

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

Historic Architectural Review Board Regular Meeting January 20, 2022

The Historic Architectural Review Board met in formal session at 1:00 P.M., Thursday, January 20, 2022, 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
Paul Weaver, III
Barbara Wingo

City Staff:

Julie Courtney, Historic Preservation Officer
Amy Skinner, Building and Planning Director
Isabelle Lopez, City Attorney
Elyse Wiemann, Recording Secretary

2. General Public Comments for Items not on the Agenda

(None)

3. Approval of Minutes

The Board provided minor scrivener's errors for the Clerk to correct.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE with the changes to the November 18, 2021, and the December 16, 2021, minutes with the corrections. 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 indicated there were no changes to the agenda.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE the Agenda. 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. Continued Items from Previous Meetings:

(None)

7. Certificates of Appropriateness

7. (a) PL2021-0176 – Jar Property Management Corporation – Applicant & Owner
159 Cordova Street

Heard after Item 8(a).

To construct a masonry wall along the front and portions of the north and south property lines to create a flood barrier.

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 the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 159 Cordova Street to allow the applicant time to consider an appropriate design, materials and configuration that are consistent with the AGHP such as:

1. Masonry flood barrier wall with wood picket fence in front to mask the inappropriate material.

2. Add an opening along the front property line to allow access to and visibility of the front porch and utilizing a temporary flood dam / stackable flood barrier system for protection during flooding events.

3. Other appropriate options as recommended by the HARB.

Joseph Repole reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:

- Left side of the wall would connect to a concrete slab/planter
- Plans were reviewed with Jessica Beach, City Chief Resilience Officer
- Proposed plan to turn could help protect home from water
- Unsure of the home elevation
- Wall would mitigate the water issue
- Water would go around wall if not connected

- Pitch driveway in order to help keep water away from home
- Applicant would install two French drains; however, these would not help in a flood
- Board was supportive of flood proofing buildings but unsure if this would work
- Intentions were good, but more information was needed
- Should consider using a door dam as they were strong and beneficial
- Elevation would be five-foot as submitted
- Opening at the sidewalk was architecturally important
- Concrete steps would allow for one or two risers
- Suggested a simple stucco wall for the material
- Wall should be at least as high as water from past hurricane
- Applicant wanted wall to resolve flooding in normal instances like king tides
- Material should be worked on with City staff
- In favor of continuing in order to submit more information
- In favor of building a wall that was effective, but appropriate
- Wall proposed was not appropriate for type of home
- A low wall similar to Synagogue would have height that was more appropriate
- Wall did not need to be the same height as porch
- Applicant was not in favor of the Synagogue wall
- Tall walls for home were not within the guidelines
- Purpose of wall was to protect the house from a flooding event

Mr. Repole stated he would return with the following information: measurable reason for the height, information for an opening, and more information on the material. He asked if he would have to wait another thirty days or was, could he work on this with staff.

Ms. Duncan told him the application would be continued to the next meeting which was February 17, 2022. She encouraged him to

reference the guidelines, since what he had proposed was not in the guidelines.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to CONTINUE application 2021-0176, 159 Cordova Street to the February 17, 2022 HARB meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Benoit.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Benoit, Wingo, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Ms. Courtney clarified the AGHP referenced wood framed fence for framed vernacular and asked if the Board was open to the applicant presenting a masonry wall, or did the Board want the applicant to add a picket fence in front of his design.

The Board discussed the topic and there were mixed opinions on the masonry wall and the addition of picket fencing in front.

Ms. Lopez informed the Board the item was closed since they had voted, and it was up to the applicant to provide more information to the Board.

8. Certificates of Demolition

8. (a) PL2021-0173 – Steven Layt and Les Thomas– Applicant **Steven and Nicole Layt– Owner** **50 Carrera Street**

For after-the-fact partial demolition of a building, constructed ca.1885-1894, that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and is a contributing building to the Model Land Company National Register Historic District, with features removed or modified including the chimney, porches on the west and south elevations, the fenestration, and proposed modifications to the wood siding.

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 action for a Certificate of Demolition for after-the-fact partial demolition of and the proposed modifications to 50 Carrera Street because it is not a local landmark or otherwise designated as a historic building:

To approve if the HARB determines the after-the-fact partial demolition will not be detrimental to the historic and architectural character of the Model Land Company National Register Historic District and City, with the findings:

1. That any of the distinguishing architectural characteristics and/or significant later additions and alterations have been retained

Or

2. The building has already been altered over time and further with the approved permit work, so that the historic architectural character has already been diminished.

Mr. Weaver asked why there was conflicting information between the agenda and the staff report.

Ms. Courtney said there was a clerical error on the agenda, and it was a noncontributing building.

Mr. Weaver said he did not understand how the property was noncontributing and questioned why the property was not considered a conforming building. He said the home had many significant features and he felt there had to be an error on the inventory.

Ms. Courtney said the project was complex and she checked the address listed and the address on the Sanborn maps. She agreed the building had significant importance, but the building could have been altered over time which could have been the reason it was not listed.

Mr. Weaver felt that was a technical error and an anomaly and there was enough information about the building that showed it was significant.

Ms. Courtney said the Ordinance in Section 28-89 the criteria for certificate of appropriateness or demolition review item three stated:

Applications for certificate of demolition of a building or structure that is of exceptional significance, has been a contributing property to a National Register of Historic Places District or has been individually listed on the National Register of Historic Places shall require the following with the burden of proof to be on the applicant. The board may also require the following of structures considered to be contributing to the historical character of the city.

Ms. Courtney informed the applicant the building could be considered as contributing to the historical character of the City. Steve Layt and Les Thomas reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

19 certified notices were sent, 6 were returned in favor, and 3 had comments.

Public hearing was opened.

Mike Boles spoke in favor of the application and was delighted with the work that had been done thus far. He felt the renovations would contribute greatly to the historic neighborhood and encouraged the Board to allow the owner to complete the renovations.

Karen Valachovic spoke in favor of the application and felt it was important to recognize the new owners would be living full time in the home as residents of the City. She felt what the new owners were doing to renovate the home would be a benefit to the City.

BJ Kalaidi was concerned with the after-the-fact demolitions within the City. She said the architect was well known in the City and should have done his due diligence. She said the City had rules which needed to be followed. She said if the application were to be approved there still needed to be a fine since it was an after-the-fact demo.

Public hearing was closed.

Mr. Weaver asked for clarification if the Board was to judge the partial demolition only and no what had been put back.

Ms. Courtney confirmed that was correct.

The Board discussed:

- Not concerned with west elevation towards the carriage house as it was post period of significance
- Main historic building new steps and railings were thought to be a non-historic addition from around the 1950's
- Porch was an addition and non-historic on the south elevation
- Wrap-around porch was on the Sanborn map but was no longer on home
- Demolishing the porches was not a negative impact as they were non-historic
- Main concern was the windows
- Concerned if windows were original and if they were was inappropriate to remove them
- Permit for windows was approved and issued on March 31st
- Chimney and siding were less important

Mr. Layt said he had a meeting with Jenny Wolfe, previous Historic Preservation Officer, to discuss the replacement of the windows. He informed Ms. Wolfe they had not decided on the window replacements but wanted to use prairie style, and Ms. Wolfe said those were not appropriate and inconsistent with the era of the home. He said when the decision was made based on the

surrounding homes, those windows were two over two.

Mr. Weaver said that was no reason to change the windows and it was a violation of the guidelines. He said on the Riberia and Carrera Street side windows, were most important and those were six over one light window. He questioned the age of the windows since those same windows were on the carriage house and looked to be added after a remodel.

Discussion continued:

- Applicant felt the two over two windows were typical for the neighborhood
- Home had five different window styles and applicant chose two over two
- Moved windows as partial demolition

Mr. Benoit asked for clarification of the scope since the bulk of the replacement had been approved, and the expectation outside the local districts was the Board had purview of the demolition but not the replacement product.

Ms. Courtney said that was correct and felt this was a complex situation. She agreed the windows were not appropriate; however, the window product number had been submitted before the permit was approved. She read an email from Ms. Wolfe regarding the project into the record from April 27th. She stated since the permit had been approved the City could not go back on it.

The Board continued discussing the windows and the approval of the City issued permit. The Board felt there was a disconnect between what the City thought was being replaced and what the applicant understood.

Discussion continued:

- Happy the applicant was returning the home to a single-family residence
- Fair amount of integrity had been removed

- Board needed to be fair to applicant since City approved the permit

Ms. Lopez said this was not in a historic district where there was review of the design, colors, etc., so the product information and approval from the Historic Preservation Officers of the replacement material was irrelevant. She said the issue was the demolition and not the replacements.

Dr. Wingo said she agreed the issue was the demolition and the problem was the removal of the windows should have been reviewed by the Board or the staff.

Mr. Weaver asked if Ms. Wolfe approved the demolition of the windows.

Ms. Courtney said Ms. Wolfe was aware the applicant wanted to change the windows, but at the site visit meeting she was unaware of how it would be replaced.

Ms. Duncan asked if the drawings turned in were to be replaced in kind with potential approved then they could in-turn replace them with their selection without consequence.

Dr. Wingo felt there was a step missing, which was to determine if the windows could be replaced or if they were significant feature to the house.

Ms. Skinner pointed out two wrongs did not make a right and there were probably some things that fell through the cracks. She said Ms. Wolfe was concerned about the potential of the project becoming a partial demolition. She said clearly there were decisions made in the field that did not involve City staff and encouraged the Board to focus on the scope before them.

Discussion continued:

- The fenestration was lost
- Modifications to wood siding which applicant was replacing in kind

- Chimney was removed because of instability
- Should keep the integrity of the siding
- The less Hardie board the better
- Siding was already approved for removal
- Porches information presented proved to have non-historic features

Ms. Courtney said the applicant had been approved to remove the horizontal siding to replace it with horizontal Hardie siding.

Mr. Benoit asked if these were acceptable for the motion:

- On page one of the application, right east side, second floor, would replace two windows with one and center it over the one below
- Same on the east; convert the two windows into one

Ms. Duncan asked if the Board considered the home lost to the historic integrity.

Mr. Weaver said over fifty windows had been changed, and he felt those were small alterations.

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE application PL2021-0173 finding that the window and siding approval had been previously approved as the original permit for the project, finding that the chimney being requested for demolition after-the-fact was shown by the applicant to have structural issues, finding the window and door changes do not adversely affect the character and contribution to the neighborhood and the porch demolition was done to address structural issues with the intent to putting them back as permitted. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

Mr. Weaver said the porches were non-historic based on the evidence provided, and he asked Mr. Benoit to add that to the motion.

MOTION

Mr. Benoit AMENDED his motion to include the porches were non-historic based on evidence provided. The AMENDED motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Weaver, Wingo, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Mr. Thomas said part of the issue was the partial demolition rule, and there were things that had to be done to meet Code. He said things change in the middle of historic renovations and it was hard to stop and wait for HARB. He suggested that staff should have the ability to handle things at this point. He pointed out he felt the home would be a contributing to the neighborhood.¹

8. (b) PL2021-0174 – Len Weeks Rental Properties – Applicant
Claude L Weeks Jr. (a.k.a. Len Weeks)–
Owner
63 Hypolita Street

To demolish a commercial building constructed ca. 1924-1930 that is recorded in the Florida Master Site file, is a contributing building to the Town Plan National Register District and is located in the HP-2 zoning district. (Previous HARB Certificate of Demolition approval from November 1991 under BDAC 91-705 expired).

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

¹ Break from 3:20 p.m.- 3:33 p.m.

actions for a Certificate of Demolition at 63 Hypolita Street:

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 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, with the following conditions:

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.

b. To limit the time that the lot is vacant, the applicant shall submit the demolition permit application and the building permit application for a replacement structure simultaneously.

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.

Len Weeks reviewed the application.

The Board provided their ex parte communication.

20 certified notices were sent, 10 were returned in favor, and 8 had comments.

Mr. Weaver pointed out the siding had been added in the 1950's but the building had lost

its integrity. He said the Preservation Board purchased the building with the intent to demolish it and rebuild a Spanish period building.

Public hearing was opened.

Les Thomas spoke in favor of the application and said the building was unsafe and needed to be demolished. He said they should be able to put something back that was appropriate to the Colonial era.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- In favor of the demo but should have new plans as a condition
- Staff conditions listed should be followed: limit time lot was vacant and should preserve any salvageable material
- When plans were submitted then demo could take place
- Unable to provide a timeline of when the property could be developed
- Building would not last another five years
- Did not want property to become a parking lot
- Applicant was willing to salvage any material that could be saved
- Building was in bad condition and had loss integrity
- Case was presented as an economic hardship, but now was being presented as unsafe and a nuisance
- Applicant had no choice other than to adhere to providing property plans before demolition

Ms. Lopez said language under subsection five was *"as a condition of issuing a certificate of demolition the Board may require the replacement design be approved by the Board and no permit be issued for the demolition of said structure until drawings sufficient for building permit and all necessary requirements for the construction of the new building have been submitted for the new construction"*.

Ms. Courtney said this was in the Staff report under conditions for demolition approval, it was Section 28-89 2(d), which was where it said *"HARB had the discretion when reviewing demolition applications"*.

Ms. Lopez emphasized it was written that the Board "may" require it.

The Board continued:

- Demolition was not an emergency since first permit had been issued thirty years ago
- It was standard for the applicant to provide plans
- Applicant did not want the liability of the building collapsing
- Applicant provided the proposed site plan but that was not exact
- If unsafe, should follow the process with the City building official and provide evidence to the Board
- Applicant had evidence from structural engineer that proved the need to demo
- Asked if the Board would accept basic plans and establish a time frame for the applicant to do work
- Wanted property built back as Spanish Colonial
- Demolition permit was valid for one year, but applicant could request an additional year

Mr. Weeks said he was requesting the demolition permit today and would begin the planning process; however, could not guarantee it would be build it in the next few years since he did not have the time or financial means.

Ms. Skinner said if the demolition was approved there was a thirty-day delay. There was a review process to have a parking lot in the historic district which would require additional steps before a parking lot could be approved.

Discussion continued:

- Anything that was to be built in the space would have to meet guidelines
- High chance the building would meet the threshold for safety
- Questioned why the building had not been condemned
- Should not approve based on anecdotal information

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE Demolition application PL2021-0174, 63 Hypolita Street to include both staff conditions which were salvage any significant historic materials at the owners discretion, and limit the time the lot was vacant the applicant shall submit the demolition permit application and the building permit application simultaneously and had a year to do so. The motion was SECONDED by Dr. Wingo

Mr. Benoit asked if the intent was to ask for the building permit application, which included the complete drawings inclusive of the civil engineering needed for the building to be ready for construction.

Mr. Weaver stated that was the standard that had been used on other projects and he wanted to be consistent. He said they provided another option for him to prove it was an unsafe structure.

Mr. MacDonald said the building might not withstand another hurricane season and could easily come down, and was not hindering Mr. Weeks from having the building department to have it condemned; however, it would have to return to HARB before it could become a parking lot if that was the main concern.

Mr. Weaver said he needed proof but would support if it was a public safety issue; however, the argument had changed, and they needed to remain consistent.

Mr. Weeks stated he provided proof from a structural engineer because that was part of the requirement.

Ms. Duncan stated that was required to demolish the building. She said for the Board to approve the demolition, the applicant would have to provide structural evidence of the reason. She said they agreed the building could come down; it was just a matter of when.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Wingo, Benoit, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. (c) PL2021-0175 – All Angles Construction, Inc– Applicant
Ian McCaskill– Owner
25 River Road

To demolish a building constructed ca. 1938 that is recorded in the Florida Master Site file and is 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 APPROVE a Certificate of Demolition at 25 River Road because it is not a local landmark or otherwise designated as a historic building with the following conditions

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.

2. To limit the time that the lot is vacant, the Board may consider a condition requiring the applicant submit the demolition permit application and the building permit application for the replacement structure simultaneously.

Chad Ruziskey reviewed the application and asked if he could remediate the asbestos prior to the demolition permit, or would he need to wait for permit approval.

Ms. Skinner said they would coordinate with the building official to determine if there were any regulations regarding the removal of asbestos prior to the thirty-day period, or if he had to wait.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi felt the developer should be asked to connect to the City sewer. She said the agenda had been amended with a new owner and she asked for clarification on when that took place.

Ms. Courtney said when Mr. Ruziskey, All Angles Construction, informed staff there was a pending transaction on the property. She told him after the transaction was final the new owner's signature would need to be on the final paperwork. She said the transaction finalized before the HARB meeting which was why it had been updated.

Mr. Ruziskey stated he spoke with the City and was told they were unable to be on City sewer, but they had mapped out a new septic system.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Agreed with the staff report
- Building would not meet the threshold for a local landmark
- Property was not in one of the districts

- Salvage any materials that could be saved
- Should be required to submit the building permit with the demolition permit
- In favor of the demolition

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE application PL2021-0175 with the two staff conditions to salvage any historic materials that could be saved and submit the demolition permit application with the building permit application, again finding the building itself does not meet the criteria for local landmark designation. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, MacDonald, Wingo, Weaver, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

9. Planning and Building Staff Communications

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

(Provided for informational purposes)

Mr. MacDonald asked about the Baker properties that did not attend the meetings. He said it was 123 St. George Street PL2021-0134. He stated he received a call from Leslie Case, the Bakers' daughter, who asked about the case and the details.

Ms. Courtney replied they were on the agenda twice. She said the first was cancelled right before the meeting, and the second they did not come at all. She said at that meeting HARB decided the work was inappropriate but there was no representation. She said the application was an after-the-fact, and Mr. Birchim discussed it being a code violation case. She said the building official had communicated with them, they had a certain amount of time for

corrections, and if not then it would be a code violation.

Mr. MacDonald asked if anything was happening.

Ms. Courtney said the contractor had contacted her about the work, and he was confused with the process. She informed him the application was denied, she referred him to the building official, and they should follow that process.

Mr. MacDonald he would follow-up again. He said they did not want to fine people just to have it corrected.

Mr. MacDonald asked about the disconnect in the Carrera Street project. He said if the building department understood a chimney on the outside of the building was a red flag and was concerned with how this happened.

Ms. Duncan said the chimney was not shown, and it was shown as staying on the elevation. She said they did not have purview of the interior.

Ms. Courtney said there was a disconnect of the ordinance. She said as staff, they were not allowed to require applicants to keep wood windows even being in a National Register Historic District, and it was difficult because the permit staff had wrong information about the ordinance. She said that was why Ms. Wolfe tried to finalize what constituted partial demolition. She felt it was unfortunate but thought the ordinance had created the problem. She said it was also difficult for the building permit staff. She said the ordinance as written did not mention windows as a significant feature. She said she believed the partial demolition ordinance was very important.

Ms. Duncan said even if the replacement were in 'like kind', that would be an issue because the permit had been issued, and the applicant could then do what they wanted. She said that was the issue and there was no standing in the demo conditions.

Mr. Benoit said in his experience with the staff, the development pressure was tremendous. He said applications were complicated, there were timeframe constraints, the level of complexity and the quantity of the projects have increased, but the amount of staff had not. He said the City needed to acquire some of the bed tax dollars to help with the needs.

Ms. Duncan said that having examples like what happened today would be beneficial and was a way to clarify the issues with those who felt they were trying to impose more rules. She said she felt people would follow the rules if they knew them.

Dr. Wingo said if they could explain why the rules were in place it would be more persuasive.

Ms. Lopez said at the previous Planning and Zoning Board (PZB) meeting, she had been tasked with a rewrite to simplify, minimize, and send most of it through staff instead of a Board which had been done and she was now receiving feedback.

Mr. MacDonald thanked the staff for all their hard work.

Ms. Courtney said she felt they were working with the permit team to provide them with the proper information pertaining to approving permits applications, but received the least amount of information and it was difficult to get all the details from the contractors. She said the quality of the permits was very important.

Mr. MacDonald stated the building inspector reviewed most of the plans and if he was aware of what was important to HARB, maybe he could pass it on.

Ms. Courtney said they review every application for the Historic Preservation (HP) Zoning districts and the HP staff had been clear about reviewing any applications that were in the National Register Historic Districts, and they had tried to communicate

with the permit staff. She said there were different opinions and understandings of partial demolition.

Ms. Skinner said that most everyone was knowledgeable of certain triggers, but applications had become more complex and complicated. She said changes were made in the field and there was one building inspector who was supposed to monitor all the projects; however, there were changes that could be made and they had identified areas that could be improved upon. She said they were hoping to get through their Mobility plan and a special meeting with PZB was coming up. She said they were tasked by the City Commission to complete Mobility, which was the priority, then they planned on readdressing the partial demolition plan. She said there were now timeframes on permits which if not answered within thirty days, they were assumed approved according to State legislation. She said the pressures were only mounting.

Mr. Benoit asked even with the pressure from the State, were moratoriums, although short term with evidence, still an option.

Ms. Lopez answered that moratoriums were not illegal, but they had to be for a specific purpose not just being 'overwhelmed'. She said there was a process, but it stopped growth generically, and that was not enough to withstand litigation. She said it had to be for a study and for a limited duration.

Ms. Duncan asked if the proposed demolition would limit the number of properties throughout the City that could be in a computer system that indicated which properties had to be viewed more closely.

Ms. Courtney said that was where they had stopped with the partial demolition language, but the Board thought should be limited to the contributing National Register Historic District properties, and in the case of 50 Carrera Street, that property was not contributing. She said there were also properties that were potentially contributing,

but not in a National Register Historic District, which could minimize the ability to achieve the designation later.

10. Other Business

(None)

11. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:10 P.M.²

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

Catherine Duncan, Chairperson

² Transcribed by Elyse Wiemann