

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

Historic Architectural Review Board Regular Meeting May 19, 2022

The Historic Architectural Review Board met in formal session at 1:00 P.M., Thursday, May 19, 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
Jon Benoit
Paul Weaver, III
Brad Beach

Absent:

Gaere MacDonald, Vice-Chairperson

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

(None)

3. Approval of Minutes

Mr. Weaver asked to defer the minutes to later in the meeting.

Heard after item 6 (d).

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE the April 21, 2022, minutes as presented. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Beach, Weaver, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. Modification and approval of Agenda

Ms. Duncan stated that the minutes would be approved later in the agenda. She said Item 6(a), 174 Avenida Menendez had been withdrawn their application. She said Item HP 2022-0020, at 28 West Castillo Drive and HP 2022-0021 28 West Castillo Drive Lot 15

requested a continuance and under Certificate of Demolition, HP 2022-0035, 93 Oneida Street and HP 2022-0036, at 95 Oneida Street had requested a continuance.

Ms. Courtney said if there were any additional questions or comments regarding last month's presentation that could be discussed under 'Other Business' and she had an announcement for the Board at the end of the meeting.

MOTION

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

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Benoit, Beach, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to CONTINUE Item 6. (g) Certificate of Appropriateness for 28 West Castillo Drive, Lot 14 HP2022-0020 moved to continue the application to the June 16, 2022 HARB meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Benoit.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Benoit, Beach, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOTION

**Mr. Weaver MOVED to CONTINUE Item 6.
(h) HP2022-0021 28 West Castillo Drive,
Lot 15, moved to continue to the
application to the June 16, 2022 HARB
meeting. The motion was SECONDED by
Mr. Benoit and APPROVED by
UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.**

MOTION

**Mr. Weaver MOVED to CONTINUE Item 7.
(b) HP2022-0035, 93 Oneida Street to the
June 16, 2022 HARB meeting. The motion
was SECONDED by Mr. Benoit and
APPROVED by UNANIMOUS VOICE
VOTE.**

MOTION

**Mr. Weaver MOVED to CONTINUE
HP2022-0036, 95 Oneida Street to the
June 16, 2022 HARB meeting. The motion
was SECONDED by Mr. Benoit and
APPROVED by UNANIMOUS VOICE
VOTE.**

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

**(a) HP2022-0033– Colour Homes LLC–
Applicant
Tobitha Hainesworth– Owner
14 Masters Drive**

**To demolish a residential building
constructed ca. 1910-1917 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 14 Masters Drive

because it is not a local landmark or
otherwise designated as a historic building.

Jason Stancil waived his rights to a public
hearing.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

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

MOTION

**Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE
application HP2022-0033 based on the
staff report and seeing no evidence the
building was a landmark or otherwise
meets the criteria of the City code for
historic structures with the condition to
make a good faith effort to salvage any
materials, and the demolition coincide
with pulling a building permit. The motion
was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.**

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Beach, Benoit, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. Certificate of Appropriateness

**6. (a) HP2022-0018 Certificate of
Appropriateness Continued from April 21,
2022– Renewal by Anderson of Florida–
Applicant
Cornelius Peter and Kimberly Kay
Dungan — Owner
174 Avenida Menendez**

Application withdrawn by applicant.

**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.

6. (b) HP2022-0029 – Don Crichlow & Associates – Applicant
Virginia Whetstone – Owner
297 St. George Street

To modify the existing front terrace by adding a roof and columns.

Ms. Seymour read the staff report and said based on a review of the AGHP, and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds that the Board can APPROVE a Certificate of Appropriateness at 297 St. George Street because it meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation #9 as a compatible contemporary design.

Don Chichlow reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:

- Proposed design tied into the existing house
- Questioned how the existing flooring would be salvaged
- Parts of the flooring was cracked and would be replaced with same size paver and neutral color to match
- Proposed design was compatible
- Seamless and subordinate to the existing building
- Flooring would have to comply with AGHP if changed

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE application HP2022-0029 finding that the proposed porch over the existing terrace is compatible to the existing structure in scale and material and does not detract from the architecture of the existing house. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Beach, Weaver, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. (c) HP2022-0028– Family Union Investment LLC– Applicant & Owner
15 Hypolita Street

To replace the existing asbestos roof shingles with a different shingle material.

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 15 Hypolita Street:

APPROVE the application if the HARB determines that the proposed shingle material, or another as recommended by the HARB meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation #9 as a compatible contemporary material.

Jason Zing reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:

- No evidence wood was on the roof and felt it was not appropriate

- City outlawed wood roof after the fires in 1914
- Unable to replace with the material that was present
- Recommend using the diamond shaped roofing material
- Diamond shaped asphalt shingles were unavailable
- Square or rectangle shape shingles were available because others were not in production
- Location next door had the same type of shingle as proposed
- Proposed Belmont shingle was unusual, had more depth, and additional texture was similar to existing
- Diamond shape would be recommended when available
- Questioned the color of the shingle either dark grey or tile red
- In favor of the dark grey coloring
- Suggested using the shingle color by Belmont Weathered wood
- Suggested adding a dark brown or black drip edge instead of white

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE application HP2022-0028, 15 Hypolita Street approving that the Weathered Wood color Belmont shingle as a compatible replacement for the two different style roof shingles on the roof, finding that the preferred diamond shaped asphalt shingle was not currently available on the market with the one condition that the roofer use a black or dark bronze drip edge metal flashing. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Beach, Weaver, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. (d) HP2022-0034– Matthews Design Group, LLC– Applicant **Bishop of the Diocese of St. Augustine– Owner** **259 St. George Street**

To pave an existing dirt parking lot and add a landscape buffer along Charlotte Street.

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 259 St. George Street:

1. CONTINUE the application to allow the applicant time to consider a more appropriate paving material as recommended in the AGHP; OR,

2. APPROVE the application because it meets the applicable Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation 9 as a compatible contemporary design if the HARB finds that the proposed colored concrete or pervious pavement material is appropriate as submitted with color specified by the HARB.

Shannon Acevedo and Deacon Bryan Ott reviewed the application.

The Board provided their ex parte communication during individual Board discussion.

Public hearing was opened.

Charles Pappas asked how the storm water was being handled in relation to paving the surface. He said the water would be displaced onto Charlotte Street and that would cause another issue.

Shannon Hart said the sand makes a mess on the road and was also concerned with the water. She encouraged the Board to allow the applicant to do something as this was an issue.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Unsure of the retention of the water as it was currently absorbed but the proposed surface would be impervious
- From a design standpoint, there was a lot of pavement
- Driveway should be paved, but could use other options like turf or landscape for the space to be more inviting for the children to play
- Tabby was not a color but an aggregate of concrete and shell
- Concrete material was not an approved material and the lot was large
- Would be more in favor of pavers but unsure if the material should be solid
- Tabby could be used to tie into the sidewalks or used on the landscape
- Questioned the landscape buffer and wanted screening to cover the larger area of concrete as it was very visible to the neighbors and a public location
- Questioned if archeology would be needed
- Pervious surface would require more prep than a concrete slab
- Questioned how much room would be allowed for buffering between the aluminum fence
- Was a width of ten feet for trees and shrubs; however, could be doubled to twenty feet but the fence was iron, and the greenery would be seen
- Public right-of-way would add an additional five feet
- Could have potentially twenty-five feet of an approved material and then for the drive aisle use the concrete
- Questioned if applicant had researched coquina concrete as an option which could be administratively approved
- Wanted to match existing in order to have a smooth surface
- Thought the pervious concrete would serve the same purpose as it was porous and would mimic a coquina concrete
- Space was large with no definition and everything was right up to the building
- If the site had smooth concrete, and there would be run off, all water would need to be treated on site
- Area on property where water was maintained was large
- Site would need to be graded for the water to flow to the established area
- Coquina concrete was expected in the historic districts and material should be an approved material
- Proposed screening would not cover at a pedestrian level
- Suggested adding landscaping to the middle to break up the space and provide draining
- Spaces were used as recreation, overflow parking for church, and other events
- The school was an asset to the area
- Suggested having a material that would soften the area and not a hard scape
- Questioned the requirements when such a large space was being paved
- Applicant would have to abide by the archeology ordinance
- Ten-foot buffer was required, and the drainage would have to be addressed by an engineer
- Desired a concept and plan before moving to site engineering
- Could use the landscape buffer as a storm swale and could have a catch basin in the concrete that filtered to the existing stormwater area
- Should focus on materials available either tabby or coquina concrete
- Should use the approved materials
- Drive isle on St. George Street had been paved asphalt and the fence and landscaping had been approved in the past ten years
- Was a big visual impact and could not support using concrete
- Suggested making drawings larger to show the scale for landscaping
- Questioned if the drive aisle would be painted for patrons

Ms. Acevedo asked since there was not a specific parking area, could that be a point of differentiation to break up the use of the other materials.

Discussion continued:

- Staff could assist with the different materials allowed to be used
- If painted, should be shown and be an approved colonial paint color
- Biggest problem was the materials being used as there were guidelines
- Instead of painting could use textures to break-up the area
- Should not be modern and harsh, but the design should fit in the historic district

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to CONTINUE application HP2022-0034 259 St. George Street, to the June 16, 2022 meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Benoit.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Benoit, Beach, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Deacon Ott questioned if moving the buffer from ten to twenty feet was not a main issue, was it more of the materials being used.

Ms. Duncan said there was concern with not having enough landscaping on the site and the twenty-foot buffer was better.

Mr. Benoit said the landscape did not have to be as linear as it was as long and perhaps be the twenty feet on the ingress and egress, as the landscape buffer could be extended in.¹

6. (e) HP2022-0031– Richard C. Hart– Applicant & Owner **249 Charlotte Street**

To construct a sunroom and partially covered deck addition on the second

story west and north elevations of the 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 take the following actions for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 249 Charlotte Street:

1. APPROVE the application if the HARB finds the proposed scope of works meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards # 9 because the proposed additions are a compatible contemporary design.

2. CONTINUE the application to allow the applicant time to prepare a more compatible design as directed by the HARB.

Philip Catullo or Shannon Hart reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:

- There were two scopes of work one over the garage and then a porch to make a sunroom
- Would not be able to repurpose the windows
- Anything added would be wood to match the existing siding and trim
- Was a compatible addition to the home
- Felt the garage apartment was a secondary structure and felt it was a mitigating factor
- Addition was substantial on the west elevation and not enclosed
- More windows were being lost but not an extremely important structure and thought there was some flexibility

¹ Break from 2:28p.m.-2:35p.m.

- Thought the windows should be grouped together differently as the proportions did not seem right
- Addition should be a similar material and tie into the main house but different
- Slope and gable end seemed to look out of place at the top
- Additional roof ridge did not match each side
- If the windows stepped in from both sides the ridge would be centered
- Banding of the windows and stepping the two sides in would help differentiate the new from the old
- To help differentiate could use a one over one lite window instead of two over two
- Suggested keeping the rafter tails as it was an exposed element
- Historic windows should be maintained in the historic district
- If windows were replaced had to provide the product approval number and meet the code requirements
- Could have the building certified as a historic structure which has different building code
- Addition design was based on comparable homes in the area
- Suggested using Weatherboard as it had a slight variation but would blend
- Windows on the front should be grouped together
- Windows would soften the addition and have a major visual impact on the building
- Windows removed were grouped into two or three which was a banding of windows
- Rafter tails should be on all three sides

Ms. Hart asked if they were able to use the two over two windows when replacing instead of the one over one windows.

Mr. Weaver said if they agreed to the Weatherboard siding, he would be fine with the two over two windows.

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE application HP2022-0031 with the following conditions, on the west facing elevation the windows to be ganged together and be continuous across that elevation, asking for the roof over the new porch be a hipped roof, left northwest side of the new addition step in an equal amount that is stepped in on the right side, bump out to be lap siding versus the drop siding that the existing house is, windows to be two over two as proposed in the current application, all of the new materials will be real wood with the simulated divided lites, and all other materials to match existing. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

Mr. Catullo said there was a door to the north and asked if a window was needed as well as a door to go around the corner.

Mr. Weaver said the Board was proposing windows on the sides and the west elevation.

Mr. Beach requested that exposed rafter tails be added to the motion.

Mr. Benoit AMENDED the motion to include the request and the AMENDED motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Weaver, Beach Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. (f) HP2022-0030 – White's Wharf LLC – Applicant & Owner 135 Avenida Menendez

To alter plans from a previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness with design and layout modifications to elements including the fenestration and walkway to the sea wall, and changes to window, door and exterior materials.

Ms. Courtney read the staff report and said based on a review of the AGHP, and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds that the Board can take the following actions for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 135 Avenida Menendez:

1. APPROVE if the board finds that the revised plans and materials are reasonably compatible with the AGHP. OR

2. CONTINUE to allow the applicant time to make modifications as recommended by the HARB necessary for the design and/or materials to be reasonably compatible with the AGHP.

Jennifer White Conner, Ryan Cornelison, and Julie White Alford reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

Mr. Weaver provided a brief history of the property.

The Board discussed:

- Building not in the Historic Preservation (HP) district which provided more flexibility in design
- Environment was harsh being on the water
- Window material previously approved was wood and proposed was fiberglass which was not typically approved
- Proposed fiberglass window was more durable and appeared to resemble a wood double hung window and could be painted
- In favor of the walkway as it was more accurate
- Doors proposed were metal, but building was outside of the HP area

- Edits were minor for trying to add a business to the building
- Should have a wood front door but able to have flexibility with the others
- More significant edits were towards the back and not seen from the HP district
- Proposed design was compatible from the original
- Windows had to keep the muntin configuration as previously approved
- No change was requested for the muntins only asking for material change
- Euro Wall door was referenced as the stacking French doors and would replace the garage doors
- Store front doors proposed were a powder coated aluminum and were more compliant with the ADA and life safety; doors had panic hardware and were more practical application
- Intent was to have store front doors instead of fiberglass or wood that was painted to resemble wood
- All doors should be from the same company to be more compatible

Ms. Courtney advised there had been several conversations regarding the change in the windows and understood the muntin patterns were not changing. She said the elevations provided were generic from the window manufacturer and the muntin could be installed in a custom way.

Discussion continued:

- Design was not changing only the materials
- Stacking door was similar to a bi-fold door that stacked to one side and would not obstruct the view
- Stacking door was not a change in material but more of a change in design and more modern
- Door would be seven-foot-high plus a transom
- Could have a transom and when the bi-fold doors were closed it would emulate French doors

- Garage doors previously approved had more of an industrial look like a 'wharf'
- Permit allowed for a panel door which would open all the way
- Thought more of a solid door would be appropriate as the proposed was too modern
- Large cabana would cover the door and would block more of the view
- Was not opposed to the shutters or walkway being changed
- Would need to keep the original configuration of the muntins and the types of doors with the transoms as shown in the plans
- Would want to keep the wood door on the front but the others could be changed
- Concerned with not having the shutters
- Proposed awning window profile would follow the rest of the windows around the building to match
- Would have a dramatic change in the appearance and normally entire building would be designed to flow together
- Should provide an elevation drawing since materials and scales were changing
- Major concerns were more exterior and not interior
- Should provide any changes to the elevations and provide a cut sheet on the product if it were to be used
- Shop drawing would provide the dimensions, material and elevation changes

Ms. Lopez stated there had been a comment regarding ordering windows and asked if it was possible to approve some of the windows.

Ms. White Conner said it would be beneficial as it was twenty to thirty weeks out for windows to come in and asked if they could have approval for the windows that were not changing.

Ms. Duncan replied in the affirmative.

Discussion continued:

- Could approve the walkway change
- Wanted to change the material of the wooden doors
- Could change if it were either Andersen or Marvin but if not could not approve
- Front door could be wood, but the Andersen and Marvin doors were composite and would not last

Ms. Lopez said the previous owner had requested the dogleg walkway and there was a cross easement between the City and the owner that would need to be resolved.

Mr. Weaver asked if the straight walkway would infringe on City property.

Ms. Lopez replied she did not believe so; however, the easements had been swapped, but that had been done by the White's predecessor. She said it did not need to be part of the motion, but she was making the Board aware.

Discussion continued:

- Proposed doors would have stainless steel hardware and the aluminum door would be powder coated
- Would be able to change the doors but the front door should keep the wood door
- The level of design review on the sides and back changed although they were very visible

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to PARTIALLY APPROVE application HP2022-0030 finding the following items were approved: change from wood window to a composite window by Marvin or Andersen as long as the architecture of the window remained the same, with the exception of the few windows that were new on the third floor could use composite windows or muntin profile windows to match other windows on the

building, approving changing the exterior doors on the south, north, and east elevations to an aluminum powder coated door and the two doors facing Avenida Menendez that were service type doors which could be store front window but the primary entry door would remain wood as approved with the original application, approve the more direct pathway from the restaurant to Avenida Menendez as requested, approve the fixed shutters on the westside, kitchen door could be the store front type door and could be moved. Then a CONTINUANCE to return with drawings and information about products and design regarding the awing windows as proposed as opposed to the wood awning shutter and drawing information on the bi-fold doors in lieu of the French doors, service doors if siding were to be added should return with how that was to be done, but if not could be the changed to a composite door in the elevations shown. The motion was **SECONDED** by Mr. Weaver.

Ms. Lopez said the continued items would return on June 16, 2022 unless that was not feasible.

Ms. White Conner replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Weaver asked if the Motion was sufficient for the applicant.

Ms. White Conner said the items that needed to be brought back to the Board were: spec sheets for the bi-fold doors, Gas Strut windows, and the elevation change.

Mr. Weaver stated the Board needed elevation drawings for each elevation that was affected.

Mr. Benoit said the bi-fold door they would need to decide on leaving the transom or not.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Weaver, Beach, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY²

6. (g) HP2022-0020 Certificate of Appropriateness Continued from April 21, 2022 – 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.

Application was continued MOTION under Item 4 (a).

6. (h) HP2022-0021 Certificate of Appropriateness Continued from April 21, 2022 – Grace Contracting, LLC – Applicant

Zigiz Holdings, LLC – Owner
28 W. Castillo Drive - Lot 15

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.

Application was continued MOTION under Item 4 (a).

² Mr. Weaver left at 4:08pm

7. Certificate of Demolition and Partial Demolition

7. (a) HP2022-0008 Certificate of Demolition Continued from April 21, 2022– 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 additional evidence of deteriorated structural integrity and case for undue economic hardship as provided is sufficient to justify demolition of the National Register District contributing 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 further evidence 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)

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

The Board discussed:

- Home looked square and plumb from the outside; however, evidence had been provided from different engineers
- Economic hardship was not defined as the highest and best use but the purchase price and the cost to renovate
- Real estate information provided was anecdotal
- The challenge was the home was in an HP district and was a contributing structure
- Unsure if it met the requirements for hardship
- Proposed replacement structure was not compatible with the other homes in the area
- If the value of a new home would be a million dollars, why not renovate the home since it was contributing to the neighborhood
- Home needed to be renovated as it did not look to be beyond repair

Mr. Silverio said he did not believe renovations could be done or could be brought up to code as the damage went through to the foundation.

Discussion continued:

- Building had been occupied until last year
- If property were demolished it would be lost
- Not in favor of demoing the home with the unknowns

- No comparison in cost for renovation versus construction
- Board did not have purview over the structure being put back
- Exterior of home looked great; however, there was termite damage on the interior which was not known when purchased
- Chimney was detaching from the structure and the entire home had vinyl siding
- Building official instructed applicant had to continue with the HARB application for approval
- Applicant provided two reports from engineers but unsure if it should be demolished
- Unsure if building had lost its authenticity
- Board did not have purview over the review, but Board did not have to allow the demolition
- New lot coverage configuration would be smaller at thirty-five percent and lot was grandfathered in at forty-two percent
- Did not see evidence of an undue hardship as it was a contributing structure
- Proposed replacement structure would be a determinate to the street as there was no architectural value or integrity
- Home needed work but if fixed could fit in with the adjacent properties
- Questioned how the new structure could be built if there was an economic hardship

Mr. Silverio said he was a contractor and would be doing most of the work himself. He said the proposed home could be built for around \$300,000 to \$400,000.00 range.

Mr. Beach said the Board could require a cost comparison, and suggested since the applicant would be the contractor, he should provide the pricing.

Mr. Silverio said he thought that would not be sufficient, as he could do the work and would be different than hiring someone. He said he did not believe the Board would take that as evidence. He said the front of the property

was in a flood zone and needed to be lifted; however, that was not able to be done.

Ms. Duncan asked what the options were since the home was contributing and if the Board did not approve the demolition, what could be done.

Ms. Lopez advised the burden was on the applicant and thought the Board was unsure of the proof provided for economic hardship. She provided guidance to the Board as indicated by the City Code.

Mr. Benoit said the question was after identifying the purchase price of the home and the cost of the renovation or construction, could the property be sold, and a profit made after those two were added. He said the Code was asking this to be done to prove if there was profitability.

Board discussion:

- Board was unable to approve as the home was in a HP district
- Should provide accurate cost in different categories not just cost for square footage
- Windows did not have to be changed if they were historic
- Would have to tie down the home
- Foundation would not need to be changed as it was existing
- If new windows were added, would have to meet the standard of the Code
- Had some items that could be repurposed
- Would be able to have a finished product faster if was able to renovate established home

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to CONTINUE HP2022-0008 finding that more proof of economic hardship was needed for the application. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Beach, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. (c) HP2022-0035– Oasis Equity Holdings, LLC – Applicant & Owner 93 Oneida Street

Requested a continuance to June 16, 2022, HARB meeting.

To partially demolish a residential building constructed ca. 1871-1885 that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and a contributing building to the Lincolnville National Register Historic District, for work related to a renovation including the front porch, roof, and rear exterior walls; and, to relocate the structure on the property.

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

7. (d) HP2022-0036– Oasis Equity Holdings, LLC– Applicant & Owner 95 Oneida Street

Requested a continuance to June 16, 2022, HARB meeting.

To partially demolish a residential building constructed ca. 1871-1885 that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and a contributing building to the Lincolnville National Register Historic District, for work related to a renovation including the two-story front porch and one-story rear wing.

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

8. Planning and Building Staff Communications

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

(Provided for informational purposes)

9. Other Business

Ms. Courtney announced the City Commission on Monday, May 23, 2022, would be issuing a Historic Preservation proclamation for preservation month and invited the Board to attend.

Ms. Courtney said if the Board did not have any feedback regarding the workplan for the 2022-2023 fiscal year that Andrea White, City Archaeologist and herself would be working on the budgeting for the next fiscal year.

Mr. Benoit asked if there would be a time for them to speak at the City Commission.

Ms. Courtney advised they could speak during public comment.

Ms. Lopez stated Planning and Zoning Board was waiting for staff to present the final rewrites and in the process a new House Bill was introduced and the intent was to make it easier for property owners to obtain demolition permits without needing a public hearing on structures below flood plain.

Mr. Benoit asked if the House Bill in terms of the flood zone provided specific guidance regarding the elevation of the house.

Ms. Lopez said it was tied to FEMA flood maps.

Ms. Duncan suggested when an application came with drawings those needed to be large enough to read in order for the Board to review.

10. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting
was adjourned at 4:59 P.M.³

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

Catherine Duncan, Chairperson

³ Transcribed by Elyse Wiemann