

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

Historic Architectural Review Board Regular Meeting February 17, 2022

The Historic Architectural Review Board met in formal session at 1:00 P.M., Thursday, February 17, 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
Candice Seymour, Historic Preservation Planner
Amy Skinner, Planning and Building Director
Isabelle Lopez, City Attorney
Elyse Wiemann, Recording Secretary

2. General Public Comments for Items not on the Agenda

(None)

3. Approval of Minutes

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE the January 20, 2022, minutes with the above corrections. The motion was SECONDED by Dr. Wingo.

VOTE ON MOTION:

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

4. Modification and approval of Agenda

Ms. Duncan announced there was a request to change Item 8(b) and move it in between Item 6(a) and 7(a).

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE the modifications to the Agenda and make Item 8(b) to the first order of business on

new items. 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

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

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

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 take the following

actions for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 159 Cordova Street:

1. CONTINUE the application to allow the applicant time to clearly illustrate the proposed design with appropriate material and how it relates to the existing structure, provide documentation that construction of the wall would sustain potential flood waters, and consider additional guidance provided by HARB.

2. APPROVE the application if the board finds that it meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation 9 as a compatible contemporary design with the following conditions:

- a. Confirmation of full dimensions (height, width, and depth)
- b. Clearly stated material, design, and color

Joseph Repole provided a review of the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:

- Four-foot high wall would offer some flood protection
- In favor of having the opening at the front
- Simple materials would be better
- In favor of smooth stucco and perhaps a cut coquina cap or tapered designed cap
- Pre-cast piece shown was for a pier
- Concerned with the lack of a proper drawing as it was challenging to understand
- Unable to know exactly what wall would look like and what materials would be used
- Part of the history of the property was a coquina wall and four feet was a good compromise
- Existing wall was in backyard and wanted to expand it into the front
- Provided several options for materials: match the back yard or use a stucco coquina finish
- Wanted to have architectural detailing around top
- Was supported by a material already on property and had more of a rustic look
- Material was appropriate and felt it fit the style
- Stucco wall seemed a bit out of character
- Unsure if materials were accessible and poured coquina wall would be an expensive solution
- Could have stucco wall as there was a precedent in the neighborhood already
- Material should have been provided to Board
- Back wall would not be connected, and water could still invade the area
- Applicant wanted to construct wall as shown in the exact way with same thickness
- Wall would be straight without piers
- Wall would mitigate most of the water
- During storms could add hurricane barriers to protect home and not obstruct the view
- Smooth stucco with a cut coquina cap was on the street already and had set a precedent
- Problem was smooth stucco finish was not intrusive when it was lower; however, the higher it was the more it did not fit with the style of the home
- Coquina block fit the era even though it was not attractive
- Four-foot wall would have never been in the front of the home
- Anything in front of the home should be appropriate
- Adding a fence in front of the stucco would be a nod to the AGHP

- Could add plants to help soak up water then wall could be lowered with a fence in front
- Wall height would not protect applicant's home from hurricane

Mr. Benoit said there seemed to be Board consensus for a four-foot wall or lower with a picket fence in front.

Mr. Repole said he provided elevations which were from the City and the wall had been suggested to be between five or six feet high to protect the home from a hurricane. He said he felt he had already compromised as to what he wanted to be aligned with the Board.

Ms. Duncan stated for this type of home it should have a wooden fence to abide by the AGHP

Mr. Repole said he had left views open, conceded to the opening and flood barrier wall, and was open to any material, and asked for approval of four-foot wall with a fence in front. He said the finish was less of an issue but would do the stucco. He said this would allow him to follow the guidelines and protect his home.

Mr. Weaver said these were done on a case by case basis and wanted a drawing of what it would look like before construction. He said if staff were willing to review it, he would be in favor.

Mr. Benoit asked if the motion were detailed was staff comfortable with a drawing being submitted at the time of the building permit that showed elevations and footing details as required for the permit.

Mr. Weaver stated the standards were a prior application provided by Mr. Crichlow, which had been approved. He said it had to be specific and to staff's satisfaction; however, if not, it would return to the Board.

Ms. Seymour asked the Board to specify the material and type of wood fence was to be in front.

Mr. Weaver indicated the Board wanted it to be to the level of the previous application and needed to meet the guidelines. He said if the drawing were of that quality and met the guidelines then it was fine.

Ms. Seymour clarified the masonry wall behind would be four-foot-high, a smooth stucco finish without a cap with the picket fence in front.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE a masonry wall at 159 Cordova Street that would be four feet high, smooth stucco, will have a designed picket fence appropriately before it based on the architectural guidelines and the precedent based on the Crichlow project with a 74 inch opening on the front, and color would be white stucco color and white picket fence. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Benoit.

Mr. Benoit asked about the height of the picket fencing.

Ms. Duncan suggested having the top railing of the fence align with the masonry wall.

Mr. Weaver said it should be based off the prior approved application.

Mr. MacDonald said the picket fence should not be eight feet tall but should cover the masonry wall.

Dr. Wingo added the fencing should be appropriate to the era of the home.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Benoit, Wingo, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. Certificates of Appropriateness

7. (a) HP2022-0002 – Sisters of St. Joseph, Inc. – Applicant & Owner **34 Aviles Street (241 St. George Street)**

Mr. Benoit recused himself from the application.

To replace the new covered entry with an enclosed vestibule connecting the archive building, constructed c. 1940s, and Lourdes Hall, and to construct a storage closet on the east elevation of Lourdes Hall.

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 take the following actions for the Certificate of Appropriateness at 34 Aviles Street:

1. APPROVE if the HARB finds that the application meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation 9 because the proposed vestibule and storage space are of compatible mass, scale, design, and material to the existing buildings and that the proposed alterations will not have a negative impact on the historic streetscape.

Les Thomas provided a review of the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:

- Area was unable to be seen from the street and had no fenestration
- One of the removed windows would be relocated to the storage room
- Handicap ramp had to stay and would have cut across the windows

- Trim around building was in front of the vestibule and would agree to run across the storage room
- Concerned with the water coming off the roof leading to the ramp
- Would have a gutter system that tied into Lourdes Hall underground
- Ramp was directed to storage area with a continuous slope
- Mitigating factor was it was impacting a historic building
- In favor and thought design was compatible

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE Item HP 2022-0002, 34 Aviles Street for a construction of a breezeway between two building with the addition of the band on the left side of the breezeway. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Weaver, Wingo, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. (b) HP2022-0003– Cornelius Peter (a.k.a Bud) Dungan– Applicant **Cornelius Peter and Kimberly Kay Dungan– Owner** **174 Avenida Menendez**

To add a new door, canvas awning, decking, and iron railings, and return shutters to second-story windows above a one-story flat-roofed wing of the south elevation visible from Avenida Menendez and construct a new access-stair from the open porch below, to construct a new parking area with brick pavers and an adjacent wall with gate at the rear/west and replace and modify an existing masonry wall and wood gate on the Marine Street property line .

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 take the following actions for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 174 Avenida Menendez:

1. APPROVE the application with the following findings:

a. The proposed rear parking area and modifications of the existing wall / associated new walls and gates meet Secretary of the Interior Standard 9 as a compatible contemporary design.

b. The alterations to the south elevation of the building meet Secretary of the Interior Standards 9 and 10, because the access stair from the first-story patio, wrought-iron rail, and canvas awning are compatible contemporary additions, and if applicant indicates that the second story decking, rail and awning are reversible in nature; OR,

2. CONTINUE the application to allow the applicant to provide further detail and consider more compatible designs as recommended by the HARB

Bud Dungan and Les Thomas provided a review of the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi asked about the parking at the rear of the home and if the yellow curbing were removed would it affect the neighbors with the new parking space. She said if the yellow curb were removed it would allow more parking on an already narrowed street.

Mr. Dungan replied there was a flat wall across the street at his neighbors' home and they would not be obstructing the area.

Public hearing was closed.

Mr. Thomas pointed out there was not enough room to leave any cars on the street.

The Board discussed:

- Wanted to have a car screen but was unable to fit
- Unable to have two curb cuts on same side of the street and one was at the garage
- Was a nod to the Moorish architecture
- Wanted more examples of the Moorish revival buildings with these railings as it seemed plain
- Anything added to the residence would be removeable
- Post would be bolted in and railing would be attached to the post
- Roof was pitched and water would flow to the scupper which was underground that flowed on to Marine Street
- Decking would be wood and would not be seen from the exterior
- Perhaps awning could be pushed back off Avenida Menendez, but railing was fine
- Adding a French door on the south elevation improved the façade
- Partially removed wall that was added when the garage was built
- Home was built to have views of the Bay
- In favor of the simple rail system in order to not create a false sense of history
- Shutters would be on the two windows matching the awning
- Color of shutters would be same as awning either brown or hunter green
- Felt shutters on the home would be an improvement and would be made of wood
- Finish materials and colors would be any of the pre-approved colors unless Board indicated otherwise
- Style of shutters would be approved by staff
- Stairs under the deck would be wood and tiled treads
- Metal staircase would be more appropriate

- Could do stucco with tile and a wrought iron
- Material in new parking area would be brick

MOTION

Mr. Benoit **MOVED** to **APPROVE** application HP2022-0003 finding that the proposed awning and wrought iron materials do meet the Secretary of the Interiors Standard number nine, as compatible contemporary design for the existing house and ask that the applicant supply staff with material details for the shutters, and the railings as well as preapproved colors for the awning and the shutters. The motion was **SECONDED** by Mr. MacDonald.

Mr. MacDonald said the tile for the stairs needed to be approved.

Dr. Wingo said the tile should be appropriate and asked if the Board was approving the parking area and materials.

Mr. Benoit **AMENDED** the **MOTION** to include the parking area and the brick materials as submitted.

The **AMENDED MOTION** was **SECONDED** by Mr. MacDonald.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, MacDonald, Wingo, Weaver, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY¹

8. Certificate of Demolition and Partial Demolition

8. (a) HP2022-0001 – Enterprise Roofing – Applicant

Carlos and Tiffany Carrion Revocable Trust– Owner
23 Rohde Avenue

For partial demolition to remove the brick chimney on a building constructed ca. 1910-1917 that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and is contributing to the North City National Register Historic District.

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 may take the following actions for a Certificate of Demolition at 23 Rohde Avenue:

1. **APPROVE** for removal of the chimney due to its structural condition with the determination that it is not a character defining feature of the building and with the condition that the applicant salvage the brick if feasible; OR,

2. **CONTINUE** the application to allow the applicant time to determine the feasibility of restoring the chimney and/or provide a report from a licensed architect or engineer regarding its structural integrity because the chimney is a character-defining feature of the building

Carlos Carrion and Chris Felix provided a review of the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

20 certified notices were sent, 6 were returned in favor, 1 was returned opposed and 4 had comments.

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi stated that she hoped the decision would be based on facts before allowing removal the chimney. She said the home contributed to the North City Register District.

Public hearing was closed.

¹ Break from 3:04p.m.- 3:15p.m.

The Board discussed:

- Chimney was a character defining feature as they were not seen in new construction
- Board had previously approved removal if unable to be seen from the street
- Unsure of the accuracy of the cost it would take to fix the chimney
- Chimney was associated with an unused fireplace
- Photos showed the chimney was compromised
- Chimney had a lean but was stable
- In favor of repair unless deemed unsafe
- Could be repointed for less than quote provided
- Chimney was around eight to ten feet tall
- Felt that price on the removal was anecdotal information
- From testimony, chimney was not in eminent danger and could be repaired
- Restoration of home should include chimney
- Style of home was a simple vernacular
- Porch was made of coquina and chimney was significant
- Could support if hazardous, but if not should make a good faith effort to save
- Needed report from a structural engineer
- Provided a cost estimate for the repointing
- Could block the chimney on the inside with concrete and then have it repointed
- Felt there were other options to save the chimney

Mr. Weaver said the Board had three options for the application. He stated there was a consensus not to remove the chimney at this point; however, the application could be continued for Mr. Carrion to provide more documentation.

Mr. Benoit asked Mr. Carrion if he wanted to continue the application and provide the Board with more information or a denial in order to move forward with the reroofing and repoint the chimney when convenient.

Mr. Weaver said the Mr. Carrion could also withdraw the application because a denial was with prejudice and could be appealed to the City Commission.

Mr. Carrion said he would like to have an engineer come out and look at the chimney.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to CONTINUE to March 17, 2022 application HP 2022-0001, 23 Rohde Avenue for the partial demolition of a brick chimney. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, MacDonald, Wingo, Benoit, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. (b) HP2022-0004 – Donald G. Poling, Jr– Applicant & Owner 148 Cunningham Avenue

Heard after Item 6(a)

To demolish a residential building constructed ca. 1885-1894 that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and not located in a district.

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 Demolition at 148 Cunningham Avenue because it is not a local landmark or otherwise designated as a historic building; additionally, the Board may consider the following conditions:

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.

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.

Donald Poling provided a reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

Mr. Weaver disclosed ex parte communication during Board comments.

17 certified notices were sent, 4 were returned in favor, 0 were returned opposed and 1 had comments.

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi spoke in opposition to the application and knew the Board would be unable to prevent the demolition and felt it was due to neglect. She was concerned the City was changing and it was because of the neglect and thought St. Augustine would not be a historic City much longer.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Would be a difficult building to repair
- Building had structural integrity and did not see much compromise
- Seal beams shown to be in good shape
- Building had not fallen as windows were in line
- If it was in a district, the building could be contributing; however, it did not meet the threshold
- Condition should be to salvage any materials that could be saved
- Dr. John Vetter previously lived in the home
- Home was an important part of St. Augustine's connection to early tourism

- Not eligible as a local landmark
- Questioned how much of the salvageable material could be used

Mr. Benoit said most of the time the glass from the windows could be used. He said unless the window was to be taken from the building and put back in the same building the window could not be used.

Dr. Wingo said there were limitation when applicants were instructed to salvage materials. She felt the City should have information on the website to help the applicants know what to do with it.

Discussion continued:

- Wood looked to be in good shape for reuse
- Most wood was destroyed by termite damage
- Able to salvage 1922 cast iron tub
- Wanted to use salvageable materials to build shed on the property
- Property had not been painted or used for the past forty years

Ms. Duncan asked if the applicant could provide drawings and photos of the property because it was an important part of history for St. Augustine.

Ms. Courtney stated that could be added by the Board.

Mr. Weaver requested a comprehensive interior and exterior photographs, floor plan, all elevations and any other details.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE Item 8(b) HP2022-0004, 148 Cunningham Avenue based on the staff report that the building was not able to be a local or national register landmark or a local or register district, and conditions outlined in the staff report, salvage historic materials, and limit the time the lot was

vacant, and submit the demolition permit application and building permit application for replacement structure simultaneously, and based on the standards the building be photographed and measure drawings of the interior and exterior be prepared before the it was demolished The motion was **SECONDED** by Dr. Wingo.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Wingo, Benoit, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

9. Certificate of Appropriateness for a Historic Preservation Ad Valorem Tax Exemption

9. (a) HP2022-0005 – Herrick A. & Debra H. Smith – Applicant & Owner
22 Grove Avenue

To review Parts I and II of a Historic Preservation Ad Valorem Tax Exemption application for a building constructed ca. 1894-1899, that is listed on the Florida Master Site File, faces Historic Preservation Zoning District 5, and is contributing to the North City National Register Historic District.

Mr. Weaver wanted to disclose the applicant was a colleague of his wife and he was able to be unbiased as this would not affect his judgement.

Ms. Courtney read the staff report and said based on a review of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds the board can **APPROVE** a **CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS** for the Historic Preservation Ad Valorem Tax Exemption at 22 Grove Avenue if the HARB finds:

1. The property is listed as contributing to the North City National Register Historic District

2. The proposed scope of work to the exterior and interior complies or is generally

consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, with possible exception of the expanded paver driveway

3. The proposed work meets the criteria established by the Department of State (see #4 of attachments).

Herrick Smith provided a review of the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi pointed out they had not started the rehab on the project and since they were in favor of keeping the chimney on a previous application would they be keeping their chimney in order to stay in line with the Ad Valorem Tax Exemption. She asked if there was a time period that the renovations had to be done to be in to qualify for the tax exemption.

Ms. Courtney stated she did not believe there was a time limit. She said the Board heard part three in the fall of 2020 for 127 Oneida Street and the original Certificate of Appropriateness was heard in 2013. She said the third part of the application had to be complete before being heard by the City Commission for approval.

Mr. Smith clarified he did not take a position on a previous application either for or against.

Ms. Duncan asked if he had planned to keep the chimney on the home.

Mr. Smith responded in the affirmative.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Early photos showed the porch could integrate or isolate who lives in the home

- Unclear of what era the home would be in; however, liked the plan proposed
- Suggested to keep the interior intact as much as possible
- Relocation of the kitchen was to help diminish the street noise as traffic was increasing
- Moving of the kitchen was not historic to the property
- For the tax credit, the interior was important as well
- Interior molding, trim and doors would be reused in the home
- Historically, would need to have smaller rooms
- Sketch of the proposed interior had been provided
- Would be keeping most of the walls in the home
- Documentation was very detailed
- Enclosure of the porch had history, but opening did as well
- Minimum alterations to the interior were acceptable
- Consensus that building would qualify as a contributing structure
- Scope of work was in line with what the Board would expect repair, reuse, and work within the guidelines
- PV solar panels lasted thirty years and the roof would need to last the same amount of time
- Wanted to be transparent about the solar panels and were nearly invisible from the street
- Would have to change to a rib roof to use the solar panels
- Felt panels would not qualify under the Secretary of the Interiors standards
- Would be a ten-year covenant but could afterwards, but not appropriate
- Not obligated to restore the original roof due to changes happening over time
- Porch windows had been there for a long time, applicant provided documentation showing the opening
- Was not the function of the kitchen, but more so the plan

- More concerned with the removal of the wall

Ms. Lopez cautioned the Board from limiting the use of solar panels. She said State Statute Chapter 163.04 specifically prohibits any adoptable ordinance which limits or prohibits the installation of solar panels or other energy devices based on renewable resources. She said the Board could point out the non-historic nature of the panels; however, advised the Board not to deny based on the solar panels as they were preempted.

Mr. Weaver felt this did not meet the Secretary of the Interiors Standards and since they were asking for an incentive it should meet the guidelines, but it did not.

Dr. Wingo explained the State Law would preempt whatever the City of St. Augustine had said were the guidelines of the tax exemption; therefore, the Board could suggest different placement to keep within the historic character of the building.

Mr. Weaver said he understood it was a regulatory measure but this was an incentive and if the guideline stated this was not allowed, that would not prohibit him from having the solar panel, but the Board would not incentive it.

Ms. Courtney said on historic homes solar panels were not the norm; however, on page eight of the staff report it had the Secretary of the Interiors Standards regarding energy efficiently accessibility considerations which says "*although this work was quite often an important aspect to a rehabilitation project it usually was not part of the overall process of protecting or character defining features rather such work was assessed for its potential negative impact on the buildings historic character, for this reason particular care must be taken not to radically change, obscure, damage or destroy character defining materials or features in the process of meeting code and energy requirements*". She said at the least the scope of work for

the Ad Valorem Tax Exemption did not include the expense of the solar panels.

The Discussion continued:

- Solar panels could be removed
- No issue with it, but should be consistent
- Location of panels seemed to be placed appropriately
- Felt the roof material was incorrect
- North elevation (back) had eight-inch novelty siding added in the 1970's
- Original building was siding, and stone/shell block was added to the front as a façade
- Florida Master Site file showed a remodel from the 1920's
- Unable to find evidence of the porch not being an original feature
- Some of the red brick piers were stucco, only stucco on the building
- Asphalt shingles were not original to the home, thought original would have been wooden shakes
- Would not favor having an asphalt shingle on the roof but would be open to a metal roof
- Proposed using a master rib or union roofing
- Proposed metal roof would fit the spirit of the home
- Windows from front porch would be used on the back porch

The Board discussed the roof and the material type. There was Board consensus that the material on the roof was grandfathered in and could be used.

There was Board consensus regarding the justification of leaving the porch open, there was a legal basis for the solar panels, and applicant had a right move forward with the design.

Mr. Weaver said the pavers had not been discussed; however, could be negotiated. He said he and Dr. Wingo felt a major concern with the removal of the wall in order to create a modern open kitchen.

Discussion continued:

- Instead of removing entire wall could have a cased opening
- Could do a partial wall as a compromise
- Would need a support beam if removed the wall but would add the same casings and moldings

Mr. Benoit said the floor plan showed the wall being removed between the living room and kitchen completely. He said the Board was asking him to leave enough starter wall or wing wall that read like a cased opening instead of being completely open. He said the mill work could be used around the cased opening; the picture molding would be retained in the living room. He said the kitchen could be discussed with the applicant but if the cased opening were there it would reference the wall and keep the integrity of the ceiling and mill work.

Discussion continued:

- Pavers throughout the property leading towards the carriage house made it feel more modern
- Solution would be to keep concrete ribbons and could have pavers in the back
- Ribbons added a lot from the streetscape and compatible
- Should keep the ribbons as a driving path without the pavers
- Back area could have pavers with a smooth finish
- Ribbons were made of concrete and went back to the carriage house and could be repaired
- If replaced with shell-crete needed to be six inches thick in order to not break
- Could be administratively approved with like-for-like material

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE application HP2022-0005 finding that the property was eligible for the City's Tax Ad

Valorem Tax credit program with the following on the exterior of the building from the top moving down, that the Board identified the most compatible roof material to be the material that matches the current front porch roof material, finding that the rest of the exterior improvements were repair and replace in kind, including the driveway which shall remain in its current form but would be replaced with new concrete to match, and the existing chimney would remain as part of the application, on the inside the Board added the condition that the wall that currently separates the living room and the front bedroom be maintained in part with the access between the living room and the proposed kitchen be through a cased opening wider than the door that was there now but with a head height that matches the other openings inside the house such that the picture molding in the living room is retained. The motion was **SECONDED** by Mr. Weaver.

Mr. Weaver said the other two items that needed to be added were they would allow the opening of the porch and the removal of the existing windows and would allow the solar panels as designed.

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to add Mr. Weavers comments to the motion. Mr. Weaver seconded the AMENDED MOTION.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Weaver, 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 Architectural Guidelines for Historic Preservation (AGHP) update phase I draft

Ms. Courtney provided a brief update regarding the AGHP update for phase one and said the consulting team received the information from the Board last spring of 2021 and provided a draft to staff in October/November that has been under discussion. She said they had received grants to update three National Register Historic Districts and National Historic Landmark nominations. She said they were discussing with the State regarding changes to those updates, and hoped to provide a draft in April, and a consultant would be able to attend to have the Boards feedback.

Mr. MacDonald asked if Mr. King wanted to protect his home and volunteered for it to be local historic landmark, at 2 Tremerton Place, could be possible.

Mr. Weaver pointed out the home was not in a historic district.

Mr. MacDoanld said it was similar to the home that was on Davis Shores. He said he wanted the home to have some level of protection.

Mr. Weaver said if in the district could be certified as a historic structure and then he could have a substantial deduction for the charitable contribution.

Ms. Lopez said Florida Statutes provides for conservation easements that provided ad valorem tax exemptions, and it would include ecology, archeology, and historic preservation which would be another option for Mr. King. She said he would have to add a conservation easement on the property.

The Board continued their discussion about Mr. King's property being reviewed as a local landmark.

Mr. MacDonald said Mr. King was ready to start the process and was not concerned with the tax break.

Ms. Lopez said no Board member was able to present an application to the Board they sit on but if Mr. King was interested, he was able to write a letter asking HARB to consider his property for a local landmark. She said once the letter was complete then HARB could direct staff to start the process. She advised the Board if time was of the essences, they were allowed to instruct staff to move forward with noticing the hearing.

There was unanimous consensus to move forward with the noticing of hearing for Mr. King's property to be reviewed for local landmark status.

12. Adjournment

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



Catherine Duncan, Chairperson

² Transcribed by Elyse Wiemann