

## CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

### Historic Architectural Review Board Regular Meeting December 16, 2021

The Historic Architectural Review Board met in formal session at 1:00 P.M., Thursday, December 16, 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 McDonald, Vice-Chairperson  
Jon Benoit  
Barbara Wingo  
Paul Weaver, III

#### City Staff:

Julie Courtney, Historic Preservation Officer  
Amy Skinner, Director, Planning and Building  
Candice Seymour, Planning and Building Clerk  
Isabelle Lopez, City Attorney  
Elyse Anderson, Recording Secretary

---

#### 2. General Public Comments for Items not on the Agenda

BJ Kalaidi

#### 3. Approval of Minutes

Ms. Duncan had some minor revisions, she felt needed to be corrected and passed them to Ms. Anderson, recording secretary.

Ms. Anderson read the corrections into the record. She said on page three, Ms. Duncan did not have an in-person meeting it was a Zoom meeting, Bolles was incorrectly spelled and a sentence needed to be removed which was "she looked around and saw there were cracks that needed to be repaired".

#### **MOTION**

**Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE the October 21, 2021, minutes with the above modifications that had been read into the record. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.**

#### VOTE ON MOTION:

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

**NAYES: NONE**

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

#### 4. Modification and approval of Agenda

Ms. Courtney noted there were no changes to the agenda.

#### **MOTION**

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

#### VOTE ON MOTION:

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

**NAYES: NONE**

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

#### 5. Public Comments related to Expedited Hearing items:

(None)

#### 6. Certificate of Appropriateness

6. (a) PL2021-0162 – Aunt Matilda's Steampunk Trunk – Applicant SARF of St. Augustine, LLC – Owner 142 St. George Street

**To approve a sign that does not meet Architectural Guidelines for Historic Preservation pre-approved colors and fonts.**

Ms. Seymour 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 for a new sign at 142 St. George Street if the HARB makes the following findings:

1. The proposed colors are generally appropriate based on:

a. Pre-approved browns closely related to 161 C

b. Common use of gold-leaf style paint, similar to 871 C, as an accent and font color

c. 3105 C (proposed blue) is a border accent and secondary font color and is not a predominant color on the sign

2. The proposed custom fonts are appropriate because they share similar elements to pre-approved lettering.

3. The proposed use of vinyl adhesive has been administratively approved for signs in HP-2 as an equivalent to paint (color permanently affixed) when placed on an appropriate material

4. All other Historic Sign Zone I criteria will be met.

Leslie Kill reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:

- Did not fit the exact guideline but fit the spirit of the guidelines
- Font was close to other approved fonts

- Colors were close to the approved but slightly different shades
- Thought it fit the intent of the guidelines
- Though the "S" was not close to the accepted fonts and was non-traditional
- Branding was a compelling argument
- Lettering was all different sizes
- Felt it did not fit the historic character
- Franchised signs should adapt to meet the historic guidelines

Ms. Kill stated she could have art team review it; however, it had been the merchandising used for the past five years and was their brand. She stated they needed a sign and wanted to comply but pointed out their brand that was used on everything.

Dr. Wingo felt that was not a persuasive argument as trademarks should have to adapt to the historic standards.

Ms. Kill pointed out there were two different fonts and there was a three-dimensional texture. She asked how large of a company did she need to be in order to use their brand and what would need to be changed.

Dr. Wingo stated the letter needed to be even and the "A" in Aunt Matilda's was not accurate. She explained it was not the size of the company as the Board would want all the business to comply with the standards.

Mr. Benoit thought they were in the branding of the time period and the logo was modified to sign form. He said the time period they were capturing was from late 1800's early 1900's when people traveled by trains with trunks. He said the brand was merchandising in that aesthetic, and thought it fit the era.

Ms. Duncan stated even with the more historic look it did not meet the guidelines. She said they try to implement the guidelines in order to not set a precedence. She said the design was simple and not over complicated; she suggested using the approved Grand Antique font for "Aunt Matilda's", and the rest

could stay the same, but overall, the design was nice.

## **MOTION**

**Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE application 2021-0162 as presented finding that the colors of the sign are close to the pre-approved colors, the size and other details about the installation meets the guidelines, and the fonts are studied and emulate either the approved fonts or traditional fonts to create a traditional looking sign. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.**

### **VOTE ON MOTION:**

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

**NAYES: NONE**

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

### **6. (b) PL2021-0161 – Les Thomas Architect– Applicant Historic Fraser Properties, LLC – Owner 3 St. George Street**

**To construct a bathroom addition to the rear/east elevation of the existing 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 APPROVE a Certificate of Appropriateness at 3 St. George Street if the HARB finds that the design of the proposed addition is compatible with the existing building and meets the applicable Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation 2 and 9.

Ex Parte Communication:  
(None)

Les Thomas reviewed the application.

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

The Board discussed:

- Thought application met the criteria
- Read as an addition by having a dropped roof line
- Fence height was five foot six inches high
- Most appropriate gate size was fifty inches with smallest being forty-four inches
- Applicant would comply with gate size of fifty inches
- Was about ten percent of the existing square footage
- Small addition on a secondary elevation
- Not visible to people on St. George Street
- Was subordinate to the existing building
- In favor of the application

## **MOTION**

**Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVED PL2021-0161 finding that the small bathroom addition was compatible to the existing structure and would not adversely affect the historic character of the neighborhood around it. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.**

Ms. Duncan clarified the gate would be fifty inches wide instead of fifty-nine.

**Mr. Benoit AMENDED the motion to include the gate change. The AMENDED motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.**

### **VOTE ON MOTION:**

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

**NAYES: NONE**

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

### **6. (c) PL2021-0613 – Len Weeks Construction Design Development– Applicant 108-110 St. George Street, LLC – Owner 61 Spanish Street**

**To construct a walk-in cooler addition and add an exterior exhaust vent to the**

**rear/northeast corner of the existing 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 61 Spanish Street.

1. APPROVE if the HARB finds that the proposed exterior mechanical equipment consisting of a walk-in cooler and ventilation system mechanical units meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards 9, will not radically change the appearance of the building, and will be located in the least conspicuous area, with the following condition:

a. that the any visible units, vents, or ductwork be painted to match the color of the building or the roof

2. Continue to provide the applicant time to consider a way to fully screen the walk-in cooler and any of the mechanical unit equipment that will be visible.

Schaffer Weeks and Les Thomas reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:

- Kitchen was in the rear of the downstairs section
- Questioned why there was not a chase in the upstairs
- Applicant tried to but the apartments had been designed and built
- Chase was present for the return air
- Chase was placed in the least visible location

- Chase should be stainless, powder coated, or paint white to blend in
- Perhaps install a fence around the box to conceal completely
- Box could be painted white or covered a cypress box
- Courtyard would be used for outside seating
- Would have a door from the outside leading into the cooler
- Would want cypress applied to resemble a gate
- Cooler was nine feet tall and the wall was five foot six
- Should be screened and blended through color

**Mr. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE application PL2021-0163 at 61 Spanish Street to install a walk-in that is to be veneered in cypress plank including the door where artificial strap and design to appear to be a gate and to install the hood exhaust on the outside of the building and behind the balcony powered coated or painted applicants choice to match the building to blend in. The motion was SECONDED by Dr. Wingo.**

**VOTE ON MOTION:**

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

**NAYES: NONE**

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**7. Certificate of Demolition and Partial Demolition**

**7. (a) PL2021-0159– Arthur Phillips - Applicant**  
**Arthur R. and Zuella L. Phillips– Owner**  
**120 Bridge Street**

**To partially demolish a residential building, constructed c. 1894 and 1899, 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 chimney, modifications to the existing**

**fenestration, and replacement of the front porch and all existing exterior materials.**

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 120 Bridge Street:

1. APPROVE if the HARB determines the 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 condition assessment, or economic hardship information, if the HARB determines that the proposed demolition exceeds the threshold of a partial demolition or will negatively compromise the architectural integrity of the building.

Arthur and Zuella Phillips reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi voiced her concern that the home might not be a contributing structure after the remodel to the Lincolnville area. She understood the financial burden that the remodel could cause; however, she thought the building was important and hoped the

home would still be part of the National Register.

Public hearing was closed.

21 certified notices were sent, 4 were returned in favor, and 2 had comments.

The Board and applicants discussed:

- Replacement of front porch looked appropriate
- Chimney had no integrity as there was no mortar left
- Remodel of inside of home had been previously approved
- Four windows on the side should be kept
- Could enclose windows from the inside for the remodel
- Applicant should have brought evidence of siding
- Thought building would lose integrity if Hardie board were to be used
- Did not feel there was justification to change siding
- Board typically required a report from an engineer or architect
- Evidence provided was anecdotal
- Chimney was not visible from the street
- Wood siding, if removed, destroyed the original fabric of the building
- Applicant felt house had no integrity
- Concerned with removal of windows on the two sides of the home because it would change the integrity and character
- Applicant thought home needed strength and wanted to add Oriented Strand Board (OSB)
- Wanted to make home nice when visible from the road
- There was no substrate and home would need to be resealed
- Would be required to sheet the building and update per code
- Thought changing one or two windows was appropriate but right side contained 75% of the windows
- Could support the scope of work if able to keep the windows and commit to retaining the proportions of the windows

- Would want the applicant to match the details of the windows when replaced to maintain the historic character
- Roofline was being preserved and porch was being restored to the second story
- Would be able to support the Hardie Board if the details were maintained
- Two windows on the front should be retained
- Applicant wanted to do mock windows and apply shutters in the closed position
- Thought the quality of wood on the home would be replaceable
- Gable end of the existing roof would be visible and would keep the vent as it was
- Applicant wanted to add a window or vent to make visually pleasing
- Windows were two over two with a muntin and a bottom sash and felt it was important to preserve the windows character
- Windows on home were original
- If able to keep original window and add a shutter, would be better than a new window
- Windows were single pane and had termite damage and may not be salvageable
- Questioned if proposed windows were simulated divided light
- Applicant agreed to the two over two with a raised profile muntin
- Applicant would not want to keep the side windows unless required and would add new windows with shutters
- Unsure if the documentation on the siding was enough
- Wanted the restoration of home to fit with the character of the National Register district
- Should maintain the siding and windows on front of home
- Sides of home could use Hardie board
- Could use the front as a template for the rest of home
- If fenestration were removed would resemble any other remodeled building
- Keeping the window and integrity was valuable for the visual exterior

- In favor if applicant kept four windows on side and repurpose siding as a good faith effort
- Could approve with those conditions and if there were, issues applicant should contact staff

Mr. Weaver felt the consensus of the Board was as follows: willing to support partial demolition of the porch and chimney, and recommend retaining existing windows and blocking them in and repurpose the siding of all four elevations into the front to retain integrity and Hardie board on the rest of the sides.

Ms. Courtney stated that was clear; however, other applications have had latitude to make a good faith effort and replaced more than the Board had expected. She said the Board pointed out in previous meetings applicants needed to provide documentation of the condition and communication with staff. She asked the Board to clearly state the parameters of the conditions for the applicant.

Mr. Weaver said if it turned out there was not enough material to do what had been asked by the Board, then he would be open to removing the condition and allowing the applicant to use Hardie Board on all four elevations.

Mr. MacDonald said the most important thing was if there was an issue with a condition or something that had been approved by the HARB, then the applicant needed to contact staff. He added there was no issue with the back-elevation's door or window.

Ms. Duncan said any new windows were to be the two over two with a raised muntin.

Mr. MacDonald said the windows on the side, in bad condition, were being replaced. He said the motion said to "keep the windows" but it was keeping the layout.

Mr. Weaver said it was to keep the openings, and preferred he kept the windows, but the

main concern was keeping the fenestration pattern.

## **MOTION**

**Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE application PL2021-0159 to approve a partial demolition of the porch, and chimney being removed, retaining the four windows on the side elevation and repurposing the siding on the Bridge Street elevation. The motion was SECONDED by MacDonald.**

Ms. Duncan asked if they were keeping the sash window.

Mr. MacDonald stated he understood they wanted the wood window back in the frame rather in good shape or not but would have salvaged sashes available from the windows on the sides to achieve that along the front and was able to replace the windows on the sides if needed. He said he would keep the two over two with the raised muntin.

Mr. Phillips stated he was planning on replacing every window including the front and sides as there was no integrity. He said the work that was taking place would not pass to obtain building permits.

Mr. Weaver stated the bottom line was to maintain the openings and if the windows had to be replaced, he would be willing to compromise.

Dr. Wingo stated as long as there was appropriate fenestration.

Mr. Weaver stated he felt that was outside the purview and outside of the Boards authority.

## **VOTE ON MOTION:**

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

**NAYES: NONE**

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY<sup>1</sup>**

## **8. Continued Items from the previous HARB meetings**

### **8. (a) PL2021-0152 – 260 St. George Street, 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, discussions at the November 18, 2021, meeting, 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 the majority of the wood siding on the north elevation does not compromise the contributing building's architectural integrity with the finding that the newly proposed 2/2 replacement windows and replacement wood muntins for the 9/9 replacement windows meet the applicable Secretary of the Interior's Standard 9.

2. DENY the wholistic change if the HARB finds that the replacement of historic exterior materials exceeded what was approved under PL2021-0027, has negatively 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.

<sup>1</sup> Break from 3:00p.m-3:09p.m

Jim Ferry and Les Koehler reviewed the application and provided evidence to the board.<sup>2</sup>

The Board provided their ex parte communication.

Staff received an email regarding the property in favor of denial.

Public hearing was opened.

Tara Owen was concerned about the project since it had stalled. She said was concerned with the parking and the color of the building. She said there were to be twelve tenants and felt there was not enough parking.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Window exhibit presented was pre-approved and did not see an issue with it
- Muntin profile was different from the original
- Muntin was wooden although not a match
- Smaller windows were to be replaced with two over two presented to the Board
- Two/four windows on front were the originals and would remain
- Board wanted to have vertical since that was the period standard
- PVC muntin would be replaced by the wooden muntin presented to the Board for the nine over nine
- Replacement was to be done "in kind"
- Staff should review the final window schedule

Ms. Courtney reviewed the pages of the applicant's packet with the Board pertaining to the muntin, window locations and the order sheet.

Ms. Duncan suggested to the applicant that these should be used to order, and it should match the configuration.

Mr. Weaver said they suggested reviewing the final order with staff to ensure accuracy.

Mr. Benoit said if he was correct, they were addressing only the windows and not the siding.

Ms. Courtney stated the siding had been addressed briefly at the previous meeting and was left to the Board if there was had anything further.

Mr. Benoit stated they had the compatible material that would quickly resemble wood. He stated he was pleased that in the original approval that the windows were reinstalled with the wood trim and the stucco be ran to it.

## MOTION

**Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE application PL2021-0152 finding that the replacement Jeld Wen (JW) windows for the front stucco portion of the building as well as the wood mullions at the back section of the building were compatible materials with the AGHP. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.**

Mr. Weaver asked for the motion to contain the light configuration'.

**Mr. Benoit AMENDED the motion to include the expectation of two over two muntin pattern on the front portion of the building and the rear would retain the nine over nine but would be wood muntins. The AMENDED motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.**

---

<sup>2</sup> Photos attached to packet

**VOTE ON MOTION:**

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

**NAYES: NONE**

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**9. Certificate of Appropriateness – City  
owned property**

**9. (a) PL2021-0160 – City of St. Augustine,  
Public Works Department – Applicant  
City of St. Augustine / FPL (owner of light  
fixtures) - Owner  
Various Locations**

**To replace existing street light fixtures  
and poles within the city limits, including  
in Historic Preservation Zoning Districts 1  
- 5, under FPL's LED program.**

Ms. Courtney provided a brief overview of the project. She said this was for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed replacement for FPL's LED lights under FPL LED program of existing FPL street light fixtures which used mercury light source and existing FPL poles within the City limits including Historic Preservation Zoning Districts one through five.

Staff does not provide recommendations for city projects and looks to HARB for review and comment on this proposed city project.

Ruben Franklin, Public Works Director, City of St. Augustine, Chris Venoy Scott Thrapp, Alex Acosta, and Mike DeHaven from FPL reviewed the application.<sup>3</sup>

Ms. Duncan asked if the existing color would stay the same as it was or change.

Mr. Franklin stated they would try to stay at the lowest kelvin range.

Mr. Thrapp stated the ranges were from 3000 to 5000 kelvin temperature and understood the desire to have a lower kelvin watt; however, the lowest kelvin range was 3000.

He said they were regulated by the Public Service Commission and the catalog presented had been approved. He said the existing lighting was high pressure sodium ranging from 2200 to 2500 kelvin temperature.

Ms. Duncan asked if it was possible to have the frosted glass colored amber in the historic district.

Mr. Thrapp stated unfortunately the frosted was the only option. He said every customer had to be offered the same options and the Public Service Commission had approved what was presented.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi stated she wanted clarification on what color the lighting would be. She said it looked like the color would be a yellow and if so, would the lighting continue being yellow or would it change it white.

Charles Pappas was in favor of what had been presented and though it was an improvement compared to what the City had currently. He said he felt this was the appropriate time to address and reduce light pollution.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Lights installed would be brighter than what was used currently but would be warm tone
- LED lights had a distribution pattern which directed light towards the street and sidewalks and less towards homes
- LED light were dark sky compliant and provided zero up light

---

<sup>3</sup> Photos attached to packet

- If needed a shield could be added for no additional cost
- Only FPL owned lights would be replaced
- Replacement would be done with like kind
- Historic area majority had 70-watt cobra head
- Would be replaced with a forty-five-watt 3k that would be the equivalent of what was in the current area
- Light fixture was smaller and more inconspicuous
- Thought all fixtures were out of scale in the historic area
- Would be using the existing poles to replace the lantern-based fixtures and any Cobra lights would be replaced with a LED Cobra
- This was an LED conversion only
- Could redesign fixtures if a City Roadway project were done in the future
- Provided a chance to have a uniform look throughout the City if agreed to before December 31<sup>st</sup>
- Thought there were other options available that was more appropriate for the historic district
- Able to choose from catalog but could cost additional money if needed to add a concrete pole
- Board wanted the City to be able to move forward with the deadline approaching
- Cobra lighting would be replaced with another Cobra fixture
- ATV2(rectangle fixture) would replace all the 200-Watt High pressure sodium in the City
- The aesthetic would be uniformed throughout, as well as the lumens
- Was in favor of the project and sustainability was important
- Major improvement from what the City had
- FPL would purchase the fixtures

- Reduction in energy and maintenance cost that FPL could pass on to the City
- No City owned light fixtures would be replaced
- Everything would be replaced 'in kind'

## **MOTION**

**Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE application PL2021-0160 finding that the LED replacement fixtures in kind will not have an adverse effect on the historic districts. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.**

### **VOTE ON MOTION:**

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

Ms. Lopez informed the Board she had confirmed with the Commission on Ethics regarding the annual financial disclosure forms and everyone had filed timely.

## **12. Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:07 P.M.<sup>4</sup>



**Catherine Duncan, Chairperson**

---

<sup>4</sup> Transcribed by Elyse Anderson