



**HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD  
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE  
Development Services Department  
Main Lobby  
700 NW 19<sup>th</sup> Ave  
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33311  
Monday, May 5, 2025 – 5:00 P.M.**

<u><b>Board Members</b></u>	<u><b>Attendance</b></u>	<b>Cumulative Attendance 6/2024 through 5/2025</b>	
		<u><b>Present</b></u>	<u><b>Absent</b></u>
Arthur Marcus, Chair	P	10	1
Robert Golden	A	1	1
Allen Jones	A	8	3
Jonathan Keith	P	2	0
Sonya Moste	P	8	3
Richard Rosa, Vice Chair	P	8	3
Tim Schiavone	P	9	2
Shane Taylor	P	9	2

**City Staff**

D'Wayne Spence, Interim City Attorney  
Gabrielle Bush, Assistant City Attorney  
Shaun Amarnani, Assistant City Attorney (via Zoom)  
Trisha Logan, Principal Urban Planner  
Lina Allakhverdieva, Urban Planner II  
J. Opperee, Recording Secretary, Prototype Inc.

**Guests**

Jay Adams  
Maggie Hunt

**Communication to the City Commission**

**Motion** made by Mr. Rosa, seconded by Mr. Schiavone to send Communication to the Commission advising that the Historic Preservation Board is pleased with the Sailboat Bend Vision Plan Summary Report, but would like to see a more concrete avenue explored to identify funds to direct to the Sailboat Bend Historic District.  
In a voice vote, the motion **passed 6-0**.

I. Call to Order/Pledge of Allegiance

The meeting of the Historic Preservation Board was called to order at 5:05 p.m.

II. Determination of Quorum/Approval of Minutes

Roll was taken, and it was determined that a quorum was present.



**DRAFT**  
**HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD**  
**CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE**  
**Development Services Department**  
**Main Lobby**  
**700 NW 19<sup>th</sup> Ave**  
**Fort Lauderdale, FL 33311**  
**Monday, May 5, 2025 – 5:00 P.M.**

<u><b>Board Members</b></u>	<u><b>Attendance</b></u>	<b>Cumulative Attendance 6/2024 through 5/2025</b>	
		<u><b>Present</b></u>	<u><b>Absent</b></u>
Arthur Marcus, Chair	P	10	1
Robert Golden	A	1	1
Allen Jones	A	8	3
Jonathan Keith	P	2	0
Sonya Moste	P	8	3
Richard Rosa, Vice Chair	P	8	3
Tim Schiavone	P	9	2
Shane Taylor	P	9	2

**City Staff**

D'Wayne Spence, Interim City Attorney  
Gabrielle Bush, Assistant City Attorney  
Shaun Amarnani, Assistant City Attorney (via Zoom)  
Trisha Logan, Principal Urban Planner  
Lina Allakhverdieva, Urban Planner II  
J. Opperee, Recording Secretary, Prototype Inc.

**Guests**

Jay Adams  
Maggie Hunt

**Communication to the City Commission**

**Motion** made by Mr. Rosa, seconded by Mr. Schiavone to send Communication to the Commission advising that the Historic Preservation Board is pleased with the Sailboat Bend Vision Plan Summary Report, but would like to see a more concrete avenue explored to identify funds to direct to the Sailboat Bend Historic District.  
In a voice vote, the motion **passed 6-0**.

I. Call to Order/Pledge of Allegiance

The meeting of the Historic Preservation Board was called to order at 5:05 p.m.

II. Determination of Quorum/Approval of Minutes

Roll was taken, and it was determined that a quorum was present.

**a. Approval of Minutes: April 7, 2025**

**Motion** made by Mr. Schiavone, seconded by Ms. Moste to approve the minutes of the April 7, 2025, meeting as presented.  
In a voice vote, the motion **passed 6-0**.

Chair Marcus recognized Vice Chair Rosa's final meeting as a member of the Historic Preservation Board.

### 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 prior to each item.

*Item VI.b. followed by Item VI.a. was heard prior to Agenda Items.*

### IV. Agenda Items

#### 1.

**REQUEST:**      **After-the-Fact Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Alterations**  
• After-the-Fact Window and Door Replacement and Alterations to the Window Openings on a Historic Landmark

Case Number	UDP-HP24039	FMSF#	BD09382
Owner/Applicant	Gabriel Palladino		
Address	701 SW 12 <sup>th</sup> Avenue		
General Location	Located at the southwest corner of the intersection of SW 7 <sup>th</sup> Street and SW 12 <sup>th</sup> Avenue		
Legal Description	RIVERSIDE ADD AMEN PLAT 1-13 B LOTS 1 & 2 & E1/2 OF VAC ALLEY ABUTTING SAID LOTS, TOGETHER WITH S 20 OF VAC 7 ST ABUTTING SAID LOTS BLK 4		
Existing Use	Residential Single Family		
Proposed Use	Residential Single Family		
Zoning	RD-15		
Applicable ULDR Sections	47-24.11.D.3.c.i; 47-24.11.D.3.c.ii		
Landmark/Historic District	Creona Riverside Park Residence		
Section 166.033, Florida Statutes	180-day Expiration Date	Extension Date (s)	
	June 29, 2025	Not Applicable	
Authorized By	Lina Allakhverdieva, Urban Planner II Trisha Logan, Principal Planner, Historic Preservation Liaison		

Ms. Logan advised that the applicant had requested a deferral but was asked to do so in person. No one was present on behalf of Gabriel Palladino, applicant, and no action was taken.

#### 2.

**REQUEST:**      **Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Alterations**  
• Replacement of a 3-Tab Asphalt Shingle Roof with a New Slate Gray Metal Roof on a Historic Landmark

Case Number	UDP-HP25006	FMSF#	BD07670
Applicant/Owner	Nicolas Fantaisie, Cristina Matthewman		
Agent	Latasha Carey, Maze Roofing INC		
Address	420 NE 15 <sup>th</sup> Ave		
General Location	Approximately 85 feet south of the intersection of NE 4 <sup>th</sup> Place and NE 15 <sup>th</sup> Avenue on the east side of the street		
Legal Description	LAS OLAS PARK CORR PLAT 6-12 B S 51 FT OF LOTS 1 & 2, BLK 7		
Existing Use	Single-Family Residence		
Proposed Use	Single-Family Residence		
Zoning	RMM-25		
Applicable ULDR Sections	47-24.11.D.3.c.i; 47-24.11.D.3.c.ii		
Landmark/Historic District	Mary Cutler House		
Section 166.033, Florida Statutes	180-day Expiration Date	Extension Date (s)	
	November 1, 2025	Not Applicable	
Authored By	Lina Allakhverdieva, Urban Planner II		

Ms. Allakhverdieva summarized the staff report and concluded with:

**Summary Conclusion:**

Staff find that the application for a COA for major alterations under case number UDP-HP25006 located at 420 NE 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue does not meet the criteria as outlined in Sections 47-24.11.D.3.c.i. and 47-24.11.D.3.c.ii.

***The Board must make a Motion for Approval, a Motion for Approval with Conditions, or a Motion for Denial.***

If, however, the HPB adopts a motion for approval with conditions, the following conditions for the COA are provided for consideration by the HPB:

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

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

Nicolas Fantaisie, applicant, stated he had lived in Victoria Park for the past seven years and appreciated the efforts to preserve history. He explained he and his partner had originally wanted to demo the secondary structure and build a new house but found out they could not. He stated they are unable to get insurance without a contract showing they would replace the roof within 60 days. He stated he wanted to utilize a safer material because he was concerned that a transformer on a pole adjacent to the house would burn it down. He noted the roof was only 20 years old and was not historic.

Ms. Moste asked when metal roofs became available on the market. Chair Marcus confirmed they were available at the time this home was constructed.

Chair Marcus stated the Board had approved a number of metal roof projects for residential properties because the longevity and upkeep is much better for the homeowner over the long term, and this project should not be different.

Mr. Schiavone stated there is always the purest goal is always preserving the historic value and the architectural materials, however times change and issues change. He commented that being responsible to the environment and conserving energy requires change. He stated he agreed with Chair Marcus.

Mr. Taylor noted that the investment in a metal roof may protect other historic aspects of the structure. He stated he was in favor.

Ms. Logan pointed out the home and the other structure on the site were one historic landmark, and the other structure, which is owned by another property owner, has an asphalt shingle roof.

Chair Marcus asked if the Board could stipulate that when that property owner wants to replace their roof, they have to use the same material. Ms. Logan advised that generally when considering a replacement roof if you are not going to replace it with the original material, it should be a compatible material, and this was not the correct method.

Chair Marcus stated the Board needed more guidance on whether they had set a precedent on approval of metal roofs.

Mr. Schiavone stated if there was a material that looked like the asphalt shingle and acted like the metal roof and it was the same cost, then there would be something to talk about. He asserted a shingle roof would look authentic, but it would not be the same and would not make as much practical sense.

**Motion** made by Mr. Schiavone, seconded by Mr. Taylor to approve with conditions the resolution for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Alterations under case number UDP-HP25006 located at 420 NE 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue based on the testimony heard today and subject to the following conditions:

1. This application is subject to approval by Building, Zoning, and all ULDR requirements.  
In a voice vote, the motion **passed 6-0**.

#### **V. Communication to the City Commission**

**Motion** made by Mr. Rosa, seconded by Mr. Schiavone to send Communication to the Commission advising that the Historic Preservation Board is pleased with the Sailboat Bend Vision Plan Summary Report, but would like to see a more concrete avenue explored to identify funds to direct to the Sailboat Bend Historic District.

In a voice vote, the motion **passed 6-0**.

#### **VI. For the Good of the City of Fort Lauderdale**

Item VI.a. was heard following Item VI.b.

##### **a. Review of Proposed Updates to Unified Land Development Regulations Article XII – Transfer of Development Rights (TDR)**

Ms. Logan provided a brief background on the agenda item, advising that the Board had discussed Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) over several months and recently took a pause to re-examine the elements of the updates and explore different options. She shared a PowerPoint presentation outlining the TDR process and reviewing the proposed amendments to the Unified Land Development Regulations Article XII.

Chair Marcus expressed disappointment that the presentation was concentrated on the receiving sites. He asserted it missed an opportunity to save some of the City's important buildings. He stated most of the City's notable buildings were not included in the list of historic properties. Ms. Logan advised that historic designation would happen through a separate process, but to some degree, making a TDR more appealing to a developer could bring more demand.

Chair Marcus suggested labeling the receiving business zoning districts listed in the amendments with the full names for clarity. Discussion ensued briefly. Ms. Logan continued the presentation. Board members asked for clarification as appropriate.

Ms. Moste asked at what point in the process a home owner would be able to request a reduction in their assessed value. Ms. Logan stated she was not sure if that was something that could be done, but it would be a County process.

Jay Adams pointed out the reference to non-residential in the draft TDR ordinance and stated it is only residential being built, so the transfer is useless. Ms. Logan stated the Code currently states non-residential floor area and density can be transferred.

Mr. Adams stated it was not clear whether the units referenced were density units per acre or the pool of Broward County units. City Attorney Spence advised this clarification was among the reasons for the proposed changes. He stated the old version was strictly density, but the projects coming forward go to a pool.

Mr. Adams commented on the calculation and asserted there should be a value based on what the land was worth. Discussion continued regarding details of the proposed formula, zoning districts, and the proposed ordinance language. City Attorney Spence and Ms. Logan provided additional explanation.

City Attorney Spence explained that fundamentally, the TDR means the sending site has those development rights. He stated he and Mr. Adams had a philosophic difference of opinion on the TDR and highlighted potential legal issues with assigning units which could not be developed on the site in order to save a historic property. Discussion continued.

Mr. Taylor suggested the discussion be tabled to the June meeting to allow Mr. Adams and his attorney time to review and comment. Ms. Logan advised the intent of the presentation was to obtain feedback and consider additional changes, and not to vote on the item. She stated staff had a meeting scheduled with Mr. Adams, Maggie Hunt, and Mr. Adams' attorney.

Ms. Moste stated she thought the ordinance provided the clarity needed by developers and noted some of the Board's previous comments had been incorporated.

Ms. Hunt shared that developers had told residents in Sailboat Bend that there were not enough units and it was too expensive to develop a contract, but there are ways to improve it. She asked the Board to suggest options for small property owners like TDR blanks and land lot mergers for combining lots for this purpose. She noted some cities also have a multiplier.

Discussion ensued briefly as to whether additional comments on the draft ordinance should be provided at this time. Consensus was to allow an additional five minutes.

Ms. Hunt asserted there were no other cities that had expiration dates on Certificates of Eligibility. She stated the expiration caused a problem because it increased risk and was more work. She discussed the TDR process in New York City and asked for clarification on availability of units. Ms.

Logan stated if the City does not have units available, they would not issue a Certificate of Eligibility for any particular development. Ms. Hunt stated that other cities have pools and let the market decide.

Chair Marcus asked that additional comments be provided to staff and noted the meeting scheduled for the following week.

Ms. Hunt stated there was disagreement on the issue and asked that the Board send a Communication to the Commission to weigh in on it.

Mr. Adams stated he would email his suggested changes to Ms. Logan and asked that she share them with the Board prior to the next meeting.

City Attorney Spence advised that Broward County Planning Council and its Comprehensive Plan govern the number of units allowed within the County. He stated the City is required to be consistent in its Comprehensive Plan, with the limited density and number of units. He commented that he appreciated looking at the other jurisdictions, but it was not the same.

Chair Marcus stated the item would be on the next agenda.

#### **b. Review of Sailboat Bend Vision Plan Summary Report**

Mr. Rosa commented on the value that could be added with streetscape in Sailboat Bend and noted ongoing issues with flooding in Sailboat Bend. He stated he did not think flood mitigation was what would change the neighborhood and acknowledged the difficulty was in determining where to start and how to get funding.

Ms. Logan provided a PowerPoint presentation reviewing the Sailboat Bend Vision Plan, beginning with an overview of public outreach and organization of feedback to create a report divided into five main categories, including sea level rise, streetscape design, community identity, planning, and parks and recreation. She advised that recommended next steps were also organized and prioritized by these themes.

Discussion ensued during the presentation regarding raising streets, installation of drainage and improvement of stormwater systems, and comparable areas.

Mr. Rosa asked why it would take 10 years to make improvements to SW 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Ms. Logan advised the timeline was dictated by the County Surtax grant. Mr. Rosa stated there were no sidewalks in the area, and it was common sense to do one thing instead of trying to do everything at once.

Mr. Rosa asked about next steps for implementation of the draft. Ms. Logan stated the plan would be presented at a City Commission conference meeting. She explained the plan would be a tool for the Commission to utilize in prioritizing and determining where to allocate resources. Discussion continued regarding appropriations.

Ms. Moste asked if this type of master plan typically would have one person spearheading the effort, such as someone from the community or an official. Ms. Logan stated certain tasks are prioritized and directed toward her as staff. She reviewed tasks worked into the Himmarshee Historic District plan which are being tackled piece by piece.

Chair Marcus noted the Board had previously discussed different zoning for the entertainment district and the residential district because they are such different uses. He asked how this could be done. Ms. Logan advised that different avenues could be taken to update the Code.

Mr. Rosa asked if there had been consideration of a percentage of permitting fees in the district going toward implementation of the plan. He stated this was the most materially significant fruition of ideas he had seen, but he did not have faith the next steps would be taken if there was no money and no creativity for funding. He suggested as an example 20 percent of impact fees could be directed to a streetscape fund. Ms. Logan stated there are limitations on how permitting funds can be utilized.

Mr. Schiavone stated he liked what Mr. Rosa was talking about, because it all comes back to money. He pointed out if drainage and safety should be prioritized, because if the rest of the things in the plan were implemented and there was still four foot puddles, that time was wasted. He commented that he could not believe there were no sidewalks in an area of the City that is referred to as historic and asked how this could continue.

Ms. Moste shared her experience with the City of Atlanta and the utilization of Tax Increment Financing districts to take out bonds to fund a redevelopment plan, paired with grants to incentivize development in underserved areas. Chair Marcus asserted it was ideas like this that needed to come out of the planning phase of the vision plan. Discussion continued.

Mr. Rosa asked how the creation of the vision plan was funded. Ms. Logan explained the City had allocated \$25,000.

Ms. Hunt invited Mr. Rosa and Mr. Taylor to take part in the Sailboat Bend Master Planning Committee. She referenced previous discussion of sidewalks and stated while in some areas there are none, in other areas there are telephone poles in the middle of existing sidewalks. She stated residents are asked to pay more to make their homes look a certain way, yet there is no investment into the neighborhood. Chair Marcus stated he believed those items were addressed well within the report.

Ms. Hunt commented on the retention area, pointing out there had been polluted water running into the river so there was infrastructure to try to clean the water. She noted how the drains had acted in the recent flooding.

Mr. Rosa suggested that if the permit fees were off limits for this use, he would suggest an allocation toward the vision plan should be part of the TDR discussion. He stated if they did not find a way to raise the revenue, they would be discussing it again in 10 years and not much would have changed. Discussion continued.

Mr. Schiavone stated there should be a prioritization of the items in the plan so that things are done in the right order, but that is not the role of the HPB. He suggested the Board recommend the City work with the Sailboat Bend Civic Association and make a commitment to whatever priorities are identified.

D'Wayne Spence, Interim City Attorney, provided clarification on restrictions on Florida municipalities levying taxes. He explained impact fees must be proportionate and related to their impact and noted the process Ms. Moste referenced was managed through Community Redevelopment Agencies (CRA) in Florida. He commented on the formula for developer rebates.

Discussion ensued regarding opportunities to bring funding into Sailboat Bend, Communication to the City Commission, and next steps.

**Motion** made by Mr. Rosa, seconded by Mr. Schiavone to send Communication to the City Commission advising that the Historic Preservation Board is pleased with the Sailboat Bend Vision



Plan Summary Report, but would like to see a more concrete avenue explored to identify funds to direct to the Sailboat Bend Historic District.  
In a voice vote, the motion **passed 6-0**.

**Adjournment**

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 6:44 p.m. The next regular meeting of the HPB is scheduled for Monday, June 2, 2025.

Attest:

Chairman:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Prototype Inc. Recording Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Arthur Marcus, 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.