



CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE**

**Development Services Department Lobby
700 NW 19th Avenue**

Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33311

Wednesday, September 6, 2023 - 5:00 P.M.

<u>Board Members</u>	<u>Attendance</u>	Cumulative Attendance	
		<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
Arthur Marcus, Chair	P	4	0
Richard Bray	P	4	0
Allen Jones	P	4	0
Richard Rosa, Vice Chair	A	2	2
Tim Schiavone	P	4	0
Ashley Walker	P	3	1

City Staff

Shari Wallen, Assistant City Attorney
Trisha Logan, Principal Urban Planner
Simone Chin, Urban Planner II
Kailly Linares, Planning Assistant
Jamie Oppерlee, Recording Secretary, Prototype Inc.

Communication to the City Commission

Motion made by Mr. Rosa, seconded by Mr. Schiavone:

To Communicate to the City Commission to take an understanding of our current roster of six Board members and to plead with them to please either revisit prior applications or to work with us to put as many as three people on the Board as soon as the next meeting, if not certainly one or two people. The Board had been unable to hear a case at the September 6, 2023, meeting due to lack of a quorum.

In a voice vote, the motion **passed 5-0**.



CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE

DRAFT
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE
Development Services Department
Main Lobby
700 NW 19th Ave
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33311
Wednesday, September 6, 2023 - 5:00 P.M.

<u>Board Members</u>	<u>Attendance</u>	<u>Cumulative Attendance</u> <u>6/2023 through 5/2024</u>	
		<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
Arthur Marcus, Chair	P	4	0
Richard Bray	P	4	0
Allen Jones	P	4	0
Richard Rosa, Vice Chair	P	2	2
Tim Schiavone	P	4	0
Ashley Walker	A	3	1

City Staff

Shari Wallen, Assistant City Attorney
Trisha Logan, Principal Urban Planner
Simone Chin, Urban Planner II
Kailly Linares, Planning Assistant
Jamie Oppерlee, Recording Secretary, Prototype Inc.

Communication to the City Commission

Motion made by Mr. Rosa, seconded by Mr. Schiavone, to Communicate to the City Commission to take an understanding of our current roster of six Board members and to plead with them to please either revisit prior applications or to work with us to put as many as three people on the Board as soon as the next meeting, if not certainly one or two people. The Board was unable to hear a case at the September 6, 2023, meeting due to lack of a quorum. In a voice vote, motion **passed 5-0.**

<u>Index</u>	<u>Owner/Applicant</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. UDP-HP23020	930 Tequesta Street, Kurt Stange and Angela Nimroozi	<u>2</u>
2. UDP-HP23026	534 N. Victoria Park Road, Todd and Shannon Clark	<u>4</u>
3. UDP-HP23027	1000 N. Andrews Ave, City of Fort Lauderdale	<u>5</u>
4. UDP-HP23028	351 SW 14 th Way, Andrew M. and Gregory S. Madar	<u>6</u>
	Communication to the City Commission	<u>9</u>
	For the Good of the City	<u>9</u>

I. Call to Order/Pledge of Allegiance

The meeting of the Historic Preservation Board was called to order at 5:31 p.m. Roll was taken, and it was determined that a quorum was present.

II. Determination of Quorum/Approval of Minutes

a. Approval of Minutes: August 7, 2023

Ms. Logan reviewed proposed edits to be incorporated into the draft. **Motion** made by Mr. Jones, seconded by Mr. Bray: To approve the minutes of the August 7, 2023, meeting as amended. In a voice vote, the motion **passed 5-0**.

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

- Demolition of a One-Story Single-Family Residence Identified as a Contributing Property to the Sailboat Bend Historic District

Case Number	UDP-HP23020	FMSF#	
Owner	Kurt Stange and Angela Nimroozi		
Applicant	Stephanie Toothaker, Esq.		
Address	930 Tequesta Street		
General Location	Southeast corner of SW 10 th Avenue and Tequesta Street/SW 4 th Street		
Legal Description	WAVERLY PLACE 2-19 D LOT 8 BLK 100		
Existing Use	Single-Family Residence		
Proposed Use	Single-Family Residence		
Zoning	RS-8		
Applicable ULDR Sections	47-24.11.D.3.c.i; 47-24.11.D.4		
Landmark/Historic District	Sailboat Bend Historic District		
Section 166.033, Florida Statutes	180-day Expiration Date	Extension Date(s)	
	November 4, 2023	Not Applicable	
Authored By	Trisha Logan, AICP, Principal Urban Planner		

Ms. Logan summarized the staff report and concluded the report with:

Staff finds that the application for a **COA for Demolition** under case number UDP-HP23020 located at 930 Tequesta Street does not meet the criteria as outlined in Section 47-24.11.D.3.c.i. of the ULDR and does not meet the criteria as outlined in Sections 47-24.11.D.4. of the ULDR.

Ms. Logan offered a verbal amendment to add reference to section 47-17.7.B. of the ULDR, the Sailboat Bend Material and Design Guidelines and that the materials found in the existing structure meet these requirements.

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 condition for the **COA for Demolition** are provided for consideration by the HPB:

1. The demolition of the structure shall not negatively impact properties within the historic district and protection from construction debris and construction equipment shall be provided, as necessary.
2. This property is located in an Archaeologically Significant Zone and a Cultural Resource Assessment Survey (CRAS) by a qualified professional is required. The completed survey must be submitted and reviewed by preservation staff prior to building permit application for demolition. Following the review of the completed survey, additional archaeological testing or monitoring comments may apply. See attached letter from the City's Archaeology Consultant for more information.
3. This application is subject to the approval by Building, Zoning, and all ULDR requirements, including landscaping.

Mr. Bray recused himself from the item, citing previous requests from the City that he recuse himself from cases abutting his property. Attorney Wallen asked Mr. Bray if it was his position that this item contributes to a financial gain or loss to him, or if he was citing a potential bias. Discussion ensued regarding voting conflicts.

Mr. Bray confirmed that he had a financial conflict.

Attorney Wallen stated there was not quorum for the item, and the item should be deferred to the next meeting.

Mr. Rosa asserted that the lack of quorum put the applicant in a difficult position, and asked what the resolution to the matter would be, other than making sure there was perfect attendance of the Board. Attorney Wallen responded that ideas could be discussed at the end of the meeting.

Mr. Bray asked if there would be automatic approval after a delay of a certain period. Ms. Logan explained the application was to be heard within 180 days, or by November 4, and any extension would require agreement of the applicant. Attorney Wallen provided additional details on the process, and noted the Statute did not call for an automatic approval. She discussed past litigation briefly.

Chair Marcus asked if the Board was meant to have nine members. Ms. Logan confirmed.

Chair Marcus asked whether the applicant was amenable to placing the item on the agenda for the October 2 meeting.

Stephanie Toothaker, with Toothaker, LLC, on behalf of the applicant, acknowledged that the move was necessary and asked to be placed as the first item on the agenda. Discussion ensued regarding whether the item required readvertisement. Attorney Wallen stated she would research the item and reach out to Ms. Toothaker with the current information.

2.

[Index](#)

REQUEST: Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Alteration

- Replacement of Existing 3-Tab Asphalt Shingle Roof with Dimensional Asphalt Shingle Roof

Case Number	UDP-HP23026	FMSF#	BD01955
Owner	Todd DuBose Clark and Shannon Torley Clark		
Applicant	Todd DuBose Clark and Shannon Torley Clark		
Address	543 N Victoria Park Rd, Fort Lauderdale, FL		
General Location	Southwest corner of the intersection of NE 6 Street and North Victoria Park Rd		
Legal Description	Lot 11, less the South 9 feet as measured along the East and West lines, and Lot 12, Block 14, Victoria Park Corrected Amended Plat, according to the plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 10, Page 66, of the Public Records of Broward County, Florida.		
Existing Use	Single-Family Residential		
Proposed Use	Single-Family Residential		
Zoning	RS-8		
Applicable ULDR Sections	47-24.11.D.3.c.i; 47-24.11.D.3.c.ii		
Landmark/Historic District	Reed Manuel House (Resolution 05-212, 12/20/2005)		
Section 166.033, Florida Statutes	180-day Expiration Date	Extension Date (s)	
	February 14, 2024	Not Applicable	
Authored By	Simone Chin, Urban Planner II		

Ms. Chin summarized the staff report and concluded the report with:

Staff finds that the application for a COA for major alterations under case number UDP-HP23026, located at 543 N. Victoria Park Road meets the criteria as outlined in Section 47-24.11.D.3.c.i. of the ULDR and meets the criteria as outlined in Section 47-24.11.D.3.c.ii. of the ULDR

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 condition for the **COA for Major Alterations** are provided for consideration by the HPB:

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

Matt Hanley, roofer for the applicant, shared samples of the roof shingles proposed and explained they were the same color as the original.

Chair Marcus opened a public hearing on the item, however there being none to speak, he closed the public hearing.

Motion made by Mr. Rosa, seconded by Mr. Schiavone to **approve with conditions** the resolution for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Alterations under case number UDP-HP23026 located at 543 N. Victoria Park Road for the replacement of the existing 3-Tab asphalt shingle roof

with a dimensional asphalt shingle roof based on the findings of fact as outlined in the staff memorandum and subject to the following conditions:

1. This application is subject to the approval by Building, Zoning, and all ULDR requirements. In a voice vote, the motion **passed 5-0**.

3.

[Index](#)

REQUEST:

Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Alterations and New Construction

- Installation of Site Improvements, Two New Shade Structures, Signs, Water Features, and Alterations to the Existing Building.

Case Number	UDP-HP23027	FMSF#	
Owner	City of Fort Lauderdale		
Applicant	Marc Isaac, Project Manager II, Parks and Recreation, City of Fort Lauderdale		
Address	1000 N Andrews Avenue		
General Location	Bounded by NE 11 Street to the North, E Sunrise Boulevard to the South, N Andrews to the West		
Legal Description	Parcel A, Replat of a Portion of Block 185 - Progresso, according to the plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 41, Page 25, of the Public Records of Broward County, Florida.		
Existing Use	City Park		
Proposed Use	City Park		
Zoning	P – Parks Recreation and Open Space		
Applicable ULDR Sections	47-24.11.D.3.c.i; 47-24.11.D.3.c.ii; 47-24.11.D.3.c.iii		
Landmark/Historic District	Warfield Park (Resolution 89-97, 04/18/1989)		
Section 166.033, Florida Statutes	180-day Expiration Date	Extension Date (s)	
	February 17, 2024	Not Applicable	
Authored By	Simone Chin, Urban Planner II		

Ms. Logan summarized the staff report and concluded the report with:

Staff finds that the application for a COA for major alterations under case number UDP-HP23027, located at 1000 N. Andrews Avenue meets the criteria as outlined in Section 47-24.11.D.3.c.i. of the ULDR, meets the criteria as outlined in Section 47-24.11.D.3.c.ii. of the ULDR, and meets the criteria as outlined in Section 47-24.11.D.3.c.iii. of the ULDR,

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 condition for the COA for Major Alterations are provided for consideration by the HPB:

1. Provide screening of new electrical service and mechanical equipment.
2. This application is subject to the approval by Building, Zoning, and all ULDR requirements.

Marc Isaac, Project Manager, Parks and Recreation Department, stated his only concern was with condition one, and asked if the Board would consider waiving the condition. He noted additional costs and design of structural components would be required.

Chair Marcus asked if the screening was a safety issue. Ms. Logan advised that screening mechanical equipment is part of the Code and is also part of the Historic Preservation Design Guidelines, so regardless of the conditions of approval it would be a requirement.

Mr. Isaac asked about the threshold for requiring the screening, noting that they were replacing existing equipment. Ms. Logan responded that they would have to discuss the issue with the Zoning Department, but generally any new equipment on a rooftop would require screening.

Mr. Bray asked what the historic nature of the site was. Ms. Logan explained the site was designated as historic due to its place as the City's oldest park. She noted there are no historic structures on the site.

Mr. Rosa asked how the improvements were determined. Mr. Isaac stated staff had conducted community outreach to determine what neighborhoods wanted. He noted some items were being added as amenities as part of an effort to standardize the City's parks, including the proposed splash pad.

Mr. Rosa inquired as to the reason synthetic turf was being used. Mr. Isaac cited safety concerns on the playground and stated the synthetic safety material would replace existing mulch.

Mr. Rosa asked for clarification on the structural concerns related to screening the rooftop equipment. Mr. Isaac stated it was an existing building with an existing roof which was designed to hold the equipment, but adding a four-foot screen that high up would require accounting for wind load.

Chair Marcus stated he looks forward to the park being brought alive again.

Chair Marcus opened a public hearing on the item, however there being none to speak, he closed the public hearing.

Motion made by Mr. Bray, seconded by Mr. Jones to **approve with conditions** the resolution for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Alterations under case number UDP-HP23027 located at 1000 N. Andrews Avenue for improvements at Warfield Par, which includes renovations and alterations to the existing community center building, signage, creation of an interactive water feature, construction of new shade structures, sidewalks, and other site improvements, based on the findings of fact as outlined in the staff memorandum and subject to the following conditions:

1. Provide screening of new electrical service and mechanical equipment.
2. This application is subject to the approval by Building, Zoning, and all ULDR requirements.

4.

[Index](#)

REQUEST:

Certificate of Appropriateness for New Construction

- Construction of a One-Story Single-Family Residence

Case Number	UDP-HP23028	FMSF#	
Owner	Andrea M. Madar 2016 Revocable Trust; Andrea M. Madar and Gregory S. Madar, Co-Trustees.		
Applicant	James Archer, P.A.		
Address	351 SW 14 th Way (Kenilworth Place), Fort Lauderdale, FL		

General Location	Northwest of the corner of the SW 14 Avenue and SW 14 Way, Southwest of Sailboat Bend Preserve Park	
Legal Description	The South One-half (½) of Lot 10, Lots 11 and 12, Block 2, River Highlands, according to the plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 10, Page 30, of the public recorded of Broward County, Florida.	
Existing Use	Single-Family Residential	
Proposed Use	Single-Family Residential	
Zoning	RS-8	
Applicable ULDR Sections	47-24.11.D.3.c.i; 47-24.11.D.3.c.iii; 47-17.7.A	
Landmark/Historic District	Sailboat Bend Historic District	
Section 166.033, Florida Statutes	180-day Expiration Date	Extension Date (s)
	February 13, 2024	Not Applicable
Authored By	Simone Chin, Urban Planner II	

Ms. Chin summarized the staff report and concluded the report with:

Staff finds that the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for New Construction under case number UDP-HP23028 located at 351 SW 14 Way meets the criterion as outlined in Sections 47-24.11.D.3.c.i., partially meets the criteria as outlined in Section 47-24.11.D.3.c.iii. of the ULDR and partially meets the criteria as outlined in Section 47-17 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. Sliding glass doors are not approved on the front elevation as part of this application and an alternative door must be selected.
2. The width of the garage door is not approved as part of this application and the door must be reduced in width to provide a door or a pair of doors that are 9 feet in width or less.
3. Consideration given to including an additional design element (.i.e. windows) above the garage door opening to be evaluated by staff.
4. This property is located in an Archaeologically Significant Zone and a Cultural Resource Assessment Survey (CRAS) by a qualified professional is required. The completed survey must be submitted and reviewed by preservation staff prior to building permit application for demolition. Following the review of the completed survey, additional archaeological testing or monitoring comments may apply. Additional information is provided by the City's Archaeology Consultant dated August 24, 2023.
5. This application is subject to the approval by Building, Zoning, and all ULDR requirements, including landscaping.

Gregory Madar, applicant, provided a brief history on the project. He stated the property had been in his wife's family since the 1930s and asserted the design fits well into the area.

Andrea Madar distributed drawings of the proposed project. Ms. Logan noted plans were available in the agenda packet.

Chair Marcus opened a public hearing on the item.

Maggie Hunt, Sailboat Bend, expressed appreciation for the Madars' plan to maintain the plant life on the property and stated it was a beautiful plan that fit perfectly on the street.

Ted Inerra, Sailboat Bend, thanked the applicant for the design. He added that he had mixed feelings about the project and had concerns about the preserve. He asked that any action possible be taken to support preservation of the canopy.

Chair Marcus closed the public hearing.

Mrs. Madar shared that her grandfather had purchased the land in the 1930s, and he was a hobby botanist. She noted there was a greenhouse still on the property that had belonged to him, and leaving the property as much as possible is important to her.

James Archer, architect representing the applicant, stated that local landscape architects were involved with the project and the intention was to maintain as much canopy as possible. He highlighted environmental design features of the project, including a teak tree which the house had been designed around.

Chair Marcus asked whether Mr. Archer agreed with the staff conditions. Mr. Archer stated he agreed with most of the conditions. He reviewed them briefly, noting the garage was not an issue, but an opening above the garage would add confusion and false historicism to the design. He explained the sliding doors were included for improved ventilation, but they could figure that aspect out.

Mr. Bray stated he agreed the window above the garage was necessary, but having two garage doors was good. He noted that sliding glass doors are part of the character of mid-century modern homes, and he was hesitant as to why the Board would force other aspects onto the home that do not apply. Chair Marcus pointed out the restriction on sliding glass doors was in the Sailboat Bend guidelines.

Mr. Bray referenced the requirement for archaeological review. He asked who actually benefits from the archaeological surveys and asserted that hiring a consultant seemed like a benefit to the government, not the property owner. He stated that consistently, this additional cost is being heaped onto property owners in the district. He noted the Archaeologically Significant Zone goes beyond Sailboat Bend, and asked if those property owners are also required to do the review.

Ms. Logan stated development permit applications located in an Archaeologically Significant Zone have the same requirements. She noted the process for review is administrative unless there is a significant finding which would require further consideration by the Board.

Mr. Bray asked about the property at 1000 SW 2nd Street. He stated there was activity there but had been no study completed. Ms. Logan explained there was no significant ground disturbing work being done as part of the scope of the project. She noted it also did not require a development permit.

Mr. Rosa commented that it did not make sense to ask people to further conform to the guidelines when the project met or partially met criteria. He stated he did not see how changing the garage door would help the design. He asserted the home was designed beautifully, and some benefit of the doubt should be afforded. He stated the ventilation aspect of the sliding doors made sense, and he would be willing to approve the design as proposed.

Mr. Jones thanked the applicants for the thoughtful design and stated he appreciated the work of the architect and the family.

Chair Marcus stated it was a wonderful interpretation of mid-century modern architecture, and noted he liked the way it ambles around the site to save some of the trees.

Motion by Mr. Schiavone, seconded by Mr. Jones to **approve with conditions** the resolution for a Certificate of Appropriateness for New Construction under case number UDP-HP23028 located at 351 SW 14 Way, based on the findings of fact as outlined in the staff memorandum and subject to the following conditions:

1. Sliding glass doors are not approved on the front elevation as part of this application and an alternative door must be selected.
2. The width of the garage door is not approved as part of this application and the door must be reduced in width to provide a door or a pair of doors that are 9 feet in width or less.
3. Consideration given to including an additional design element (.i.e. windows) above the garage door opening to be evaluated by staff.
4. This property is located in an Archaeologically Significant Zone and a Cultural Resource Assessment Survey (CRAS) by a qualified professional is required. The completed survey must be submitted and reviewed by preservation staff prior to building permit application for demolition. Following the review of the completed survey, additional archaeological testing or monitoring comments may apply. Additional information is provided by the City's Archaeology Consultant dated August 24, 2023.
5. This application is subject to the approval by Building, Zoning, and all ULDR requirements, including landscaping.
6. Zoning Review Conditions:
 - a. Screening of the air condition condenser units on the north and south sides of the property; and
 - b. Location of the pool equipment, which will also have to be screened; and
 - c. Discrepancy in the elevation heights for the building, which show a ground level change that differs in each illustration will need to be corrected.

V. Communication to the City Commission [Index](#)

Motion made by Mr. Rosa, seconded by Mr. Schiavone, to Communicate to the City Commission to take an understanding of our current roster of six Board members and to plead with them to please either revisit prior applications or to work with us to put as many as three people on the Board as soon as the next meeting, if not certainly one or two people. The Board was unable to hear a case at the September 6, 2023, meeting due to lack of a quorum. In a voice vote, motion **passed 5-0**.

VI. For the Good of the City of Fort Lauderdale [Index](#)

Attorney Wallen explained that City Resolution No. 20-214 provides that for Quasi-judicial items, a Board member is not allowed to participate via telephone or Zoom and may not be counted toward quorum. She suggested that if the Board wanted to, they could make a recommendation to the Commission to participation on quasi-judicial items by phone or Zoom if a quorum is seated in person.

Mr. Bray disclosed that he had received an email from an outside source indicating there was

interest from the public in discussing incentives for historic preservation. He asked if they could proceed with a focus group. Ms. Logan stated anything beyond a Board meeting would require Commission direction.

Mr. Bray suggested the Board request the Commission establish a focus group for the subject matter.

Attorney Wallen stated there are credentials and requirements to serve on the Board. She stated if there was a focus group or committee established, the Commission would establish requirements for participation in a resolution. She noted this was the purpose of the Historic Preservation Board, staff was open to ideas being brought forward, and several incentives were already passed as a result. She asserted she was not sure who would be more qualified than the Board for that purpose, and expressed concern another group would be redundant. Attorney Wallen reiterated that there are three open Board seats, so if there are people the members feel would be useful to add to the membership for the purpose of discussing incentives, they could make those recommendations to the Commission.

Mr. Bray stated he was hearing that he should create a focus group on his own to get feedback from various different people. Attorney Wallen asserted that was not what she was opining.

Mr. Bray explained he believed there were various different people who had an interest in creating incentives, such as general contractors and landscapers, whose input would be helpful to the process. Attorney Wallen agreed that there was other input which could be gathered. She stated there are three open Board seats, and this would be a great way to address the vacancies.

Chair Marcus stated he understood how a committee might be useful, but in the past, Board members who had heard suggestions from contractors or other individuals would bring that to the Board for discussion. He noted the restrictions of Sunshine Law in creating sub-groups.

Attorney Wallen pointed out that any member of the public can also address the Board during its meetings. She stated if they have ideas, the Board and staff are here to listen.

Dr. David Kyner, former Board Chair, stated he had extensive experience with focus groups. He asserted an open discussion with people who had experienced bringing an application before the Board would be the best way to identify the problems. He advised that coming up with solutions and assistance was for the Board, but this would be the way to see what is experienced. Continuing, Dr. Kyner stated Sailboat Bend Civic Association is waiting to be put on the agenda to open a discussion regarding issues with excavation requirements.

Chair Marcus argued the Sailboat Bend Civic Association is already a focus group. He stated he was sure they came up with suggestions that might work, and asked why they don't express those to staff.

Attorney Wallen pointed out that under Florida law, the group does not need to be on an agenda to bring their items forward, they can come to a meeting and say whatever they like. Discussion ensued briefly regarding the process.

Dr. Kyner stated there are questions the residents of Sailboat Bend want to bring forward to clarify items which are confusing. Attorney Wallen explained that while a lengthy question-and-answer period may not be appropriate during the meeting, Ms. Logan is available outside of the Board

meetings to answer questions regarding historic preservation.

Mindy Noble noted it might help the Board to review the section on the My Florida website which references archaeological studies and cultural resources. She stated archaeological sites on public and private property may have tax benefits to the residents.

Maggie Hunt stated as far as incentives, the only thing that currently helps is not having to pay permit fees. She noted parking and transfer of developmental rights have not helped financially, and stated in many cities they are never used. She added that she and others would get together to talk about potential incentives and bring their ideas to the Board. Continuing, Ms. Hunt advised that individuals in the neighborhood had paid over \$10,000 for the archaeological digs. She stated these are working class people and from an ethical position she did not think it was right to say that the City wants this data, but residents have to pay for it.

Mr. Bray asserted that one of the things a focus group would do would be to have a moderator. He stated then a designated group of tradespeople could come to a Board meeting on an agenda item to discuss their concerns.

Mr. Rosa commented that he did not follow what the benefit would be. He asked how the Board would gain material information which could be formulated into an incentive based on hearing from contractors who share that they don't like working in Sailboat Bend.

Mr. Schiavone stated he agreed with that perspective but saw the suggestion more in terms of owners wanting to know why they are bearing the financial weight. He noted Attorney Wallen had laid out the process well, but in all of the meetings he had been at, he had never seen anyone raise their hand to speak.

Michaela Conca, Broward Trust for Historic Preservation, asked for clarification on the process for getting answers to legal questions. Attorney Wallen explained that she represents the Historic Preservation Board.

Ms. Conca asked for additional clarification on where concerns could be raised, including whether Ms. Logan could take public comments brought forward on behalf of the Broward Trust for Historic Preservation back to the City for discussion. Attorney Wallen and Chair Marcus provided additional detail on the process.

Mr. Rosa referenced the Board openings and asked whether the City keeps a list of potential members. Ms. Logan stated there is a Board application form on the City website for anyone that would like to apply for a Board. She explained the process briefly and stated there had not been any applicants for the Historic Preservation Board.

Mr. Rosa stated that he would be frustrated as an applicant to have to walk away without their application being heard and noted he would think about potential members to suggest. Discussion continued regarding the issue and sending Communication to the Commission.

Motion made by Mr. Rosa, seconded by Mr. Schiavone, to Communicate to the City Commission to take an understanding of our current roster of six Board members and to plead with them to please either revisit prior applications or to work with us to put as many as three people on the Board as soon as the next meeting, if not certainly one or two people. The Board was unable to

hear a case at the September 6, 2023, meeting due to lack of a quorum. In a voice vote, motion **passed 5-0.**

Attorney Wallen suggested that a Board member attend the Commission meeting to outline the request. Mr. Rosa stated he would attend if he did not have scheduling conflicts.

Mr. Rosa asked whether members of the Board were able to talk to members of the public that reach out to air concerns. Attorney Wallen confirmed that they were but would need to disclose that information if the item came before the Board as an agenda item.

Mr. Bray expressed concern that engaging with residents via email represented a potential conflict. Attorney Wallen stated it was not an issue to engage with the public, but if Mr. Bray wanted to forward the emails he was concerned about, staff would be happy to evaluate and share an opinion.

Mr. Schiavone encouraged Board members to keep the door open and talk to residents about historic preservation.

Ms. Logan reminded the members that there was a Board training scheduled for Thursday, September 14 at 4 p.m.

Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 7:03 p.m. The next regular meeting of the HPB is scheduled for Wednesday, October 2, 2023.

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.