

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD  
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE  
MONDAY, DECEMBER 5, 2016 - 5:00 P.M.  
FIRST FLOOR COMMISSON CHAMBER  
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE  
FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA**

<b><u>Board Members</u></b>	<b><u>Attendance</u></b>	<b><u>Cumulative Attendance</u></b> <b><u>6/2016 through 5/2017</u></b>	
		<b><u>Present</u></b>	<b><u>Absent</u></b>
David Kyner, Chair	P	4	1
George Figler, Vice Chair	P	4	1
Ginger Coffey	P	5	0
Brenda Flowers	P	3	2
Marie Harrison	A	0	5
Marilyn Mammano	P	3	2
Donna Mergenhausen	P	5	0
Phillip Morgan	P	5	0
Drew Melville (arrived 5:05)	P	4	0
Arthur Marcus (arrived 5:05)	P	3	0
Alexandria Scherer	A	1	4

**City Staff**

Merrilyn Rathbun, Fort Lauderdale Historical Society, Consultant to HPB  
Lynda Crase, Administrative Aide  
Linda Mia Franco, AICP, Historic Preservation Board Liaison  
D'Wayne Spence, Assistant City Attorney  
Mona Laventure, Recording Secretary, Prototype Inc.

**Communication to the City Commission**

None

<b><u>Index</u></b>	<b><u>Applicant/Owner</u></b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>
1.	H-16-015 FDOT/City of Fort Lauderdale FDOT/City of Fort Lauderdale	<a href="#"><u>2</u></a>
2.	H-16-016 Paul Pfadenhauer, Robin Haines Merrill, agent/ First Evangelical Lutheran Church	<a href="#"><u>7</u></a>
3.	H-16-017 Armando Colon/AC Shutters & Awnings Inc./ Nichole O'Neal	<a href="#"><u>14</u></a>
4.	H-16-018 LAS OLAS RIVERFRONT LP/Courtney Crush	<a href="#"><u>18</u></a>
	Good of the City	<a href="#"><u>21</u></a>
	Communication to the City Commission	<a href="#"><u>21</u></a>

**I. Call to Order/Pledge of Allegiance**

Chair Kyner called the meeting of the Historic Preservation Board to order at 5:01 p.m.

## **II. Determination of Quorum/Approval of Minutes**

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

The Board noted changes to the minutes.

**Motion** made by Mr. Figler, seconded by Ms. Coffey, to approve the minutes of the Board's November 2016 meeting as amended. In a voice vote, motion passed unanimously.

## **III. Public Sign-in/Swearing-In**

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

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

## **IV. Agenda Items:**

1.

[Index](#)

<b>Case</b>	H16015	<b>FMSF#</b>	
<b>Review and Comment</b>	<b>Henry F. Kinney Tunnel/Tunnel Pedestrian Plaza</b>		
<b>Owner</b>	FDOT/City of Fort Lauderdale		
<b>Developer</b>	City of Fort Lauderdale/Elizabeth Van Zandt		
<b>Address</b>	SE 6 <sup>th</sup> Avenue/Las Olas Blvd. Tunnel		
<b>General Location</b>	Intersection of East Las Olas Boulevard and South Federal Highway		
<b>Legal Description</b>	A PORTION OF RIGHT OF WAY AT THE INTERSECTION OF EAST LAS OLAS BOULEVARD AND SOUTH FEDERAL HIGHWAY IN SECTION 11, TOWNSHIP 50 SOUTH, RANGE 42 EAST MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:  BEGIN AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF TRACT 2, "BURNHAM'S SUBDIVISION", ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF, RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 15, PAGE 29, OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA; THENCE SOUTH 87'34'20" WEST ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF SAID TRACT 2 AND ALSO BEING THE SOUTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF EAST LAS OLAS		

BOULEVARD, A DISTANCE OF 23.00 FEET; THENCE NORTH 02°33'11" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 80.00 FEET; THENCE NORTH 88°05'12" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 36.70 FEET; THENCE NORTH 01°54'48" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 75.00 FEET; THENCE NORTH 88°05'12" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 67.00 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 01°54'48" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 75.00 FEET; THENCE NORTH 88°05' 12" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 25.00 FEET TO THE EAST RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF SOUTH FEDERAL HIGHWAY AND ALSO BEING THE WEST LINE OF LOT 7, BLOCK "8", "EDGEWATER ADDITION CORRECTED PLAT", ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF. RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 2, PAGE 73, OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA; THENCE SOUTH 01°54'48" EAST ALONG SAID WEST LINE AND THE SOUTHERLY EXTENSION THEREOF. a distance of 67.52 FEET TO THE SOUTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF EAST LAS OLAS BOULEVARD AND ALSO BEING THE NORTH LINE OF THE PLAT "RE-SUBDIVISION OF BLOCK "A" EDGEWATER", ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF, RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 2, PAGE 6, OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA, ALSO PREVIOUSLY KNOWN AS BLOCK "A", "EDGEWATER ADDITION", ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF, RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 1, PAGE 123, OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA; THENCE SOUTH 88°02' 12" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 10.09 FEET TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAID PLAT, BOOK 2, PAGE 6, AS IT NOW EXISTS; THENCE SOUTH 01°54'48" EAST, ALONG THE EAST LINE OF SAID PLAT, BOOK 2, PAGE 6, ALSO BEING THE EAST RIGHT OF WAY OF SOUTH FEDERAL HIGHWAY, A DISTANCE OF 11.00 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 87°58'17" WEST. A DISTANCE OF 95.00 FEET TO THE WEST RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF SOUTH FEDERAL HIGHWAY AND ALSO BEING THE EAST LINE OF SAID TRACT 2; THENCE NORTH 01°54'48" WEST, ALONG SAID EAST PROPERTY LINE AND WEST RIGHT OF WAY OF SOUTH FEDERAL HIGHWAY, A DISTANCE OF 16.00 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

SAID LANDS SITUATE, LYING AND BEING IN THE CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE, BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA, CONTAINING 14636 SQUARE FEET OR 0.3360 ACRES, MORE OR LESS.

<b>Existing Use</b>	Tunnel
<b>Proposed Use</b>	Same
<b>Applicable ULDR Sections</b>	
<b>Request(s)</b>	Board Review and Comment on a project to create a pedestrian plaza on top of the existing and NRI eligible Henry F. Kinney Tunnel by adding a deck extension of usable space with a 15' clearance zone with a collapsible warning structure. A new center wall will be constructed at the US 1 median to handle most of the new weight load.

Ms. Rathbun read from her memo:

**Description of the Project:** The applicant has brought a project to the Board to build a pedestrian plaza on top of the NR eligible Henry F. Kinney tunnel. The project would involve structural changes to the tunnel. Presently, according to the applicant's report, an auto driver's sight, approaching the intersection at Las Olas Boulevard, is blocked by the height of the tunnel wall from seeing an approaching pedestrian trying to cross at the slip road.

The applicant reviewed several plans and made a choice of what was seen as the best option. The chosen proposal calls for a 50' deck extension on top of the tunnel. This option requires the construction of a new supporting center wall for the proposed deck at the median of U.S. 1 and construction of a new tunnel entrance. It should be noted that important Art Deco design elements would be hidden by the new construction and a nearby NR listed historic resource, Stranahan House, could be impacted by any construction on the tunnel. The applicant states that this option would require partial road closures during construction. When built, the tunnel was a "cutting edge" project; it was the first tunnel in the state of Florida and its design included many innovations. The tunnel was built to replace an aging bascule type bridge that was causing a severe traffic bottle neck on U.S. 1. The tunnel still serves the purpose of moving traffic quickly and efficiently through the center of the city. Any questionable changes to the structure of the tunnel could cause serious problems in the future.

When the tunnel was under construction (1958-1960) traffic from U.S. 1 was diverted to temporary bridges at S.E. 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, southbound, and S.E. 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue northbound. The S.E. 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue bridge was under construction at that time. To this day the street ends at S.E. 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue in the Rio Vista neighborhood on the south side of the New River and in Colee Hammock on the north side have remained open in case there is any need to divert traffic from the tunnel. Now some of that traffic would probably be diverted to the S.E. 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue Bridge; however the 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue option might still be needed.

In addition to pedestrian safety the applicant maintains that a plaza as proposed in the preferred option would be of benefit to the Las Olas merchants, their patrons and other visitors to the area. The plan calls for a gathering place with shaded seating and an information kiosk of some sort. It should be noted that there is an existing small plaza, on the riverfront next to the Riverside Hotel. The applicant also included a drawing by TBG Partners for the Downtown Development Authority, which showed an elaborate garden landscape for the proposed deck. There should be more information as to how this proposed deck in either its simpler or more elaborate form would be of benefit to this very important commercial and historic neighborhood.

**Summary Conclusion:**

Alternative options for pedestrian safety, which do not involve such a serious impact on this NR eligible resource, the tunnel, should be investigated and presented. This preferred option, even though it may be the best of several presented, could do serious damage to the historic resource and adversely impact the already troubled traffic patterns of the city; the proposed tunnel plaza would be of questionable value to the commercial and historic neighborhood.

Elizabeth Van Zandt, Transportation and Mobility manager and project manager, provided a Power Point presentation on the project, a copy of which is attached to these minutes for the public record.

Mr. Marcus liked the idea of the park, which would provide a view while walking across the tunnel. He asked if a smaller extension had been considered to lessen the impact and Ms. Van Zandt remarked that the impact would only be during construction. She said a 10-foot extension would not accomplish their goals. Mr. Marcus wanted to understand why a ten-foot extension would not work and why the pump room was a problem for the 25-foot and 35-foot extensions but not for the 50-foot extension.

Ms. Mammano wondered why the Board was being asked to review and comment on a design that had not been fleshed out yet. She asked if they would have the opportunity to comment further after the project was more concrete. Ms. Van Zandt stated they needed the Board's comments before sending the project to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and then to the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT). She agreed to come back to the HPB when they had a few concepts and before the consultant began work. Ms. Van Zandt stated the mitigation agreement the City or State would enter into with SHPO could specify that the concepts must be brought back to the HPB.

Ms. Mergenhagen noted the number of stakeholders, such as the Stranahan House, the DDA, the Las Olas Merchant Association and the Rio Vista Civic Association, that would be affected by the project and wanted feedback from them before taking a stance. She felt a smaller scale project would accomplish the safety goal and lessen the construction

impact. Ms. Van Zandt said they were balancing more than one goal, including incorporating open space, which a ten-foot park would not accomplish.

Mr. Figler agreed that the Board did not have enough information and felt the mitigation plan could include the requirement for the Board to review the project further.

Ms. Coffey asked if they had considered diverting vehicular traffic as a “no build” option. She was concerned about vagrants loitering in a park. Ms. Van Zandt said the design criteria would include making sure it did not become a “home for people that don’t have homes.”

Mr. Marcus was not comfortable approving the project because they did not yet have enough information.

Mr. Spence stated a recommendation was not required as part of the Board’s review and comment. The Board could relay its concerns to SHPO through their meeting minutes.

Ms. Mergenhagen asked what would be sent to SHPO and Mr. Spence explained that only the Board’s comments would be sent, unless they voted to include Ms. Rathbun’s report. Lynn Kelly, FDOT, informed the Board that FDOT was conducting an extensive repair project on the tunnel which required its own approval. The plaza was separate because the City needed the have SHPO sign off and then FDOT would take over design and construction. The plaza design would be dictated more by what SHPO agreed to. SHPO had already opined that all three current options had excessive adverse impact on the historic resource and would request minimization of the design.

Chair Kyner said there was a need for an east/west connector and he felt “tarting up” the plaza would give the false impression that it was from the Art Deco period. He thought minimal, movable design was better because then the site could be returned to its historic look at any time. Chair Kyner wished to send a communication to SHPO that the Board agreed with what they had already said and they wanted minimal impact while achieving the goal of safety and connectivity and also that the Board wanted to be included in the next step. Mr. Figler did not agree that the elements on the site must be movable because then it would become too transient; there must be elements that would become part of the architecture of the City. Mr. Melville agreed with Mr. Figler and felt that a larger park would enhance appreciation of the Kinney Tunnel.

Ms. Kelly stated the best next step would be for Ms. Van Zandt to submit the determination of effects to SHPO, receive their comments and make the Board aware of their response.

Chair Kyner opened the public input portion of the meeting.

Judy Summers wished the tunnel to remain eligible for historic designation and suggested the park could be built into the driving lane and traffic could be diverted.

There being no one else present wishing to address the Board on this matter, Chair Kyner closed the public hearing and brought the discussion back to the Board.

**Motion** made by Ms. Mammano, seconded by Mr. Figler to forward the approved minutes of this meeting to SHPO and encourage them to come back to the HPB prior to finalizing any designs so the Board could continue to provide input regarding the project. In a roll call vote, motion passed 9-0.

2.

[Index](#)

<b>Case</b>	H16016	<b>FMSF#</b>	
<b>Applicant</b>	<b>Paul Pfadenhauer, Robin Haines Merrill, agent</b>		
<b>Owner</b>	First Evangelical Lutheran Church		
<b>Address</b>	441 NE 3 <sup>rd</sup> Avenue		
<b>General Location</b>	Southwest corner of NE 3 Avenue and NE 5 Street		
<b>Legal Description</b>	NORTH LAUDERDALE AMENDED PLAT 1-182D LOTS 1-7, LESS E5 FOR ST, BLK 29		
<b>Existing Use</b>	Church		
<b>Proposed Use</b>	Same		
<b>Applicable ULDR Sections</b>	<i>Section 47-24.11.B.6</i>		
<b>Request(s)</b>	Historic Landmark Designation for First Lutheran Church		

Ms. Rathbun read from her memo:

**Property Background:**

Saint Anthony's Church (now 1<sup>st</sup> Lutheran) was built in 1921 for Fort Lauderdale's Roman Catholic congregation. Saint Anthony's, established in 1921, is the oldest Catholic parish in Broward County. That year Bishop Michael J. Curley announced that local Catholics would finally have a church. A lot on Las Olas Boulevard was selected as the building site. At that time the new parish had a resident priest, Father E.F. Callahan. In 1921 the "builder priest" Father G.J. Plunkett arrived and took up the duties of pastor. Father Plunkett specialized in building churches; he had worked as architect/builder for the church for fourteen years. Local contractor John Olsson was hired to oversee the construction project.

Mr. Olsson had arrived in Fort Lauderdale about the time that the City was incorporated in 1915; he along with Edwin King and George Young was one of the builders of the

historic city. Olsson owned property in the Waverly Place subdivision, now SBHD, and was responsible for building many of our historic homes.

**Criteria for Historic Designation:**

*ULDR Section 47-24.11.B.6*

*c. Its identification with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the city, state or nation.*

Consultant Response: Throughout his career, John Olsson contributed to the building of the historic fabric of the City. When the Catholics built a new church, Mr. Olsson, a founding member of the 1<sup>st</sup> Lutheran congregation, arranged to purchase the old church for \$1 and moved the church to the present site on NE 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue for use by the Lutherans.

**Building Description:**

In style the church references Romanesque or Romanesque Revival churches although it does not have the characteristic semicircular arches of those styles. The church has a stone veneer; the stone was imported from North Florida. The façade is two stories in height with a gabled center section and is flanked at each corner by two attached square towers. Engaged columns are at the corners of both towers. At the original site on Las Olas the left hand tower was crowned with a battlement and the right hand tower roof was flat. When the church was moved to the NE 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue site, the tower positions were switched; the right hand tower now has the battlement.

The main entrance is centered at the gabled end. The double door entry, approached by five steps, is centered in a squared surround and topped by a segmental arched window. A rose window is positioned above the door, with a niche above the rose window. A saint's statue was positioned in the niche when it was Saint Anthony's. Narrow pointed arched windows are located at the first floor level of both towers. The battlemented tower has a pointed arch at the upper story. At the side elevation there is a row of segmental arched windows which are separated by engaged pilasters.

Once the church was moved to the NE 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue site an addition was built to house offices etc. The contractor, Mr. Olsson, used the same sort of stone for the new construction. The addition is two stories with an L shaped footprint. There is a street facing gable end at the short leg of the L. A large triple window is set in a segmental arched surround; other segmental arched windows are found on the second floor of the new addition. Some years later another addition was built at the rear of the church; however no attempt was made to match the older building.

**Criteria for Historic Designation:**

*ULDR Section 47-24.11.B.6*

*e. Its value as a building recognized for the quality of its architecture, and sufficient elements showing its architectural significance.*



Consultant Response: The 1<sup>st</sup> Lutheran Church (Saint Anthony's as it was) is valuable because of the uniqueness of its architecture in Fort Lauderdale; there is nothing else like it in the City. It is also valuable because of the historic move. Historically, moving buildings, or recycling them, in Fort Lauderdale was quite common.

**Summary Conclusion:**

1<sup>st</sup> Lutheran Church is historically significant and its designation should be approved.

Paul Pfadenhauer, pastor and applicant, introduced Robin Haines Merrill, his agent, and said she was a visionary and an activist.

Ms. Merrill stated she and her husband had renovated the "cottage" on the church property and used it for ministry. She provided a Power Point presentation, a copy of which is attached to these minutes for the public record.

Ms. Merrill reviewed the criteria for designation:

a) Its value as a significant reminder of the cultural or architectural heritage of the city, state or nation;

Ms. Merrill recalled the building's background and the fact that it had been moved brick-by-brick.

b) Its location as a site of significant local, state or national event;

Ms. Merrill stated the Catholic Church had sold the building to the Lutheran Church (the same denomination that began the Protestant Reformation away from the Catholic Church) for \$1 to in an amazing display of generosity and defiance of prejudice.

e) Its value as a building recognized for the quality of its architecture and sufficient elements showing its architectural significance;

Ms. Merrill stated this was a rare, Romanesque-style building, unique to Fort Lauderdale and Florida. The architect was a builder-priest, Father G.J. Plunkett, also known as the first pastor of Fort Lauderdale.

f) Its distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style valuable for the study of a period, method of construction or use of indigenous materials;

Ms. Merrill reported the grey stones had been quarried in north Florida and the stained glass windows were by Willett.

Ms. Merrill showed a video explaining the urgency of this designation. The stained glass windows were being removed and an administrator had threatened to bring down the stones as well. She said the windows had been removed in response to her citing the windows as fitting the criteria for historic designation. Mr. Spence cautioned the Board about taking hearsay testimony from Ms. Merrill regarding who was represented and what they had said to her when she was filming.

Ms. Merrill explained to Mr. Marcus that Tahoe Development had purchased the property and they wished to demolish the site and redevelop it along with the other half of the block which they already owned.

Pastor Bill Knott, owner of the First Evangelical Lutheran Church, the current church on the site, asked for the application to be dismissed or deferred because they had not been provided adequate notice to prepare. He said the application was rife with errors and inaccuracies and had been made without their consent. Pastor Knott said the congregation was changing and had a bold plan and vision and the people deciding the church's future were those supporting the ministry of the congregation. He stated the money from the sale of the property would stay in Fort Lauderdale and be invested in local mission and ministry. Pastor Knott reported that of the 24 Fort Lauderdale residents whose comments were included in the application, not one participated in the ministry of the congregation.

Pastor Knott stated the old Saint Anthony's Church was not moved brick-by-brick; only the original façade was moved and the Catholic church later demolished it. They had removed the stained glass windows and wished to remove the façade in order to use it in their new building. He continued that the building was not a unique Romanesque style but was a standard block and brick construction with a façade. Father G.J. Plunkett was not the architect of this building; he had been the architect of the St. Anthony's, which had had its façade removed and was later demolished. The stained glass windows were not part of the original building; they were bought by members and friends of the First Church from Willett Stained Glass in Minnesota. Those windows had been removed by members of the congregation. Pastor Knott said the Joe Test House had been essentially unused for seven years and become a bone of contention to neighbors and City services.

Pastor Knott asked the Board to withdraw its involvement in the mission and ministry of First Church and allow them to pursue their mission and ministry without the undue influence or interference of people who had no part in their congregation. If that was not possible, he asked the Board to defer any decision to allow them time to defend their position. If the Board agreed to defer, the church would agree to not remove any stone from the building until that meeting. Pastor Knott stated they had received the notice on November 8.

Pastor Knott said they intended to sell the property to fund their cooperative ministry to benefit people in Fort Lauderdale, Broward County and the world. He said he requested the deferral to examine the application and to prepare a response.

Pastor Knott could not estimate the cost of relocating and reusing the façade but said they had reserved \$2 million for that purpose.

Mr. Spence advised the Board that they could grant a deferment if they felt there was insufficient information for them to make a decision, but if the applicant insisted that they wanted to move forward on their evidence, the Board was obligated to provide a decision.

Mr. Marcus wondered why the church could not sell the property for adaptive reuse instead of for demolition. Pastor Knott stated they had received no offers that did not include demolition. Chair Kyner recalled that the Secretary of the Interior guidelines found adaptive reuse far superior to enhance the value of a building and the neighborhood. Pastor Knott said he did not disagree, but wanted time to investigate that.

Ms. Mammano reminded the Board that their responsibility was to decide whether or not the property was worthy of designation. Ms. Mammano asked if notice was adequate and Ms. Franco responded that the notice had been sent out more than 30 days before the meeting, per the code. Mr. Spence said the applicant should clarify which portions of the church property were under consideration for designation. Ms. Rathbun stated her memo only addressed the church building.

Ms. Franco stated the application included the church, the addition and some information about the cottage, but Ms. Rathbun's evaluation had not included the cottage. Ms. Merrill confirmed she was requesting designation for all seven properties, since it was all one folio. Ms. Mammano said she would be hesitant to favor designation for the entire property absent substantive information about the cottage. Ms. Mergenhagen noted that the legal description on the application included empty land and Ms. Franco said landmark designations included the structure and the land so that future improvements on that vacant land would come back to the HPB for approval. This property was one boundary comprising seven lots.

Chair Kyner opened the public input portion of the meeting.

Mark Berry, church member, said there were problems with the building and it would come down if money were not put into it. He said he had pulled the permit to remove the windows to save them.

Richard Rubin, former president of the First Evangelic Church Council, stated when he became president, he noticed the church was running out of funds and recommended they sell the land, excluding the sanctuary. They had taken bids for eight months and Burns and Company had offered considerably more than the price for just the land. During this time, City Church had offered to buy the entire property with a guarantee of never selling it, allowing First Evangelical Church free usage in perpetuity. Mr. Rubin said both of these deals were still available. The Lutheran Synod had then taken an interest when they found out what the land was worth and replaced Pastor Pfadenhauer with Pastor Knott, who allowed the letter of intent from Burns and Company to expire and refused to speak with any representatives. Pastor Knott had then made a deal with Tahoe and Company with no attempt to save the sanctuary. Mr. Rubin recalled that the congregation had been adamant about preserving the sanctuary. He believed the sanctuary could be saved through negotiations.

Tim Smith, former Fort Lauderdale City Commissioner, said he was manager of the Annie Beck House, which had been adapted for use as a community center. He said there was no question this church was historic and he did not trust the new owner. Mr. Smith asked the Board to save the church.

Charles King stated he had spoken against virtually every historic designation recommendation to the City Commission but noted that this church had been built at the beginning of the City and "if anything is historic, this would be, and it's a public building..." Mr. King was concerned that the church had run a soup kitchen and the Flagler Village neighborhood was upset about it. Mr. King said the church had been a "pestilence on the community that's attracting hundreds of vagrants every Wednesday..."

Katie Jacob, Director of Education at the Preservation Foundation of Palm Beach, advocated for saving the church. She said the stonework style was unique and classic Romanesque. Ms. Jacob stated there were numerous ways to save the church and the first step was designation.

Timothy Davis, Artistic Director for New City Players, was in favor of designation. He said his theater group was an offshoot of City Church, one of the tenants of the church, where they rehearsed and sometimes performed. Mr. Davis asked the Board to designate the property so it could be used for something other than condos.

Ryan Maloney said he had moved here to start the theater group with Mr. Davis and he favored the preservation of this "historical religious, social, and cultural landmark." He said members of the City Church and New City Players were committed to the growth of the City and partnered with groups such as schools, the homeless community and the artistic community. Mr. Maloney said the Board could help preserve a building whose function was to offer the community a true sense of sanctuary.

Kristin Moss stated this was clearly an historical site. She stated there was an online petition with over 350 signatures in favor of preserving the property. Ms. Moss stated the church was a beautiful part of Lutheran and Catholic history in Fort Lauderdale and asked the Board to approve designation.

Ana Boza said the Board had an important decision to make and she was shocked that the church could be demolished. She wanted the Board to preserve this piece of history.

Steven Glassman, president of the Broward Trust for Historic Preservation, stated on 11/3/16, their board of directors had voted unanimously to support designation for the church. They concurred with the applicant and Ms. Rathbun's reports on the criteria. He reminded the Board that they were charged with deciding whether the church met one of the eight criteria for designation, which he believed was very clear. He

emphasized the importance of not moving the building, per the recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior's guidelines.

Robert Larson, president of the Flagler Village Civic Association, reported the general membership had voted to support the designation of the structure. He said Flagler Village would experience explosive growth once the new railroad station was finished and the Wave streetcar was instituted and this would be a long lasting testament to the history of this neighborhood.

Another resident urged the Board to designate the church.

Marla Sherman-Dumas had written a book review on a book about the "Pioneer Parish," the original church, which documented the church's history and architecture, including the fact that the architect was G.J. Plunkett. The book also contained information on important people and events related to the building.

Scott Strawbridge, former HPB member, said he had co-authored the National Register nomination for St. Anthony's with Ms. Rathbun. He stated, "The fact is that you have enough evidence here...to designate this site." He felt it would be wrong to designate the building only. Mr. Strawbridge said he had approached the church about designation but they did not want to proceed because they did not want to deal with the HPB. He stated the church should have been designated 15 years ago and "shame on the City for leaving it 'til this last minute."

Pastor Pfadenhauer stated he had been asked by community members to apply for the designation. He remarked on the effect of walking through new York City (where he had lived for 60 years) and happening upon an old church or other landmark amid newer development. He discussed historic properties in Fort Lauderdale. Pastor Pfadenhauer stated he found the heart and soul of the Flagler Village neighborhood in First Lutheran Church.

There being no one else present wishing to address the Board on this matter, Chair Kyner closed the public hearing and brought the discussion back to the Board.

Mr. Figler felt they had no option but to recommend designation and said the application covered the church and the property. He wanted to ensure that the building was protected, now that the windows had been removed. Mr. Spence said the HPB could not stop the church from pulling permits as the application went through the designation process. Ms. Mammano hoped that the owner would refrain from demolishing any more of the building because this would diminish its worth.

Mr. Marcus felt that designating the entire property and the cottage would take away value from a potential buyer and he wanted to consider designating just the church,

which go undergo adaptive reuse. Ms. Mammano said she would feel comfortable dealing with this at a later date when a project was proposed.

Mr. Spence clarified that the code indicated that each designation automatically included the designation of the site upon which the landmark existed as a landmark site. As Ms. Franco had indicated, the property was one folio and one complete site.

Chair Kyner asked if the Board should specify the criteria under which the Board was recommending designation and Mr. Spence advised that they should.

**Motion** made by Mr. Figler, seconded by Ms. Mammano to grant historical preservation status to the First Evangelical Lutheran Church and the property listed in the legal description per ULDR Section 47-24.11.B.6 a), b), c), e) and f). In a roll call vote, motion passed 9-0.

3.

[Index](#)

<b>Case</b>	H16017	<b>FMSF#</b>	
<b>Applicant</b>	<b>Armando Colon/AC Shutters &amp; Awnings Inc.</b>		
<b>Owner</b>	Nichole O'Neal		
<b>Address</b>	1125 Waverly Road		
<b>General Location</b>	Northeast corner of Waverly Road and SW 12 Avenue		
<b>Legal Description</b>	WAVERLY PLACE 2-19D LOTS 1,2,3&4, BLK 105LESS FOL DESC BEG NW COR LOT 4, ELY 75 TO POB, CONT ELY 60 TO NE COR LOT4, SLY 75 TO SE COR LOT 1, SWLY ALG SLY BNDRY LOT 155.36, NW 48.79 TO APT IN ALINE 75 E OF		
<b>Existing Use</b>	Residence		
<b>Proposed Use</b>	Residence		
<b>Applicable ULDR Sections</b>	ULDR Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.i; ULDR Section 47-17.7.B; ULDR Section 47-24.11.C.3.c.ii		
<b>Request(s)</b>	Certificate of Appropriateness for minor alteration <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Installation of Accordion Shutters</li></ul>		

Ms. Rathbun read from her memo:

**Property Background:**

The house at 1125 Waverly Road is a one story Ranch style, with a hip roof and a gable roofed front extension; it was built ca. 1950 and is contributing in the SBHD. The applicant requests a COA for the installation of accordion shutters.

**Description of Proposed Site Plan:**

Metal louver accordion shutters to be installed on 18 windows are requested by the applicant. This type of shutter is mounted on exterior tracks permanently installed on

the exterior of the historic house. *The City of Fort Lauderdale: Historic Preservation Design Guidelines* states that this type of shutter obscures windows and is not appropriate to historic buildings; permanently mounted exterior tracks are also discouraged by the *Guidelines*.

**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 requested type of shutter will obscure the windows of the historic house

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

Consultant Response: This type of shutter is not appropriate in the historic district

*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.**

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. 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: The applicant requests
- a. General.
  - vii. Other; accordion shutters
- The requested accordion shutters are discouraged in the SBHD.

**Request No. 2 - COA for Alterations:**

The applicant is requesting a certificate of appropriateness for alterations.

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: There is no change in the use

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: The character of the resource will be impacted by the installation of the requested shutters

### **Summary Conclusion**

The requested shutters are not appropriate in the SBHD, as stated in the *City of Fort Lauderdale: Historic Preservation Guidelines*. The application should be denied.

Nichole O'Neal, owner, stated she wanted the shutters because there was no protection for the windows now. She felt the accordion shutters would provide security and be easy for her to close herself. The shutters were thinner than older versions of accordion shutters.

Mr. Marcus asked if she had considered impact windows instead and Ms. O'Neal stated the windows were very expensive compared to the shutters and could still break during a storm. Mr. Figler suggested hurricane fabric and Armando Colon from A.C. Shutters and Awnings stated they would not work with this house because there was not sufficient space next to the house. Mr. Figler argued that a hotel in Palm Beach used the fabric. Mr. Colon added that the fabric could become loosened.

Ms. Mammano suggested shutters on the rear of the house and impact windows on the front. Ms. O'Neal reiterated that the windows could break and were very expensive to replace. Mr. Colon said Bahama Shutters were another option, but they made the house dark.

Ms. Mammano asked if the Board could approve the shutters, despite their going against the guidelines. Chair Kyner stated in his time on the Board, they had never approved accordion shutters. He said the Board was fairly lenient regarding the rear of a property and asked Ms. O'Neal to consider shutters on the rear and impact windows on the front. Ms. O'Neal reminded the Board that this was a corner house, so two sides were visible from the street.

Ms. Coffey feared that approving this would set a precedent.

Chair Kyner opened the public input portion of the meeting. There being no one present wishing to address the Board on this matter, Chair Kyner closed the public hearing and brought the discussion back to the Board.

Mr. Marcus wanted to grant the applicant the opportunity to put shutters on the two rear facades and to install hurricane impact windows on the two front facades. Ms.

Mammano and Ms. Flowers wanted to be flexible but Mr. Morgan explained that this was not the application before the Board.

Mr. Spence said the Board could approve the shutters on sections of the building but could not specify what must be done on other sections. The applicant could also request a deferral to investigate other options based on the Board's input.

Mr. Colon said Coral Gables allowed owners to install decorative shutters over accordion shutters. Mr. Figler stated the Board must see the specifics to make a determination.

Ms. Rathbun advised Ms. O'Neal to consult the code section regarding windows and doors.

Ms. O'Neal requested a deferral for 60 days.

Mr. Colon noted that Ms. O'Neal and he had not been told that this request was subject to HPB approval until after the permit application was submitted.

**Motion** made by Ms. Mergenhagen, seconded by Ms. Flowers, to defer the case for 60 days. In a roll call vote, motion passed 9-0.

4.

[Index](#)

<b>Case</b>	H16018	<b>FMSF#</b>	
<b>Review and Comment</b>	<b>Riverfront Redevelopment</b>		
<b>Owner</b>	LAS OLAS RIVERFRONT LP		
<b>Applicant</b>	Courtney Crush, Crush Law, P.A.		
<b>Developer</b>	Property Markets Group		
<b>Address</b>	330 Brickell Avenue		
<b>General Location</b>	Approximately 87 feet west of the southwest corner of SW 1 AVENUE AND SW 2 Street		
<b>Legal Description</b>	BRICKELL REDEVELOPMENT PLAT 147-27 B THAT PART OF PARCELS B & C & ADJ DED PARCELS & PT VAC BRICKELL AV DESC'D, COMM AT SE COR PAR A, WLY 104.64, NW 22.67, N 85.49, W 52 TO POB, W 52.95, W 23.86, NW 8.31, NLY 1.82, W 16.52, NW 21.19, W 14.01, NW 25.78, N 545.47, E 35, N 20, E 85.6, S 345, W 0.50, SLY 70, ELY 34.90, SLY 179.58 TO POB LESS POR DESC IN OR 38744/1512 & 39559/1551 AKA: PAR 2 IN OR 26157/107 ALONG WITH BRICKELL REDEVELOPMENT PLAT 147-27 B PART OF PARCEL C & E & PT VAC'D R/W DESC'D AS, COMM AT		

	SW COR OF PAR C,N 109.52 TO POB,CONT NLY 435.48,ELY 27.75,SLY 50,ELY 27, NLY 50,ELY 45.00,SLY ALG LINE 17.5 W OF E/L OF PARCEL C FOR 545.47,NW 94.50,NLY 59.51,WLY 20 TO POB AKA: PARCEL 3 REVISED PER OR 26157 PG 103
<b>Request(s)</b>	Review and Comment for Las Olas Riverfront

Ms. Rathbun read from her memo:

**Description of the Project:**

The Board is asked to review and comment on a proposed development for the Las Olas Riverfront property at 300 SW 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue. The developers have presented a plan for a hi-rise rental apartment complex of over 100,000 square feet, consisting of a 12 story base and two towers which rise to 461 feet for the north tower and 441 feet for the south tower. The base has apartments, described by the developer as “skinny” or “micro,” which surround a parking garage. The towers have skinny and micro apartments as well as one bedroom lofts and two and four bedroom apartments.

The proposed project is across Brickell Avenue from the NR listed Bryan Building (Fig. 1, no. 1) and is adjacent to the locally designated H-1 Historic District.

The project is located in the Downtown core and there are other large buildings in the immediate vicinity, i.e. the sixteen story bank building and the proposed twenty five story 4 West Las Olas project. These two buildings unlike the proposed River front project are sufficiently distanced from the H-1 District so as to have no adverse effect on the contributing properties. The proposed 4 West Las Olas and the extant bank building act as mid-rise transitional buildings to the hi-rise development of the downtown core.

New construction in the H-1 District is limited to 25 feet in height; the tallest building in the district is probably the NR listed New River Inn at approximately 36 feet. The massive 41 story Riverfront project will create an immense wall effect effectively isolating the historic district from the downtown. A person standing on the front porch of the contributing Philemon Bryan Home would not be able to see the top of this project.

The Bryan Building on Brickell Avenue would have a serious shadow impact at various times of the year (see Fig. 3). The adjacent sixteen story bank building would be affected; its façade, the western elevation, could be completely in shadow at times.

**Summary Conclusion:**

The mass and height of the proposed Riverfront project overwhelms the adjacent H-1 Historic District; it should be mentioned that the district is also part of the City’s entertainment district and anything that impacts the Historic district will also impact this important commercial district. The developer did not address the effect that his project might have on the H-1 District. The NR listed Bryan Building and other locally

designated properties on Brickell Avenue would be seriously impacted; the Riverfront project would leave these properties at the bottom of a man-made canyon.

Courtney Crush, attorney for the applicant, provided a Power Point presentation, a copy of which is attached to these minutes for the public record.

Mr. Melville asked about plans for demolishing the Riverfront structure and how the surrounding buildings would be protected. Ms. Crush said they were working on a demolition plan with the City now. Mr. Figler asked about monitoring and seismic surveying. Adrian Hartman, managing director of Property Markets Group Florida, said they were redeveloping elsewhere with the same issues and they conducted settlement and vibration monitoring. They would conduct a baseline study and a post study with monitoring during construction. She agreed to provide updates to the Board.

Ms. Mammano asked about shadows and Ms. Crush confirmed that in the morning, the small historic area would be in shadows; the rest of the day it would not.

Mr. Marcus noted that this building was a wall and he was concerned about the fact that the project would overwhelm the nearby historic district, as pointed out by Ms. Rathbun in her memo. Ms. Crush said the structure today was unattractive and did not provide connectivity or allow anyone to see the surroundings. Mr. Figler stated there would be no sun in the historical district until noon year-round. Jiro Yates, architect, said the AutoNation building already shaded the three historic buildings; this project would not contribute to that. Their shadow study showed that the historic buildings west of the railroad would start receiving sun by 10 a.m. in March and be in full sun by 10 a.m. on December 21.

Ms. Crush stated part of what the comprehensive plan discussed regarding respecting historic resources was not purely aesthetic; it was also “what you do to improve interaction and have better planning around it so that it becomes a better resource.”

Chair Kyner asked how this would contribute to the historic district and Ms. Crush replied, “Connectivity, primarily.” Chair Kyner argued that this building was “a barrier to the historic area.” Ms. Crush felt that coordinating with the historical area on wayfinding and improving what the Riverwalk looked like would bring people in and allow them to see the historical resources. Chair Kyner disagreed, and said, “That’s like saying the Icon building is helping out the Stranahan House; it clearly doesn’t and it clearly puts it in shadow.” He said he did not like the cut-through because they had “squeezed the most important part, which is the river, into a little, narrow public walkway” and put up a wall as a barrier. Ms. Crush stated they were creating outdoor features that were not intended to be barriers.

Ms. Mammano wanted to see more openness where the buildings faced the historic buildings. She recommended rethinking the edge along the railroad tracks; rather than

thinking of it as a landscape buffer, allow a view of the railroad tracks and the buildings beyond. Ms. Crush confirmed that they were doing this, and explained that the FEC was also working with stakeholders to create a bikeway/greenway along the tracks.

Ms. Mammano wanted to remind the City Commission that the key concept was visibility and connectivity to the historic properties. Chair Kyner suggested an elevated platform.

Mr. Marcus suggested putting the two towers at an angle to minimize the shadows and the wall. Ms. Crush stated they had already been through multiple designs and concluded that this was the most appropriate.

Ms. Mammano remarked that the City had just asked the County for another 5,000 units downtown and this would locate a large number of them in this one project.

Chair Kyner opened the public input portion of the meeting. There being no one present wishing to address the Board on this matter, Chair Kyner closed the public hearing and brought the discussion back to the Board.

**Motion** made by Ms. Mammano, seconded by Mr. Marcus, to state that that the Board acknowledged receipt of the information regarding the project and wished to express concern about the effect the project would have on historic properties and asked the City Commission to give great attention to the design. In addition to the consultant's concerns expressed in her report regarding massing, the Board asked the commission to be sensitive to the transparency and connectivity to the historic properties and the adjacent H-1 district. The Board also wished to receive updates about the demolition process. In a voice vote, motion passed unanimously.

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

[Index](#)

None.

## **V. Good of the City**

[Index](#)

Mr. Glassman requested the Board consider the following communications to the City Commission:

- Change the code to require an approved site plan prior to any demolition permit being issued.
- Demolition permits should not be issued for any property that was in the process of historic designation
- Perhaps developers should be required to control a site by ownership, not just an option to buy, before proceeding with a development application.

Mr. Glassman related what had occurred on Alhambra Street when properties were demolished based on a hotel application that was later withdrawn. The subsequent buyer had moved forward with demolition despite have no plan for redevelopment.

Ms. Mergenhagen wanted to discuss verification of a property owner for properties coming before the Board. Mr. Spence stated the property or the owner's agent could submit an application; City staff checked whether or not the application was proper. Ms. Franco explained how staff verified ownership.

### **Adjournment**

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 10:28 p.m.

Chairman,

\_\_\_\_\_  
David Kyner, Chair

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
ProtoType Inc. Recording Secretary

The City of Fort Lauderdale maintains a Website for the Historic Preservation Board Meeting Agendas and Results:

<http://www.fortlauderdale.gov/departments/city-clerk-s-office/board-and-committee-agendas-and-minutes/historic-preservation-board>

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