

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

Historic Architectural Review Board Regular Meeting April 21, 2022

The Historic Architectural Review Board met in formal session at 1:00 P.M., Thursday, April 21, 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
Brad Beach

City Staff:

Julie Courtney, Historic Preservation Officer
Candice Seymour, Historic Preservation Planner
Amy Skinner, Director, Planning and Building Department
Andrea White, City Archaeologist
Richard Thibault, Assistant City Attorney
Elyse Wiemann, Recording Secretary

Ms. Duncan welcomed Brad Beach, the newest Board member.

Mr. Beach introduced himself and said he was excited to be on the Board.

2. General Public Comments for Items not on the Agenda

BJ Kalaidi

3. Approval of Minutes

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE the March 17, 2022, minutes with the as presented. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

VOTE ON MOTION:

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

4. Modification and approval of Agenda

No modifications were made to the agenda.

MOTION

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

VOTE ON MOTION:

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

5. Public Comments related to Expedited Hearing items:

(None)

6. Certificate of Appropriateness

6. (a) HP2022-0018– Renewal by Anderson of Florida – Applicant Cornelius Peter and Kimberly Kay Dungan– Owner 174 Avenida Menendez

To replace divided-lite wood windows with arched transoms on the upper level west, north, and east elevations of the detached garage with squared single-lite composite windows with no transom;

and, to install a short metal fence on top of the masonry wall along the south 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 finding that the windows and proposed metal fencing meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation #9 as compatible contemporary designs; OR,

2. CONTINUE the application to allow the applicant time to present more appropriate window and fence designs and details as recommended by the HARB.

Cornelius Dungan, Christ Sundstrom, Operations Manager and Todd Chambers, Sales Manager, for Renewal by Anderson of Florida reviewed the application and the materials.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:

- Anderson windows were a good product; however, proposed material was not wooden
- Historic Preservation (HP) District One windows must be wood
- Wrought iron for fence/railing would be the best look
- Building was iconic and had been used in the Architectural guidelines when discussing the Moorish design
- Proposed windows were well planned, but were not historic and should follow the guidelines
- Railing should be simpler and the proposed was off a store rack
- Concerned with the style as it was not Moorish Revival and should be distinctive
- Height should be considered as it would sit on top of the garden wall
- Windows in place had a level of detail that the proposed single-lite windows did not
- Square windows were fine as it tied back into the main house, but the vertical scale of the windows was out of proportion
- Wrought iron would be challenging as it wrapped around and the concrete wall tapered down at the corner, the detail would be seen from the street and it should be maintained
- Proposed windows and material were not architecturally compatible
- Did not want this to radically change the character of the building which was important to maintain
- Original drawing of the window showed much lighter, less heavy mullions than what was installed
- If replaced, should reflect the original design to provide the lighter look and the muntin configuration
- Building would change if the arched opening and muntins were eliminated
- Windows with wood added to the quality of the home
- Home was built differently than approved architectural plans
- Should return to HARB approved plans
- Previous plans would assist with the applicants concerns
- Replacing windows would help with the thinner horizontal bar but keep the arched opening
- Wall was very high and showed six feet; however, not six feet from the inside
- Wall in front was higher but the side wall was the concern, which was four feet
- Proposed fence was stylized in something that did not relate to the Moorish Revival style
- AGHP stated fence should be at least four feet high, but less than five feet high adjacent to the street

- Heights along the side property lines would have to consult zoning; however, wall was closer to the front and seen from Avenida Menendez
- Encouraged owner to work with fabricator to have a shop drawing done that would tie into the wall where it curved
- Should tie into what had been approved
- Could raise the wall and fill in with stucco

Mr. Dungan said the fence did not need to be much higher and on the opposite side there were coquina triangles that could be added to match the other side which would provide an extra four to six inches.

Discussion continued:

- Since window topic was being continued, should bring back the fence proposal as suggested by applicant with the coquina triangles
- Applicant was willing to use the sunglass to maintain the same look

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to CONTINUE item 2022-0018, at 174 Avenida Menendez to come back with a wood window product to match the profile shown in the old HARB approved drawings and to bring back shop drawing solution for railing cap or angled cap or the option for both, to show how the corner would be dealt with. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Weaver, Beach, Benoit, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. (b) HP2022-0019– Les Thomas Architect — Applicant **Robert Edward & Constance M Kosberg– Owner** **53-55 Marine Street**

To modify the building at 55 Marine Street on the northeast corner to partially enclose the ground-floor porch and add exterior stairs; to replace an existing window on the east elevation of 53 Marine Street with new double French doors and construct associated steps and platform; and, site modifications to include a new outdoor kitchen structure on the southeast corner of the property visible from Avenida Menendez, an in-ground pool, new exterior lighting, new and modified concrete and brick walkways, and relocation of existing mechanical equipment and fire pit.

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 53-55 Marine Street:

1. APPROVE the application if the HARB finds that the proposed materials are compatible with the AGHP and the scope of work meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards # 9 for compatible contemporary design that matches existing contemporary additions and architectural features already approved on the site.

2. CONTINUE the application to allow the applicant time to provide additional information regarding the proposed materials and project scope and/or alter the proposed design(s) as recommended by the HARB.

Les Thomas, Rob Kosberg, Connie Kosberg, John Antonio and John Antonio Jr. reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:

- Modification and additions were compatible with the existing structures
- Good interpretation of what was there and matching the existing materials
- The Summer kitchen tied into the main house and was compatible
- Struggled with moving the stairs but thought it was best to move them
- Wanted to make sure the pool materials were compatible to match the Mediterranean Revival theme
- Building was on the 1978 survey and was considered a Colonial with the masonry construction and Spanish style as it sat on the street
- Additions proposed were in the proper locations
- Pool had archeological impacts, but it was of minimal size, raised up, and attractive
- Landscape was superb and everything fit properly
- Questioned what lighting would be used and should be clarified and approved
- Unsure of the pool material to be used
- Suggested using pressure treated wood for decking as 'trex' were not allowed in the area
- Pool was to be raised and only two feet in the ground and archeology would be done on site
- Pool would be a cement gunite with a white finish (white sand and cement)
- Tiles were a natural volcanic basalt in the pool and the edge and sides would be white stucco to match the house
- Pool equipment and AC units would be screened with landscape
- Doors and windows would match the existing with the same materials
- Lighting fixtures should match those in the building
- Suggested a fan and two lights which staff could approve

- Landscaping would stay the same, additions would be low, and the approved plant list would be used

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE application HP2022-0019 finding that the proposed improvements are compatible in both material and design, with the following conditions: all new decking would be wood, pool sides would be stucco to match all other proposed improvements with the coping in the natural basalt material as proposed and if different would need to return to the Board, work with recommended planting to screen pool equipment at the location shown in the presentation, and the new doors and windows would be wood to match existing wood hardware, and submit final lighting fixtures and specifications to staff for review. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

Mr. Weaver asked if the motion covered all of staffs' concerns.

Ms. Seymour said the motion was sufficient.

Ms. Duncan added the screening for pool equipment had to cover from the start and not in two years.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Weaver, Beach, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. (c) HP2022-0014

(Continued from March 17, 2022)–
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. (*Review of detached two-story building at rear and site modifications following HARB approval of alterations to the main building).

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

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

The Board provided their ex parte communication.

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

The Board discussed:

- Colors had been chosen from the preapproved pallets and were within the guidelines
- Reduced height of overall structure by one foot
- Questioned the garage elevation as plans indicated it was at twelve feet
- There was a two-foot slope that would be addressed at the driveway
- Needed to know how the elevation change would be addressed, or was it an error in the drawing

Mr. Knight stated that it was incorrect, and the slope would be around eighteen inches from the crest of the road to the garage.

Discussion continued:

- Garage elevation would be at nine feet
- All other changes met the requirements
- On St. George Street garage apartment and building type could serve as a precedent
- Concerned the Opinion of Appropriateness (OOA) was not presented at prior meeting
- Garage door looked more like a door for a house with someone living there
- Had setbacks which were met as an accessory building
- Clarification was key regarding garage elevation; wanted to ensure it would be eighteen inches from crown of street as nine feet could be too high
- Roof line towards the south resembled more of a house and not a detached garage
- Hip porch scaled down the tall columns, which was an appropriate response to the Boards' feedback; however, some elements helped tie it back to the house

Mr. Knight told the Board he was confused, since the original drawings were not different from what was presented at the last meeting and no different other than what had been asked by the Board.

The Board discussed:

- Any building would out scale the bungalow and would not be very visible from St. George Street
- Concerned with having sliding glass doors on the side of a garage
- Questioned the space use with French doors on the garden side
- Detached garage was viewed as heavy because the upstairs balcony over the garden area projected out from the main space compared to the original house
- Brackets were shown supporting the roof on the garage side, but none were above the second-floor roof on the south side
- Brackets were on the existing house and was shown before but not now

Ms. Courtney informed the Board the OOA drawings had been included as a reference in the staff report and the minutes were included from the past meetings.

Discussion:

- Height different in the garage and the balcony had been reduced by a foot
- Trying to maintain the sightlines from the master bedroom to not look at a roofline
- Garage would be used for a car, but it offered flexibility
- Siding would be wood
- Appropriate revisions were done based on Board comments and differentiating the old from the new

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE application HP2022-0014 recognizing that the purposed improvements were compatible with the AGHP but with the following recognitions of new materials submitted: columns on the garage would be the tapered revisions as submitted in the revision, picket fence would be to the height and layout as shown in the submittal, cedar shake material would be a natural wood product, would be

working with pre-approved colors for the bungalow as included in the AGHP, and the grade of the garage slab will be eighteen inches above the crown of the street and would be submitted with the site plan with the building permit would have the elevation shot of the crown of the street and then the proposed elevation of the building recognizing that the result would add some hyperstatic vents to the first floor of the garage, and brackets to all gable ends. The motion was SECONDED by MacDonald.

Ms. Courtney asked for clarification about the brick pavers as the pervious calculations would have to be revised.

Mr. Knight indicated the brick pavers would be a clay brick.

Ms. Courtney confirmed the splayed columns would be on the ground level only as it was indicated to be only on the breezeway.

Ms. Whitney replied in the affirmative.

Ms. Courtney pointed out there was a lack of details for the gate.

Mr. MacDonald said there were guidelines for the height and width of gates and asked if it could be submitted to staff for review and whether it was within the category, as he felt the design was fine.

Ms. Duncan questioned the height of the fence.

Ms. Whitney stated the fence was four feet high with the end post slightly higher and she showed the location to the Board.

Mr. Benoit said the gate would be at the existing sidewalk.

Mr. Benoit AMENDED the MOTION to include the clarification about the fence height, materials, and location of the gate to be approved by staff. The AMENDED

MOTION was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, MacDonald, Weaver, Duncan

NAYES: Beach

MOTION CARRIED 4/1¹

**6. (d) HP2022-0020– Grace Contracting, LLC– Applicant
Zigiz Holdings, LLC– Owner
28 W. Castillo Drive - Lot 14**

To construct a new 1-1/2 story single family residence along W. Castillo Drive and a two-story detached building with a garage and residential space above to the rear along Grove Avenue with site modifications to include the addition of an in-ground pool with paver surround, front and rear paver driveways, fencing, landscaping, and associated mechanical and utility equipment .

Ms. Seymour informed the Board there was one staff report for both applications as they were identical and would be heard together.

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 CONTINUE Certificate of Appropriateness applications at 28 W. Castillo Drive – Lot 14 (HP2022-0020) & Lot 15 (HP2022-0021) to allow the applicant time to provide sufficient information regarding materials, and construction details as noted in the staff report, and, to consider any design changes recommended by the HARB.

Alan Register reviewed the application.

The Board provided their ex parte communication.

Public hearing was opened.

Yvonne Picket spoke in opposition to the application and said after reviewing the plan she felt her quality of life would be affected. She said she would be looking at a garage and a parking pad filled with vehicles. She said on the 1910 San Borne maps there were no garages facing Grove Avenue which still applied. She pointed out the road flooded as there was only one storm drain, and at high tide, water did not drain. She said Lots 14 and 15 would drain towards Grove Avenue. She asked why storm water could not be directed to pipes on Castillo Drive as Grove Avenue could not handle more water and other homes would flood.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Concerned with the position of the properties as they were backwards
- Unsure why applicant wanted to have homes as proposed
- Garages would be where a house should be located
- Same exact house did not help with the character of the neighborhood
- Houses presented did not provide any detail or character and did not bring value or charm to the neighborhood
- Most homes were the same as they were framed vernacular house
- Small details set the homes apart from the others
- Concerned with how narrow Grove Avenue was and the potential influx of people
- Density was a concern
- Were two buildable lots and density was governed by zoning
- Proposed homes were in a historic district and needed a street elevation to show the direction of the proposed homes to ensure compatibility
- Should match the area and the historic district; may need flexibility to fit within the AGHP

¹ Break from 2:47p.m.- 2:59 p.m.

- Proposed buildings would face opposite streets: Lot 14 would face Castillo Drive and Lot 15 would face Grove Avenue
- Windows in the gable and first floor were not accurate in terms of height and length
- Proposed front door was a basic six panel
- Applications lacked detail needed; had an opportunity to add to the block or create an issue but should want to add value
- Should relate to the other homes in the neighborhood

Ms. Duncan pointed out the AGHP required “new construction to be framed vernacular style and encouraged site plans heights, widths, massing, spacing, roof forms to be consistent with and complementary to the existing historic streetscape”. She said the adjacent properties needed to be shown in relation to the proposed to understand how it would affect the streetscape. She said each house needed to address its location and understand how it fit with the historic character. She said the homes needed to be presented as a detailed house showing elements of the vernacular.

Discussion continued:

- Foundation details showed slab on grade and an elevated slab
- Should provide elevations to avoid having a slab on grade house when there was flooding in the neighborhood
- Not in support of homes as one was out of context on Castillo Drive and the other would not fit on Grove Avenue
- Homes should add to the streetscape
- Homes on Grove Avenue were not overly complex; should take inspiration from homes on the street

Mr. Register stated he was representing the homeowners and he worked with the builder. He explained the reason the homes were opposite of each other was to differentiate between the two. He said both homes could face Grove Avenue and the drainage was left

as it was how the lot currently drains. He said he loved the area and it was important to keep the look in the historic districts.

Mr. Benoit requested a site plan that had been reviewed by zoning for approval in order to eliminate discussing something that was unable to be built.

Ms. Courtney asked if Mr. Benoit were concerned with building code issues, as that could be reviewed during Friday Review.

Mr. Benoit explained it was not the density of the use but more so the elevation of the garage and the stairs that came out to the side which had to meet setbacks.

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to CONTINUE HP2022-0020 based on discussion for the applicant to come back with more information. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Weaver, Beach, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**6. (e) HP2022-0021– Grace Contracting, LLC– Applicant
Zigiz Holdings, LLC– Owner
28 W. Castillo Drive - Lot 15**

Heard with item 6(d)

To construct a new 1-1/2 story single family residence along W. Castillo Drive and a two-story detached building with a garage and residential space above to the rear along Grove Avenue with site modifications to include the addition of an in-ground pool with paver surround, front and rear paver driveways, fencing, landscaping, and associated mechanical and utility equipment .

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 CONTINUE Certificate of Appropriateness applications at 28 W. Castillo Drive – Lot 14 (HP2022-0020) & Lot 15 (HP2022-0021) to allow the applicant time to provide sufficient information regarding materials, and construction details as noted in the staff report, and, to consider any design changes recommended by the HARB.

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to CONTINUE HP2021-0021 with the same concerns and allow the applicant to return with more information. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Weaver, Beach, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. Certificate of Demolition and Partial Demolition

7. (a) HP2022-0022 – SEG Companies, LLC– Applicant **David Westbrook– Owner** **104 Gaspar Street**

To demolish a residential building constructed ca.1910-1920 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 104 Gaspar Street because it is not a local landmark or otherwise designated as a historic building with the condition that 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.

Sarah Sullivan and Scott Nagoz, SEG Construction, reviewed the application.

Ms. Seymour said the County normally provided these applications with a set of pictures and a preliminary plan for the replacement structure; however, they had not been received.

Mr. Nagoz advised those items had not been released by the County. He said the replacement structure would be a one-story single-family resident and in the exact location.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi said she was concerned as the property was in the West City of St. Augustine and had been built between 1910-1920 although not located in a district. She asked if the home could be renovated and if there was a lot of damage. She said the report from the County would probably be beneficial. She asked if the Board was able to stop the demolition if the information from the County was not provided.

Ms. Courtney said the design review was not in the purview of the Board but could require the applicant to submit the permit plans for the new structure at the same time as the demolition permit.

Mr. Weaver stated a standard practice with the Board was the applicant had one year to act on the demolition once granted, but prior to the demolition the applicant would have to secure a building permit.

Ms. Courtney advised that could be an added condition.

Public hearing was closed.

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

Mr. Benoit asked if the building flooded at any time.

Ms. Sullivan replied there had been a lot of water damage to the original wood windows and it had taken five years since applying for the program. She said the County thought it would be less expensive to rebuild than to repair.

The Board discussed:

- Board had two options: a local landmark or approve the demolition
- Local landmark status did not apply as there was no significant community history
- In favor of granting a demolition
- Building was raised but there was water damage on the west side through the windows
- Could require new drawings to be submitted prior to demolition
- Could ask for drawings of the building for documentation as built which could be through photographs of interior and elevation
- Thought building was important for the area as it had interesting features
- Salvage any materials in a 'good faith effort'

Ms. Duncan advised the program may have the report with all the documentation that the Board had requested.

Mr. Nagoz advised the program had not released the documentation, but it would provide site plan, prints, and would determine the items to salvage and if the proposed building met the code requirements in the area.

Ms. Duncan felt that documentation should be added as a condition to be submitted with the demo permit.

Mr. Nagoz said the resident lives in the home, and this was the prior process and he was not able to proceed until everything was in place and the resident had vacated.

Mr. Beach asked if the motion would include the plans for the proposed new structure.

Mr. Nagoz said he understood that was mandatory and the County would provide a complete package.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE based on the staff report and discussion that the home was not in any areas that qualified as a Historic National Register, local district, or applies to the level for a local landmark and to provide the plans from the County, floor plan and other information, salvage materials and would be required it to be permitted before proceeding with the demolition. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Beach, Benoit, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**7. (b) HP2022-0023– SEG Companies, LLC– Applicant
Barbara Fogg– Owner
5 Atlantic Avenue**

To demolish a residential building constructed in 1954 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 5 Atlantic Avenue because it is not a local landmark or

otherwise designated as a historic building with the following condition:

1. (Per Section 28-89(2)d, COSA Code of Ordinances): No permit be issued for the demolition of said structure until drawings sufficient for a building permit and all necessary requirements for the construction of a new building have been submitted for the new construction.

Scott Nagoz, representing SEG Construction and Ms. Fog, reviewed the application. 17 certified notices were sent, 1 was returned in favor, 1 was returned opposed and 1 had comments.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

Public hearing was opened.

Andrew Gregory spoke on behalf of his partner who was concerned with the elevation for the property proposed at 5 Atlantic Avenue and he was worried about flooding. He said the hope was for the new construction to keep the Fullerwood charm and character as the other homes in the neighborhood.

Ms. Duncan advised the Board did not have any purview of the new construction.

BJ Kalaidi said she knew the Board did not have purview but was concerned if the properties were to use septic or City sewer.

Charles Pappas spoke in favor of the demolition and felt there should be a way to have a checklist for staff to approve or expedite certain structures for demo, as he thought this building had no value to the neighborhood and was a perfect demolition example.

Mr. Nagoz clarified if the properties were on City sewer the home would be tied in; however, all that was assessed ahead of time, determined, and submitted to the City.

He said they would not add a septic if it was unnecessary.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Home had no value and could not be repaired
- A building like this could be referred to staff; however, if staff were uncomfortable it should be sent to the Board
- Flooding was a concern within the City and building on piers would be beneficial to neighbors

Mr. Thibault advised for staff to make the decision to approve demolitions without HARB approval would require a change in the City Code.

Ms. Courtney said some items could be expedited; however, staff and the Board had to review it formally. She said it could be on the agenda as an expedited item, but the reason this application was not, was it did not have all the materials that were normally seen on the County demos.

Mr. Weaver stated administrative review had been discussed but there was push back from the public and they felt it was important for the Board to review the demo applications because demolition was forever.

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE demolition application 2022-0023, at 5 Atlantic Avenue. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

Mr. Weaver asked to amend the motion to include the documentation for the replacement structure, and for it to be contingent on acquiring a building permit.

Mr. MacDonald was amenable to Mr. Weaver's recommendation. Mr.

MacDonald AMENDED the MOTION was and was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Weaver, Beach, Benoit, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. (c) HP2022-0024– Hunter Hayden, Oasis Equity Holdings, LLC– Applicant& Owner
1 Palm Row

To partially demolish a residential building constructed in 1905 that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File, located in the Historic Preservation 1 Zoning District (HP-1), and is a contributing building to the St. Augustine Town Plan National Register Historic District, including removal of a masonry addition, replacement of existing siding and modifications of fenestration on wood addition, and extending the opening of the existing masonry wall on the east 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 APPROVE a Certificate of Demolition for partial demolition at 1 Palm Row if the HARB finds the following:

1. Removal of the contemporary masonry addition and widening of the masonry wall opening will not be a detriment to the historic architectural integrity of the structure.

2. Associated alterations to the building and site as proposed.
Hunter Aden reviewed the application.

Ms. Duncan asked if there would be any changes to the elevation on the Palm Row side of the building.

Mr. Aden replied there were no changes in elevation on the Palm Row side.

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

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

Public hearing was opened.

Stephanie Kite, representative for the Ximenez-Fatio House Museum, expressed concerned since Palm Row was a historic area. She said they were concerned with retaining the historic integrity of the property and the neighborhood. She said renovations being done in the area should be completed with the upmost integrity and should co-exist with other historic structures.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Application was straight forward and had minimal impact on what was being removed
- Appeared to be mostly in back on home; however, photos of the front elevation showed screened porch on front of the home which was being enclosed and would be glass enclosure and should not be done

Mr. Aden stated that was not part of this application. He said the intent was not to change the screened in porch and it was an error on the drawings and it was not in the staff report. He said this application was for the demolition and the wall.

Ms. Duncan wanted to make sure it was on record this application was for a small addition to the back of the building. She said this was a very important street and the screened porch would be a screened porch.

Mr. Weaver asked if the Board was only reviewing what was in the report and the screened porch was not part of the application.

Ms. Seymour stated that was why she added to her presentation that anything additional beyond the scope of work would have to return to the Board as a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Discussion continued:

- Building was being maintained
- Supportive of proposed changes
- Any new siding or doors would be wood
- Driveway opening was to be wider; however, the material was hard to source
- Board approval should be intentional
- Piers should be reinstalled to retain the definition on each side of the driveway
- Block was unique; should try to leave as much as possible

Mr. Aden said the caps on the wall had been removed but he wanted to relocation the sections being opened and bring them down to finish out the wall in order to have a continuous wall. He said he wanted to round out the wall near the palm tree and bring it back to what it looked like previously.

Discussion continued:

- Application was to widen the opening and remove and replace
- Removal of the two sections at the end would provide enough to fill in and planned to work with a mason to fill in the rest
- Supported widening the opening and repairing existing wall but not of whole scale removal and reconstruction
- Felt wall was a significant landscape feature
- Should maintain the integrity of the wall
- Reuse the materials and document everything done to know if there were enough materials
- Keep as much of the wall as possible and infill the areas that were dislocated
- A survey would be beneficial or could use the site plan to detail the work

- Possibly of wall failing because it was not reinforced or poured solid
- Footers needed to be addressed due to a crack in the wall
- Supportive of the application but the expectation was to have the wall look authentic when completed

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE application HP2022-0024 finding that both the proposed improvements to the house and modification to the wall were compatible with the AGHP with the following conditions or clarifications: all new building materials applied to the building would meet AGHP preapproved materials for example wood and the wall be widened and repaired using the existing materials or materials in kind and the new driveway opening was flanked by piers as it was presently. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

Ms. Duncan recommended adding that the screened porch stay screened.

Mr. Benoit AMENDED the motion to include the recommendation. The AMENDED MOTION was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Beach, Weaver, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY²

**7. (d) HP2022-0025– Jay Neumark–Applicant
Gerald Neumark– Owner
69 Lemon Street**

To partially demolish a residential building constructed ca. 1917-1924 that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and is an altered but contributing building to the Model Land National Register

² Break from 4:32p.m.-4:42p.m.

Historic District, including the removal of a rear addition, modifications to the fenestration, and replacement of existing 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 regarding a Certificate of Demolition for partial demolition at 69 Lemon Street:

1. APPROVE the application finding that the proposed demolition and fenestration changes will not negatively impact the historic architectural integrity of the already altered but contributing building

2. CONTINUE the application to allow the applicant time to consider alternatives to proposed changes in fenestration as recommended by the HARB.

Jay Neumark reviewed the application.

Ms. Duncan asked about the front elevation drawing which showed two windows were being installed on each side and the front porch remained the same but was eliminating the windows next to the front door.

Mr. Neumark replied instead of the series of awning windows which were around the entire porch was what made the front porch enclosed.

Ms. Duncan stated the plan made it look like a completely different house because there was a single window, the front door was off set, whereas the front door now was centered.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

22 certified notices were sent, 5 were returned in favor, 0 were returned opposed and 1 had comments.

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

The Board discussed:

- Unsure of the Board's purview on design as this was in the Model-Land area
- Removing the back portion only and adding a door where a window was located
- All information was on the plan and labeled for review
- Elevation proposal changed front of the house
- Front porch reading as a porch was one of the defining characters features of the house
- Renovations affected a character defining feature
- Home was not in a district but was a contributing structure
- Needed more precise documentation
- Unable to support application as presented
- Drawings were not accurate for the application

Mr. Neumark said it was very frustrating as they were unaware, they would have to go through this process and thought more clarification throughout the process would have been beneficial. He said the home was in poor condition and was a part of the square footage when purchased. He said he was willing to do whatever the Board advised; however, the process had been very difficult.

Board continued discussion:

- Could deny the demolition if the Board felt it compromised the building
- Offset the door to avoid zig-zag pattern within the home
- Change proposed on the home no longer registered as a porch that was enclosed
- Could change the layout to better accommodate and keep the porch

Mr. Neumark said he was confused why the Board felt there was a need to keep the enclosed porch instead of having the home look finished.

Discussion continued:

- HARB's purpose was to maintain the integrity of the buildings in town
- Home had features that required review, and this was an application to remove windows
- Concerned with the elevation as it changed the front of the house
- Could propose removal of the aluminum windows and leave it open an open porch
- Most homes in area had an open porch
- Did not want to eliminate the history of a porch being on the home
- Understood the need for the air-conditioned square footage
- Questioned if both bedrooms had to be stripped of the porch details as not all homes had enclosed porches on both sides
- Board's purview was with what was being removed not what was being put back
- Applicant was not removing historic features

Ms. Seymour pointed out there were fenestration changes not only on the front but on all four elevations. She said there were other windows being moved and removed not just the windows in the front. She said the concern was opening and closing of the window locations not the actual windows.

Discussion continued:

- Should provide a softer impact to the porch
- If changed, the house would cease to resemble what it looks like today
- Could applicant replace windows in current locations and the front door
- Leave it the way it currently existed
- Supportive of what needed to happen in the back and sides of the home

- Willing to leave the sides and front of porch the way it existed

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE application 2022-0025 to replace the windows down both sides and back of the house and to demolish the newer addition in the back with the exception that the awning windows on the front façade the door and the two side lights and the awning windows on the side at both sides of the original front porch remain as they are. The MOTION was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Weaver, Beach, Benoit, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. (e) HP2022-0008 (Continued from March 17, 2022 without being heard)– Michael Silverio Sr., Shotgun Saragossa LLC– Applicant & Owner 74 Saragossa Street

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.

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 74 Saragossa Street:

1. APPROVE the application if the HARB finds that the evidence of deteriorated structural integrity as provided is sufficient to justify demolition of the structure 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; OR,

2. CONTINUE the application to allow the applicant time to provide proof of undue economic hardship, and any additional documentation as required by the HARB to justify demolition of the structure.

Michael Silverio reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

21 certified notices were sent, 1 was returned in favor, 4 were returned opposed and 3 had comments.

Public hearing was opened.

Marion Chesek was not sure if she was for or against the application as she was unsure why it would be demolished and what would replace it. She said she spoke with the owner who had purchased the home and she understood and was happy to hear it would be another home in the same footprint.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Building was contributing and thought to be sound after reading the engineers report
- Reluctant to grant demo unless it was due to an economic hardship
- Model Land Historic District was a Federal District

- Met code as a historic structure, met the threshold and was contributing
- Unsure if Board had design purview of replacement structure
- Was not an anchor or landmark building in the area
- Building was part of the streetscape and the building had history
- Bought in November and intent was to live in the home and structure had been eroded
- Two structural engineers provided assessments
- Applicant obtained interior demolition permit under plumbing licenses
- Building from outside had vinyl siding more than likely to cover damage
- Front of home was in a flood zone and rear of property was not
- Felt there were a lot of things compromised on the home
- Board had no purview on what was being built
- San Borne maps showed a front porch on the home
- Whole house could be repaired; however, it would be expensive
- Remodel was 50% over the cost value of the home and was unable to bring the home to code as it was currently
- Board did not want to demo any home that had history and this home was on the register
- Unsure if termite damage justified removal of an entire house
- Unsure of the financial burden for a new home versus renovations on the home since no evidence was provided
- Although, Board had no purview on the rebuild, providing design of proposed rebuild would be persuasive
- Suggested obtaining quotes to provide information in relation to economic hardship
- Would want to raise house to have home out of flood plain as it had flooded previously
- One stipulation could be to obtain building permit before demolition

- Elevation certificate would be beneficial
- Structural engineer did not believe it could be lifted
- Applicant thought the house was unsafe
- If deemed an unsafe structure by the City of St. Augustine, it could be demolished
- Safety was number one for the Board who would not disagree with safety

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to CONTINUE application HP2022-0008, 74 Saragossa to demolish a build that was recorded in the Florida Master Site File and was a contributing structure to the Model Land National Register Historic District to May 19, 2022. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

Mr. Weaver said there had been discussion to prove economic hardship and if there was additional evidence from the City or anyone else, it could be introduced.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, MacDonald, Beach, Benoit, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**7. (f) HP2022-0026– Bart Piniaz – Applicant
163 School Street, LLC– Owner
163 School Street**

To partially demolish a residential building constructed ca. 1910-1917 that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and is a contributing building in the Lincolnvill National Register Historic District, including the existing detached garage and removal of existing roof and aluminum siding related to a second-floor addition and renovation.

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 CONTINUE a

Certificate of Demolition application at 163 School Street to allow the applicant time to provide a full scope of work for partial demolition review; or, to readvertise the application as a full demolition because the HARB has determined that the work as proposed and/or clarified by the applicant meets the threshold for full demolition.

Bart Piniza reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

28 certified notices were sent, 0 were returned in favor, 1 was returned opposed and 0 had comments.

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

The Board discussed:

- Any new construction had to meet Planning and Zoning setback requirements
- Application did not meet basic zoning threshold because the second floor did not meet the setback requirements
- Application would require a variance; therefore, was unsure how to proceed

Mr. Thibault said he thought the applicant would be required to have a variance to build up; however, he thought the Board was able to approve the partial demolition and then the applicant could apply to Planning and Zoning for the variance.

Ms. Skinner advised if it were to be demolished, the applicant would have one year to rebuild within the existing footprint; however, if there was an increase in the cubic content that would require a variance from the Planning and Zoning Board it would increase the impact of the nonconforming situation to the adjacent properties.

Discussion continued:

- Board needed to be aware this was a two-part approval process
- Primary front setback would be fifteen feet, and secondary front would be half of the front not less than eight feet
- Side yards on the other two sides would be 10% of the lot width but no less than four feet
- Existing structure seemed to have been modified a lot
- Wanted to maintain the integrity of the original structure
- No issue with removal of the detached garage and aluminum siding
- Roof was a character defining feature, and if the proposal were completed, it would no longer be contributing
- Moving the roof gable back, having a shed roof, and adding two porches would respect the original house
- Design would be compatible but not contributing

Mr. Piniza asked if he would need to return to HARB if he wanted to leave the home as it was and if he could have approval for the demolition of detached garage and the siding.

Mr. Weaver said a partial demolition could be provided.

Ms. Seymour said if the applicant wanted to renovate the structure, he would have to return to HARB if any of the fenestration was changed, for instance changed the window openings or moving them.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to Partially APPROVE the partial demolition of the garage and the aluminum siding deferring the removal of the roof to the June 16, 2022 meeting with the full information

requested by staff. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, MacDonald, Beach, Benoit, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

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

8. (a)HP2022-0027 – Bridge Street Estates, LLC– Applicant
Joseph Griffin– Owner
115 Bridge Street

Mr. Weaver had recused himself from the application.³

To review parts I and II of a Historic Preservation Ad Valorem Tax Exemption application including proposed restoration and rehabilitation of existing architectural elements for a building constructed ca. 1800 that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and is a contributing building to the Lincolnville National Register Historic District .

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 115 Bridge Street if the HARB finds:

1. This is a qualifying property since it is listed as contributing to the Lincolnville National Register Historic District

2. The proposed scope of work to the exterior and interior of the existing building and with the addition complies or is generally consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation

³ Recusal form attached to original minutes

3. The proposed work meets the criteria established by the Department of State (see #6 of attachments)

Les Thomas reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

Andrea White, City Archaeologist, said any archeology deposits that would be impacted needed to be mitigated under the Federal Tax Credit Program. She said there were intact deposits related to Mission Palica Refugee Community from the early 1700's found, and some artifacts of intact post and floors and evidence of the plantation activity including a donkey burial.

The Board discussed:

- Respectful of what was originally there, and proposed elements tied in well
- Inquired about the angled wall and suggested to square it up; however, if it had historic significance should keep it
- Kept the integrity of the existing building
- Tax credit would help, and Board was in support
- Would have to return to the Board for part three of the application in the future
- Flooring was original hard pine in some of the area, and some was damaged, and those would be replaced with hard pine
- Thought the Coquina room had a tabby floor but was unsure
- Elevation of the home was above the flood plain

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE the Ad Valorem Tax Exemption application HP2022-0027. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, MacDonald, Beach, 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 inquired about 66 Hypolita Street, which was in Historic Preservation District Two. He said the grey shingles had been removed and replaced with the same instead of wood shakes and was this appropriate.

Ms. Seymour said as pre-existing material, it was grandfathered in and could be replaced with 'in kind' materials. She said if they wanted to change the type then it would need to come before HARB.

Mr. MacDonald asked about the Church paint.

Ms. Courtney stated she spoke to the City Attorney regarding what could be asked of the Board. She said that she and the Building Official met with the contractor and he had painted the first coat. He provided the sample from the November 2021 meeting which had been approved and matched what had been applied for. She asked the contractor to sand it after he applied the coat, and to dilute the second coat 50%, and she was awaiting an inspection.

Mr. Thibault clarified that if the coating were not up to standard, it could be sent to Code Enforcement and then back to HARB.

Mr. MacDonald announced he would not be able to attend the HARB meeting in May.

10. Other Business

10. (a) Discussion Regarding Historic Preservation Division Work Plan 2022-2023

Ms. Courtney and Ms. White reviewed the topic, spoke about the Key Strategies in the Historic Master Plan, discussed the status of the goals established in 2021-2022, and reviewed the upcoming goals in 2022-2023.

11. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:06 P.M.⁴

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

Catherine Duncan, Chairperson

⁴ Transcribed by Elyse Wiemann