



CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING MINUTES
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT
700 NW 19 AVENUE, FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33311
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 2023 – 6:00 P.M.**

<u>Board Members</u>	<u>Attendance</u>	Cumulative Attendance 6/2023 through 5/2024	
		<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
Arthur Marcus, Chair	P	6	0
Richard Bray	P	6	0
Allen Jones	P	6	0
Sonya Moste	P	1	0
Richard Rosa, Vice Chair	P	4	2
Tim Schiavone	P	5	1
Shane Taylor	P	1	0
Ashley Walker (until 7:49 p.m.)	P	4	1

City Staff

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

Communication to the City Commission

Motion made by Mr. Bray, seconded by Mr. Rosa, to Communicate to the City Commission a consider a revitalization plan to bridge the Sailboat Bend and Himmarshee (H-1) Historic Districts including a request to provide initial funding. In a voice vote, motion **passed 7-0**. Ms. Walker was not present for the vote.



**HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING MINUTES
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT
700 NW 19 AVENUE, FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33311
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 2023 – 6:00 P.M.**

CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE

**Cumulative Attendance
6/2023 through 5/2024**

<u>Board Members</u>	<u>Attendance</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
Arthur Marcus, Chair	P	6	0
Richard Bray	P	6	0
Allen Jones	P	6	0
Sonya Moste	P	1	0
Richard Rosa, Vice Chair	P	4	2
Tim Schiavone	P	5	1
Shane Taylor	P	1	0
Ashley Walker (until 7:49 p.m.)	P	4	1

City Staff

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

Communication to the City Commission

Motion made by Mr. Bray, seconded by Mr. Rosa, to Communicate to the City Commission a consider a revitalization plan to bridge the Sailboat Bend and Himmarshee(H-1) Historic Districts including a request to provide initial funding. In a voice vote, motion **passed 7-0**. Ms. Walker was not present for the vote.

<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-HP23035	1116 Broward Boulevard	<u>6</u>
3. UDP-HP23036	333 SW 14 th Way, BC Capital Properties LLC	<u>8</u>
4. UDP-HP23037	819 SW 1 st Street, Ally Investments LLC	<u>10</u>
5. UDP-HP23038	1205 SW 4 Street, Jill Adler	<u>12</u>
	Communication to the City Commission	<u>15</u>
	For the Good of the City	<u>15</u>

I. Call to Order/Pledge of Allegiance

The meeting of the Historic Preservation Board was called to order at 5:00 p.m. Roll was taken, and it was determined that a quorum was present. New Board members Sonya Moste and Shane Taylor introduced themselves briefly.

II. Determination of Quorum/Approval of Minutes

a. Approval of Minutes: October 2, 2023

Motion made by Mr. Jones, seconded by Mr. Bray:
To approve the minutes of the October 2, 2023, meeting as presented.

In a voice vote, the motion **passed 8-0**.

III. Public Sign-in/Swearing-In

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

Board members disclosed communications and site visits for each agenda item.

IV. Agenda Items

1.

[Index](#)

REQUEST: Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition

- 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		

Mr. Bray recused himself from discussion of the item.

Stephanie Toothaker, representing the applicant, made a PowerPoint presentation outlining the request. She noted the application had been deferred three times, and they were thrilled to have the opportunity to speak. She highlighted that the property itself was not historic, though it was in the historic district. She explained the original structure was contributing and pointed to pieces of the structure which had been changed over time. She reviewed the criteria for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition briefly, and asserted the applicant's position was that the requirements were met. She stated a full structural report had been completed, and reviewed takeaways, including lack of continuous load path and question as to whether the house would withstand a hurricane, and most importantly, that it was too low for rising water levels. Continuing, Ms. Toothaker reviewed other applications the Board had approved and shared images of the site and discussed the pieces which were original to the home based on the old plans. She pointed to the letters of support which had been provided in the backup materials for the meeting and provided a map showing the addresses of those supporters, noting their proximity to the home.

Kurt Stange, owner, shared that he and his wife, along with their two-year-old twins love the area and need a home they can grow into. He asked for understanding from the Board and stated he was present to answer any questions.

Chair Marcus opened a public hearing.

Ronald Palamara, 922 Tequesta Street, shared that he had lived next door to this property for 35 years. He stated he hopes this application is approved, because this is the third couple who had lived there and outgrown the home. He commented on other projects in the district, and stated that just because it is old, does not mean it is nice or contributes to the community.

Dr. David Kyner, 416 Palm Avenue, read a statement for the record. He asked for support for the application, asserting it was logical and fair, and consistent with the Board's recent decision to permit demolition of 700 SW 4th Street. He asserted the properties were remarkably similar, and stated this house did not meet the guidelines to be named as contributing. He reviewed changes to the property over time which were inappropriate.

Ms. Walker asked Dr. Kyner how many of the original features of the building he believed were still present. Dr. Kyner stated he could only speak to the façade, but the vast majority of the detailing was missing or false.

Ellen Kendrick, Sailboat Bend, stated she was unaware of the modifications which had taken place to this house over time so did not have specific comments on it, but wanted to share that she hoped Sailboat Bend was kept historic. She bemoaned the lack of historical preservation in the City, and stated something modern would not fit the character of the neighborhood. She asked the Board to be careful in its preservation of old Florida.

Maggie Hunt, Sailboat Bend, argued this house is historic, and is a contributing property. She stated it was built in 1940 and was featured as one of eight photos in a 2009 survey prepared by staff.

Ms. Hunt asked to share the referenced documents. Attorney Wallen provided clarification on the process for submitting a document to the Board. Ms. Hunt stated she would email the survey and provided a copy of the original building permit.

Ms. Hunt stated the house was adorable. She asserted the vertical and roof lines were still present, and returning the front of the house to its original would be easier than taking the addition down on the back. She discussed the history of the house and shared images of a previous owner's seaplane, highlighting the importance of protecting this history.

Michaela Conca, Broward Trust for Historic Preservation, stated she was present to support the Board in maintaining its contributing structures. She asserted that with the continued loss of the Sailboat Bend Historic District structures, the fabric of this district will begin to fray and gradually unravel. She asserted a denial of this application does not deny the owner reasonable use of the property. She requested if the application was approved, she would request only the addition be demolished and the contributing structure be maintained.

Chair Marcus closed the public hearing.

Attorney Wallen asked Mr. Bray to clarify for the record his reasons for abstaining. Mr. Bray stated he was abstaining because of an abutting property, and he had submitted his form. Attorney Wallen confirmed this would be under Chapter 286, Prejudice or Bias.

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.

Ms. Logan clarified that the future new construction project which was projected on the screen during the applicant's proposal had not been evaluated by staff.

Chair Marcus acknowledged Ms. Conca's previous comments, and stated as an architect, he believes in adaptive reuse of old buildings. He stated a 1940s house cannot adhere to current Zoning Codes, and noted how other jurisdictions would handle restoration of the porch. He added that a qualified architect would be able to put a preservation plan together.

Mr. Taylor asserted it was hypocritical to say it could be turned back into a screened porch when it had already been changed.

Chair Marcus stated if the owner wanted to restore the house, they could take off the siding and restore it to the original if the drawings were sufficient.

Mr. Taylor argued the fact that it no longer looked like a screened-in porch was a major factor for him in that it looks completely different, along with the addition of a window and carport. He referenced the applicant's engineering report and the FEMA flood report and stated he does not think the home is safe and he supports the request.

Ms. Moste concurred with Mr. Taylor's assertion that the house had been changed significantly and was no longer contributing. She stated the home is pretty but is a liability for the homeowner.

Ms. Walker stated historic districts are created for the preservation of history. She advised that she was struggling with this application because 80 percent of the house is new, and a lot of the front façade has been changed significantly. She added that she was also concerned about the risk of flooding and the safety of the home in a hurricane, and wanted to balance the needs of the homeowner to have a safe structure they can live in while also preserving history. She stated this was a case where she found herself disagreeing with the staff report.

Mr. Jones asked whether Ms. Logan had spoken with the applicant's representative while preparing the staff report. Ms. Logan stated they had not reached out to set up a meeting.

Mr. Jones stated he was always struck by the cited precedents in these discussions, but he yields a lot of his thought to the staff expertise and the number of houses that remain in this district. He advised Chair Marcus' comments on adaptive reuse were compelling, as they could address the issues raised by other members of the Board. He noted he would like to find a way to maintain the house on the property.

Mr. Schiavone acknowledged the Board was between a rock and a hard spot, as this young family want a house they can build a future and grow in, and for that it has to be safe. He stated some of the considerations on the table were extremely affected by safety issues and questioned how many hurricanes this house had left in it. Mr. Schiavone stated he leaned heavily toward allowing the house to be replaced with a safer, newer home. He asked how much adaptive reuse would cost compared to what was proposed. He noted it must be extremely expensive.

Mr. Rosa agreed this was a difficult application. He asked whether there was anyone of significance named in the design of this house. Ms. Logan confirmed there was not, and noted a lot of the early houses in Sailboat Bend did not have architects associated with them, were vernacular homes with traditional materials that were found in the area by local builders.

Mr. Rosa asked whether anyone of significance to the area had lived in the home. Ms. Logan stated there was nothing she was aware of other than what Maggie Hunt had mentioned, and pointed out that was not necessarily required to be a contributing structure in a historic district.

Mr. Rosa stated he was leaning more toward approving the demolition because there had been a major alteration or reconfiguration of the façade on the front elevation, and he weighs that more heavily because that is what is seen from the street. He noted the practicality of maintaining a home at a four-foot flood elevation and the impossibility of insuring the house.

Chair Marcus reiterated that the Federal Historic Preservation Standards and Guidelines say that if alteration has been made to a historic building and those alterations can be undone and the building brought back to its original state, that is something that should be done. He asserted this was one of the original homes featured in the district and even though it is altered, the size and character contribute to the district. Chair Marcus pointed out that when he mentioned adaptive reuse, he was only talking about retaining the small portion at the front. He suggested it could be made into a foyer with a new house at the back to be respectful of the current architecture yet take its own direction.

Motion made by Mr. Taylor, seconded by Ms. Walker to **approve with conditions** the resolution for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition under case number UDP-HP23020 located at 930 Tequesta Street based on the fact that it meets all criteria on page three of the staff report, the criteria outlined in 47-24.11.D.4.ii, and based on the testimony and documentation provided and subject to the following conditions:

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.

Motion passed **5-2**. Mr. Jones and Chair Marcus voted no. Mr. Bray abstained.

2.

Index

REQUEST: Certificate of Appropriateness for New Construction

- Installation of (3) New Signs: (2) Illuminated Wall Signs and (1) Illuminated Double Faced Panel for Existing Freestanding Sign

Case Number	UDP-HP23035	FMSF#	
Owner	1116 Broward Blvd BC LLC		
Applicant	Ryan Abrams, Abrams Law Firm		
Address	1116 W. Broward Boulevard		
General Location	Approximately 150 feet west of the intersection of West Broward Boulevard and Southwest 11 th Avenue		
Legal Description	WAVERLY PLACE 2-19 D LOT 18 TO 23, LESS ST & N1/2 VAC ALLEY ABUTTING SAID LOTS BLK 124		
Existing Use	Commercial		
Proposed Use	Commercial		
Zoning	B-1 - Boulevard Business		
Applicable ULDR Sections	47-24.11.D.3.c.i; 47-24.11.D.3.c.ii; 47-17		
Landmark/Historic District	Sailboat Bend Historic District		
Authored By	Trisha Logan, AICP, Principal Urban Planner		

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

In accordance with Sections 47-24.11.D.3.c.i. and 47-24.11.D.3.c.ii. of the ULDR, staff finds that the application for a COA for **Major Alterations** under case number UDP-HP23035 located at 1116 W. Broward Boulevard does not meet the criteria as outlined in Section 47-24.11.D.3.c.i. of the ULDR, does not meet 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, including landscaping.

Chair Marcus asked for clarification on why the sign was not compatible. Ms. Logan explained it was the scale of the sign on the north elevation.

Chair Marcus asked her to address the type of lighting proposed. Ms. Logan stated the guidelines address an external light source to illuminate the façade, but these signs were channel letter signs that are internally lit.

Chair Marcus asked what type of lighting would be appropriate. Ms. Logan stated it could be either back lit or halo lit.

Mr. Rosa inquired as to whether there would be a difference in lumens between what was proposed and what staff was referencing. Ms. Logan confirmed she believed halo or back lighting would be softer, but a lighting calculation was not required for this application. Discussion continued regarding sign code and historic preservation regulations for signage.

Ryan Abrams, representing the applicant, outlined the request. He stated the structure had been vacant for some time, as it was previously used as a nightclub and had not been updated in years. He advised this was a case of adaptive reuse under the Code. He stated the signage was not out of character for this area, and shared images of other examples, as well as of the site and the proposed signage. He asked that any specific objections be noted so they can be addressed. Mr. Abrams reviewed the criteria briefly and asserted the proposed made sense. He noted there was a preference in the criteria, but it was a judgment call.

Mr. Rosa stated he appreciated that this was different from a house in a neighborhood, and pointed out that it had been four or five years since anyone took a shot at this building, so he believed every measure should be used to encourage the applicant's success and long-term viability in the location.

Ms. Walker stated she was surprised to learn that businesses on Broward Boulevard were included in the historic district. She agreed it was consistent with the businesses in the area.

Mr. Bray advised the signage was not to his preference but was acceptable. He stated it was a block from the Police Station and fit the character of the neighborhood better than the new sign there does. He asserted there had to be more flexibility for businesses to operate profitably.

Chair Marcus advised that he wished the Broward Boulevard section was separated from the rest of the Sailboat Bend Historic District, but he does support the staff report. He stated he believed the sign was too large and he would prefer a backlit channel.

Mr. Rosa pointed out that the staff report stated this type of lighting is "discouraged," and asked what language was used in the Code. Attorney Wallen read from 47-17.4 and 47-17.7.

Chair Marcus asked how the Board could suggest separating out Broward Boulevard. Ms. Logan noted there had been a proposal several years ago, but the Board had sent a communication to

the City Commission that they did not want the change to move forward. She explained if that was something the Board wanted to reconsider, they could send a communication.

Motion made by Mr. Rosa, seconded by Mr. Jones to **approve with conditions** the resolution for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Alterations under case number UDP-HP23035 located at 1116 W. Broward Boulevard based on the findings of fact as discussed that the application meets the material and design guidelines and is subject to the following condition:

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

In a voice vote, the motion **passed 8-0**.

3.

[Index](#)

REQUEST: Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition

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

Case Number	UDP-HP23036	FMSF#	
Owner	BC Capital Properties LLC		
Applicant	Greg Brewton		
Address	333 SW 14 th Way		
General Location	Approximately 170 feet northwest of the intersection of Southwest 14th Avenue and SW 14th Way		
Legal Description	RIVER HIGHLANDS 10-3 B LOT 9, NWLY 1/2 OF LOT 10 BLK 2		
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.3.c.ii; 47-17		
Landmark/Historic District	Sailboat Bend Historic District		
Section 166.033, Florida Statutes	180-day Expiration Date	Extension Date(s)	
	April 13, 2024	Not Applicable	
Authored By	Trisha Logan, AICP, Principal Urban Planner		

Greg Brewton noted as the former Sustainable Development Director for the City of Fort Lauderdale, he had additional background on the inclusion of Broward Boulevard in the Sailboat Bend Historic District. He spoke on the topic briefly, explaining there were several discussions on its inclusion throughout the years.

Mr. Brewton provided a *PowerPoint* presentation outlining the request. He explained the house was built in 1989, designed by civic leader and pioneering architect Bill Bigoney and owned by former Mayor James Naugle. He provided an overview of the subject property and reviewed the criteria briefly, noting the subject property is not a historic residence.

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

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-HP23036 located at 333 SW 14th Way does meet the criteria as outlined in Section 47-24.11.D.3.c.i. of the ULDR and partially meets the criteria as outlined in Sections 47-24.11.D.4. 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 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. No archaeological deposits are anticipated within the subject property, however, if archaeological materials or features are discovered, then work in vicinity of the discovery shall stop and the City shall be notified immediately to coordinate the discovery. If unmarked human remains are encountered, then excavation in the vicinity of the find shall halt immediately and the archaeologist shall alert the City's historic preservation staff to coordinate the discovery and take measures to implement Chapter 872.05 Florida Statutes as it pertains to the discovery of unmarked human remains.
3. This application is subject to the approval by Building, Zoning, and all ULDR requirements, including landscaping.

Mr. Jones asked for clarification on the comment from the staff report that no archaeological deposits were anticipated. Ms. Logan explained every application that comes before the Board for potential for archaeological deposits, utilizing information collected over time and in the original archaeological survey to evaluate the potential on each property. She stated the consultant reviewed the application and determined there was a low probability at this time and further study was not required.

Chair Marcus stated he also supported the application and did not believe the house was architecturally significant. He asked about the disposition of another Bill Bigoney property. Ms. Logan responded that they had not yet submitted an application.

Motion made by Ms. Walker, seconded by Mr. Jones to **approve with conditions** the resolution for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition under case number UDP-HP23036 located at 333 SW 14th Way based on the following findings of fact as outlined in the staff memorandum and is subject to the following conditions:

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. No archaeological deposits are anticipated within the subject property, however, if archaeological materials or features are discovered, then work in vicinity of the discovery shall stop and the City shall be notified immediately to coordinate the discovery. If unmarked human remains are encountered, then excavation in the vicinity of the find shall halt immediately and the archaeologist shall alert the City's historic preservation staff to coordinate the discovery

and take measures to implement Chapter 872.05 Florida Statutes as it pertains to the discovery of unmarked human remains.

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

In a voice vote, the motion **passed 8-0**.

4.

[Index](#)

REQUEST:

Certificate of Appropriateness for New Construction

- Construction of a Two-Story Two-Family Residence

Case Number	UDP-HP23037	FMSF#	
Owner	Ally Investments LLC		
Applicant	Ally Investments LLC		
Address	819 SW 1 st Street		
General Location	Approximately 200 feet west of the SW 8th Avenue and SW 1st Street intersection on the north side of street.		
Legal Description	SUB OF LOTS 3,4 BLK 20 FT LAUD 3-15 D LOT 10, TOG WITH S1/2 OF THAT VACA 10' ALLEY, AS DESC IN OR 27529/568, LYING B/W LOTS 9 & 10		
Existing Use	Vacant Lot		
Proposed Use	Residential (Two-Family)		
Zoning	RMM-25		
Applicable ULDR Sections	47-24.11.D.3.c.i; 47-24.11.D.3.c.ii; 47-17		
Landmark/Historic District	Sailboat Bend Historic District		
Section 166.033, Florida Statutes	180-day Expiration Date	Extension Date(s)	
	April 12, 2024	Not Applicable	
Authored By	Simone Chin, Urban Planner II		

Mr. Rosa clarified a discrepancy with the ownership of the property as listed in the staff report. He stated he owns SB 819 LLC, but the LLC no longer owns this property. Staff reviewed the records and confirmed that Ally Investments LLC owns the property.

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

Staff finds that the application for a COA for New Construction under case number UDP-HP23037 located at 819 SW 1st Street 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.iii. of the ULDR, and meets the criteria for consideration of materials as listed under 47-17.7.B. 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 New Construction** are provided for consideration by the HPB:

1. All glass must be clear with an option of Low-e.

2. There is a discrepancy between the illustration and the elevation drawings, regarding a wall section below the balcony railings on the front elevation. The design will need to be clarified at the time of permitting.
3. This application is subject to the approval by Building, Zoning, and all ULDR requirements.

Antonino Treu, representing architect Neal Aronson and Carlos Vargas of Ally Investments, presented an overview of the project. He stated the building is at the end of a dead end next to the Salvation Army, and the architect has tried to create a cohesive building that will be a good neighbor and incorporate many of the features and characteristics of Sailboat Bend.

Ms. Walker asked the applicant if they were comfortable with the conditions. Mr. Treu stated they had met with staff and the final drawings will reflect the changes as requested. He confirmed they agreed with the conditions.

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

Chair Marcus stated he liked that consideration of the features of the neighborhood was integrated into the design.

Mr. Bray added that he liked the symmetry of the proposed project.

Motion made by Mr. Jones, seconded by Mr. Schiavone to **approve with conditions** the resolution for a Certificate of Appropriateness for New Construction under case number UDP-HP23037 located at 819 SW 1st Street based on the following findings of fact as outlined in the staff report and is subject to the following conditions:

1. All glass must be clear with an option of Low-e.
2. There is a discrepancy between the illustration and the elevation drawings, regarding a wall section below the balcony railings on the front elevation. The design will need to be clarified at the time of permitting.
3. This application is subject to the approval by Building, Zoning, and all ULDR requirements.

In a voice vote, the motion **passed 8-0**.

5.

[Index](#)

REQUEST:

Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Alterations

- Construction of a One-Story Addition to the Front Façade of a Contributing Property

Case Number	UDP-HP23038	FMSF#	BD02855
Owner	Jill M. Adler		
Applicant	Ronald Dugand, Dugand & Associates		
Address	1205 SW 4 Street (Tequesta Street)		
General Location	Approximately 170 feet west of the intersection of SW 12th Avenue and SW 4th Street		
Abbreviated Legal Description	WAVERLY PLACE 2-19 D THE S 90 OF LOTS 29 & 30 LESS W 5 OF N 45 THEREOF AND LESS E 5 OF W 10 OF N 15 BLK 109		
Folio Number	504209090941		
Existing Use	Single-Family Residence		

Proposed Use	Single-Family Residence	
Zoning	RML-25 - Residential Multifamily Low Rise/Medium High Density	
Applicable ULDR Sections	47-24.11.D.3.c.i; 47-24.11.D.3.c.ii; 47-17	
Landmark/Historic District	Sailboat Bend Historic District	
Section 166.033, Florida Statutes	180-day Expiration Date	Extension Date(s)
	April 12, 2024	Not Applicable
Authored By	Simone Chin, Urban Planner II	

Jill Adler, applicant, read a letter she had submitted for the record. She stated she was in love with the house and wanted to enlarge the home. She noted she had obtained photos of the previous alterations, which were done without permits. She advised that she had since learned that there may be issues with the addition because the plan was to replicate the front façade, and asserted this was devastating because of money already spent on architectural drawings and furniture while on a limited income. Ms. Adler pointed out the house cannot be seen from the street, as it is nestled in the back of the property. She stated she had reached out to past homeowners and learned the back of the home may have previously been the front of the home. She asked the Board to help her resolve the issue, as she just wants to enhance her home.

Chair Marcus opened the public hearing.

Lynne Goldman, the owner's sister, commented on how much her sister loves the cottage. She stated it was her understanding that the curb appeal and characteristics would remain the same, it would just be pushed out.

Chair Marcus closed the public hearing.

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-HP23038 located at 1205 SW 4th Street partially meet the criteria as outlined in Section 47-24.11.D.3.c.i. of the ULDR, does not meet the criteria as outlined in Section 47-24.11.D.3.c.ii. of the ULDR, and partially meets the criteria as outlined in Section 47-17 of the ULDR.

Elements that do not meet the criteria include the following:

1. Removal of original materials that characterize the building.
2. Placement of a new addition on the front elevation that creates a false sense of history, is not subordinate to the original structure, and is not differentiated from the original structure through the use of appropriate materials, massing, and placement.

Elements that partially meet the criteria include the following:

1. Fiber cement siding is not listed within the material and design guidelines. The new siding should match the existing in profile and materiality. The exterior finish of the structure needs to be cohesive as one type.
2. The color of the glass was not identified for the windows. Windows need to be clear with an option for a low-e coating.
3. Roof pitch is higher than the existing roof line and is not subordinate to the existing structure.

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. All glass must be clear with an option of a low-e coating and applied muntins must have a raised profile.
2. The exterior finish of the structure must be wood clapboard to match the existing.
3. The relocation of the existing canopy structure is not included in this approval.
4. This property is located in an Archaeologically Significant Zone. No archaeological deposits are anticipated within the subject property, however, if archaeological materials or features are discovered, then work in vicinity of the discovery shall stop and the City shall be notified immediately to coordinate the discovery. If unmarked human remains are encountered, then excavation in the vicinity of the find shall halt immediately and the archaeologist shall alert the City's historic preservation staff to coordinate the discovery and take measures to implement Chapter 872.05 Florida Statutes as it pertains to the discovery of unmarked human remains.
5. This application is subject to the approval by Building, Zoning, and all ULDR requirements.

Mr. Taylor pointed to the Zoning observations in the staff report and asked, if the application were approved, whether there would be a requirement to move the fence back to follow the Code. Ms. Chin explained that as no permits were found, the applicant had agreed to move it.

Mr. Taylor asked the applicant what the plan would be for the canopy structure. Ms. Adler stated she would remove it if it was a problem.

Ms. Walker asked the applicant if they were comfortable with the conditions. Shlomo Perez, Sonart Construction, builder for the project, stated they were okay with the conditions.

Ms. Moste asserted this was a great example of what the Board was here to do. She stated the owner was doing their best to keep the character of the property.

Ms. Walker agreed with Ms. Moste's comments and stated she appreciated the homeowner's willingness. She stated she believed the conditions were important, especially as it pertains to the materials remaining consistent.

Mr. Bray stated there were a lot of photos submitted, and some were significantly different from what is there today. He asked whether the building had been completely rebuilt. Ms. Adler provided clarification on the photos.

Mr. Bray asserted there had been a lot of modifications and it made him think this property was no longer contributing. He stated since they were attempting to rebuild the original façade, he thought there should be flexibility to support the attempt. He commented that Hardie Board had been utilized for decades and had been approved on other recent applications.

Mr. Jones stated he looked forward to driving by the new cozy cottage.

Mr. Schiavone asked Mr. Bray to clarify his comments regarding Hardie Board and the cement board requested in the application. Mr. Bray stated it was a similar material. Mr. Schiavone noted the Board had approved that a number of times in the past. Ms. Logan stated the request for the

Hardie Board is only for the addition and the rest of the structure is wooden, so it would not match and would look different.

Chair Marcus stated part of the criticism in the staff report was that the new addition should look different, and this material would differentiate it. Ms. Logan confirmed that it would, but not in the way that the standard from the Secretary of Interior describes.

Mr. Rosa expressed concern that requiring wood clapboard would burden the owner in a situation where the circumstances of the property were already not ideal. Discussion continued.

Chair Marcus stated he did not want to specify anything with wood in this environment as a required material because it does not last. Ms. Logan noted that past approvals involving Hardie Board had been in noncontributing buildings.

Mr. Rosa suggested stucco be utilized. Mr. Schlomo stated stucco would work and agreed that he also does not like wood because of termites and other maintenance issues.

Chair Marcus stated this was a corner house, which always begs the question of which is the front. He noted the area being recommended for an addition looks like the front of the house, despite comments that it may have previously been documented as the rear. He stated he had no problem with putting the addition where it is because there are no other places to put it, but he does share staff's concern regarding differentiating the new from the old. He suggested a small reveal and different materials would go a long way.

Chair Marcus noted the applicant was seeking to recreate the original front of the house and they had great photos. He suggested a reveal between the two pieces and returning the original window. Discussion continued.

Mr. Bray asserted reconstruction was one of the options available in the criteria, and that is what the applicant was asking to do. He stated she was using the same windows and doors to reconstruct the existing architecture and could use materials with a similar look to achieve that. Ms. Logan stated she would be careful with the term reconstruction, because in the Secretary of the Interior standards, that criteria is specific that it should be reconstructed based on the exact dimensions of the original, not a projection of the original. She noted this was an addition.

Mr. Rosa asked whether the applicant could use another material that is already approved if the Board removed the second condition and left it open. Ms. Logan explained the applicant could work with staff to find a material that would be appropriate, or the Board could select a material.

Ms. Walker stated she wanted to give as much flexibility as possible, rather than designing from the dais and putting the homeowner in a difficult situation. Attorney Wallen suggested referencing use of the materials in Section 47-17.

Motion made by Ms. Walker, seconded by Mr. Jones to **approve with conditions** the resolution for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Alterations under case number UDP-HP23038 located at 1205 SW 4th Street based on the following findings of fact as outlined in the staff memorandum and subject to the following conditions:

1. All glass must be clear with an option of a low-e coating and applied muntins must have a raised profile.
2. ~~The exterior finish of the structure must be wood clapboard to match the existing.~~

3. The relocation of the existing canopy structure is not included in this approval.
 4. This property is located in an Archaeologically Significant Zone. No archaeological deposits are anticipated within the subject property, however, if archaeological materials or features are discovered, then work in vicinity of the discovery shall stop and the City shall be notified immediately to coordinate the discovery. If unmarked human remains are encountered, then excavation in the vicinity of the find shall halt immediately and the archaeologist shall alert the City's historic preservation staff to coordinate the discovery and take measures to implement Chapter 872.05 Florida Statutes as it pertains to the discovery of unmarked human remains.
 5. This application is subject to the approval by Building, Zoning, and all ULDR requirements.
- In a voice vote, the motion **passed 8-0**.

Item V was discussed as part of Item VI.a.

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

Motion made by Mr. Bray, seconded by Mr. Rosa, to Communicate to the City Commission a consider a revitalization plan to bridge the Sailboat Bend and Himmarshee(H-1) Historic Districts including a request to provide initial funding. In a voice vote, motion **passed 7-0**. Ms. Walker was not present for the vote.

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

a. Himmarshee Street/Himmarshee Historic District Revitalization Project

Ms. Logan shared a flyer related to an open house being held as an initial public outreach event to gather public input from the neighborhood and stakeholders related to potential improvements in the Himmarshee Street area. She noted one-on-one meetings had been held with some stakeholders, including the Downtown Development Authority (DDA), Historical Society, Riverwalk Inc., Commissioner Steven Glassman, and others. She stated an interactive map was also available on the website and invited feedback from the Board. She advised the consultant would prepare a report following the event, compiling all of the feedback and creating a strategy to move forward.

Mr. Rosa asked where the Himmarshee (H-1) Historic District ends on the west. Ms. Logan explained the district ends at the O-B House.

Mr. Bray discussed ideas to change the planning and zoning in the Himmarshee (H-1) and Sailboat Bend Districts to invite mixed use and allow for small businesses and create new opportunities. Discussion ensued regarding the role of the Board in making recommendations related to revitalizing the district and language for a potential motion.

Ms. Walker left the dais at 7:49 p.m.

Motion made by Mr. Bray, seconded by Mr. Rosa, to Communicate to the City Commission a consider a revitalization plan to bridge the Sailboat Bend and Himmarshee(H-1) Historic Districts. In a voice vote, motion **passed 7-0**. Ms. Walker was not present for the vote.

b. Continued Board Discussion of Historic Preservation Incentives

Item not addressed.

Ms. Logan stated there were currently no applications for the December meeting. Consensus was to meet for continued discussion of historic preservation incentives.

Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 7:56 p.m. The next regular meeting of the HPB is scheduled for Monday, December 4, 2023.

Attest:



Prototype Inc. Recording Secretary

Chairman:



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.