

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

Historic Architectural Review Board Regular Meeting October 21, 2021

The Historic Architectural Review Board met in formal session at 1:00 P.M., Thursday, October 21, 2021, in the Alcazar Room at City Hall, St. Augustine, Florida. Catherine Duncan, Chairperson, called the regular meeting to order, and the following were present:

1. ROLL CALL: Catherine Duncan, Chairperson
Jon Benoit
Paul Weaver, III (left at 5:17p.m.)
Gaere MacDonald

Absent: Barbara Wingo, Vice-Chairperson, excused

City Staff: Julie Courtney, Historic Preservation Planner
David Birchim, Planning and Building Director
Isabelle Lopez, City Attorney
Elyse Anderson, Recording Secretary

Ms. Duncan announced that Ms. Courtney would be the new Historic Preservation Officer.

2. General Public Comments for Items not on the Agenda

- Ed Slavin

3. Approval of Minutes

Mr. Weaver noted in the September 16, 2021, minutes on page eight he had recused himself from item 7. (b) 44 Avenida Menendez and wanted that reflected in the record. He also pointed out a typographical error on page one.

MOTION

Mr. Benoit **MOVED to APPROVE** the August 19, 2021, and the September 16, 2021, minutes with the above corrections. The motion was **SECONDED** by Mr. MacDonald.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, MacDonald, Weaver, Duncan

NAYES: NONE
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. Modification and approval of Agenda

Ms. Duncan stated item 6. (c) PL2021-0138 withdrawn and item 7(a) PL2021-0104 asked for a continuance prior to the meeting.

Ms. Courtney said item 7. (d) PL2021-0121 had also asked for a continuance prior to the meeting.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver **MOVED to APPROVE** the modifications to the Agenda. The motion was **SECONDED** by Mr. Benoit.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Benoit, MacDonald, Duncan
NAYES: NONE
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Ms. Duncan stated staff would not be presenting full presentations only a summary.

Ms. Courtney said the staff report and the application packets were available if any questions were to arise; however, staff would only read the recommendation for the Board.

5. Public Comments related to Expedited Hearing items:

**5. (a) PL2021-0133– Rickey M. Garmon– Applicant & Owner
515 Arricola Avenue**

To demolish a residential building, constructed c. 1955, that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File but is not located in a district.

Rick Garmon agreed to waive his right to a presentation and public hearing.

Ms. Courtney read the staff report recommendation and said Based on a review of the AGHP and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds that the board can APPROVE a Certificate of Demolition at 515 Arricola Avenue because it is not a local landmark or otherwise designated as a historic building with the following condition:

1. For aluminum windows to be salvaged, in accordance with Sec. 28-89(2)d6: The board may require, at the applicant's expense, salvage and preservation of significant building materials, architectural details and ornaments, fixtures, and the like for reuse in restoration of other historic properties.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

14 certified notices were sent, 0 were returned in favor, 0 were returned opposed and 0 had comments.

Public hearing was opened; however, there was no response.

There was a brief discussion regarding whether the windows were original to the building and the desire of the Board to salvage the windows.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE the expedited item 5. (a) PL2021-0133 515 Arricola Avenue to grant a Certificate of Demolition based on the staff report and not a historic building under the code or a contributing building to a National Registered District with one condition for the applicant to make a 'good faith effort' to salvage and repurpose the aluminum windows. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, MacDonald, Benoit, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6.Certificate of Appropriateness

**6. (a) PL2021-0128– Boston Painting Services– Applicant
Trinity Episcopal Church of St. Augustine– Owner
215 St. George Street**

To apply a mineral based coating to the existing exterior stucco of the original church building.

Ms. Courtney read the staff report and said Based on a review of the AGHP and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds that the board can take the following actions for a CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS at 215 St. George Street:

1. Approve if the HARB finds that the proposed coating is an appropriate material that will not cause long-term damage to the building's exterior and will duplicate the existing as closely as possible in strength, composition, color, and texture

2. Continue the application if the HARB finds that more information and documentation about the proposed coating is needed.

Danny Boston reviewed the application.

Ms. Duncan stated she and Ms. Courtney met through a Zoom call with the representatives from the church, and the State of Florida Preservation team. She said she also spoke with Ken Smith after the discussion since he had worked on the building previously.

Mr. Weaver asked if the State Historic Preservation officer was on the call.

Ms. Courtney said there had been several discussions with the State because the church had a restrictive covenant for any exterior work. She said the Chief of the Historic Preservation Bureau at the State, said the Preservation Architect and Grant positions were vacant. She said she confirmed with a federal tax grant person who had used the product. She said they spoke to Ken Smith, architect who had worked on Memorial Presbyterian Church and Danny Boston used that product on the church and Mr. Smith confirmed Mr. Boston had done an excellent job. She said the concern was the material was different from the material of the church. She said the State had left it up to the Board discretion.

Public hearing was opened; however, there was no response.

The Board discussed:

- Should use the same standards and consistent State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO)
- Bolles Hall built in 1925 was on the National Registry and used the same material
- Would be more accepting if Ken Smith, the architect wrote a letter approving the material

- State approved of the material
- Product was not familiar to the public
- Mainly being used on unfinished concrete, bright colored homes and was gaining popularity
- Should test a small section of the church as it could not be undone
- Applicant had used the material multiple times
- Product had been used by masons in Europe on historic buildings
- Asked applicant to share knowledge on the masonry buildings and share what had been learned
- In favor of the product being used on historic buildings
- Previously discussed using a clear coat on the historic part of the church
- Paint covers as a solid material
- Would be a smooth un-textured surface and would take away the character of the building
- Building had never been painted

Ms. Duncan stated during the meeting she was told that stucco would deteriorate, but she spoke to Ken Smith, and he said that was not accurate and it would need to be repaired. She said she looked around the building and saw there were cracks that needed to be repaired. She said she was concerned there was not a preservation architect on the project.

The discussion continued:

- If a solid material were added building texture would change
- Other product options were available
- Applicant could provide samples of different available products
- Ken Smith and State previously recommended a 'clear coat'
- Should not create a false sense of the aggregate
- Concerned with having a monolithic color
- Applicant could color match with different products

- Product able to be thinned to be almost transparent
- Patches on stucco would be visible
- Repairs could be done to maintain the building
- Clear coat would not hide cracks
- Calking would be seen since building was stucco
- Building did not have major cracks, but the cracks provided character
- Thought there was a conflict with the standards since building had never been painted
- Anything that changed the building could be inappropriate
- Building was very important and should be thought out thoroughly
- Product could help keep a more 'historic look'
- Unfinished aggregate was part of the building's patina

Mr. Boston asked if he could provide samples to the Board. He said he could speak to a mason to provide mockup boards with what the building could look like.

Mr. Weaver stated before any work was done on the building he suggested speaking to Ken Smith.

Mr. Benoit stated he thought the review for Memorial Presbyterian Church's coating was scrutinized since it was a National Landmark building.

Mr. Boston said that church had been brushed with thinned concrete and had to have numerous repairs and looks more monolithic than from when they started but the integrity of the building would be saved compared to the cracks and breakdown over time.

Ms. Duncan said there were other ways to stop water intrusion from entering a building not only through the walls and that may need to be addressed in other ways.

Mr. Boston stated that any unfinished concrete will absorb water and when the water gets drawn back out, it would break down the concrete.

Mr. MacDonald asked if an architect could be hired for this project since it was of vast importance.

Mr. Boston said he had two he could ask; however, the roof had been replaced and the wooden roof around the steeple had been replaced as part of a grant. He said he did not think there were any issues with water getting into the building, only through the unfinished stucco.

Public hearing was opened:

BJ Kalaidi said she thought the application should be continued and samples should be brought in to show the Board in order for them to make the best decision.

Martha Chance said when they spoke about aesthetics, they were referring to the patina and the goal was not to make everything look new in St. Augustine.

Public hearing was closed.

Mr. Weaver stated he thought based on the discussion he thought the application needed to be continued and should have the opinion of Ken Smith. He said the building was important should be addressed.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to CONTINUE application PL2021-0128 to the November 18, 2021, HARB meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, MacDonald, Benoit, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**6. (b) PL2021-0134 – Dailey Builders LLC– Applicant
Baker Family Revocable Trust– Owner
123 St. George Street**

For after-the-fact modifications to design elements of the storefront changed in a different manner than the approved building permit application, including the use of a different window framing and configuration than the existing design; and to replace the incompatible lower mirror glass panel that was added along the bottom with an aluminum composite panel.

Ms. Courtney stated she received an e-mail stating the applicant might not be able to attend and sent in more documentation that was not included in the application packet. She said it was the Boards decision on if they wanted to hear the application.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to CONTINUE application PL2021-0134 to November 18, 2021. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Benoit.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Benoit, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**6. (c) PL2021-0138– Shirah and Company, LLC, OBO T-Mobile South, LLC– Applicant
Grace United Methodist Church — Owner
8 Carrera Street**

To evaluate for reasonable compatibility the installation of new wireless antennas inside the bell tower openings of a building that faces the HP-3 Zoning District.

Applicant withdrew the application prior to the meeting.

7. Continued Items from the previous HARB meetings

**7. (a) PL2021-0104 Certificate of Demolition Continuing from August 19, 2021– Trinity Independent Methodist Church, Inc.– Applicant & Owner
84 Bridge Street**

To partially demolish a church building constructed in 1913, limited to the bell tower, that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and is a contributing structure to the Lincolnville National Register Historic District.

Applicant asked for a continuance to the November 18, 2021, meeting.

**7. (b) PL2021-0091 Certificate of Demolition Continuing from September 16, 2021– Synergy Construction & Maintenance — Applicant
H&H Real Estate Investing, LLC– Owner
144 Martin Luther King Avenue**

To demolish a residential building, constructed c. 1904-1910, that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and is a contributing structure to the Lincolnville National Register Historic District.

Ms. Courtney read the staff report and said Based on a review of the AGHP, previous discussion by the HARB at the September 16, 2021, HARB meeting, and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds that the board can take the following actions for a Certificate of Demolition at 144 Martin Luther King Avenue:

1. Continue to allow more time for the applicant or building owner to provide additional documentation if the HARB determines that more details are still needed to determine the condition of the existing building and/or the applicant or building owner has not sufficiently

demonstrated that a denial will cause undue economic hardship

2. Approve if the HARB determines the removal of the contributing building will not be detrimental to the historic and architectural character of the city and that the applicant or building owner has sufficiently demonstrated that a denial will cause undue economic hardship

3. Deny the demolition if the board finds the removal of such building will be detrimental to the historic and architectural character of the city and that the applicant or building owner has not proven that a denial will cause undue economic hardship

Hunter Haden and Bob Morgan reviewed the application.

1 additional response was received after the previous meeting.

The Board and applicants discussed:

- Major concern was the inside roof
- Roof was inadequately able to support the additions
- Load was on the king post and should not be an issue
- Original structure was compromised due to extensive termite and water damage
- Exterior looked to be in good condition
- Foundation needed repairs
- Sensitive to losing buildings in Lincolnville due to losing historic designation
- Homes shown in other locations were too modern
- Pricing of \$205,000 estimated on record for repairs to address the deficiency in the building

Mr. Haden said after the last meeting he addressed several scenarios on the economic hardship:

- Renovating the existing home

- Rebuilding the same home at 708 square feet
- Rebuilding as a rental
- Rebuilding a slightly larger house at 1,500 square feet

Mr. Haden stated he created a spreadsheet with all the information for the Board to review.

Ms. Duncan stated she reviewed the breakdowns of the numbers and questioned why the gypsum wall board on the original building cost more than the gypsum wall board on the proposed building. She asked why the numbers were higher for the renovation.

Mr. Haden stated the numbers were standard as renovations required more prep work and would take longer than building new.

Mr. MacDonald agreed and thought the prices were not unreasonable.

Ms. Duncan asked what qualified as a hardship.

Ms. Lopez stated there was criteria in the Code and the burden of proof was on the applicant. She said the report had been presented from the architect or structural engineer, which was part of the criteria. She said proof of reasonable or undue hardship could be demonstrated by the following:

- Estimated cost of proposed construction, demo, or removal
- Estimated market value of the property under the current conditions
- Estimated market value after the proposed construction
- Estimate of economic feasibility of rehabilitation or reuse
- Annual gross income for the past two years of the property

Ms. Lopez said there were eleven in total, and these were just a few that could be considered.

Ms. Courtney stated the information was on page six of the staff report for reference.

Ms. Duncan thought the applicant would not lose money if he were to renovate and sell the property.

Mr. Benoit said the property was recently purchased and the offer price for property could have been higher than it was worth because the applicant thought he could demo the structure and that did not constitute a hardship. He said he thought it was an owner created hardship. He said this would negatively impact the neighborhood by removing the structure. He stated he was not in favor of the demolition because it did not meet the City's thresholds and was concerned with setting precedence. He said if the property was a contributing structure in a historic district full demolition would be reviewed very carefully.

Mr. Weaver said most of the value was in the land and with rising property values he thought the applicant could sell for a profit. He pointed out there were tax credits and benefits in preserving the building that had not been considered. He stated he did not see an economic hardship. He said the home was smaller and to become more marketable, the applicant wanted to increase the square footage. He suggested a compromise to preserve the original structure and then add an addition that could accommodate the extra square footage. He said none of those factors had been considered and he felt the burden of proof had met.

Mr. Benoit stated with this property he was unsure of what was a surprise and based on the pictures provided, the issues should have been foreseeable.

Mr. Haden said the home was covered in aluminum siding when purchased and was not removed prior. He said they were able

to see the foundation issues and once the plaster was removed inside, they were able to see more issues. He said they had not demolished a historic building before, and the intent when buying the home was to renovate.

Mr. Benoit said the Board had to be careful because Lincolnville was losing to many structures and once they were gone they could not be replaced.

Ms. Duncan thought it was a great home to restore and had a lot of potential.

Mr. Haden asked how far Lincolnville was from losing the historic designation.

Ms. Courtney stated Jenny Wolfe, the previous Historic Preservation Officer for the City of St. Augustine, complied information for the proposed partial demolition ordinance and in Lincolnville went from 81% down to 67% of the historic contributing buildings. She said the rule was 51% of the buildings in the district had to be deemed historic contributing structure.

Mr. Weaver said this was a historic city and we should want to maintain the historic character.

Mr. Haden stated he agreed; however, he thought they provided a good financial break down of both renovation and new. He said this was a small family-owned company and taking a large financial hit could impact his business.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

Public hearing was opened.

Charles Pappas stated the economic value in Lincolnville was the historic buildings. He said he did not see an economic hardship. He said the application was for demolition and should be denied.

Ed Slavin thought the application should be denied and not continued since the burden of proof was not met.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed continued:

- No reason to continue unless applicant could provide additional information
- Thought it could be a partial demolition but not full

Mr. Haden requested for a continuance to allow them more time to go through the options suggested by the Board and would allow him additional time to present more information.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to CONTINUE item 7. (b) PL2021-0091 144 Martin Luther King Avenue to November 18, 2021. The motion was SECONDED by MacDonald.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, MacDonald, Benoit, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY¹

7. (c) PL2021-0118 Local Landmark Designation in association with a Certificate of Demolition Continuing from September 16, 2021– Lester F. Sanders– Applicant Charles Sears– Owner 307 Minorca Avenue

To demolish a residential building constructed c. 1925-1927, that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File but is not located in a district. In addition, to evaluate the property by the Historic Architectural Review Board for designation as a Local Historical Landmark using criteria and standards established by the National Register of

Historic Places substituting importance to the City and State levels rather than the nation as a whole.

Ms. Courtney read the staff report and said Based on a review of the AGHP and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds that the board can CONTINUE a Certificate of Demolition at 307 Minorca Avenue, with the following considerations or findings that can be determined by the HARB:

1. The building has been noted in previous surveys and identified by historians as being significant. The HARB may consider whether the building has integrity and significance to warrant local landmark designation, which would make the building eligible for preservation incentives.

2. If the board finds it is not a candidate to be designated as a local landmark, that there is no economic hardship, and that the building's demolition does not impact the architectural/historical integrity of the city, the HARB can approve the demolition and staff would recommend the following conditions:

a. For all exterior and interior salvageable historic materials including those listed under the Staff Analysis to be salvaged, in accordance with Sec. 28-89(2)d6: The board may require, at the applicant's expense, salvage and preservation of significant building materials, architectural details and ornaments, fixtures, and the like for reuse in restoration of other historic properties.

b. Archival documentation as per Section 28-89(2)d6: In accordance with Sec. 28-89(2)d6 ...the board may also require at the applicant's expense the recording of the structure for archival purposes prior to demolition. The recording may include, but shall not be limited to, photographs and measured drawings.

¹ Break from 2:44 p.m. – 2:53 p.m.

Mr. Weaver asked how many of the criteria needed to be identified to designate the property as a local landmark.

Ms. Courtney stated she thought it was similar to the National Register designation and it only needed to meet one.

16 certified notices sent, 6 total were returned, 4 were in favor of local landmark, 2 were in favor of demolition, 1 was opposed to local landmark, 4 were opposed to demolition and 3 had comments.

Charles Sears reviewed the application.

The Board provided their ex parte communication.

Public hearing was opened.

Martha Chance spoke in favor of the designation and thought the demolition would have a negative effect on the neighborhood and would affect the density. She thought the building met the criteria to become a local landmark and encouraged the Board to designate the property as such.

Deborah Sanders stated she grew up in the home and it was in the process of being sold until three days ago; however, it needed a lot of repairs, and the repairs would cost a vast amount.

Ed Slavin spoke in favor of the application and thought the home should be deemed a local landmark. He felt the applicant was mocking the historic preservation ordinance and the history of Davis Shores. He thought the home should be designated as a historic landmark.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Had a strong National Register Program and Historic Preservation (HP) District program

- Five HP districts in the City
- Building met the threshold for integrity
- Thought the home met the Association with an Event, which was the Florida Boom in the 1920's
- These buildings were the embodiment of the Florida Boom
- Event did not have to be a success, it could be a failure, but it was still part of St. Augustine's history
- Met the criteria for Association with important individuals, D.P. Davis, and Harold Ryman
- D.P. Davis had the idea and was the creator of Davis Shore
- Harold Ryman was the owner of a business in the community directly associated
- Thought the property met at least two of the criteria for a landmark designation
- Building was important and strongly felt it should be on the register
- Ryman connection was significant
- Ryman sold the properties after the death of DP Davis
- Building had integrity and materials seemed to be original to the home
- Was tied to the landmark event and people of Davis Shores
- Provided as a reminder to the community of the history and connections
- Landmark status normally came from a demolition request
- Thought the home had a real 'Florida Feel'
- Property was unique for the scale and quality of the design
- Property needed restoration but was in good condition
- Agreed with the nominating the home for local landmark status

Mr. Sears stated the Board had established the home was related to the Florida Land Boom. He questioned the Board about when did the Florida Land Boom stop.

Mr. Weaver stated it was associated with the hurricane in Miami, and it started to end in 1926 and declined through the Great Depression.

Mr. Sears stated D.P. Davis died in 1926 and the Florida Boom had already ended.

Mr. Weaver stated the Florida Boom was generally post WW1, 1919-1926. He said this development was within that period.

Mr. Sears stated this house was not built until 1927. He said he did not understand how this home was related to the Florida Boom when it was built after it had ended and thought it could not be connected to D.P. Davis since he had already passed.

Mr. Weaver replied part of Boom period was when Davis Shore was developed. He said it ended over time not suddenly.

Ms. Courtney stated the staff report indicated the home was built between 1925-1927 and that was based on historical research.

Mr. Sears stated there were multiple dates on the staff report of when the home was built. He did not believe there was a set date of when the home was built because there were different years listed.

Ms. Duncan stated no matter when it was constructed the home was part of the continual history of the development of Davis Shores.

Mr. Sears stated they contributed Mr. Ryman to be associated with the home and the Board was required to consider his significant contribution during the period of association. He felt owning a real estate firm was not historical.

Mr. Weaver disagreed. He said Ryman was important during and after the period. He said he was part of his responsibilities were related to the settlement of the bankrupt Davis Shores and he lived in the home.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE the landmark designation based on its integrity, based on the association of the Florida Land Boom, based on the association with Mr. Davis and Mr. Ryman and the architectural significance locally. The motion was SECONDED by Benoit.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Benoit, Mac Donald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Ms. Duncan stated the second part of the application was for demolition. She said this was an important home.

Mr. Sears stated if it were to be a local landmark and not demolished would be an economic hardship. He said he owned the property, and he did not have the finances to renovate the property. He felt the Board set a precedence with the Knights of Columbus house and a demolition precedence had been set for Davis Shores. He stated he had not been informed that if the Board would discuss economic hardship at this meeting and this was strictly about landmark designation nomination.

Ms. Courtney advised it was clearly advertised and the staff report provided also had that information in it.

Mr. Sears stated he wanted a continuance to provide more information to the Board since he did not think it had been considered. He said he received the home from his grandfather and the home needed repairs. He said he thought there was a buyer up until three days prior and that was why the home had not been listed with an agent.

Ms. Duncan stated she felt the Board had reviewed the economic hardship and

thought Mr. Sears had stated he did not have the funds for the renovations.

Mr. Weaver stated he thought the Board should continue the application to allow additional documentation to be submitted.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to CONTINUE to the November 18, 2021, HARB meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Benoit

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Benoit, Benoit, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. (d) PL2021-0121 Certificate of Appropriateness Continuing from September 16, 2021 – CD + Urban Applicant
44 Avenida Menendez, LLC– Owner
44 Avenida Menendez

To construct a new two-story commercial building and courtyard with outdoor seating to replace the one-story drive-through building (Following Opinion of Appropriateness application approval on July 15, 2021).

Applicant asked for a continuance to the November 18, 2021, meeting.

8. Certificate of Demolition and Partial Demolition

8. (a) PL2021-0136– Cronk Duch Architecture, LLC– Applicant
36 Granada, LLC– Owner
36 Granada Street

To partially demolish a commercial building, constructed c. 1905-1910, that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File but is not located in a district, including portions of the front facade, north elevation, and rear/west elevation, and to modify the existing fenestration.

Ms. Courtney read the staff report and said based on a review of the AGHP and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds that the board can APPROVE a Certificate of Demolition at 36 Granada Street because it is not a local landmark or otherwise designated as a historic building and the partial demolition will not be detrimental to the historic integrity of the city.

Henry See reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

8 certified notices were sent, 0 were returned in favor, 0 were returned opposed, 0 had comments and 4 e-mails were attached.

Public hearing was opened.

Aaron Jockers opposed the application and pointed out the design did not highlight St. Augustine's architecture. He said it should be nominated to be a historic landmark as it would be beneficial to Lincolnville. He said he did not understand why the structure could not be maintained.

Ed Slavin opposed the application and thought the application should be continued to research local landmark status. He stated movies were a part of the history in the City and this was a gathering place for the community. He thought the building was historic.

BJ Kalaidi opposed the application and stated because it was just slightly outside the historic district that caused an issue. She felt it was completely inappropriate. She said she was concerned with the parking and with Granada being a one-way street. She said the design was modern and not historical.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Pleased that the applicant did not want a full demolition
- Building had flooding issues
- Retaining building and massing was not changing
- Photos showed openings from when initially built
- Appropriate use of the building
- Unsure of the building's integrity for a local landmark designation
- A lot of openings on the corner but was an adaptable reuse
- Board unable to review the traffic concerns
- No negative effects for the building being more open
- Clashed with the historical aspect of the area
- Thought openings could resemble the store previously there
- Building did not have any fenestration
- Reported to be largest brick building
- If brick was exposed and back to the original store look would represent history for the town
- Not against the development of the project
- Unable to be a local landmark due to integrity threshold
- Conversion to a movie theater the building lost all the fenestration

Mr. Weaver asked if HARB would have design review authority since it faced Historic Preservation (HP) district.

Mr. Birchim said the Board would not, and that only applied to HP districts one, two and three. He stated the Board's authority only extended to the partial demolition.

The discussion continued:

- Encourage the applicant to keep in mind the history of the building

- Thought reopening of the building was a way to take it back to the business and shop
- Wanted the design to take in the context of the surrounding buildings
- Demonstrate why the design was acceptable
- Context was what people reacted to and building was taken out of context as a standalone building
- Board was unable to review the design
- Was in favor of the partial demolition
- Would feel more comfortable approving if design fit the area
- Thought the current design did not blend with the area
- Massing of the openings were too large

Mr. Weaver stated the front of the packet had a different photo that seemed to look appropriate; whereas the photos in the packet seemed to be entirely different and were a different scale. He said he understood the issues but there was no reason to deny a partial demolition based on the design.

Ms. Duncan asked if the parapet on the façade the same height as the parapet was currently.

Mr. See responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Duncan questioned the heights of the openings with the transoms.

Mr. See replied on the design it was higher.

Ms. Courtney said in the applicant's packet there were interior demolition pictures on pages fourteen and fifteen showing what had been originally behind the stucco. She stated the Florida Master Site File the survey photograph was included which showed what was there before it had been altered.

Mr. See said the height of the parapet and the massing had not changed. He said none of it would be above the roof and it was all penetration to open the blocks to create store fronts and covered seating.

The discussion continued:

- Left bay original opening seemed clear and was the same for the project
- Other openings were showed below the wall mounted lantern
- Three brick bay openings were tall
- Would support partial demolition if limited to the infill of the bays
- Would be the recreation of the historic openings
- Would remain the same just lower the brick
- Southern Grounds opening was placed where previous opening had been located
- Lower brick openings to where they were located originally

Mr. See stated the height of the opening was extended because of the flood elevation. He said the flood elevation was at eight and they had to raise the entire deck of the building. He stated the front area was raised to five and the back area to eight.

There was a brief discussion regarding elevations and opening heights to assist with flood mitigation while protecting the integrity of the building.

Mr. MacDonald said for simplicity for a partial demolition should be the original existing openings. He said if they lost two feet below it could be added to the top.

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVED the partial demolition of application PL2021-0136 at 36 Granada Street to reopen the front façade of the building on the existing pattern as the original building, with the exception proviso on the sections where they were raising the floor two feet would allow two feet increase in the height of the opening in those related spaces. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Benoit.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Benoit, Weaver, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. (b) PL2021-0119– Jerry D. Bain – Applicant & Owner **181 Martin Luther King Avenue**

To demolish a residential building constructed c. 1910-1917, that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and is a contributing structure to the Lincolnville National Register Historic District, to include removal of the roof, rear elevation and porch, elements of the front porch, and fenestration modifications.

Ms. Courtney read the staff report and said based on a review of the AGHP and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds that the board can take the following actions for a Certificate of Demolition at 181 Martin Luther King Avenue:

1. Review as a partial demolition with the finding that the house has already lost its architectural integrity with the changes over time that resulted in the removal of all historic exterior materials and alterations to significant features like the porches

2. Continue the application to allow the applicant time to provide the required condition assessment and optional economic hardship information, if the HARB determines that the proposed demolition

exceeds the threshold of a partial demolition.

Jerry Bain reviewed the application.

The Board provided their ex parte communication.

21 certified notices were sent, 0 were returned in favor, 1 was returned opposed and had comments.

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi pointed out this was not a full demolition but only a partial demolition. She asked if there would be a porch in the front of the home and if the home would be a contributing structure in Lincolnvile.

Ms. Duncan stated she did not believe it would be a contributing structure.

Ms. Courtney stated if the district was reevaluated it more than likely would not be, and was unsure if it was in the current state. She said the next few applications were submitted as a partial demolition, but the threshold might exceed that because the Board was not able to review the design but only the demolition within the area. She said the proposed building plan would not resemble the historic structure that was a contributing structure.

The Board discussed:

- Unsure how much was left from the original structure
- All Hardie on the outside and all new windows
- Building would not be represented in the same way
- Roof and back of the house were coming off
- Not much of the original fabric left
- Integrity was the threshold for a landmark
- No reason to deny based on the loss of integrity

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE a partial demolition for application 2021-0119 finding that the existing building has lost most of its original historic integrity. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Weaver, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. (c) PL2021-0137– John Valdes & Associates, Inc– Applicant
Joseph Griffin– Owner
115 Bridge Street

Mr. Weaver recused himself.²

To partially demolish a residential building, constructed c. 1800, that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and is a contributing structure to the Lincolnvile National Register Historic District, including the roofs of the front and side porches, dormers, and historic accessory structures.

Ms. Courtney read the staff report and said based on a review of the AGHP, without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds that the board can take the following actions for a Certificate of Partial Demolition at 115 Bridge Street:

1. Approve with the finding by the HARB that the removal of the proposed elements requires a compromise to mitigate against further damage to the structure and the following conditions in accordance with Section 28-89(2)d6:

a. At the applicant's expense, salvage and preservation of any coquina and other salvageable materials for reuse in the

² Attached to original packet

restoration of the house or other historic properties.

b. At the applicant's expense, the recording of the structure for archival purposes prior to the partial demolition. The recording may include, but shall not be limited to, photographs and measured drawings.

2. Continue if the HARB determines more information is needed on the existing conditions or the project areas proposed for demolition, or if proposed replacement plans are requested.

Les Thomas reviewed the application.

The Board provided their ex parte communication.

35 certified notices were sent, 1 were returned in favor, 0 were returned opposed, and 1 had comments.

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi stated she thought what the applicant proposed would not take the property off the National Register and her main concern was protecting Lincolnville.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Tax credit would hold home to a high standard and could stay on the National Register
- Thought the loggia was in good condition
- Supported the application
- In support of the home being restored
- In need of demolition in order to restore the home
- Porch had to be removed but would replace with what had been there previously

- Encouraged communication with staff if beyond the scope of what had been discussed by Board

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVED application PL2021-0137 finding that a partial demolition will not adversely affect the historic integrity of the house. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Duncan.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Duncan, MacDonald

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

John Valdes invited the Board to stop by the property. He said he was very excited to be involved with the restoration of the home.

Mr. Benoit stated he thought this would be an application for a full demolition since the home was in disrepair; however, he was pleased it was only a partial demolition.

8. (d) PL2021-0132– John Valdes & Associates, Inc. – Applicant
Charles M. Sapp– Owner
160 Oneida Street

Item heard before 8. (c)

To demolish a residential building constructed c. 1885-1894, that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and is a contributing structure to the Lincolnville National Register Historic District, including the roof, second floor, the front porch, and the majority of the first floor.

Ms. Courtney read the staff report and said based on a review of the AGHP, discussions by the HARB for a previous Certificate of Demolition application (F2018-0118), and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds that the board can take the following actions for a Certificate of Demolition at 160 Oneida Street:

1. Review the application as a Certificate of Partial Demolition.

2. Continue the application to allow the applicant time to provide updated and a more comprehensive structural assessment and economic hardship information, if the HARB determines that the proposed demolition exceeds the threshold of a partial demolition.

Charles Sapp reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

23 certified notices were sent, 2 were returned in favor, 0 were returned opposed, and 2 had comments.

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi stated she was concerned if the building would be a contributing structure. She said the district percentage would be reduced after these historic structures were demolished.

Public hearing was closed.

Mr. Benoit asked if the submitted site plan was accurate and if it had a ten-foot setback. He said regarding the overhangs, the new overhangs would encroach when added back with the new additions. He said the lot was fifty feet wide, but he was unsure if the setbacks were ten feet.

Mr. Birchim stated when a building was nonconforming and demolished after an approved Certificate of Demolition, then the footprint was grandfathered in for one year, and the new building could be reconstructed within the one year retaining the nonconforming setbacks and would have to be substantially completed within that year to retain the setbacks.

Mr. Benoit asked they could remove the roof and add a new roof with overhangs.

Mr. Birchim stated they could not be more nonconforming, but they could be in the same footprint. He said if they added an addition to the back of the home that would not be grandfathered in, and the extension would have to meet requirements.

Mr. Benoit asked if the ten-foot setbacks were accurate.

Mr. Birchim stated for a conforming lot, ten-foot setbacks were accurate; however, for a nonconforming lot it would be ten percent of the width of the property.

Mr. Benoit informed the applicant that the new proposed addition would exacerbate a grandfather condition and would need another review by a different Board.

Mr. Sapp stated each time he had spoken to the City they were in the setbacks except for the southwest corner of the building which was one inch over the setback. He said it was not straight on the lot but at a slight angle. He said his understanding was the setback was five feet on the side, both from the surveyor and the City.

Mr. Benoit said it seemed to not be an issue if it was five feet for the new roof. He said this was a major change to the architecture of the house and when previously reviewed for full demolition, they focused on the bay window as it had integrity. He said he was pleased that the bay window would be saved but overall, it was a full demolition.

The Board discussed:

- If property was a contributing structure, it would lose that status
- By preserving the one section it maintained the streetscape
- Able to manage the overall scale of the product
- Roof had changed dramatically
- Hip roof shown in the photograph made the front elevation what it was

- Two doors were not in the original plans but would be in the location of where it would have been
- Thought the hip roof was an important part of the building
- Thought the roof line would adversely affect the character of the house and would adversely affect the character of the neighborhood
- Front elevation the same where the bay window was
- Would keep the way it was currently only changing the roof line, adding back the window above the bay window and doors as shown on the elevation
- Pair doors above and single door below
- Porch would not be moved
- Building would be off the register if applicant removed roof, second floor and most of the first floor
- Unsure as to why they wanted to demo so much of the building instead of working with what they had
- Applicant wanted to keep as much of the structure as possible
- Downstairs room span was 2x4 (floor joist) with no support and would not meet code
- Applicant wanted to restore what was able to be restored
- Studs were not attached, and the siding was termite eaten
- House widens on the front southside section
- Back of the home not an issue
- Demo plan showed large area rear of the first and second floor could come off without affecting the integrity or the neighborhood but limit to that area
- Shifting of the south wall would cause an issue if removed
- Should protect the integrity of the building
- Unsure about expanding the home because it would cause it to lose the character of the building
- If significant termite damage could repair and replace as needed but not changing
- Applicant did not think the south side expansion would change the overall look of the home
- Current addition was added in the 1960's
- Would restore back to the original look but a bit larger
- Additional space needed for the new staircase
- Not in agreeance on approval for an extension
- House had been tented for termites
- West wall had to be removed and some of the interior support
- Had a builder who was into preservation
- Home had been raised and beams replaced
- Would have to replace all the flooring on the second floor and tie back into north wall
- Was not in favor off adding an addition to the south side as it changed the integrity of the front of the building
- Porch on the first floor had fallen off, which would be reconstructed
- Second floor porch was rotten and dangerous which was to be repaired and reconstructed
- Board agreed to a partial demolition to the west side, back of the house, but not the in agreeance to the south side
- Perhaps table the application and come back with new architectural plans
- Applicant cannot get all items needed in the home without the expansion
- Board was concerned with the exterior and the streetscape
- If main structure was left alone and built in the back of the property might not be an issue

- If able to see original roof lines and discern the addition would be able to support

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to CONTINUED application PL2021-0132 to the November 18, 2021. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, MacDonald, Weaver, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY³

9. Planning and Building Staff Communications

9. (a) Planning and Building Staff Approved Permits Report

(Provided for informational purposes)

10. Other Business

10. (a) Staff memo regarding October 5th PZB meeting discussion related to proposed partial demolition ordinance language

Mr. Birchim provided an update for the Board and thanked them for attending the Planning and Zoning Board meeting and providing feedback about the proposed Ordinance. He said it would be discussed at the next meeting, November 2, 2021, and if they wanted to attend, they were more than welcome.

Mr. Benoit stated the plan as written allowed HARB to have design review for demolitions and he was unaware of that and questioned if it should stay in the Ordinance.

Ms. Courtney stated that if HARB could review what was being replaced it would be beneficial to the Board.

Ms. Duncan noted that the Board was already able to do that in the Historic Districts but currently if any other contributing builds were doing a partial demolition, it would not have to come before HARB.

Mr. Birchim stated it would reduce the amount of inventory coming before HARB.

Mr. MacDonald stated the language was important and what would be allowed to be put back would be more in the form than the materials.

Mr. Birchim stated the Board could advocate; however, PZB could change the language, but HARB could not.

Mr. MacDonald asked how the Board was able to protect the homes that were significant that were outside a historic district.

Mr. Birchim stated it could be done through demolition which was how it had been done thus far or when they applied for a preservation property tax exemption that could also be tied to local landmark status. Or to be proactive, have a historic preservation planner create a list of homes of potential landmark status properties and present them to HARB and invite the homeowners to HARB for review to add to the National Register.

Mr. MacDonald thought this would be wonderful to see; however, could be a project for a later date. He stated he felt there were many homes that should be addressed.

Ms. Duncan stated some homeowners were not aware of how to start the process for local landmarks and she felt this could be a way to get the information out to the public.

10.(b) Election of Chair and Vice-chair

The Board had a brief discussion about a new chairperson and vice-chairperson.

³ Break at 5:17 p.m.-5:28 p.m.

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to elect Ms. Duncan as the Chairperson and Mr. MacDonald as the Vice-Chairperson. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

11. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:04 P.M.⁴

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Catherine Duncan', written over a horizontal line.

Catherine Duncan, Chairperson

⁴ Transcribed by Candice Seymour