Board's June meeting. In a roll call vote, motion passed 7-0.

V. Communication to the City Commission Index

None.

VI. Good of the City Index

Chair Kyner asked about the progress of Francis Abreu hotel. Mr. Spence reported the process was in abeyance. The Magistrate had provided the applicant time to develop a design plan to submit to City staff for comments. The Special Magistrate had requested the attorneys set up a status conference.

Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 8:41 p.m.

Chairman,

David Kyner, Chair

Attest:

ProtoType Inc. Recording Secretary

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.