

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

Historic Architectural Review Board Regular Meeting November 18, 2021

The Historic Architectural Review Board met in formal session at 1:00 P.M., Thursday, November 18, 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
Gaere MacDonald, Vice-Chairperson
Jon Benoit
Barbara Wingo
Paul Weaver, III

City Staff:

Julie Courtney, Historic Preservation Officer
David Birchim, Director, Planning and Building Department
Richard Thibault, Assistant City Attorney
Elyse Anderson, Recording Secretary

2. General Public Comments for Items not on the Agenda

- BJ Kalaidi
- Hugh McClelland

3. Approval of Minutes

(None)

4. Modification and approval of Agenda

Ms. Duncan announced item PL2021-0148 had been administratively withdrawn and item PL2021-0118 was withdrawn by the applicant.

MOTION

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

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Weaver, Wingo, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. Public Comments related to Expedited Hearing items:

5. (a) PL2021-0146 – First Coast Equity Builders, LLC — Applicant Stanley & Catherine Paris- Owner 22 Dolphin Drive

To demolish a residential building, constructed c. 1948, that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and not located in a district.

Randy Baker waived his right to a public hearing and presentation.

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 22 Dolphin Drive because it is not a local landmark or otherwise designated as a historic building.

1. For any salvageable historic materials, including the wood windows, to be salvaged, if possible, 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)

18 certified notices were sent, 5 were returned in favor, 0 were returned opposed and 0 had comments.

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi opposed the application stating what would be replaced on the property would be a three-story building and she felt this would change the streetscape and the historic fabric of the neighborhood. She said history needed to be honored.

Public hearing was closed.

There was a brief discussion about who was the agent for the property as the owner was not present.

Mr. Birchim advised the Board that Mr. Baker was able to represent the application for the owners.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE application PL2021-0146. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Benoit.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Benoit, Wingo, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. Certificate of Appropriateness

6. (a) PL2021-0149 – Michael Skjerning – Applicant & Owner
165 Cordova Street

To enclose three total first floor window openings at the rear of the north and south elevations and to construct a

driveway gate adjacent to the north elevation.

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 APPROPRIATENESS at 165 Cordova Street if the HARB finds the proposed project scope meets the applicable Secretary of the Interior's Standards 9, and 10 (for the driveway gate) with the following conditions:

1. For any salvageable historic materials, including the wood windows, to be salvaged, if possible, 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.

2. To make the gate slightly shorter, use black/bronze hardware, and similar dog-ear pickets of the previously approved fence.

Mr. Skjerning reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:

- Applicant agreed to follow staff recommendation for the gate
- Gate should be lower than five feet regarding the AGHP
- Alternative would be to keep windows and fill from inside
- Windows could be salvaged in place adhering to the staff recommendation
- Filling from inside would allow applicant to achieve what was needed

- Windows in kitchen could be filled but not in the rear of the home
- Thought windows were original to the property
- No objection from applicant to fill windows instead of removal
- Three windows totals: two for the kitchen and one for a bathroom

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE application PL2021-0149 keep the windows on the north elevation and fill from inside, remove and block in the multi-light window, and make the gate shorter using black bronze hardware and similar dogeared pickets of the previously approved fence. The motion was SECONDED by Benoit.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Benoit, Wingo, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. Certificate of Demolition and Partial Demolition

7. (a) PL2021-0147– Emergency Services and Homeless Coalition of St. Johns County, Inc– Applicant & Owner 62-1/2 Chapin Street

To demolish a residential building, constructed c. 1924-1930, that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and not located in a district.

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 on a Certificate of Demolition at 62-1/2 Chapin Street:

1. APPROVE because it is not a local landmark or otherwise designated as a historic building, with the following condition:

a. For any salvageable historic materials to be salvaged, if possible, 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.

2. CONTINUE to consider designating the overall complex as a local historic landmark.

Deborah Redding reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

10 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.

The Board discussed:

- Home was in middle of the lot and not visible from the street
- Little impact to the neighborhoods character
- Entire campus had been considered for landmark status
- Property was owned by a non-profit
- Photographic evidence provided showed cost would be substantial for renovation
- Supportive of demolition
- Questioned if the executive director was allowed to represent the application

Dr. Beverly Carmichael was sworn in for the record.

Dr. Beverly Carmichael was on the Board of Directors with Judy Boler, the President, and stated all the Board members were in support of the application.

Dr. Wingo thought Staff should make sure there was a resolution from the Board or something more substantial before proceeding. She said the President may have the authority to conduct real estate transactions; however, none had been stated in the documentation.

The discussion continued:

- Questioned if research had been done to show these were railroad workers homes
- Applicant went to Historical Society, but archives did not have proof
- Had oral information from previous resident that homes were where railroad workers had lived
- Did not believe the oral history would change the outcome of the building
- Applicant should have conducted more research about the property
- Willie Galimore's home was on the campus
- Galimore home would not be destroyed
- Galimore house has an Accord Marker
- Did not believe there was a legal basis to deny the demolition
- Building did not meet the standards for local landmark status
- Thought the applicant could qualify for grants to help the organization
- Current building did not have integrity
- Suggested to have the slab be off grade to decrease the chances of flooding
- Slab if elevated would cost more than verse a slab off grade

Ms. Redding thanked the Board for the suggestions and stated they were about keeping the homes, not tearing them down. She said they were interested in speaking with Florida East Coast Railway to help with research to provide proof these were railroad workers homes.

Mr. Benoit asked since the building was in the middle of the lot were, they able to rebuild in the same footprint and was there a time limit requirement.

Mr. Birchim answered they would have twelve months after the demolition to rebuild on the same footprint.

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE application PL2021-0147 finding that it is not an individually listed historic landmark building or otherwise designated as a historic building. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

Mr. Weaver stated there were two conditions: first was to salvage any historic materials and he thought the second had been satisfied, which was to consider designating the overall complex as a local historic district, which had been agreed upon.

Mr. Benoit AMENDED the motion to add the condition to salvage any historic materials.

Mr. Weaver SECONDED the amended motion.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Weaver, Wingo, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. (b) PL2021-0148– Thomas Bryant, III – Applicant & Owner **132 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.

Administratively Withdrawn prior to meeting.

8. Continued Items from the previous HARB meetings

8.(a) PL2021-0128 Certificate of Appropriateness Continuing from October 21, – 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. He read a letter from A.D. Davis Construction into the record. He brought samples for the Board to view.¹

The Board provided their ex parte communication.

Public hearing was opened.

Ms. Courtney clarified a few items from the staff report. She said they needed to understand where the proposed coating would be located since the application indicated it would be for the old church

building, but the photographic evidence provided showed the wing that was later built facing St. George Street and was not part of the original Sanborn maps. She said the second issue was when was the plaster applied to the original church building. She said the letter from Mr. Davis stated the mid 1990's but there was a restrictive covenant from the State because the church received a grant which was used for additional plaster work. She said there was a possibility that the stucco on the original building was not from the 1990's.

Mr. Boston stated the historic preservation brief from the National Park Service recommended the coating could be used. He read the brief into the record.

Matt Marino was in favor of the application. He said the original part of the church was located on King Street and that building was coquina and the rest were brick. He stated the brick and the coquina had lost significant stability and he said there was significant damage to the mortar which upheld the brick pillars that hold the roof supports. He said if water was on the brick there would be a loss of integrity to the roof trusses. He said the main concern was having a building still standing one hundred years from now.

Mike Davis stated they had worked on the building back in 1994 with Ken Smith and above the arched windows were major structural cracks. He said Mr. Smith's original plan, with a structural engineer, was to remove the stucco and inject epoxy and bind the brick and mortar together. He said the mortar was too soft and the epoxy would not adhere to the mortar. He said after further review, Mr. Smith and the engineer pinned the openings with a control joint that was not originally there to stop the spread of the arch windows. He said the mortar within the brick was not in good condition due to many years of water intrusion which has gone through the stucco. He said if the building was not sealed, the stucco would have to be removed

¹ Attached to packet

within another five or ten years. He said the original church was made of coquina; however, the coquina was very soft and removing the stucco would remove layers of coquina.

Mr. Weaver asked if he was able to detect how extensive the stucco removal was on the coquina and brick portion.

Mr. Davis replied that there were many hollow spots and very few sections that would adhere and around 75% to 80% was loose. He said it would come off easily and it did not look like it does today.

Mr. Weaver thought most of the stucco was around thirty years old.

Mr. Davis replied that he was unaware of the age of the stucco but what was there now had been there since 1994 -1995. He said he did not remember any major stucco work taking place when the grant was received, but work was done on the steeple, and other places on the church but not stucco.

Mr. Weaver stated this helped him and being that it was not an original material and more modern he thought that was a factor to take into consideration.

Ms. Duncan stated Ken Smith told her there were no expansion joints in the stucco which was causing a lot of the damage too. She said there would need to be expansion joints. She asked if there were any put in.

Mr. Davis stated the only place where expansion joints were added was above the arched windows. He said adding expansion joints on a building that did not have them would have looked terrible.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Thought the building needed to be watertight

- Building had hairline cracks that obtained moisture
- Building would be compromised with water behind the coquina
- Keeping moisture away was essential
- Thought more damage could be done by removing stucco
- Find a correct coating that would be appropriate could help with the issue
- Most important was to keep building for next 100 years
- Thought the monolithic paint coating would change the building
- Last discussed was a clear coat
- Clear coat could assist with waterproofing but keep the same appearance
- Stucco had an aggregate and new coating could be monolithic on the building
- If goal was to keep water out a clear coat could accomplish that
- Evidence that building had been painted at one time
- Would be supportive if able to solve with a clear coat
- Painting would dramatically change the building
- In 2014 coating had been approved for the building
- Questioned if adding a coating would exacerbate any of the problems or should repairs be done before adding the coating
- Thought coating was breathable to allow water to escape
- Correct coating was fundamental and how it changed the building was as important
- Thought they needed to waterproof the building and keep the same appearance as close to the current condition
- Some coatings could exacerbate problems
- National Parks Service (NPS) approved of the product

- If NPS approved thought to be a reasonable solution
- State did not have a preservation architect and deferred approvals to the Board
- Board consensus to have some sort of coating
- Preservation standards were to avoid it, but other actions had been taken with no success
- Thought removing of stucco and leaving it unfinished left building in same place thirty years prior
- Would have to be repaired and maintained over time
- Did not think stucco repairs would stop by adding coating
- Masonry repairs would be ongoing and would not stop water penetration
- Water proofing specialist could provide the amount of water or mold in the building
- Asked if the church had a mold issue
- Exact scope was questioned by staff
- Photographic evidence was from areas that were not on the application
- Should provide photos of the area in question
- Area in question had been added in 1889
- Coating would be applied to the coquina and the brick work
- Previous meeting discussed one area, and this was a different location

Ms. Courtney stated the application indicated it would be coating the original church building and she knew the church had been added to over the years. She asked the applicant to provide exactly where the coating would be used.

Discussion continued:

- Having an architect would be helpful for the project
- Would have to have repairs before adding paint

- Clear seal could go over the crack, but the crack would still be present
- Crack would be more visible with the clear sealer
- Clear sealer would be a short-term solution
- Thought they were approving the original building but now assessing the entire building
- Project was the unpainted portions, the chapel, and the entrance to the chapel
- Proposed product was a long-term solution
- Proposed product would not deteriorate, bubble, or fade
- Product was mineral based and would bond with the surface
- Product would last around twenty-five to thirty years
- Many historical properties had used the proposed product
- Product had positive reviews from NPS and Georgia State Historic Preservation
- Same product had been used on the Memorial Presbyterian Church in St. Augustine
- Product could be diluted keep a little color but seal the building
- Might have to recoat more frequently if product was diluted
- Thought all sides of the building would appear differently over time no matter what coating was added

Ms. Duncan stated Ken Smith said, "the waterproofing was an issue, and the product would have no effect on the appearance that it would be a clear coat. The report stated if the cracks were repaired then he would recommend it. They had used the waterproofing on various buildings around the state and you could not see the coating on the structures".

Mr. Benoit stated the cracks had to be repaired and with the clear coat, the cracks would stay and be seen through the material.

Ms. Duncan thought the cracks should be repaired.

Mr. Benoit pointed out there were two different approaches. He said the product would fill in the cracks well enough to waterproof the building, but without bridging the cracks or repairing.

Ms. Duncan asked where that information came from.

Mr. Benoit replied he had reviewed that information on the products website. He said this product would seep into the cracks. He said on the Memorial Presbyterian Church the masonry work and texture could be seen.

Ms. Duncan stated she did not believe on this particular building with the product the texture would be able to be seen.

The Board continued:

- Agreed with the statement from Ken Smith
- Had to decide between paint or clear finish
- Thought this would create a dramatic change to the building
- Was a long-standing history of the building not being painted
- Try a wash instead to gain longer life from the product instead of a clear coat
- Evidence showed building had been whitewashed previously
- Would help seal the cracks and not have a monolithic appearance
- Would be less maintenance over time and keep the natural look that was there
- Was in support of the wash sample provided
- Stucco that had fallen off and patching stucco would be seen
- Thought if a clear coat were used could be providing a disservice to the church

- Applicant would clean and make repairs as needed on the stucco
- Concerned with the scope of the project and thought it should be clearly defined
- With a clear coat, repairs would be easily seen but with a non-clear coat thought would be going back to the original look of the building
- Thought the building would not have been built without a coating on it
- Would be in support of the thinned coat
- Thought the building was constructed in two historic eras
- Supportive of painted finish if lead to long-term stability and preservation
- Thought there was enough evidence to support it
- Same issue should not return to the Board in three to five years
- Applicant matched the paint to the stucco currently on the building
- Would provide the mixture for the future if more were needed

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE application PL2021-0128 finding that the proposed mineral based coating is appropriate for the historic building based on the fact that prior masonry repairs had not been successful in keeping water out of the building also understanding the scope of work would be to the original church structure built of coquina as well as the 1880-1890's addition constructed of brick, also stipulating the material could be applied is the diluted version with the color match as presented today. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

There was Board discussion about cleaning the building and providing a sample patch to be administratively approved prior to coating the entire building.

Mr. Benoit AMENDED his motion to include staff review of the mock-up before final application of the coating.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, MacDonald, Wingo, Weaver, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY²

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

Mr. Weaver recused himself.³

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).

Ms. Courtney read the staff report and said based on a review of the AGHP, the previous discussions of the HARB for the OOA application and at the September meeting for the COA application, and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds that the board can take the following actions regarding a CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS at 44 Avenida Menendez:

1. APPROVE if the board finds that the revised plans are compatible with the AGHP and/or Manucy's Houses of St. Augustine (Staff to provide suggested conditions)

2. CONTINUE with a finding that the overall design is not compatible with the AGHP and/or Manucy's Houses of St. Augustine and to allow time for these outstanding issues to be resolved.

Cliff Duch, Marquesa Cope, John Arbizzani and Jeremy Marquis reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:

- Applicant supplied a great narrative with supportive evidence from the neighborhood
- The design emulated the basic form of Manucy's house plans
- Only issue was glazed windows on the west side in the courtyard
- Windows were not as visible and had provided similar evidence of same windows just not in historic buildings
- One-story building should not be as large, preferred it to be smaller
- Applicant met the zoning requirements
- Questioned if building heights were in line with zoning
- Building could not be over thirty-five feet tall and secondary building was not able to be over fifteen feet

Mr. Duch stated from the point of measurement the building was under thirty-five feet as described by code.

Mr. Benoit said the measurement started at the base flood elevation of nine feet.

The discussion continued:

- Thought the building was supposed to line up with Harry's Seafood next door
- Applicant provided elevation that showed that relationship

² Break from 2:48 p.m.-2:53p.m.

³ Recusal form attached

- Height of the first building was forty-four feet minus nine to be at thirty-five feet
- Secondary building was at twenty-four feet minus nine to be at fifteen feet
- Both buildings measured at the correct heights in line with code

Mr. Birchim clarified the base flood elevation was measured at eight the City code measured height from the one-foot free board which was one foot above base flood elevation and that was where the nine foot reference was from.

The discussion continued:

- Unsure why there were so many French doors and thought the glazing was inappropriate
- French doors were removed from the east and would remove one pair from the north
- Wanted to keep the northeast pair
- Would replace French door with a window similar to what was presented on the east side
- Appeared to be two French doors on the second story on either end with two windows in the center
- Thought there was a compromise to replace the prior French doors with the six over six windows
- Visual from the street were the four windows
- By reducing the number of doors up top kept with the guidelines
- Issue with the glazing as it did not appear colonial
- Guidelines had to meet the guidelines based on Manucy's survey of St. Augustine
- Had hotel next door built within the same set of guidelines
- Thought the building emulated many of the characteristics of Manucy
- Materials needed to be compatible and reiterate Manucy's designs
- Items presented were not compatible with the AGHP guidelines

- Guidelines meant to be used as a guide for what was expected and what could be done
- Felt there was precedence for French doors as French doors had been approved by HARB in the past
- Thought the glazing was incorrect
- General project was very good
- There needed to be some latitude keeping the look accurate but should be able to function
- Thought the east elevation main two-story structure was good
- Applicant had compromised and brought the building to the street
- Wall height not above the double gates was eight foot six inches
- Above the double gate the wall was another two feet higher
- Concerned with the height and hoped to see in from the courtyard from Treasury Street
- Two cut outs on the wall to provide a slight view into the courtyard
- AGHP required the minimum height for street walls to be at five and a half feet with the openings or gate to be fifty inches maximum and forty inches minimum in Spanish Colonial
- Thought the eight-foot height was in line with the AGHP
- Wall on Treasury Street would not be touched as it was historic
- Gate was six-foot-wide, and applicant thought to have proof of wider gates in the area
- Thought gate should stay the same width
- Applicant thought gate width was a fire safety issue
- Max gate width for AGHP was fifty inches with a minimum of forty-four inches
- AGHP referenced openings and it was assumed to be overall opening
- Applicant would have to do a fire safety plan before opening

- Guidelines left room for lead way on the gate size by stating "most appropriate"
- Gate proposed was seventy-two inches which was considerably over the fifty inches set by the AGHP
- Applicant showed other gates in area being larger than fifty inches
- Asked if gate could be scaled back to sixty inches since seventy-two inches seemed large
- Staff thought eight-foot high walls were compatible with AGHP
- East elevation single story with the French door and the glass were more visible since wall was lowered
- If glassed in area were hidden would not be as bad but with lowering the wall it was too visible
- Applicant tried to meet the wall requirements and keep in within a "working waterfront" but thought walls did not need to be there at all
- If building was supposed to be a warehouse the argument was not persuasive for glazing and French doors
- Thought the glazing and French doors were relevant since in the 21st century
- Would be supportive of keeping the wall at eight-foot height or a lower height across the opening
- Needed to have movement in and out
- Not supportive of such a large opening and seemed disproportionate to the rest of the building
- Compared opening to a warehouse or utility building from research from applicant
- Standard gate size was fifty inches
- Fire egress was not a compelling argument to widen the gate
- From an urban design standpoint, the larger opening helps with connectivity between the street and the courtyard
- Would be able to see out of the courtyard and did not need the larger opening for the gate
- Thought the fifty inches made the space more vertical
- Did not feel the gate was out of scale
- Applicant trying to meet zoning requirements and Spanish Colonial buildings were built to the street
- Sanborn maps showed secondary buildings did not come to the street
- Building design had to meet egress unable to have one that did not
- AGHP had different wall heights in the north elevation, eight feet met the AGHP requirements
- Opening for the gate was wider than AGHP allowed
- On east elevation should keep walls higher to hide glass
- Applicant tried to meet wall requirement using a scope of utility building
- Supportive of the east elevation with the evidence provided
- South end remove wall or keep as presented
- Option would be to keep wall the same and add two more openings for symmetry
- Supposed to work with applicant to help them meet the guidelines
- Opposed to taking the wall all the way across because building was at the sidewalk
- Concerned with the large arch opening with the glazing
- Looked modern and not colonial
- Thought to be an interpretation of a working building with large doors
- Wooden doors would be more appropriate
- Was used on the entire north elevation as a concept and glazed the arch opens everywhere
- French doors on the second story were not as much of an issue being so high
- Applicant would remove the glazing, add an air current above the arch and keep the wooden doors

- West elevation had similar glazing that faced another historic district

Ms. Courtney asked the applicant on the permit drawing to add that sketch for reference. She said to clarify all the glazing was being removed and the door would be at the outside.

Mr. Duch stated the proposed two doors flanking were the historical conjecture utility building. He said for operational purposes they would remain, and the owner would have solid wooden doors that would shut from the inside.

Discussion Continued:

- Flt pergola would work better with the building
- Pergola cut through the middle of the glass and perhaps should be removed
- Arch with glass behind the pergola change to a wooden single door and arch would be square
- Changes to the pergola would need to be indicated before end of meeting
- Needed to have more details for the pergola of scale, height, and mass

Mr. Duch asked if the changes could be approved but only after submitting staff requirements based on the conversation from the meeting. He said he wanted to submit a cleaner version to Ms. Courtney before being administratively approved.

Discussion continued:

- Pergola solution based on Manucy by keeping an eight-foot spacing and nine-foot clearance leading into the building
- Pergola and design needed to be appropriate
- Free standing simple grape arbor structure

- On A2.4 windows were shown on the wall
- Change in materials on outer ends were wooden siding and not stucco
- Conjecture of first floor was Spanish Colonial and second was period two or British modifications
- Should not be stucco since British used timber siding
- Two set of doors on second story were not centered on the north façade
- Should use the arch as primary and center in the arches
- Should have one French door both upstairs and downstairs
- Landscape met the criteria and applicant provided evidence
- Unsure if fire pit and water feature were appropriate

Mr. Marquis stated the water feature was made from coquina concrete and was a utilitarian piece that fit in the time period. He said this was centered with the center door with the main stairs and main door, and the base was five foot eight inches and width were two foot eight inches.

Mr. Marquis continued that the fire pit was a cut coquina finish and it had a simple form. He said the height was one foot eight inches and the coping around was about a foot. He said the radius inside was one foot four inches and was surrounded by a coquina shell surface in the courtyard.

Mr. MacDonald stated it flared out and that was not accurate for the time period. He suggested making it straight to resemble more of a Spanish well.

Mr. Marquis said being straight up and down indicated there had previously been a well there and there was no evidence of that. He said the flare made it have distinction and would not be physically attached to any walls.

Ms. Duncan agreed with Mr. MacDonald and thought it should be straight because the flare was not Colonial.

Mr. Marquis said he could keep the coping around the outside to project beyond by six inches adding weight and leave the sides straight.

Ms. Duncan asked about the furnishings and did those need approval.

Ms. Courtney stated as long as they were compatible materials, they could be approved by staff.

Ms. Duncan pointed out there were specifications for clad and she felt it needed to be wood.

Mr. Duch stated clad had been removed.

Ms. Duncan questioned if the door was also wooden.

Ms. Cope replied in the affirmative.

Ms. Courtney the window had to be all wood with raised muntins and a raised profile.

Ms. Courtney stated on the east elevation was there a consensus with exception to the south end and the redesign of the arch opening and asked if there were any changes to the size of the gate and the height of the step-down wall.

Mr. MacDonald thought the walls and the gate on the north side were fine as presented since there had been a compromise to change the French door to a wooden door when entering the secondary structure.

Mr. Duch provided the list of changes as follows:

- Remove the glazing
- Air curtain above on the inside
- Security doors on the inside that were not seen during operations

- Historic doors on the outside that remain; flanking open with appropriate hardware

Mr. Duch asked if they should leave the walls as presented because if so, the current design allows them to prevent drunk and disorderly conduct. He said if walls were removed, they needed to add a wrought iron handrail.

There was Board consensus to leave the walls as presented.

Ms. Courtney asked the Board if they agreed on the wider gate at seventy-two inches.

Mr. Duch said in the scale analysis the graphic scale was at eight-foot wide. He said if needed, they would compromise.

There was Board consensus to have the gate at six-foot in width.

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE with conditions application PL2021-0121 conditions being on the east elevation at the one story element towards the south end, eliminate the glazing in the arched opening and replace with a solid pair of functional wooden inswing doors and an air curtain above on the inside, depicting doors stay as shown, also on the east elevation the pair of north of gates on the north end of the perimeter wall opening will go to six-feet wide. On the west elevation in the southern most arched opening on the first floor shall be changed to a rectangle door so the pergola terminates into the building without interference. The door will be seven-foot-high and align with glazed doors on the same elevation. On the north elevation at the second-floor proposed change one double French door to a window to match other windows on the building, on the first-floor change one double French door to a window to match others, the doors changing are the ones

not at the entry behind the steps. On the south elevation there are no changes to the proposed design. On the landscape there are no changes on the plan. On the hardscape plan the fire pit design shall be changed so the walls of the fire pit are vertical plumb. All the materials on the exterior will be wood siding, wood windows, wood doors, wood shutters, and the proposed wood shakes for the roof. The motion was **SECONDED** by Dr. Wingo.

Mr. MacDonald added the fifteen lights on the doors instead of nine.

Mr. Benoit Amended the motion to include all French doors should have fifteen lights.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Wingo, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY⁴

Mr. Arbizzani thanked the Board for all their hard work and working with them to put the project together. He said this was a great example of public and private partnership to have a common goal that would benefit the community and historic St. Augustine.

8.(c) 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.

Ms. Courtney read the staff report and said based on a review of the AGHP, previous discussion by the HARB at the August 19, 2021, meeting, and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds that the board can **APPROVE** a Certificate of Partial Demolition at 84 Bridge Street if the following findings can be determined by the HARB:

1. The newly submitted structural engineering plans clearly define the scope of work is limited to the building's bell tower and is necessary to restore the tower.
2. The stabilization through the required structural work and rehabilitation of the overall bell tower will mitigate the partial demolition of the tower, such as the removal of the existing stained-glass windows and decorative arch details, which are to be reinstalled, and any damage to the brickwork, which is to be repaired or replaced with matching, according to the recently submitted engineering plans.

With the following condition:

1. For any salvageable historic materials to be salvaged, if possible, 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.

Pastor Greg Anderson reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

Mr. Weaver asked how to proceed with the application since it was no longer a partial demolition.

⁴ Break from 4:45p.m-4: 54p.m

Mr. Birchim responded that the City was working with the church in hopes to restore the bell tower; however, if there was a collapse in the structure, they did not want it to be a Code Enforcement issue. He said it was important to show the Board both options for either a remove and replace or to repair the steeple. He suggested the City monitor the repairs but in the event of a collapse the Board would be aware.

The Board discussed:

- Was a good approach to the application
- Application could be approved for the method using to save the steeple
- Allowed the applicant to do the second part of the plan which was to reconstruct if it were to collapse or be a partial demo
- Thought this was necessary because of the instability of the tower
- Project had several structural engineers and
- Final engineer was savvy at historic buildings
- Revised plans had some elements what would be removed from structure
- Supportive of the application
- Thought there was a way to restore without removal
- Structure was very important to the Lincolnville National Register

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE partial demolition application 2021-0104 finding that the applicant and owner intend to use best efforts to remove, restore, and reinstall building elements including exterior doors, stained glass windows, brick, and steeple if absolutely necessary. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

Mr. Weaver asked if there would be any materials that could be salvaged or would they be recycled.

Ms. Courtney stated the plan stated the materials would be recycled if able to be reused. She said some brick had been damaged.

Mr. Benoit AMENDED the motion adding any if there were materials that were not able to be repurposed it should be salvaged for other uses. Mr. Weaver SECONDED the AMENDED motion.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Weaver, Wingo, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8.(d) 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 discussions by the HARB at the September 16 and October 21, 2021, HARB meetings, 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. Approve if the HARB determines the newly submitted plans will not require a Certificate of Relocation, do not exceed the threshold as a partial demolition, and will not permanently alter the contributing building's architectural integrity, with the following condition:

a. For any salvageable historic materials to be salvaged, if possible, 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.

2. Deny the full or partial demolition if the board finds the full or partial removal of such building will permanently alter the contributing building's architectural integrity and/or 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.

Cheryl Lynch reviewed the application.

The Board provided their ex parte communication.

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi clarified the application was no longer a demolition and she felt that was good. She asked if the certified notices needed to be read into the record or if that was no longer a requirement. She asked the Board to consider reading them, so the public knew there was concern.

Ms. Courtney stated the certified notices were mailed out when the application was first heard. She said the application had been continued several times and after a certain time would be sent again if necessary.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Kept the integrity of the building
- Thought the building was fixable
- Glad the structure would remain
- Applicant would add addition on the back
- Pleased applicant was working with the Board

- Supportive of the application
- Understood there would be minor modifications to stabilize the building
- Overall, pleased with the outcome

Mr. Benoit questioned in the staff report mentioning relocation and was unsure of the intent.

Ms. Courtney replied when she spoke to the owner, there was a new approach to add the addition and they would have to relocate the building on the site moving it forward on the lot. She informed him that in order to do so, the application would have to be modified to include a Certificate of Relocation as the application had not been advertised as such and had been advertised as a Certificate of Demolition. She asked the applicant to confirm if the plans that were presented to HARB would require relocation.

Ms. Lynch stated the site plan presented would fit within the setbacks and did not believe relocation would need to take place. She said it would provide more backyard space but would be an extra cost for them.

Ms. Courtney informed Ms. Lynch that she could return to HARB if relocation was needed in the future, but since it was not advertised for relocation that would not be part of the application. She said the application was for a partial demolition as exterior walls would be changed; the rear wall and porch would need to be removed for the addition.

Mr. Benoit clarified the partial demolition referred to lifting the structure for new foundation, openings, siding, and exterior materials.

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE partial demolition application 2021-0091 recognizing applicant had agreed to withdraw full demolition application and the partial demolition to approve removal of woodchip lap siding, the existing

windows, existing pier foundation, and parts and pieces of the rear of the structure to accommodate an addition to the rear. The motion was **SECONDED** by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Weaver, Wingo, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. (e) PL2021-0118 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.

Application was withdrawn prior to the meeting.

8. (f) PL2021-0132 Certificate of Demolition Continuing from October 21, 2021 – John Valdes & Associates, Inc.– Applicant Charles M. Sapp — Owner 160 Oneida Street

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 from the October 21, 2021, meeting and from related meetings 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. APPROVE if the HARB determines the new project scope does not exceed the threshold of a partial demolition, and will not permanently alter the contributing building's architectural integrity, with the following condition:

a. For any salvageable historic materials to be salvaged, if possible, 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.

2. Continue the application to allow the applicant time to provide a revised project scope, a more updated comprehensive structural assessment, or 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)

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi stated this application was no longer for a complete demolition and felt the agenda needed to acknowledge what was going to take place especially in the historic districts and with contributing structures.

Ms. Courtney advised that the language on the agenda was from the original notice and advertisement.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Revised drawings reflected what had been previously discussed
- Keep front part of building the same and addition added on the outside corner

- Stunned at the amount of demolition needing to be done to the structure
- Questioned if the structure would have any integrity left
- Not a bad plan but removed a lot of historic fabric
- No windows on the south elevation
- Thought the building had a lot of deterioration and replacement and reconstruction was necessary
- Questioned if the south wall needed to be removed
- Applicant wanted to keep as much of the structure as possible
- Beams had been replaced
- Entire roof would not have to be removed but would tie into the existing roof
- Applicant unable to tell Board exact amount of the structure that would be removed
- Contractor for the applicant knows to keep as much of the original structure as possible
- If removal of a material would try to recycle and reuse
- Thought applicant had made a good faith effort to preserve as much as possible
- Questioned if there would be windows on the second floor where there was a new wall
- Windows would be on the new wall just not on the drawing
- Would have windows but unsure on location due to a staircase
- Would not have to completely demo the second floor
- Thought it would be beneficial to have a better scope of the demolition area

Mr. Sapp discussed the project and reviewed the reduced scope with the Board.

Mr. Weaver felt the application had changed but did not believe it was an unreasonable demolition. He said it was selective repair and replacement.

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVED partial demolition to include the rear addition sections and possibly all of the south wall from that addition up to the front of the porch and the removal and rebuilding of the porches and the modifications from a gable to a hip roof. Should the demolition exceed that contact staff to inform or if significant change may need to return to HARB. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

Mr. Weaver asked Mr. MacDonald to include applicant was to salvage any materials that were salvageable.

Mr. MacDonald AMENDED the motion to include reasonable salvage and repurposing of any architectural elements.

Mr. Weaver SECONDED the AMENDED motion.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Weaver, Wingo, Benoit, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

9. Certificate of Appropriateness: After-the-Fact

9. (a) PL2021-0134Continuing from October 21, 2021

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.

The applicant was not present.

The Board had a brief discussion about how the applicant had not been present for the past two meetings and what had been previously approved by administration was not followed by the applicant. The Board discussed denying the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi asked if there would be any penalty for an after-the fact application. She asked after an applicant was given several chances to obtain approval which Board was able to propose a penalty to the applicant.

Mr. Birchim stated staff would contact the property owner and it would be turned over to Code Enforcement division for prosecution. He said the applicant would be given ten days to restore the building with the proper permits to reflect what had been previously approved. He said if that was not completed it would be referred to the Code Enforcement Board to handle and the penalty for an irrevocable, irreparable violation was up to \$5,000.00 per violation per State regulations.

Mr. Weaver asked if the applicant was able to operate.

Mr. Birchim answered in the affirmative as the applicant still had a Certificate of Occupancy. He said the goal was compliance not punishment. He informed the Board the application could be sent back to HARB from Code Enforcement.

Mr. Benoit inquired about the replacement glass that had been approved and if there

were manufacturers for commercial store fronts frames that were thinner.

Ms. Duncan stated the architect indicated it would be replaced and she had spoken to Jenny Wolfe, previous Historic Preservation Officer, to verify and match the existing.

Ms. Courtney stated that was their understand from speaking to the architect, and that was why the architectural review was signed off administratively instead of a HARB approval. She said the reason they had to go before HARB was because the contractor was unable to find an exact framing match and the elevation drawing that had been created by him concerned the Board. She said the Board requested an architectural review and then staff was assured the framing would match exactly.

Mr. Weaver stated he remembered it would be a beveled edge for the store front or match in kind and that was not completed.

Mr. Birchim stated for the record, the applicant would be able to appeal any decision made by the Board to the City Commission.

Mr. Weaver stated they had given two opportunities and they had a right under the due process clause appeal to the City Commission.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to DENY a Certificate of Appropriateness after-the-fact for item 9. (a) PL2021-0134 123 St. George Street because they have not followed the administrative approval that was granted and replaced with a non-conforming store front that does not adhere to the Architectural Guidelines. The motion was SECONDED by Dr. Wingo.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Wingo, Benoit, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

9. (b) PL2021-0152 260 St George St., LLC
-Applicant & Owner
260 St. George Street

For after-the-fact replacement of wood windows and replacement of wood siding in a different manner than approved by the HARB in April 2021.

Ms. Courtney read the staff report and said based on a review of the AGHP, previous discussions by the HARB at the March and April meetings for the related COA application PL2021-0027, and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds that the board can take the following actions for an after-the-fact Certificate of Appropriateness at 260 St. George Street:

1. APPROVE if the HARB determines that the wholesale replacement of the historic windows and wood siding does not compromise the contributing building's architectural integrity, with the finding that the replacement elements meet the applicable Secretary of the Interior's Standard 9

2. DENY if the wholistic change if the HARB finds that the historic exterior materials exceeded what was approved under PL2021-0027, has compromised the architectural integrity of the building, and determines the replacements do not meet the applicable Secretary of the Interior's Standards 2, 4, and 9. The HARB should clarify which elements of the project are denied.

Chris Middlebrooks reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:

- Should have contacted staff if any issues came up
- Thought if applicant could provide evidence would help his case
- Felt the contractor need to be at the HARB meeting
- Thought there was two different understandings from what had been previously approved
- The commitment was to preserve as much of the structure as possible

Ms. Courtney clarified based on the order previously approved by HARB, they had provided some leeway for the applicant. She said this was an example of why the Board needed to be specific when providing conditions to an application. She felt the siding was an issue but thought the windows were of more concern.

Mr. Weaver stated selective repair and replacement went a long way. He said if everything was to be replaced the applicant should have contacted staff. He agreed that the windows were concerning.

Discussion continued:

- Disconnect between the applicant and the contractor
- Windows were wood; however, did not have the same muntin profile
- Thought applicant should have provided more information to the contractor

Mr. Benoit questioned the six over six and nine over nine windows, whether they were treated in the same manner.

Ms. Courtney replied those appeared from staff observation to have the appropriate exterior muntin with a raised profile. She said those were more than likely true divided lite windows and the new replacement windows were more of a grid applied to a sheet of glass and not true divided lites. She said the issue with those was the grid was a PVC or

vinyl material and were supposed to be all wood windows.

The Board discussed:

- Applicant was having wooden grid fabricated
- Windows were not true divided lites, but had same profile and detail
- Replacement windows would be simulated divided lites
- Photos presented with gaps and pine wood were not acceptable
- Applicant was to repair the windows
- Unable to put in the original windows but should install an appropriate window with the appropriate profile
- Thought the windows were not professionally installed
- Windows would not hold up and would need replacement in a few years
- Unsure how applicant got into the predicament
- Contractor was highly recommended but was labor only
- Questioned why staff was not informed about windows being removed
- Applicant should have reported the issues to the City before City observation
- Applicant should have been proactive with the process

Mr. Benoit asked if any Windsor windows were installed.

Ms. Courtney clarified on page fourteen of the staff report the two over two windows were the ones that replaced the windows that could be restored and were completed in the appropriate manner, but the one shown today was the same but with glazing added; all the two over two windows were documented from pages fourteen through seventeen. She said the replacement windows for the nine over nine were on page eighteen but was unclear what the replacement windows were, which seemed

to be from a manufacturer and completed properly.

The Board discussed:

- Applicant should provide a window schedule
- Two over two windows were like the ones on the front façade
- Had a raised muntin but a simple profile
- Nine over nine were from a manufacturer
- Windows in rear of building were approved previously to be replaced
- Wooden windows were rebuilt with the weights, pulleys, and counterbalances in front of building
- Windsor was the replacement windows
- Nine over nines issue had a PVC muntin but could be replaced with wood
- Needed to show samples and the cut sheets of what was purchased
- Should take photographs demonstrating what was replaced and purchased
- Thought there needed to be a complete review
- Should have a replica of what was there since there were no originals left
- Building department had requirements for windows

Mr. Birchim stated there were State requirements, a product list, and windows had to be approved by the State. He said building historic windows may have an exemption; however, he should have had a permit identifying what would take place for each window.

Discussion continued:

- Did not meet design standards
- Needed to provide proper documentation

- Unable to resolve the issue without more information
- Only issue for the nine over nine windows were the muntins
- Applicant had to provide window schedule to Board
- Provide sample of the wooden muntin before installation

There was Board consensus for the applicant to bring a cut sheet, a window schedule, and samples to the next meeting.

MOTION

**Mr. Weaver MOVED to CONTINUE item 9.
(b) PL2021-0152 260 St. George Street to
December 16, 2021. The motion was
SECONDED by Mr. Benoit**

VOTE ON MOTION:

**AYES: Weaver, Benoit, Wingo,
MacDonald, Duncan**

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

10. Planning and Building Staff Communications

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

(Provided for informational purposes)

11. Other Business

11. (a) Review and Approval of 2022 HARB Meeting Schedule

There was a brief discussion regarding the HARB 2022 meeting schedule and there were no objections.

Ms. Courtney advised the Board all the meetings were the third Thursday except for August 17, 2022 meeting that had been moved to Wednesday due to a City Commission meeting conflict.

12. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:40 P.M.⁵



Catherine Duncan, Chairperson

⁵ Transcribed by Elyse Anderson