

DRAFT
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE
MONDAY, DECEMBER 1, 2014 - 5:00 P.M.
FIRST FLOOR COMMISSION CHAMBER
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE
FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA

<u>Board Members</u>	<u>Attendance</u>	<u>Cumulative Attendance</u> <u>6/2014 through 5/2015</u>	
		<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
David Kyner, Chair	A	2	2
George Figler, Vice Chair	P	4	0
Brenda Flowers	P	3	1
Joyce Gardner	A	1	2
Marie Harrison	P	3	1
Timothy Lyons	P	3	1
Marilyn Mammano	A	3	1
Christopher McDonald	A	1	3
Phillip Morgan	P	4	0
Carol Lee Ortman	P	4	0
Alexandria Scherer	A	1	3

City Staff

Merrilyn Rathbun, Fort Lauderdale Historical Society, Consultant to HPB
Linda Mia Franco, AICP, Historic Preservation Board Liaison
Dwayne Spence, Assistant City Attorney
Lisa Edmondson, Recording Secretary, Prototype Inc.

Communication to the City Commission

None.

<u>Index</u>	<u>Applicant/Owner</u>	<u>Page</u>
H-14-014	Hansen Associates/Michelle Grosman	2
H-14-018	Arthur S. Bengochea, Architect/ Andrew Jimenez	10
H-14-017	Damon T. Ricks/Flynn Engineering Services P.A./ Tiffany House LP	17
	Good of the City	23
	Communication to the City Commission	23

I. Call to Order/Pledge of Allegiance

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

II. Determination of Quorum/Approval of Minutes of October 2014 Meeting

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

Motion made by Ms. Ortman, seconded by Mr. Lyons, to approve the minutes of the Board’s October, 2014 meeting. In a voice vote, motion passed unanimously.

III. Public Sign-in/Swearing-In

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

IV. Agenda Items:

1.

[Index](#)

Case	H14014	FMSF #	
Applicant	<i>Hansen Associates Architecture & Design</i>		
Owner	Michelle Grosman		
Address	1016 Waverly Road		
General Location	Approximately 117 feet east of the SW 11 th Avenue and Waverly Road intersection.		
Legal Description	LOTS 1,2,3,4,5,6 AND THE EAST HALF OF LOT 7 BLOCK 101 “WAVERLY PLACE” PLAT BOOK 2 PAGE 19 OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, LOCATED IN BWD COUNTY, FL, LESS AND EXCLUDING THE WEST 5 FEET OF THE EAST ON-HALF OF LOT 7, BLOCK 101 OF WAVERLY PLACE.		
Existing Use	Residence		
Proposed Use	N/A		
Applicable ULDR Sections	47-24.11.C.3.c.i, 47-24.11.C.4.c		
Request(s)	Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition 1. Demolition of an existing single-family residence.		

Board members disclosed communications and site visits they had regarding this case. Mr. Spence reported Board members had been provided a packet regarding an archeological study conducted on an adjacent property.

Ms. Rathbun read from her memo:

Property Background:

Note: The applicant came before this board with this request for demolition of Rivermont House in October 2014. At that meeting, members of the board asked to see historic photographs of the house. Mr. Dave Baber, Broward County, said at the meeting that he had seen a photo in the FLHS collection that showed the house. In a later communication to the FLHS curator, Mr. Baber said that he was wrong about the photograph and it did not show the house. FLHS has over 400,000 photographs in its collection. FLHS Research Assistant has searched the cataloged photo collection and has found no photos of Rivermont House.

The 1918 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map for the City of Fort Lauderdale shows a frame structure with a small irregularity (a less than room size projection) on the south side and an open porch on the north elevation of Rivermont House at 1016 Waverly Road. By 1928 the Sanborn maps show that the south facing irregularity has been enlarged to room size; this configuration is shown on all subsequent Sanborn maps for the City.

At some later date the open front porch was enclosed and another room sized addition (with a curved wall) was made to the south side of the building. A Broward County Property Appraiser's sketch map, from 1965 shows this late addition; city records show that a permit for a major remodel and repairs was issued on October 30th 1947, permit number 53018, with a job cost listed as \$20,000.00, which may have included this late addition. The configuration (without the late addition) shown on the Sanborn maps is the early historic footprint; however, The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings states:

4. Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.

As well as the additions that were made to the original c.1918 footprint, the house has a basement which, according to the 1965 Property Appraiser's sketch map, is located under the original (1918) portion of the house.

Only a few houses in Fort Lauderdale (all of which were built on natural high ground) have basements. The original owner of Rivermont House deliberately chose to build on the high ground of the site, although it was well known to the pioneer community, that this high ground was an Indian mound. A Dade County business directory for 1896-97, a publication that was available to the general public, under the title Indian Mounds, said "At Fort Lauderdale were found at the depth of about four feet human skeletons buried in a circle after the manner of spokes of a wheel, one tier the feet to the center and next the heads." No one knows exactly where this excavation was done. The existence of that basement poses an interesting historic question; it could be an indication of the attitudes of the pioneer settlers of Fort Lauderdale towards the Indians and Indian culture, or the mound might have already been disturbed. The basement appears to

have been dug into the slope of the mound; the original footprint of the house is not located on the highest part of the mound. The highest and undisturbed portion of the mound appears to be under the later additions to the house (see Google earth photo, page one of this memo). The basement is an important historic resource in itself.

The house has a hip roof which likely dates from the 1920s and/or earlier. There is a small gable roofed dormer lighting the attic space. The existing S-tile roof cladding is a replacement; city records show that there have been a number of roof repairs and replacements over the years. All of the existing windows are replacements. The house has stucco wall cladding. It stylistically resembles the Masonry Vernacular with Spanish influences that was popular in the 1920s.

The first owner of Rivermont was D.T. Hart. Mr. Hart was the vice-president of the Security State Bank and owner of D.T. Hart and Co., sellers of hay, grain and feed. In 1921, Rivermont was purchased by New York City businessman, Ross Clark. Mr. Clark and his partner had purchased 400 acres just south of the New River for a new housing development. In c. 1922 Rivermont was sold to William Carmichael from Miami who was planning a major development. At the same time, Carmichael purchased 29 acres of land south of the river from Clark's company, Turner and Clark. Apparently, Mr. Carmichael may never have lived at Rivermont. The Clarks were still living at the house in the summer of 1923 when Mrs. Clark's brother, Morton T. Ironmonger, visited at the house.

Carmichael purchased more land from Turner and Clark and mortgaged both purchases, possibly including Rivermont. Carmichael built a new house on Rose Drive in his new development which he named Placidena. He soon found himself in financial trouble; he owed Turner and Clark \$100,000 and was in trouble with his bank. The Placidena development was sold to investors from Chicago and renamed Croissant Park

In the late 1930s, Rivermont was owned by Norbourne B. Cheney, owner of the Broward Abstract Company. For many years the property was known locally as the Cheney Estate.

The Rivermont property is part of the Loesch/Rivermont Site, a large aboriginal archeological site that is located between SW 9th Avenue and west of SW 12th Avenue in the Sailboat Bend Historic District. The site extends north from the New River for distances from 150' to 300'. The site is a black earth and shell midden site, i.e. an elevated ridge of decomposed organic matter, a constructed refuse heap rather than a natural formation. The site was formally recognized as an archeological site in the 1930s, but it was known as early as 1909. The site is described in the Florida Master Site file as: "SITE CONSISTS OF A BLACK DIRT & SHELL MIDDEN SITUATED ALONG THE NORTH BANK OF THE NEW RIVER. THIS IS THE LARGEST & MOST INTACT PREHISTORIC MIDDEN KNOWN TO HAVE SURVIVED ALONG THE NEW

RIVER”. The FMSF recommendation stated: “CLOSE MONITORING OF ANY CONSTRUCTION IN SITE AREA TO PREVENT FURTHER DISTURBANCES. PRESERVATION.”

There have been incursions on the Loesch/Rivermount Site, mainly from residential building; but the Loesch/Rivermount site, excluding the house site, has the largest untouched portion of the midden. The Rivermont House occupies a small part of the Rivermont property; however there have been other constructions on the site. There were some accessory buildings on the site, which have been removed. A kidney shaped pool and a storage building on the riverfront, which remain, are shown on the 1965 Broward County Property Appraiser’s sketch map.

Description of Proposed Site Plan:

The applicant requests a COA to demolish a contributing structure (1016 Waverly Road, Rivermont House) in the SBHD. The applicant asks for demolition of the house under criterion iii., i.e. The demolition or redevelopment project is a major benefit to a historic district. In his narrative the applicant states that the house “...does not have historic significance” and the “...site has limited archeological significance’. The applicant states that the house will be demolished, the existing basement will be filled in, any usable Dade County Pine will be recycled and any artifacts found will be preserved.

The applicant proposes to build a new single-family residence on the cleared lot. According to his proposal the new construction will be “...Florida Vernacular, using precedents from the early 1920s and 1930s to serve as a model for historical accuracy.” The applicant does not specify the size of the new house, however he notes that the site is a very large property. He states that the new house “...will be of a scale and style that will complement the neighborhood.” The applicant maintains that “...almost all of the existing open space will be preserved.”

Criteria for Certificate of Appropriateness:

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

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

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

Consultant Response: An important historic resource, Rivermont House, will be lost.

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

Consultant Response: There is a possibility that a registered archeological site could be damaged by demolition of the house and new construction.

- c) The extent to which the historic, architectural, or archeological significance, architectural style, design, arrangement, texture, materials and color of the landmark or the property will be affected;

Consultant Response: The historic house will be destroyed and its history lost to the community.

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

Consultant Response: The applicant's proposed plans do not comply, see below:

From the "United States Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings."

2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

4. Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.

8. Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.

Note: At the Board's direction, by vote at the October 2014 HPB meeting, a phase one archeology survey was undertaken. The complete report was not released by the property owner; however it was stated that the survey found a human tooth on the property. If this COA application is granted then appropriate mitigation measures will be required.

Request No. 1 - COA for Demolition:

The applicant is requesting a certificate of appropriateness to demolish one existing structure

Pursuant to ULDR Section 47-24.11.C.4.c, the Board must consider the following additional criteria specific to demolition, taking into account the analysis of the materials and design guidelines above:

ULDR Section 47-24.11.C.4.c

- i. The designated landmark, landmark site or property within the historic district no longer contributes to a historic district; or

Consultant Response: Rivermont House is a contributing property within the SBHD

- ii. The property or building no longer has significance as a historic architectural or archeological landmark; or

Consultant Response: The building retains its historic significance and the site is an important registered archeological site.

- iii. The demolition or redevelopment project is of major benefit to a historic district.

Consultant Response: There is no advantage to the historic district in demolishing an important historic house and replacing it with a modern copy of an historic house

The applicant has not given enough information on the proposed construction for the site. The applicant states that the new house will occupy the footprint of the existing house which will be demolished and that "...almost all of the existing open space will be preserved." Before an informed decision can be made, the board needs to know exactly what part of the site will be affected. The applicant should present plans for his project.

Summary Conclusion:

The applicant is asking for the demolition of an historic house, a contributing property in the SBHD, which is located on the Loesch/Rivermount archeological site, which according to a letter from M. DeFelice is the "...largest intact archeological complex situated along the New River" and "...may be considered a significant archeological resource at the local (city and county) as well as National level under Criterion D of the National Register."

The Loesch/Rivermount site and the New River Midden, have been known for over 100 years. The historic Rivermont House, which is significant in the built history of the town, occupies a small portion of the site; together the house and the archeological site are one of the most important historic resources of the City of Fort Lauderdale. Demolition of the house will cause the destruction of the site. At this point, no further incursion should be made on the site; the house should be stabilized and rehabilitated. The applicant's proposed demolition of the house is not appropriate. The application should be denied.

Steven Tilbrook, attorney for the applicant, presented documents into evidence. He summarized the applicant's representatives' testimony from the prior hearing and said that demolition had occurred over time, very little of the home remained intact, the structure was in terrible condition and rehabilitation was not recommended or feasible. The applicant had demonstrated that the property met the criteria for a Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition because the property had been so extensively demolished and renovated that it no longer contributed to the historic district and no longer had significance as an architectural or historical landmark and that demolition of the existing home and the construction of a new home would be of significant benefit to the historic district.

Mr. Tilbrook reported pursuant to the Board's request at the previous hearing, the applicant had hired Robert Carr from The Archeological and Historical Conservancy Inc. to conduct an archeological assessment and develop a demolition management plan. The applicant had also hired Robert Tuthill, architect, to develop a site plan and a conceptual plan. This information had been provided to Board members the previous week.

Mr. Carr said they had completed a phase 1 archeological assessment of the property and the materials were still being tested. They had also created a demolition management plan to minimize impact to the site. He reported they found thousands of items of Tequesta culture going back possibly 1,000 years and said this was one of the most significant prehistoric sites in Fort Lauderdale. Mr. Carr stated they had written specific guidelines for preserving the existing archeological deposits including installing temporary fencing separating intact areas from the proposed demolition area; providing written guidelines and meeting with the demolition contractor; placing environmental fabric on the access road used for demolition equipment; identifying an assigned staging area; demolish the building by pushing and pulling debris into the house footprint; stabilizing voids left by the house, basement and pool; filling voids with clean fill; monitoring of ground disturbing activity by an archeologist who would provide a report to the Board.

Mr. Carr said the resources could be protected with proper procedures and monitoring and this plan was an appropriate and reasonable method for pursuing demolition and use on this site. The architects had also consulted Mr. Carr regarding an appropriate method for new construction and he had advised them to utilize foundation piers instead of footers to avoid disrupting the site. If human remains were found, this would be fully documented, the State and the tribe would be notified and a plan would be developed for dealing with the remains.

Mr. Tilbrook displayed a rendering of the proposed new construction and a site plan. He reported the project had been presented to the Sailboat Bend Civic Association general membership and they had unanimously voted to support it.

Charles Jordan, president of the Sailboat Bend Historic Trust, said the Trust had agreed to renovate the property as part of a deal with the City in which the City was acquiring the land. That deal was in process when this buyer came in and intended to renovate the house. Mr. Jordan said this building was contributing in the Sailboat Bend Historic District, and he cited the testimony of Dave Baber from the Broward County Historical Commission and the City's own survey of the Sailboat Bend Historic District. Mr. Jordan said the renovations already done to the building did not significantly alter the historic resource. Based on his inspection of the house, he felt the original structure was intact and the house did not meet the criteria to allow demolition. He encouraged the Board to deny the application.

Ms. Flowers asked Mr. Jordan what architecture would be lost and Mr. Jordan replied that they would lose one of the City's most valuable historic resources "that make the district the district."

Mary Hughes, president of the Sailboat Bend Civic Association, said many members had been inside the building and everyone had voted to demolish it.

Paul Bogges, Sailboat Bend resident, stated when Sailboat Bend had been declared an historical district, this house had been used as one of the main structures in the district. It had not changed since the district was created and was one of the most historic structures in Sailboat Bend.

Molly Hughes, Sailboat Bend resident, questioned the fairness of the application of rules. She said substantive construction, reconstruction and site disturbance had taken place at the adjacent property. She wanted to know what the difference was between the two sites.

Dr. Michele Williams, Director of the Southeast and Southwestern Regions of the Florida Public Archeology Network, emphasized that the archeology site was significant and there would be destruction of the site, even utilizing this demolition plan.

Robert Tuthill, architect, said a previous owner had removed the front and back facades and installed porches. The building sides had been destroyed 30-60% by the installation of new windows and doors. Mr. Tuthill said any steel beams and columns in the structure were not from the 1800's to the early 1900's. These reasons led to their conclusion that the building should be demolished.

Leo Hansen, architect, stated the worst thing they could do was to "put up something...that looks historic but it's not." If this application were denied, this is what the Board would force the owners to do. Mr. Hansen said 90% of the walls had been rebuilt. He felt the best thing for the City would be to hire an archeologist to oversee the demolition.

Ms. Flowers felt her concerns had been addressed by the demolition plan the applicant had submitted.

Mr. Morgan asked how the promises in the plan would be documented so the City could ensure that the owner was complying with the points of the plan. Mr. Tilbrook replied that the eight criteria they had submitted were conditions of the Board's approval. Ms. Flowers wanted to know how the City would monitor the eight criteria.

Mr. Spence said the applicant had promised to follow the demolition plan and any additional conditions the Board might specify may be incorporated into the plan. Mr. Tilbrook referred to item nine on the plan, which required an archeologist to monitor and document all ground disturbing activities and provide a report to the Board. These reports could be provided as often as the Board wished. Ms. Ortman suggested that a weekly report be provided to an independent archeologist and that person could report to the Board once per month. Mr. Hansen explained that the demolition would probably not take more than one month. Mr. Tilbrook clarified condition eight: the monitoring archeologist would provide weekly monitoring reports to the City of Fort Lauderdale Historic Preservation team and the Broward County archeologist. Mr. Tuthill further

suggested that any significant discovery on the site would be reported in writing to the HPB and the County archeologist within 48 hours. Mr. Tilbrook agreed to this.

Ms. Franco asked what action could be taken if the demolition management plan were not followed or if a significant item was discovered on the site. Mr. Spence said a Stop Work Order could be issued in the event of a significant find. Mr. Tilbrook stated the demolition management plan could be included in the permit and be subject to a Stop Work Order for the Building Official if it was not followed.

Motion made by Ms. Flowers, seconded by Mr. Morgan to approve the application, adopting the demolition management plan, with the modification that the eight measures to minimize the impact on the archeological deposits be included in the plan, as modified by number eight, providing a weekly report to the Broward County Archeologist and if any significant findings were found on the site, work stoppage should occur immediately and be directed at the area of discovery and the find would be reported to the Broward County Archeologist within 48 hours; work would continue only after approval by the Broward County Archeologist. In a voice vote, motion passed unanimously.

2.

[Index](#)

Case	H14018	FMSF #	
Applicant	Arthur S. Bengochea		
Owner	Andrew Jimenez		
Address	725 & 727 W. Las Olas Blvd		
General Location	Approximately 106 feet east of the northeast corner of SW 8 th Avenue and Las Olas Blvd. intersection.		
Legal Description	Lot 32, Block 22, of BRYANS SUBDIVISION OF BLOCKS 21 and 22, FT. Lauderdale, according to the plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 1, Page 29 of the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, Florida; said lands situate, lying and being in. Lying and being situated in Broward County, Florida.		
Existing Use	Vacant		
Proposed Use	Residential		
Applicable Sections	ULDR	47-24.11.C.3.c.i, 47-17.7.B, 47-24.11.C.3.c.iii	
Request(s)	. Certificate of Appropriateness for New Construction > 2,000 SF GFA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of new two-story, two(2) family dwelling units 		

Board members disclosed communications and site visits they had regarding this case.

Ms. Rathbun read from her memo:

Property Background:

At this time the lot at 725 West Las Olas Boulevard is vacant. Sanborn Fire Insurance maps for the City of Fort Lauderdale show that there was a two-story wood frame building on the site, which is first shown on the 1928 map; at some point that building was demolished or moved from the site. The property immediately to the west of the applicant's lot is a ca.1925 Mission Revival apartment complex of two buildings separated by a courtyard. This is a significant building within the SBHD. The house to the east of the applicant's property is a one story wood frame house with a gable roof; it is contributing in the SBHD.

Description of Proposed Site Plan:

The applicant proposes to build what he describes as a two-story, two-family dwelling on the vacant lot at 725 West Las Olas Boulevard. The new building will have a rectangular footprint that will occupy the major portion of the lot. The proposed plan calls for a massive, high pitched hip roof with dormers on both the north and south elevations; the dormers are large enough to accommodate two triple windows, three windows ganged together, i.e. six windows for each dormer. Although the applicant's request for a COA calls for approval of a two story dwelling, the presence of the dormers and the height of the roof suggests that at some point this will be a third floor living space.

The proposed plan calls for the standard front, rear and side setbacks. The historic apartment building to the west of the lot is built up to the lot line, which means that there will be just 5 feet 8 inches between the historic building and the new construction. The new building will loom over the one story historic complex.

The façade of the new residence has street facing garage doors, one at each corner. There is a full width second floor balcony which is supported by pillars, which gives the effect of a porch on the ground floor and diminishes the impact of the front facing garage doors.

Criteria for Certificate of Appropriateness:

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

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

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

Consultant Response: The applicant's lot is vacant at this time

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

Consultant Response: The applicant's legitimate request for the standard 5' 8" setback for the west side of his project, means that there would be a very narrow space between the new building and the zero lot line historic building next door. This narrow space would be visually incompatible with other setbacks on the street.

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

Consultant Response: no information

e) Whether the plans may be reasonably carried out by the applicant;

Consultant Response: no information

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

Consultant Response: See below

From the "United States Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings." In reference to the historic streetscape, i.e. the environment:

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

<<Following section to be included only for properties within the SBHD>>

In addition, pursuant to ULDR Section 47-17.7.A, the Sailboat Bend Historic District material and design guidelines shall be read in conjunction with the existing guidelines provided in this section and shall be utilized as additional criteria for the consideration of an application for a certificate of appropriateness for new construction, alterations, relocation, and demolition.

In each of the following sections below, relevant to the specific request being made, a description of the architectural features corresponding to the material & design guidelines as outlined in the ULDR (47-17.7.B) is provided for both the existing buildings and the proposed new construction.

In addition to the General Criteria for obtaining a COA, as outlined above, pursuant to ULDR Section 47-17.7.A, the Board must consider the following material and design guidelines to identify existing features of a structure which conform to the guidelines and determine the feasibility of alternatives to the demolition of a structure:

ULDR Section 47-17.7.B

1. Exterior building walls.

a. Materials and finish.

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

- ii. Wood: clapboard, three and one-half (3 1/2) inches to seven (7) inches to the weather; shingles, seven (7) inches to the weather; board and batten, eight (8) inches to twelve (12) inches; shiplap siding smooth face, four (4) inches to eight (8) inches to the weather.
- iii. Masonry: coral, keystone or split face block; truncated or stacked bond block.

Consultant Response: **Exterior building walls.**

- b. Materials and finish.

Stucco: smooth

2. Windows and doors.

- a. Materials.

- i. Glass (clear, stained, leaded, beveled and non-reflective tinted).
 - ii. Translucent glass (rear and side elevations only).
 - iii. Painted and stained wood.
 - iv. Aluminum and vinyl clad wood.
 - v. Steel and aluminum.
 - vi. Glass block.
 - vii. Flat skylights in sloped roofs.
 - viii. Domed skylights on flat roofs behind parapets.
- b. Configurations.
 - i. Doors: garage nine (9) feet maximum width.
 - ii. Windows: square; rectangular; circular; semi-circular; semi-ellipse; octagonal; diamond; triangular; lited only to gable ends.
- c. Operations.
 - i. Windows: single and double hung; casement; fixed with frame; awning; sliders (rear and side only); jalousies and louvers.
- d. General.
 - i. Wood shutters sized to match openings (preferably operable).
 - ii. Wood and metal jalousies.
 - iii. Interior security grills.
 - iv. Awnings.
 - v. Bahama shutters.
 - vi. Screened windows and doors.

Consultant Response: **Windows and doors.**

- e. Materials.

Glass (clear, and non-reflective tinted).

Steel and aluminum.

- f. Configurations.

Doors: garage nine (9) feet maximum width

Windows: rectangular;

- g. Operations.

Windows: single hung

3. Roofs and gutters.

- a. Roof--materials.
 - i. Terra cotta.
 - ii. Cement tiles.
 - iii. Cedar shingles.
 - iv. Steel standing seam.
 - v. 5-V crimp.
 - vi. Galvanized metal or copper shingles (Victorian or diamond pattern).
 - vii. Fiberglass/asphalt shingles.
 - viii. Built up roof behind parapets.
 - b. Gutters.
 - i. Exposed half-round.
 - ii. Copper.
 - iii. ESP aluminum.
 - iv. Galvanized steel.
 - v. Wood lined with metal.
 - c. Configurations.
 - i. Roof: The pitch of new roofs may be matched to the pitch of the roof of existing structures on the lot. Simple gable and hip, pitch no less than 3:12 and no more than 8:12. Shed roofs attached to a higher wall, pitch no less than 3:12. Tower roofs may be any slope. Rafters in overhangs to be exposed. Flat with railings and parapets, where permitted, solar collectors and turbine fans at rear port.

Consultant Response: **Roofs and gutters.**

a. Roof—materials

Steel standing seam.

b. Configurations.

Simple gable and hip, pitch no less than 3:12 and no more than 8:12

b. Arcades and porches.

a. Materials and finish.

- i. Stucco (at piers and arches only): float finish, smooth or coarse, machine spray, dashed or troweled.
- ii. Wood: posts and columns.
- iii. Masonry (at piers and arches only): coral, keystone or split face block; truncated or stacked bond block.
- iv. Metal (at railings only): wrought iron, ESP aluminum.

Consultant Response: **Arcades and porches.**

a. Materials and finish.

Wood: posts and columns

Masonry (at piers and arches only): coral

The applicant's request for materials is appropriate.

Request No. 3 - COA for New Construction:

The applicant is requesting a certificate of appropriateness for new construction of a two-story, two-family home.

In addition to the General Criteria for obtaining a COA and the Material and Design Guidelines, as previously outlined, pursuant to ULDR Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.iii, the Board must consider the following additional criteria specific to new construction, taking into account the analysis of the materials and design guidelines above:

“Additional guidelines; new construction. Review of new construction and alterations to designated buildings and structures shall be limited to exterior features of the structure, except for designated interior portions. In approving or denying applications for certificates of appropriateness for new construction, the board shall also use the following additional guidelines. Where new construction is required to be visually related to or compatible with adjacent buildings, adjacent buildings shall mean buildings which exhibit the character and features of designated or identified historic structures on the site or in the designated historic district where the site is located.”

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

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

Consultant Response: The applicant’s proposed project is located on the West Las Olas Blvd. block between SW 7th Avenue and SW 8th Avenue. All of the existing buildings on that block are one story, but one which is one and a half stories. The proposed project at two and one half stories is not visually compatible with the adjacent buildings of the streetscape

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

Consultant Response: The applicant’s project does not meet this criterion as to visual compatibility.

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

Consultant Response: The applicant’s proposed project has a series of full length French doors on the second story and French doors and garage doors on the ground floor. The proposed project windows are not compatible with the width and height of the street facing windows of the adjacent buildings on the streetscape.

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

Consultant Response: The applicant’s project does not meet this criterion as to visual compatibility.

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

Consultant Response: The applicant's legitimate request for the standard 5' 8" setback for the west side of his project, means that there would be a very narrow space between the new building and the zero lot line historic building next door. This narrow space would be visually incompatible with other setbacks on the street.

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

Consultant Response: The proposed project's massive hip roof is not visually compatible with the low to medium rise gable roofs and parapeted flat roof of the adjacent buildings on the street.

i) The size of a building, the mass of a building in relation to open spaces, the windows, door openings, porches and balconies shall be visually compatible with the buildings and places to which it is visually related.

Consultant Response: The proposed project is dissimilar in size, form and massing to adjacent buildings on the block

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

Consultant Response: The proposed project meets this criterion.

Summary Conclusion:

In reference to new construction, The City of Fort Lauderdale Historic Preservation Design Guidelines states:

In Fort Lauderdale's residential neighborhoods the following is encouraged:

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

As it is presented, the applicant's proposed plan is inappropriate, and unless the plan is modified, the requested COA should be denied.

Art Bengochea, architect, distributed photos of the property and pointed out that there was a 12-foot wall on the east side of the property. He said they proposed a two-story, two-family dwelling that would meet all setback requirements. They had created a porch on the second story on the front of the house and moved the garage doors back to be less prominent. The garage doors would give the appearance of a carriage house. Mr. Bengochea explained that in response to their meetings with the neighborhood, they had created hips in the roof to make it less linear. He showed photos of other properties in the area for a comparison of the buildings' masses.

Ms. Franco distributed photos of other properties in the area. Andrew Jimenez, owner, remarked that there were many buildings in the area that were similar to the one they wanted to build. He had a letter of support from one adjacent neighbor; the other adjacent apartment complex was currently unoccupied.

Ms. Flowers noted that the plan looked to be three stories. Mr. Bengochea said he had included dormers to add interest to the roofline. Ms. Flowers pointed out that she had not seen other buildings in the area that were this tall. Mr. Bengochea explained that there was a building across from the apartments that was three-story.

Mr. Figler was concerned about the building fitting in, considering its massing and Mr. Bengochea said they had tried to design the building to make the front very inviting and to include articulation in the walls for the character they were trying to achieve.

Motion made by Mr. Morgan, seconded by Mr. Lyons, to approve the application for a COA for new construction. Motion passed 4-2 with Ms. Flowers and Mr. Figler opposed.

3.

[Index](#)

Case	H14017	FMSF #	
Applicant	Damon T. Ricks/Flynn Engineering Services PA		
Owner	Tiffany House LP		
Address	2900 Riomar Street		
General Location	Southeast corner of Riomar Street and Bayshore Drive.		
Legal Description	BIRCH OCEAN FRONT SUB 19-26 B LOT 1 TO 4 BLK 8		
Existing Use	(29,000 sq. ft.) Historic structure and vacant land		
Proposed Use	124 residential units		
Applicable ULDR Sections	47-24.11.C.3.c.i, 47-24.11.C.4.c, 47-24.11.C.3.c.ii, 47-24.11.C.3.c.iii		
Request(s)	1. Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To include interior renovation of historic structures to restore back to hotel use (96 rooms). Including demolition of cabana building (not part of original construction), swimming pool, and one story meter room. 		

	<p>2. Certificate of Appropriateness for New Construction >2000 SF GFA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To include new 8-12 story building with 128 multifamily residential units, 322 space valet parking deck, and 2000sf commercial space is planned for the vacant southerly parcel directly abutting the existing building.
	<p>3. Certificate of Appropriateness for Alteration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To include new canopy at the front entrance of historic resource with the condition that the canopy angle be 2-1/2 and 12, the canopy support structure be lighter and the canopy be made of transparent material, Replacement of windows, doors, stucco repair as applicable, and paint roof to match original appearance. The pool will be renovated in the same location with a pool that meets current regulations.

Ms. Rathbun read from her memo:

Property Background:

The Escape Hotel was built in 1951 by entrepreneurs George Gill, Jr. and his father George Gill, Sr. The hotel, a complex of buildings, designed by architects Theo Meyer and Lester Avery, was the first of the Gill’s tropical style resorts. The hotel buildings were designated as an historic resource in the City of Fort Lauderdale in 2004. The hotel is sited on the north side of a trapezoid shaped lot; a large open space, formerly used for tennis courts, south of the hotel buildings.

In 2013, this applicant came before the Historic Preservation Board requesting a COA for demolition of interior spaces of the historic buildings, a COA for alteration , i.e. the addition of a canopy at the front entrance to the hotel, a COA for new construction of a proposed condominium of a 12 and 8 story sections to be sited above a 245 parking space, four level parking deck located on the open portion of the lot and 2000sf of commercial space. At the HPB meeting there was some discussion about the request for an addition of the canopy structure. Board members suggested that the angle of the canopy be lowered, that the canopy structure be lightened and the canopy be made transparent; the applicant agreed to these changes. The COAs for demolition and new construction were approved as was the modified COA for alteration.

Description of Proposed Site Plan:

The applicant is before the board today requesting a COA for demolition of the hotel interior spaces, the demolition of a non-historic cabana building, swimming pool and one story meter room. He also requests a COA for alteration, i.e. the addition of a

canopy structure as modified by the board at the 2013 HPB meeting and a COA for new construction of a condominium building of two sections , one 8 stories in height and one 12 stories in height. The design for the condo building has been altered from the previous submission. In the 2013 plan the 12 story section of the building was stepped back from the north facing wall of the parking deck while the north elevation of the 8 story section was to be built in line with the parking deck. There was a concern about possible shadow effect of the 8 story section on the historic resource

Today the applicant is presenting plans that increase the size of his condo building from 74 units to 128 multi-family residential units. The height of the 12 story section will not change but the mass of the section will be increased; the north elevation of the 12 story section is to be pushed forward so that it is in line with the north elevation of the 8 story section and the north wall of the parking deck. This alteration could cause a shadow effect on the historic structure. The applicant's consultant included shadow studies for the project in his narrative.

Criteria for Certificate of Appropriateness:

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

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

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

Consultant Response: The only change, visible from the exterior to the historic hotel complex is the addition of the canopy to the entrance. The design of the canopy has been modified to lessen its impact on the historic structure. The increased mass of the condo building will have a greater shadow impact on the historic resource

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

Consultant Response: The proposed condo building is sited very close to the historic hotel building and could have some adverse visual impact on the resource.

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

Consultant Response: The historic buildings are two stories in height, the new construction is considerably larger in height and mass. See below

From the "United States Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings."

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

The related new construction is differentiated from the old, but it is much larger in terms of massing size and scale.

10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

The new construction could be removed without damage to the historic resource.

Request No. 1 - COA for Demolition:

The applicant is requesting a certificate of appropriateness to demolish 2 existing structures and existing interior spaces of the historic hotel.

Pursuant to ULDR Section 47-24.11.C.4.c, the Board must consider the following additional criteria specific to demolition, taking into account the analysis of the materials and design guidelines above:

ULDR Section 47-24.11.C.4.c

ii. The property or building no longer has significance as a historic architectural or archeological landmark; or

Consultant Response: The cabana building and the meter room are non-contributing to the historic resource

iii. The demolition or redevelopment project is of major benefit to a historic district.

Consultant Response: The return of the hotel to its original purpose is of major benefit to the neighborhood.

Consultant Response:

Criteria ii. and iii. apply in this case.

Request No. 2 - COA for Alterations:

The applicant is requesting a certificate of appropriateness for alterations to one structure.

In addition to the General Criteria for obtaining a COA and the Material and Design Guidelines, as previously outlined, pursuant to ULDR Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.ii, the Board must consider the following additional criteria specific to alterations, taking into account the analysis of the materials and design guidelines above:

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

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

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

Consultant Response: The applicant intends to return the historic resource to its original purpose as a hotel

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

Consultant Response: Windows and doors to be replaced in the hotel buildings will closely match the originals in design

c) All buildings, structures, and sites shall be recognized as products of their own time. Alterations which have no historical basis and which seek to create an earlier appearance shall be discouraged;

Consultant Response: This criterion will be met

e) Distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship which characterize a building, structure, or site, shall be treated with sensitivity;

Consultant Response: This criterion will be met

f) Deteriorated architectural features shall be repaired rather than replaced, wherever possible. In the event replacement is necessary, the new material should match the material being replaced in composition, design, color, texture, and other visual qualities. Repair or replacement of missing architectural features should be based on accurate duplications of features, substantiated by historical, physical, or pictorial evidence, rather than on conjectural designs or the availability or different architectural elements from other buildings or structures;

Consultant Response: This criterion will be met

Request No. 3 - COA for New Construction:

The applicant is requesting a certificate of appropriateness for new construction of ...

“Additional guidelines; new construction. Review of new construction and alterations to designated buildings and structures shall be limited to exterior features of the structure, except for designated interior portions. In approving or denying applications for certificates of appropriateness for new construction, the board shall also use the following additional guidelines. Where new construction is required to be visually related to or compatible with adjacent buildings, adjacent buildings shall mean buildings which exhibit the character and features of designated or identified historic structures on the site or in the designated historic district where the site is located.”

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

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

Consultant Response: The height of the proposed new construction is significantly higher than that of the historic resource

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

Consultant Response: The width and height of the new construction differs from the historic structure but is similar to that of other high rise buildings in the neighborhood

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

Consultant Response: See b) above

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

Consultant Response: See b) above

i) The size of a building, the mass of a building in relation to open spaces, the windows, door openings, porches and balconies shall be visually compatible with the buildings and places to which it is visually related.

Consultant Response: The proposed new construction is compatible with other large scale buildings in the immediate vicinity. The neighborhood is a mixture of mainly low rise buildings interspersed with high rise construction.

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

Consultant Response: The new construction meets this criterion.

Summary Conclusion:

The request for a COA for alteration, i.e. the new canopy, and the request for a COA for demolition are appropriate and should be approved. The board should carefully consider the possible impacts of the increased size and mass of the proposed condominium building on the historic resource before approving the requested COA for new construction.

Board members disclosed communications and site visits they had regarding this case.

Robert Lochrie, attorney for the owner, provided a brief history of the hotel and explained that they were before the Board with modifications to a plan the Board had approved in 2013. These changes concerned solely the residential south portion of the property, including making the parking garage more efficient and reconfiguring the residential units to be smaller. He described the changes on a rendering.

Mr. Lochrie said Steve Glassman had sent a letter on his own behalf and on behalf of the Broward County Trust for Historic Preservation. The project had also been presented to the Central Beach Alliance and received their approval.

Abby Laughlin, Fort Lauderdale Surf Club, recalled that originally the site had been rezoned for 21 units and this project was over 100. She was concerned about the deterioration of the building that would render it beyond repair and result in its demolition. Ms. Laughlin wanted assurances that the building would be saved.

Mr. Lochrie stated the building was salvageable and they intended to preserve it, not demolish it.

Mr. Figler felt this was an excellent project and suggested installing a plaque to commemorate the building's history. Mr. Lochrie said this would be part of the marketing plan. He agreed to work with the City regarding a plaque.

Motion made by Ms. Flowers, seconded by Ms. Ortman, to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition. In a voice vote, motion passed unanimously.

Motion made by Mr. Morgan, seconded by Ms. Harrison, to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for new construction. In a voice vote, motion passed unanimously.

Motion made by Mr. Morgan, seconded by Ms. Ortman, to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for alteration. In a voice vote, motion passed unanimously.

V. Communication to the City Commission

[Index](#)

None.

VI. Good of the City

[Index](#)

None.

Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 7:45.

Next Meeting

The Board's next regular meeting was scheduled for January 5, 2015.

Chairman,

David Kyner, Chair

Attest:

ProtoType Inc. Recording Secretary

The City of Fort Lauderdale maintains a [Website](http://ci.ftlaud.fl.us/documents/hpb/hpbagenda.htm) for the Historic Preservation Board Meeting Agendas and Results: <http://ci.ftlaud.fl.us/documents/hpb/hpbagenda.htm>

Any written public comments made 48 hours prior to the meeting regarding items discussed during the proceedings have been attached hereto.