

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

Historic Architectural Review Board Regular Meeting March 17, 2022

The Historic Architectural Review Board met in formal session at 1:00 P.M., Thursday, March 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
Barbara Wingo

Absent: Paul Weaver, III, excused

City Staff:

Julie Courtney, Historic Preservation Officer
Candice Seymour, Historic Preservation Planner
Isabelle Lopez, City Attorney
Elyse Wiemann, Recording Secretary

2. General Public Comments for Items not on the Agenda

Heard after Item 3

BJ Kalaidi
Gene Hand

3. Approval of Minutes

Dr. Wingo noted a few minor edits and stated on page two and three it should be precedent instead of precedence.

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE the February 17, 2022, minutes with the requested corrections. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

VOTE ON MOTION:

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

4. Modification and approval of Agenda

Ms. Duncan announced Item 6a HP 2022-0001, 23 Rhode Avenue and Item 8(a) HP 2022-0013, 158 Blanco Street had been withdrawn by the applicants. She clarified Items 7(a), (b) and (c) would be presented simultaneously. She noted Item 8(c) HP 2022-0008, 74 Saragossa Street requested a continuance as they did not have enough time to submit all documents requested by staff.

Ms. Lopez advised the Board that a motion for Item 8(c) was needed since they had requested a continuance.

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE the modifications to the Agenda to include the continuance for application HP 2022-0008. The motion was SECONDED by Dr. Wingo.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: 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 (a) HP2022-0001 Continued from February 17, 2022 ~~WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT~~– Enterprise Roofing– Applicant Carlos and Tiffany Carrion Revocable Trust — Owner 23 Rohde Avenue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.

7. Certificates of Appropriateness

7. (a) HP2022-0010– A to Z Custom Homes Inc.– Applicant Pirate Haven LLC– Owner 118 Avenida Menendez

To replace existing cedar shake roof with composite cedar shakes.

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 118 Avenida Menendez:

1. APPROVE the application if the board finds that the proposed composite roof shingles are a compatible replacement material because they match the original roof material in size, shape, color, and texture and meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation 6 for repair or replacement of deteriorated or missing architectural features based on historic evidence; or,

2. CONTINUE the application to allow the applicant time to submit a more appropriate material.

3. DENY the application because the composite material shingles are not appropriate for the style of the building or the district because they do not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation 2, for retention of distinguishing architectural character and 6 for repair or replacement of deteriorated or missing architectural features based on historic evidence

Charles McHone, A to Z Roofing and Waterproofing, reviewed the applications.

Ex parte communication was provided during individual Board discussion.

Public hearing was opened.

Gene Hand, Eco Star, spoke in favor of the application and provided samples of the different materials that could be used at the different properties.

Tim Steel, representative of the Columbia restaurant, spoke in favor of the application and said they also needed to replace the shingles there. He encouraged the Board to be open-minded about the other products available as they would last longer and were similar to cedar shingles.

Charles Pappas spoke in opposition to the applications as these were prominent buildings. He said he understood the insurance issue; however, as long as the roof was watertight underneath it should be fine. He asked the Board to thoroughly examine the applications regarding the cedar shakes.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Town had financial success by keeping the Colonial style in the historic district

- AGHP guidelines should be followed: replace wood for wood in Historic Preservation (HP) Districts One, Two, or Three
- Twenty-four-inch shakes would assist with insurance
- First two applications should retain a wooden roof
- Last application was framed vernacular and questioned if a metal roof would be a viable option being in HP district
- Framed vernacular and masonry vernacular with a pitched roof could use the pre-approved roofing materials such as galvanized steel 5-Vcrimp and unpainted metal
- 28 Cadiz Street, roof could be changed if approved by HARB
- If changed from diamond shape shingle to metal roof, would require compliance with the AGHP guidelines
- On Cadiz Street an asphalt match was hard to find and slate composite was compatible, kept the same color, retained the architecture, and was an appropriate alternative material
- Wood shake material aged differently than composite
- Would be similar at installation but over time wooden shakes would change
- Cost was a burden but benefited from keeping within the historic nature of the area
- Should provide substantial evidence if insurance companies were no longer insuring wooden roofs
- Should retain best practices as some wooden roofs lasted longer than others
- Thought Bayfront would change if the proposed composite shake was approved
- Synthetic material was not appropriate substitute for the wooden shakes in the historic districts, but was appropriate for the asbestos shingle
- Providing information of where to purchase materials would be beneficial and help to not sway from guidelines
- Cedar shakes appreciated overtime, whereas most materials depreciate

- Not in favor of the synthetic shake for the first two applications
- Anecdotal information regarding insurance; should provide a letter as proof
- Favored the synthetic for the Cadiz building
- Questioned having a black roof in Florida and felt the diamond shape was better than a metal roof
- Black color seemed to be harsh for the heat absorption; suggested lighter grey as historically there were no black roofs

Mr. Hand noted any color could be provided; however, the standard colors were more cost effective.

Discussion Continued:

- The Federal Grey would replicate closer than the existing asbestos shingles
- Applicant could provide samples of the diamond shape shingles in any color for Staff
- Colors would vary under different lighting

Ms. Seymour provided the Board with the current asbestos shingle that was on the roof for comparison.

Ms. Duncan reiterated there were three applications before the Board 7 (a), (b), and (c) and if anyone wanted to speak now was the time.

Mr. McHone thanked the Board and said the cedar materials used were from a distributor from up north which were twenty-four-inch heavies. He said they completed thirty-one cedar roofs in St. Augustine since the hurricanes and used the twenty-four-inch heavy cedar shingle with the cedar breather and felt between the layers. He said they would use this for the replacement, the life expectancy was between twenty to twenty-five years, and he would provide the materials to staff for reference if anyone else needed the information.

Mr. MacDonald stated the asbestos shingle was very dark; however, he agreed with a lighter color as it would be better for the environment.

Mr. McHone said he would provide different color samples, put them on the roof, and resubmit, as the colors in the daylight were completely different.

Mr. MacDonald asked if that could be done with staff or would the applicant need to come back for HARB approval.

Ms. Duncan stated that could be done by staff as they knew what the Board was looking for.

Public Comment was closed.

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to DENY application HP2022-0010 at 118 Avenida Menendez finding that the proposed composite shingle does not meet the Secretary of the Interiors Standards for replacement materials. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, MacDonald, Wingo, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. (b) HP2022-0011– A to Z Custom Homes Inc– Applicant Historic Fraser Properties LLC– Owner 5 Spanish Street

Item heard under 7(a).

To replace existing cedar shake roof with composite cedar shakes.

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 5 Spanish Street:

1. APPROVE the application if the board finds that the proposed composite roof shingles are a compatible replacement material because they match the original roof material in size, shape, color, and texture and meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation 6 for repair or replacement of deteriorated or missing architectural features based on historic evidence; or,

2. CONTINUE the application to allow the applicant time to submit a more appropriate material.

3. DENY the application because the composite material shingles are not appropriate for the style of the building or the district because they do not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation 2, for retention of distinguishing architectural character and 6 for repair or replacement of deteriorated or missing architectural features based on historic evidence.

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to DENY application HP2022-0011 at 5 Spanish Street finding that the composite shingle was not a compatible replacement material for the wood shake shingle on the building. The motion was SECONDED by Dr. Wingo.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Wingo, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. (c) HP2022-0012– A to Z Custom Homes Inc– Applicant
National Society of Colonial Dames – Owner
28 Cadiz Street

Item heard under 7(a).

To replace asbestos roof shingles with composite slate shingles.

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 28 Cadiz Street:

1. APPROVE the application if the board finds that the proposed composite roof shingles are a compatible replacement material because they match the original roof material in size, shape, color, and texture and meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation 6 for repair or replacement of deteriorated or missing architectural features based on historic evidence; or,
2. CONTINUE the application to allow the applicant time to submit a more appropriate material.
3. DENY the application because the composite material shingles are not appropriate for the style of the building or the district because they do not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation 2, for retention of distinguishing architectural character and 6 for repair or replacement of deteriorated or missing architectural features based on historic evidence.

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE application HP2022-0012 finding that the diamond shaped composite slate type shingle was a good replacement for the diamond pattern asbestos shingle on the

building currently with the condition that the applicant work with staff to finalize the color. The motion was SECONDED by Dr. Wingo.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Wingo, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. (d) HP2022-0009– Len Weeks Construction Design Development– Applicant
St. Augustine Art Association Owner
22 Marine Street

To replace exterior divided-lite French doors with aluminum-clad impact-resistant doors styled to match existing exterior wood doors and to install metal roll-down hurricane shutters on courtyard windows.

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 22 Marine Street:

1. APPROVE the application if the board finds the proposed replacement doors meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation (SOIS) 9 as a compatible contemporary design and material, and that the screen hurricane window coverings (the second option provided by the applicant) meet the SOIS 2, having the least impact on the overall design of the windows interior to the courtyard; or,
2. CONTINUE all or part of the application to allow the applicant time to consider more compatible and appropriate options for the replacement doors and/or the proposed hurricane shutters/screens.

Shafer Weeks reviewed the application.

The Board provided their ex parte communication.

Public hearing was opened.

Diane Brady spoke in favor of the application and said the doors were unable to be seen from the street and the materials resembled wood and the majority of the door was glass. She said there was a lot of deterioration being close to the Bayfront, but she wanted to protect the building. The roll down type hurricane shutter were the best option as the volunteers who run the Art Association were unable to get on ladders.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- This was a noncontributing building in the Historic District
- Being a noncontributing building the Kolbe and Kolbe aluminum clad and other details matched the wooden French door
- It was a reasonable replacement for the wood doors
- Rest of the building was not impact rated but wanted to install roll down shutters
- Roll down shutters were too large in front of the window
- Use of a soffit below the eave of the roof would be intrusive and odd to have a box in front of each window
- Fabric was the best viable option, would prevent water from entering the building, would not be visible most of the year, be less intrusive and easy to install
- Questioned ability to install roll down shutters on the inside, or from the bottom up, to be disguised as a window box
- Space on inside was not wide enough because they were hallways
- If installed below the window the tracts would be seen on the sides
- They would stucco the boxes since building was stucco, and paint it the same color

- Could mount at the top with a wooden valance and build something to encompass the arched window
- Door on Charlotte Street should be wooden; however, doors in courtyard could be aluminum
- Doors were not in good shape and needed to be replaced
- Felt long term solution would be to replace with impact rated doors

Mr. Weeks stated they wanted to do the aluminum clad on the front since it was a noncontributing building and those doors were tucked away, and he would agree to replacing the back door with wood as it was more visible. He said they would agree to the fabric screens; however, if they were able to come up with a creative solution to conceal the roll down shutter then they would return to HARB.

Mr. MacDonald clarified the Board agreed to the aluminum clad doors in the entry/courtyard and a wooden door on Charlotte Street, and the impact rating was at the applicant's discretion. He said they would approve the mylar screen system for the windows as that would be appropriate for the three arches.

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE application HP2022-0009, 22 Marine Street for the installation or replacement of two double doors in Kolbe wood with aluminum covering in the foyer with a Kolbe wood door on the Charlotte Street side the single door and all opening protections to be done with the mylar screens and pins. The motion was SECONDED by Dr. Wingo.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Wingo, Benoit, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. (e) HP2022-0015– Len Weeks
Construction Design Development –
Applicant
Claude L. Weeks, Jr. – Owner
58 Hypolita Street

To enclose an existing covered porch area on the north-east corner with stucco walls and install a wood window on the Spanish Street elevation with finishes and materials to match the existing building.

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 the application Certificate of Appropriateness at 58 Hypolita Street if the board finds the proposed design meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards 9 as a compatible contemporary design, with the following condition:

1. The proposed new window will be wood with exterior muntins that have a raised profile.

Len Weeks reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:

- This was a minimal request and did not see an issue with it
- It would be a custom wood window to match the space
- Compatible way to solve utility issues
- Would stucco the outside to match existing exterior
- Would have around one foot and a half for landscaping

- Could waterproof up to about ten feet high to help floodproof the building
- Could enter storage from the outside not associated with the location

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE application HP2022-0015 finding that the enclosing of the rear open area was compatible addition to the existing building. The motion was SECONDED by Dr. Wingo.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Wingo, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY¹

7. (f) HP2022-0014– Michelle D. Ruby,
Luckie Street Enterprises– Applicant &
Owner
308 St. George Street

To construct a one-story attached addition and a detached two-story building at the rear of the existing residential building; to renovate the existing residence including window, door, and roof replacement, changes to fenestration and removal of exterior walls on north and west elevations for additions; and site modifications to include addition of in-ground pool, paved patio and rear driveway, wood deck, lighting, landscaping, and a wood picket fence along the front elevation.

Ms. Courtney read the staff report and said based on a review of the AGHP, and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds that the board can take the following actions relating to a CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS at 308 St. George Street:

1. APPROVE if the applicant satisfactorily provides confirmation on the outstanding

¹ Break from 2:34p.m. - 2:40p.m.

design details listed above and the board finds that the COA plans are compatible with the AGHP with the following conditions:

a. That all proposed building and site elements will be in materials compatible with the AGHP

2. CONTINUE with a finding that the overall design is not compatible with the AGHP or more details about the proposed design need to be confirmed by the applicant and to allow time for these outstanding issues to be resolved.

Loyda Whitney and Bill Knight reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

Public hearing was opened.

Robert Plum spoke in favor of the application and said it was important for the backyard to have a good appearance from Lake Maria Sanchez.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Architecture was respectful to the bungalow scale and compatible
- Similar material patterns to help carry the bungalow theme
- Siding could be differentiated from old versus new
- Two-story garage invoked the bungalow traits and was semi-detached which helped manage the scale of the additional square footage
- Thought it met the AGHP guidelines; however, the materials should be addressed
- Proposed windows were not a bungalow window lite pattern

- Detached building had a vertical feel unlike a bungalow feel which had heavier elements
- Difficult to obtain bungalow feel with small footprint
- Garage was twelve inches above grade
- French doors were on garage provided a different look; however, they were not appropriate
- View from Lake Maria Sanchez was a garage door with a balcony above it
- Roof did not have the feel of a bungalow
- The secondary building at eleven feet was tall and the roof should be brought down
- Trying to keep the same pitch as the main house but reducing the height would reduce the square footage
- Nine feet was high but could be brought down with a slopped roof in the interior which would align with a bungalow style
- Nine lite French doors were the norm but could be more compatible with a six lite; however, the four lite was the issue
- Existing front door was solid wood and applicant tried to replicate the pattern in glass
- Application did not match previously approved Opinion of Appropriateness (OOA)

Ms. Courtney advised there were photos of the OOA in the packets for Board review.

Board Discussion:

- The OOA and the COA were completely different
- Favored continuing the application until all staff questions were answered
- There were more items added since the OOA
- Rely on the guidelines for selections and support
- An addition can be different but should be complementary

Ms. Whitney asked if the two-story component was the main concern. She said all the concerns mentioned at the last

meeting had been discussed such as the hardware, windows, and the siding which had been retained. She said regarding the windows, there was a Kolbe specification in the packet which matched the bungalow.

Discussion Continued:

- Several concerns existed as the OOA was different from what was in front of the Board
- Concerned with the size and scale of the garage
- Should be more focused on the details at the meeting instead of the design
- If garage slab were low should be able to lower the ceiling heights
- Keep garage lower with no ramp in front and wetproof it
- Floor of garage was at road level (4.8)
- Grading effort the Board went through was to encourage owners to leave the garage down to avoid grading up and building ramps
- Right elevations had two roof lines in a valley which could cause water intrusion; however, this was an existing condition
- Main house was closer to previous discussion, but garage was not
- French door with panel at the bottom was appropriate type of door for the single and double doors
- Should be mindful that the back of the home could be viewed from the lake
- Rear of main house had several sets of doors that faced out
- Favored the doors in the rear as it was a modern interpretation and the front of the bungalow was compatible from St. George Street
- All doors should be full glass and perhaps have a new wooden siding pattern
- Not in favor of Hardie in the Historic District
- Roof was proposed as a grey painted roof, but guidelines specified mill finished galvalume
- Agreed to the mill finished galvalume roof and the preapproved bungalow colors
- All new windows for the interior and exterior were wooden and old windows were not being replaced
- Could to keep existing windows in the existing place but unable to reuse in other locations
- Proposed light fixtures were lanterns with a copper finish which came in various sizes but not the bungalow style
- Could confirm lighting at next meeting with the garage and landscaping
- Would comply with wood siding and wooden windows

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE a partial approval for application HP2022-0014 at 308 St. George Street, MOTION to DENY the application relative to the two-story detached the garage, pool and site improvements but would APPROVE the application as it relates to the main house and the proposed addition to the main house with the following conditions: would have galvalume mill finish five feet crimp roof, all new windows would be wood windows per the drawings, doors at the rear would be full light doors with no mullions, front door to remain with the existing hardware per the application, new front door will have lights to match in scale the to the existing front door with a light below and or panel below (half-light) and the wood siding proposed at the rear would be wooden with a different siding such as novelty siding. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

Mr. MacDonald asked if it could be shingles instead of novelty siding.

Ms. Duncan stated shingles would be a nice way to break it up.

Mr. MacDonald asked if it was a denial or a continuance for the items that were not being approved.

Mr. Benoit AMENDED the MOTION to be a continuance for the two-story detached garage, pool and site improvements. The AMENDED MOTION was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, MacDonald, Wingo, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. Certificate of Demolition and Partial Demolition

8. (a) HP2022-0013 ~~WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT~~– St. Johns County Hurricane Housing Recovery Program– Applicant Margaret Hankerson– Owner 158 Blanco Street

To demolish a building constructed ca.1885-1899 that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and is a contributing structure to the Lincolnville National Register Historic District.

8. (b) HP2022-0016– Matthew and Kimberly Harrod– Applicant & Owner 40 Water Street

Mr. Benoit recused himself.²

To partially demolish a residential building constructed c. 1906 that is recorded in the Florida Master Site file and is a contributing structure to the Abbott Tract National Register Historic District, for work related to a building elevation and rehabilitation including the removal of the front, side, and enclosed rear porches, upper deck one-story north wing, portions of exterior wood and all cedar shake siding, changes to fenestration, and removal or replacement of certain doors and windows.

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 Demolition at 40 Water 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 or economic hardship information, if the HARB determines that the proposed demolition exceeds the threshold of a partial demolition.

Les Thomas, Kimberly Harrod and Michael Harrod reviewed the application.

Mr. MacDonald provided ex parte communication during Board discussion.

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

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi questioned if after the partial demolition was completed, would it be a contributing structure within the Abbott Tract National Register Historic district.

Public hearing was closed.

² Recusal form attached to original minutes

The Board discussed:

- Reviewed by Board since it was considered a partial demolition
- No concerns with the side porch additions in rear of home which were recent and unfinished
- Front porch with the bay window was reviewed by Planning and Zoning Board (PZB) which made the porch unfunctional, but needed to be finished
- Streetscape would not be impacted
- Porch would be expanded by three feet and the stairs would be twelve feet from the street
- Shingles were deteriorating on the home
- Plan would make the home a good functioning house
- Supported the application
- Board did not have purview over making sure a building would be a contributing structure
- A lot of the home was being demolished
- Most areas to be demoed were additions over the years and were not contributing to the structure
- Board had no purview; however, the wood siding being removed was significant
- Additions and raising the home were being completed nicely and added to the integrity of the home
- Integrity of the home would be lost if siding were removed
- Would deny based on the removal of shingles if not replaced
- Siding was part of the integrity, but applicants were keeping a lot of the important elements
- If the shingles changed the home, it would never look the same
- If applicant agreed in 'good faith' to replace siding with shingles, would favor supporting the application

Ms. Harrod said they would look into the cedar shingles; however, they were wanting to have longevity and something that would not be damaged. She said when they purchased the home there was extensive

damage and they had insurance issues and the main concern was the siding. She said everything they were doing was to help improve the home.

Discussion continued:

- Real cedar shingles would add value and beauty to the home
- Added porches would help protect the shingles since they had overhangs
- Board was unable to condition the application but asked if applicant would agree to cedar shingles
- Suggested Cedar Valley Shingles which would be beneficial, last longer, they were cedar shakes, and easier to install
- Chimney was nonfunctional and removed when the roof was replaced
- Possible Board approval after-the-fact for removal of the chimney
- Additions to the structure should not change as a contributing structure if appropriate to the house
- Board agreed with the change in the streetscape

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE application HP2022-0016, 40 Water Street as per the plans with the condition that the cedar shakes would be replaced with a wood cedar shake or cedar shake wood system. The motion was SECONDED by Dr. Wingo.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Wingo, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**8. (c) HP2022-0008 Previously 8(a):
Incomplete Application at time of
printing– Michael Silverio Sr., Shotgun
Saragossa LLC– Applicant & Owner
74 Saragossa Street**

Motion under Item 4.

To demolish a building constructed ca.1904-1910 that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and is an altered but contributing structure to the Model Land Company National Register Historic District.

9. Consideration for Local Historic Landmark Status

9. (a) HP2022-0017– Caleb J. King – Owner
2 Tremerton Place

To evaluate for designation as a Local Historical Landmark using criteria and standards established by the National Register of Historic Places substituting importance to the city and state levels rather than the nation as a whole for a residential building constructed c. 1917 – 1924 that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File but not located in a district.

Ms. Courtney read the staff report and said Based on a review of the AGHP and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds that the board can take the following actions related to a Local Historic Landmark designation for 22 Tremerton Place:

1. Designate the main house building as a Local Historic Landmark if the HARB finds the building has the integrity and significance to warrant local landmark designation based on the following:

a. Architectural significance
b. Possible archaeological significance (there is a possibility of the property yielding information important to history (archaeological significance)).

2. Continue the consideration if the board finds more information is needed for designation as a local landmark

Leslee Keys, representative for Caleb King, reviewed the application and was available for questions.

Ms. Duncan asked if the home had issues with flooding or would it need to be raised. Mr. Mac Donald stated the finished floor of the home was around ten and a half feet. He said at this time it did not but might need to be in the future.

Ms. Keys said it could be lifted if needed as it was part of the new standards by the National Parks Service.

The Board discussed:

- Noncontributing and contributing criteria had a subjective nature to them
- Since it was a local landmark, the Board had more flexibility
- National Park Standards were almost the same since implemented
- Knew the contractor/builder, but questioned if other information could be provided, would continue to research the contractor
- Coquina bricks were only in three locations and were significant to the home and made the home fairly architecturally significant
- North City Stonework produced north city blocks and was in business in 1924/1925
- Stone bricks were from St. Augustine Stone Works and Building Supplies in business 1927-1930
- Pleased the owner wanted property to be a local landmark for the City
- Questioned why the building was not a local landmark and why did the City not have more since it was a way to protect them

Ms. Courtney replied these considerations were brought to the Board's attention when there was a demolition or if an Ad Valorem Tax Exemption was desired. She said not being in a Historic District, a National Register District, or contributing to a district would be a reason to become a local landmark. She said there were only four, and the Board might want to consider more but would be talking about this more regarding the legislation.

Dr. Wingo advised the need for being consistent with following the criteria set forth. She asked if the State were to preempt the whole area.

Ms. Lopez stated the Bill had been passed and would provide a briefing at the next meeting. She said this was regarding residential only and would require the property owners' approval or consent.

Ms. Keys stated financial incentives were beneficial, and in return, the owner gave up some development rights, but it would lower the tax burden, which would pass to subsequent owners.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

13 certified notices were sent, 3 were returned in favor, 0 were returned opposed and 2 had comments.

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

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE application HP2022-0017 local landmark status for 2 Tremerton Place finding that it meets the Secretary of the Interiors Standards for architectural threshold and significance, a quintessential example of the bungalow style with unique materials to St. Augustine incorporated into that style. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Duncan.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Duncan, Wingo, MacDonald

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. Duncan announced this would be Dr. Wingo's last meeting and thanked her for all her dedication, time, and support.

Ms. Courtney noted Dr. Wingo was appointed in February 2016 for her first full term and had served six years. She said that was a lot of work and thanked her for all her hard work and for being willing to continue serving as an alternate. She said Mr. Weaver sent his thanks as well.

Dr. Wingo thanked Ms. Courtney and said she enjoyed all the policy issues that had been discussed over the years.

Mr. MacDonald asked about the St. George Street application.

Ms. Courtney said the application was on-going; however, they had secured Sarah Ryan Architect's services who was trying to resolve it. She said the applicant understood he may have to return to HARB.

Ms. Courtney noted 215 St. George Street was approved November 18, 2021, by HARB for a coating to be applied to Trinity Church with the condition to apply a sample and have staff review it before the church was coated. She received an email from the contractor about the sample being ready and went to look at it and an entire wall had been coated with one coat. She was concerned with the direction the Board wanted, to go as there was an application that had been approved based on a sample from the meeting.

Mr. MacDonald asked how it looked.

Ms. Courtney said her concern was it looked like a grey paint. She said according to an email from the applicant he had coated the entire building and had determined how to finish it in accordance with the sample.

Ms. Duncan said she felt the project should be stopped as it was not as the Board approved, and the Board needed to review it before moving forward.

Ms. Courtney said the permit had come in either Tuesday or Wednesday and once the permit was issued then work would begin. She said there had been a stop work order issued after speaking with the building official and code enforcement.

Mr. MacDonald suggested stopped and not adding a second coat, then reconvening.

Ms. Keys said there was a National Park certified coating which would meet the Secretary of the Interiors Standards as a coating and was breathable.

Ms. Duncan stated the material was good quality, but the building was different as it had a shell finish. She said the idea was to have a clear coat as they were having water intrusion.

Ms. Lopez advised to conclude the discussion as this was not the Code Enforcement issue and if there was a violation of what had been approved, they would be directed to the Code Enforcement Board. She continued if there was a violation, they would have the ability to return to HARB to remedy the issue.

12. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:04 P.M.³



Catherine Duncan, Chairperson

³ Transcribed by Elyse Wiemann