

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

Historic Architectural Review Board Regular Meeting July 21, 2022

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

Gaere MacDonald, Vice-Chairperson
Paul Weaver, III
Brad Beach

Absent:

Catherine Duncan, excused
Jon Benoit, 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

(None)

3. Approval of Minutes

(None)

4. Modification and approval of Agenda

Mr. MacDonald advised Item 6(e), 50 Marine Street and Item 7(b), 36 N. St. Augustine Boulevard would be administratively continued to the August meeting due to a lack of quorum. He said the applicants for Item 7(d), 103 South Street and Item 8(c) 22-24 Cathedral Place requested a continuance to the August meeting.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to CONTINUE Item 7(d) to the August 17, 2022 HARB meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

**AYES: Weaver, Beach, MacDonald
NAYES: NONE
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to CONTINUE Item 8(c) to the August 17, 2022 HARB meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

**AYES: Weaver, Beach, MacDonald
NAYES: NONE
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

5. Public Comments related to Expedited Hearing items:

5. (a) HP2022-0054– Cara and Allan Farquhar– Applicant & Owner 272 St. George Street

To partially demolish a building limited to the detached structure and wall-built ca. 1960-1970. (Previous HARB Certificate of Demolition (Partial) approval under F2020-0076 expired).

Ms. Courtney read the staff report and said based on a review of the AGHP, a previous HARB review and COD approval (F2020-0076), and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds that the Board can APPROVE a Certificate of Partial Demolition

for the one story detached structure at 272 St. George Street because it is not a local landmark or otherwise designated as a historic building, with the following condition:

1. For any salvageable historic materials such as the wood door and windows, 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 Ryan, Cara Farquhar and Allan Farquhar reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

29 certified notices were sent, 3 were returned in favor, 1 were returned opposed and 2 had comments.

Mr. Farquhar said there were no windows in the shed structure; however, they were willing to preserve the door.

Ms. Ryan noted the Farquhar homeowners and what would be presented in a new application would be in the spirit of what had previously been approved.

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

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE HP2022-0054, 272 St. George Street to demolish a historic attached structure with the condition in the staff report to salvage any significant architectural features. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

Mr. Beach noted the two courses of perforated block and asked if it was considered an architectural element could they be salvaged.

Ms. Courtney said that would be appropriate although not mentioned specifically it was an element that was indicative of late midcentury revival.

Ms. Ryan said it could be incorporated in back into the carriage house.

Mr. Weaver AMENDED the motion to include that the perforated block be salvaged. The AMENDED motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Beach, MacDonald

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. Certificate of Appropriateness

6. (a) HP2022-0046 – Gabriel Wicks– Applicant

Gabriel and Megan Wicks – Owner
155 Cordova Street

To replace the existing asbestos roof shingles with metal panels

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 155 Cordova Street:

1. APPROVE the application with the finding that the proposed metal roof panels meet Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation number 9 as a compatible contemporary material that is a listed pre-approved material for the building's architectural style and time-period; OR,

2. CONTINUE the application to allow the applicant time to consider an alternative roof material that more closely matches the existing or historic roof material in composition, size, shape, color, and texture.

William Porter reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi encouraged the Board to continue the application in order for the applicant to find an alternative material that would match the historical requirements.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Felt this was a second roof added in the 1940's but thought either solution was appropriate
- Metal roof could conflict with the warmer qualities of the home
- The shingles would be the best option as it would match the current materials; however, knew there were issues obtaining the diamond pattern and could use the architectural asphalt shingle
- Building was built in 1864 or 1865 and would have had cedar shakes but preferred to match the diamond shape and color
- If unable to get the diamond shape could use an architectural shingle

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE application HP2022-0046 with the condition: first option diamond shaped asphalt shingles and second option architectural shingle in dark grey coloring. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Beach, MacDonald

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. (b) HP2022-0042 – KRP Properties V of Valdosta, LLC– Applicant & Owner 18 Cordova Street

Item heard after 6(f)

To replace the existing metal (possibly tin shingle) roof with an asphalt 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 18 Cordova Street:

1. APPROVE the application with the finding that the proposed asphalt shingle material is reasonably compatible with the HP-3 zoning district and meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation number 9 as a compatible contemporary material that is a listed pre-approved material for the architectural style and time-period, with approved color specified by the HARB; OR,

2. CONTINUE the application to allow the applicant time to consider an alternative roof material that more closely matches the existing roof in composition, size, shape, color, and texture such as one of the pre-approved metal roof options.

Austin Beck, representative for the owner, reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:

- Roof was part of the fabric of the home and important
- Roof looked to be beyond repair
- An option could be a metal shingled roof, but could be expensive
- Should explore possibility of a replacement

- San Borne maps showed this type of roof and was likely to be original
- The metal standing seemed roof was not appropriate in current condition
- In favor of a metal shingled roof with an embossed look similar to the tin currently but questioned if the materials were available
- Asphalt shingle roof would be the second option in the driftwood color proposed by the applicant
- Metal roof with an industrial look could be worse than the asphalt shingle
- Similar to metal roofs in the area
- Tin roof shingles put on in 1950 or 1960 was historic considering the age
- Having a standard seam would not be appropriate, but tin would be the ideal replacement
- If application was continued applicant should explore stamped shingle to include the availability and cost
- Board leaned more towards the driftwood coloring for the proposed shingles

Applicant responses:

- Roof had multiple coatings and was unsure if it could be matched in like and kind
- Repairs had been made to the roof previously
- Never worked with a tin stamped roof but thought it was repairable; however, the owner wanted shingles due to cost and to remedy the leaks
- Proposed asphalt shingle was in three colors: onyx black, estate grey or driftwood
- Not opposed to continuing the application to the next meeting

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to CONTINUE Item 6(b) HP2022-0042, 18 Cordova Street to the August 17, 2022 HARB meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Beach, MacDonald

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. (c) HP2022-0043 – Brock Fence – Applicant
Richard Baker– Owner
36 Treasury Street

To construct a wood privacy fence along the side and rear property lines.

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 36 Treasury Street:

1. CONTINUE the application if the details requested by staff have not been sufficiently conformed by the applicant to allow time for those items to be provided; OR,

2. APPROVE the application if the HARB finds the proposed fencing is generally appropriate for the side and rear elevations according to the AGHP, will replace a non-conforming fence type in the HP-2 zoning district, and meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation #9 as a compatible contemporary design.

Richard Baker reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

Public hearing was opened.

Ginger Borgman spoke in opposition to the application and said the photos that had been submitted depicted a six-foot privacy fence on Treasury Street which was not in line with what was in the area. She understood the need for protection but felt this was not the best solution to the problem and it was not aesthetically appropriate.

Public hearing was closed.

Mr. Baker replied to public comment and said there were other fences in the area taller than what he was requesting. He said this was to keep people from looking into his yard. He noted the type of hardware they were wanting to use which was black iron to help with authenticity. He said the hardware would be behind the gate in order to conceal it.

Mr. MacDonald clarified the fence would not be on Treasury Street but behind the applicant's home.

The Board discussed:

- Vehicular parking along the fence should be limited
- Would be an upgrade as to what was there currently
- Eliminate the trespassing signs across the fence
- Preferred a shadow box fencing or open to a variety
- Entire fence should not have continuous vertical members
- Should abide by Manucy's book as it contained appropriate fencing models
- Fence should not have a modern design
- Questioned the reason for the large gate opening
- Questioned if a shadow box fence was allowed under the guidelines
- Pre-1821 fencing had guidelines; however, post-1821 fences were not addressed
- Property was in HP Two and gate was wider than what was typically approved
- Gate should be consistent with what was there
- Questioned the reason for the no parking signage
- Suggested signs be displayed on a post for a cleaner look
- Gate could be fifty inches with the smallest opening at forty-four inches
- Recommended keeping the gate at ten feet as opposed to twelve feet

- Questioned having a rolling gate or would it be more appropriate as a hinged gate
- Not opposed in this context as there would have been industrial doors
- Should have shadow box around the property and a ten-foot rolling gate
- Signage on fence was fine but only one at each space

Applicant's response:

- Needed a larger gate due to renovations in the future
- Shadow block fence had been approved on the front and side of the home and was not opposed to keeping that style
- Signs were posted to deter tourist from parking
- Parking was managed by the people who rented from the applicant
- Unsure of the HARB guidelines for gate openings but wanted it to be slightly larger than what was there to accommodate RV and future renovations
- Wanted to have a roll across gate
- Only solution to eliminate signage would be to add gates on both sides of the lot
- If on a post, would lose three feet of parking
- Agreed to the shadow box fence as it allowed air to flow more freely
- Wanted to follow HARB suggestions and would have natural authentic hardware with the rolling gate
- Hardware would be hidden with a wrought iron handle

MOTION

Mr. Beach MOVED to APPROVE application HP2022-0043 fence on 36 Treasury Street to be six-foot-high shadow box fence with a ten-foot rolling gate with signage organized and cleaned up on the length of the fence. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

Ms. Seymour asked about the finish color.

Mr. Beach AMENDED the motion to include a natural wood finish. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Beach, Weaver, MacDonald

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. (d) HP2022-0047– Sarah Ryan, Architect LLC– Applicant

Cara and Allan Farquhar– Owner

272 St. George Street

To construct a new one-story garage at the northwest corner of the property.

Ms. Seymour read the staff report and said based on a review of the AGHP, the previous discussion and approval of COAF2020-0070, and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds that the board can APPROVE a Certificate of Appropriateness at 272 St. George Street with the following condition:

1. That the materials of the garage doors and exterior entry doors be compatible with the AGHP

2. That all wood windows and glazed doors with divided lites have exterior muntins with a raised profile.

Sarah Ryan, Cara Farquhar and Allen Farquhar reviewed the application.¹

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:

- Questioned if there was a fence on the west side of home
- Felt the concept was improved

- Footprint was smaller and the garage doors were facing the street which would blend in
- Proposed design complemented the main house and followed the spirit of the previously approved design
- The dormer window on the carriage house was wider than the dormer window on the main house and suggested reviewing the proportions
- Felt second story windows should not be larger than ones on the first story
- Liked that the windows had been replicated into the new building
- Questioned if fiberglass doors were allowed according to the AGHP

Ms. Courtney advised fiber glass was an allowed material but would have a wood appearance.

Applicant's responses:

- Fence was six-feet tall and proposed to continue the fence once the concrete masonry wall was removed
- Agreed in reinforcing the dormer from the main house onto the proposed carriage house

Mr. Weaver confirmed the following items with the applicant:

- Door would be white wood grain
- Windows and glazed doors were divided lites would have muntins with a raised profile
- Dormer on the garage would match the scale of the dormer on the main building

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE application HP2022-0047, 272 St. George Street with those three conditions. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

¹ Documentation attached to packet

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

6. (e) HP2022-0044 – Les Thomas
Architect– Applicant
Ocean Breezes Real Estate, LLC– Owner
50 Marine Street

Administratively continued due to lack of quorum.

To modify the main residential structure, including the addition of a balcony over the existing front porch and a rear second story dormer and to enclose an existing covered porch space on the rear elevation; and, to construct a new two-story garage with living space above to the rear of the property, with associated landscape features including a new brick-paved patio and walkways.

6. (f) HP2022-0045 – Dailey Builders LLC -
– Applicant
Baker Family Revocable Trust– Owner
123 St. George Street

For after-the-fact modifications to design elements of the storefront changed in a different manner than the approved building permit application, including the use of a different window framing and configuration than the existing design; and to replace the incompatible lower mirror glass panel that was added along the bottom with an aluminum composite panel.

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 123 St. George Street:

1. Approve the after-the-fact work completed to the storefront and the proposed replacement of the lower mirror panel with an aluminum composite panel if the HARB finds

that these modifications retain the commercial character of and are compatible to the building, meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Standard for Rehabilitation 9.

2. Deny if the HARB finds that the after-the-fact work does not retain the commercial character of the building through contemporary design, is not architecturally compatible to the building, and/or does not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standard for Rehabilitation 3, 6, or 9.

Duncan Daily, Daily Builders, and Sarah Ryan reviewed the application.
Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi encouraged the Board to deny the after-the-fact application. She said she understood mistakes were made but felt the applicants should be held liable.

Leslie Baker said, as the owner of the property, they had been trying to rectify the problem for almost two years. She said they wanted to make it right and thought the window should be installed with metal instead of wood. She said pressure washing on St. George Street was done daily and she felt the walls would rot. She said their goal was to make it better.

Public hearing was closed.

Mr. Weaver said the application was administratively approved, and since then the Board had heard the application three times.

Ms. Courtney explained the first meeting was in 2020 where the application was continued; then the application was withdrawn, and the applicant then submitted a building permit with the architectural plans that showed the store front would not be altered but would have replacement framing. She said staff was comfortable after

speaking with the architect and administratively approved the application. She said the permit was issued; however, the work was incorrect, and the applicant was notified that they would need an after-the-fact approval from HARB. She said in October, the applicant was not present at the meeting nor at the November 2021 meeting and the Board denied based on their findings.

Mr. Weaver said the design was inappropriate and asked if the Board could hear the application or did, they need to appeal as the application was the same.

Ms. Lopez said the appeal period was thirty days, which was well overdue. She said the applicant wanted help in order for HARB to approve it.

Ms. Courtney informed the Board of a site visit that was conducted in April with the architect, the contractor, the building owner, and the glass installer. She said they have been in contact with the Building Official and he thought a framing system could be used without a Florida Product approval number if it had an engineering stamp and seal; however, the glass installer refused to use any product without a Florida Product approval number. She added if the Board denied the application, it would be heard before Code Enforcement and they would determine the penalty, if it was unable to be corrected in a way the Board saw fit.

The Board discussed:

- Not concerned with the material as much as the basic design
- Kick panel was not appropriate, and the mullion was not correct
- Looked like a modern store front, which did not resemble what had originally been there
- If application was the same was in favor of a denial unless the applicant was willing to modify what had been done
- Felt there were some solutions to fix what had been done
- Should have matched the original window frame; however, it was not available in the with those dimensions
- Frame size there met the current code standards
- Should repair and replace what was there with what had been approved
- Original photographs showed eight-inch terracotta seal which could be replicated
- Should remove the horizontal mullion
- Questioned if the architect thought what had been originally proposed could be done
- Should have discussed what was to be done before completed since there were issues
- Vertical rail was from top to bottom and the intermediate rail could be removed
- Design was achievable and could resemble the approved design and meet code
- Using the Cory Tile was moving away from the design but could be discussed
- Kick plate should not be aluminum but perhaps masonry
- Needed to be compatible but felt the application needed to be continued

Applicant's responses:

- Bottom eight-inch rail was a painted metal and was part of the store front system
- Felt there was no issue when meeting with the original contractor but then was different as proposed
- Unable to reach the initial supplier for it to be repaired
- New supplier was brought in who wanted a Florida Product number on it since the glass was slanted about four degrees
- Had approached two other store front companies since first was unreachable
- On each side of store front, the datum was at twenty-four inches, which was more appropriate
- Wanted to remove the mirrored panel and replace with a muter panel and if not, would need an entire new system

- If it were veneered, it would add to the size and that was a concern as it was already a quarter of an inch wider, and this would make it bigger
- Could add the Red Cory Tile on both sides could continue that underneath to keep the same profile

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to CONTINUE application HP2022-0045, 123 St. George Street to the August 17, 2022 HARB meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Beach, MacDonald

NAYES: ONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY²

7. Certificate of Demolition and Partial Demolition

7. (a) HP2022-0049 – McDonald Brothers, LLC– Applicant
Theresa M. Travis– Owner
10 Tremerton Street

To partially demolish a residential building that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and not located in a district, including removal of the chimney, a dormer, porch and deck, and changes to the fenestration related to elevation, renovations, and additions.

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 related to elevation, renovations, and additions at 10 Tremerton Street because it is not a local landmark or otherwise designated as a historic building with the following conditions:

1. For any salvageable historic materials to be salvaged, if possible, in accordance with Sec. 28-89(2)d6: The board may require, at the applicant's expense, salvage and preservation of significant building materials, architectural details and ornaments, fixtures, and the like for reuse in restoration of other historic properties.

2. To limit the time the lot remains vacant, that no permit be issued for the demolition of the structure until drawings sufficient for a building permit and all necessary requirements for the construction of a replacement building have been submitted for the new construction.

Theresa Travis and David McDonald reviewed the applicant.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

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

The Board discussed:

- Building was not historic but was older
- Chimney was capped which indicated it was not an oil burning stove
- Would have more questions if it were in a National Register district or in an HP area but it was not
- Was in support of the application
- Questioned where the main entrance would be
- Felt in the design, there were many competing elements
- Did not feel any of the new additions were helping
- Applicant should simplify and narrow down the main focus

² Break from 2:34p.m.-2:40p.m.

- Not in the purview of the Board as to what could be done to the building
- Questioned why applicant was raising the home only one foot as hurricane Matthew was nine feet

Applicant responses:

- Chimney was never a full wood burning fireplace
- Was a wraparound porch and the main entrance was on the north elevation
- Home was surrounded by three streets and the door faced north where there was no street
- Would have a side door into the "L" shaped porch
- Previous additions were small; however, the setbacks from the three streets were challenging and the lot line on the south elevation
- The additions on the east elevation were trying to tie in the angles on the roof
- Did not want to change the porch as it was a functional outdoor living space
- Adding an extra door to the kitchen addition that would be on the east side
- Piers were deteriorating and new ones would be built and wanted to add a foot to be in line with the FEMA benchmark for flooding

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE Certificate of Demolition 7(a) 2022-0049, 10 Tremerton Street with the condition to make a good faith effort to salvage any salvageable materials. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Beach, MacDonald

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**7. (b) HP2022-0051– K.A. Morrison– Applicant
Kenton Andrew Morrison Revocable Trust– Owner**

36 N. St. Augustine Boulevard

Administratively continued due to lack of quorum.

To demolish a residential building constructed ca. 1953 that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and not located in a district.

**7. (c) HP2022-0053 – 36 Granada, LLC – Applicant & Owner
36 Granada Street**

To modify an existing HARB approved Certificate of Demolition (Partial, PL2021-0136 from October 2021) for a commercial building constructed ca. 1905-1910 that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and not within a district, including removal of the front entrance from Granada Street, and alterations to the existing and previously approved window fenestration and the roof form.

Ms. Courtney read the staff report and said based on a review of the AGHP, a previous HARB review and partial COD approval (under PL2021-0136), 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 36 Granada Street:

1. APPROVE because it is not a local landmark or otherwise designated as a historic building and the structure does not have a high degree of integrity to become one, if the HARB can make a finding that the newly proposed partial demolition of the already significantly altered building will not be detrimental to the historic integrity of the city.

Joe Cronk reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

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

The Board discussed:

- Did not see much of a difference from the last proposal
- Should preserve the fenestration
- Was adding store front to the elevations
- Parapet had been cleaned up and was no longer jogging
- In favor of the proposed

Applicant response:

- Many different openings and fenestrations that had occurred
- Focused on Granada Street as per the photo from history
- Wanted to maintain the pedestrian scale of the original store front on Granada Street while having a higher finished floor
- Moving the entry from Granada Street to the north which had shifted a few openings
- Had improved the southern façade since first reading
- Tried to respond to the comments provided

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE application HP2022-0053 36 Granada Street to modify existing HARB approved Certificate of Demolition. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Beach, MacDonald

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. (d) HP2022-0052 – KP Meiring Company– Applicant
Meiring Trust– Owner

103 South Street

Motion under Item 4.

To demolish a residential building constructed ca. 1904-1910 that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and is a contributing building to the Lincolnville National Register Historic District. (Previous HARB Certificate of Demolition approvals under F2019-0109 (Partial) and 2018-0005 expired).

7. (e) HP2022-0050 – Thayver Holdings LLC, ETAL– Applicant & Owner
30 Sanford Street

To demolish a residential building constructed ca. 1910-1917 that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and is a contributing building to the Lincolnville 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 APPROVE a Certificate of Demolition at 30 Sanford Street if the HARB finds that the condition assessment report and/or undue economic hardship documentation provided by the applicant are sufficient to justify demolition of this contributing building in the Lincolnville National Register District with the following conditions:

1. For any salvageable historic materials to be salvaged, if possible, in accordance with Sec. 28-89(2)d6: The board may require, at the applicant's expense, salvage and preservation of significant building materials, architectural details and ornaments, fixtures, and the like for reuse in restoration of other historic properties.

2. To limit the time the lot remains vacant, that no permit be issued for the demolition of the structure until drawings sufficient for a building permit and all necessary requirements for the construction of a

replacement building have been submitted for the new construction.

Sankar Thayer reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

19 certified notices were sent, 2 were returned in favor, 1 returned opposed and 2 had comments

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi said it seemed this home would be demoed by neglect. She asked how many people were notified regarding the demolition.

Public hearing was closed.

Mr. MacDonald read a letter from David Nolan which provided information regarding the age of the property.

The Board discussed:

- Property would be income producing
- Economic hardship information provided was inadequate and incomplete
- Could take advantage of tax credit program and should be factored in as it would qualify for those programs
- Letter from a history in architectural expert advising that the building was important
- Building was carried over from the Greek Revival era and architecturally important
- Additions added to the back were not done well; however, the building was square and felt the building could be saved
- Not opposed to a partial demolition to put the building into a better position to be renovated
- Building was solid and thought it could potentially be a landmark in Lincolnville with many financial incentives

- The home was a treasure especially in a historic district
- Structure of the house was in good condition and should be salvaged
- Thought there were many opportunities for renovation and tax incentives
- Home was located in the Lincolnville Community Redevelopment Area (LCRA) and asked if property would qualify

Ms. Lopez advised under the current form of ownership, although speculation, there was a "fix it up" program that was under a certain income level and focused on properties that were owner occupied. She said this would be income producing and she suspected it would not qualify.

Ms. Seymour informed the Board the qualifications for economic hardship were included in the applicant's staff report and on the application. She said the applicant selected the ones they thought applied.

Mr. Thayer asked what types of programs were available.

Mr. Weaver said one was the Ad Valorem Tax exemption program that would provide an exemption on the improvements made to a property if renovated. He said the property taxes would stay where it was currently, and the exemption would be over a ten-year period. He said another program was through the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). He said the staff had information that could be provided.

Ms. Courtney advised this had been mentioned but they could be able to provide more information.

Mr. Thayer said when they had purchased the building, demolition was not the intent; however, the numbers for renovation were more than expected and they did not have the funds to fix the building.

Mr. Weaver said this could be a way to help and it should be factored in when trying to determine an economic hardship.

Mr. MacDonald said this was a large building and a \$200,000 budget would not be enough to renovate it.

Mr. Thayer said the building from outside was nice but there were many additions and numerous small rooms, which would be a lot of work. He said if he had the money, he would renovate but lenders were not willing to lend him the money.

Mr. Weaver pointed out these programs could be benefits and those could be passed on to the lender to gain equity capital to complete the renovations.

Mr. Weaver advised the Board could continue the application so the applicant to explore some of the programs or bring back more information or the Board could vote and if denied, the applicant could appeal to the City Commission.

Mr. Thayer said he wanted the application continued.

Mr. MacDonald said he could do a partial demolition to rid the property of the additions that were not done well and that would be buildable land.

Ms. Lopez added the property was in a Federal Opportunity Zone, which was another corporate tax benefit. She said the applicant could potentially have local property taxes held back for ten years and potentially use the SHPO benefit and perhaps use the corporate tax benefit.

Mr. Weaver asked if Mr. Thayer wanted to return to HARB in August or September.

Mr. Thayer agreed to September.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to CONTINUE application HP2022-0050, 30 Sanford Street to the September 15, 2022 HARB meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Beach, MacDonald

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. (f) HP2022-0048 – Angela Kalb– Applicant & Owner 9 May Street

For after-the-fact partial demolition of a building constructed ca.1915-1924 that is recorded on the Florida Master Site File and contributing to the Nelmar Terrace National Register Historic District, including removal of the brick chimney, windows on the west and south elevations, and rear porch deck; and, to alter the fenestration and replace existing windows on the east 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 for a Certificate of Demolition at 9 May Street:

1. APPROVE if the HARB determines:

a. the after-the-fact project scope does not exceed the threshold of a partial demolition,

b. and did/will not permanently alter the architectural integrity of the contributing building, to the Nelmar Terrace National Register District, and/or the city.

2. Continue the application to allow the applicant time to provide a comprehensive structural assessment, or economic hardship information, if the HARB determines that the proposed demolition exceeds the threshold of a partial demolition.

3. Deny if the HARB finds the after-the-fact modifications and removal of architectural elements from the contributing building permanently alters the architectural integrity of the contributing building, to the Nelmar Terrace National Register District, and/or the city. If the HARB approves the replacement of the proposed windows, staff recommends 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.

Angela Kalb and Brandon Estes reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication was provided during individual Board discussion.

14 certified notices were sent, 3 were returned in favor, 1 returned opposed and 1 had comments

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi said she did not understand how people could come to the City and not pull permits before completing work. She said this was happening all over town, not just in the historic area. She said the procedures needed to be followed and this was not helping preserve the history of the City.

Ms. Kalb said when she purchased the home, she was unaware the home was in a historic district. She said it would be beneficial for buyers to know before purchasing the home. She said when applying for the roofing permit she was not advised the home was in a historic district.

Public hearing was closed.

Mr. Weaver asked if they were advised the home was in a National Register District when they applied for the permit.

Ms. Courtney replied that it would not matter if the home were in a National Register District or if a chimney were removed without HARB approval on any building in the City, it would be considered partial demolition. She said that was a requirement on any building fifty years or older. She said the chimney had been done without a permit; however, the roof was permitted but the permit had been pulled by the roofing contractor. She noted the rest of the work had been completed without a permit and permits were required no matter if new or old construction. She said the Board would be reviewing this case no matter where the home was located.

The Board discussed:

- If the applicant knew they needed to have a permit for removing a chimney
- Felt it would have been dangerous to remove a chimney in an urban environment
- Information could have been provided regarding the process if applicant sought a permit
- Unfortunately, the top of the chimney was removed, but did not disqualify the home as being contributing
- Chimney was a defining element with the bungalow style
- Other major issue was removal of the dormer at the rear, did not destroy the character of the building
- Dormer could not be seen from the streetscape

Applicant responses:

- Not aware they had to have a permit to do demolition; thought building permits were required for new construction
- Chimney was removed by hand because they thought it was unsafe

Mr. Weaver asked if the chimney and the dormer were the two major elements that had been demoed on the home.

Ms. Courtney replied there had been many things done to the home and were outlined in the staff report on page three. She said the items were as follows:

- Removed or enclosed windows on elevations
- Removed the rear porch
- Removed rear dormer
- Covered the stucco siding with Board and Batten siding

Ms. Courtney said they were asking for a partial demolition for replacing windows on the east elevation and changing the fenestration of the east elevation windows by raising the sill height. She said the work on the east elevation had not been completed.

The Board discussed:

- Not opposed to the rest of the work if they stopped removing the historic fabric of the home
- Significantly extended the overhang on the back of the home which looked odd
- Overhang was new construction and Board's concern was demolition
- Front dormer window had a different grid pattern with muntins
- Chimney was an important part of the home
- Felt all the defining features of the windows had been removed
- Covered the stucco with Board and Batten
- Roof should have been replaced with like and kind as standing seam was not appropriate for the building
- Everything about the building was wrong
- Need to understand nothing could be completed without a permit
- Unsure how the applicant was not aware of the HARB

Ms. Kalb said before purchasing the home the realtor never informed her about HARB or that the area was historic. She said she did not want to live in an area where there were rules and regulations similar to a Homeowners Association (HOA). She said they were trying to make the home look better and the neighborhood.

Mr. Estes said he removed the chimney after speaking with several roofing companies and mentioned he wanted to remove the porch, dormer, and chimney. He said they advised to call them after the work was completed in order to do the roof. He said he did not know about the permit requirements nor HARB. He apologized to the Board for completing work on the home without HARB approval and proper permits.

The Board discussed:

- The work could not be put back once removed
- Felt the fabric of the City was disintegrating
- Town was based on its history, and it could not be replaced
- Unfair to those who went through the process and had to maintain a chimney while others removed them without permission
- Unfortunate situation but the home could still be a contributing structure

Mr. Weaver asked for clarification on the items the applicant requested to change.

Ms. Courtney said the windows on the east elevation would be replaced with windows with interior muntins but openings would be changed in size.

Mr. Weaver said for him to support the application, there would need to be no more demolition. He said he was not in favor of approving anything else. He said the alternative would be for the Board to deny the applicant and for the application to be heard

before Code Enforcement where they would be fined.

Mr. Beach asked since the chimney was a contributing feature could it be put back.

Mr. MacDonald said that was not in the Board's purview but could be done at Code Enforcement.

Mr. Weaver noted the chimney was a mitigating feature and the gable window on the front was an important feature and it had been replaced with a one over one lite. He asked if the Board had any authority over mitigation.

Ms. Lopez said the Board could authorize or not authorize the demolition aspects and had nominal code authority to look at replacement. She said the applicant could agree to a compromise. She noted the applicant would have to willingly agree to replace items they had removed and if so, she was not opposed.

Mr. Weaver said no more demolition was allowed. He asked if they would consider rebuilding the chimney and adding the window back in the configuration as it was as a condition of approval.

Ms. Kalb preferred not to put the chimney back since it would not be functional and to prevent leaks. She said the chimney would only be for aesthetics and she felt it was not worth it. She added that they wanted to remove the aluminum windows on the porch and restore it to the original state as an open porch and asked the Board if that could be a compromise.

Mr. Weaver said the dormer on the second story was a true bungalow window with a six lite.

Mr. MacDonald said what was offered was adding the chimney back and fix the dormer window and it could be approved or it could be denied, and it would go before Code Enforcement.

Mr. Weaver noted he was fine with opening the porch, but the historic windows should be left alone.

Mr. MacDonald said they would need to apply for a building permit before removal of the windows on the front porch and the application would have to come before HARB.

Ms. Courtney said that could be approved today and the east side windows could be approved in like and kind with no change to the window size.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE the Demolition after-the-fact application HP2022-048, with the condition to not remove any more historic windows, add back the chimney, add the window back to the dormer on the main elevation, allowed to remove the windows on the enclosed porch, but no more demolition on the existing windows or any other historic fabric on the building without returning to HARB. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

Mr. MacDonald asked if the applicant was in agreeance.

Mr. Estes asked for the specifications for having the chimney rebuilt.

Mr. Weaver said the chimney needed to be restored based on photographic evidence.

Ms. Kalb agreed to the motion.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Beach, MacDonald

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. Continued Items from the previous HARB meetings

8. (a) HP2022-0020 Certificate of Appropriateness (Continued from April

21, 2022)– Grace Contracting, LLC — Applicant
Zigiz Holdings, LLC — Owner
28 W. Castillo Drive - Lot 14

Applicant for Item 8(a) and 8(b) was not present at the meeting.

To construct a new 1-1/2 story single family residence along Grove Avenue and a two-story detached building with a garage and residential space above to the rear along W. Castillo Drive 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.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to CONTINUE application HP2022-0020 and HP2022-0021 to the August 17, 2022 HARB meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Beach, MacDonald

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. (b)HP2022-0021 Certificate of Appropriateness (Continued from April 21, 2022)– Grace Contracting, LLC– Applicant
Zigiz Holdings, LLC– Owner
28 W. Castillo Drive - Lot 15

Motion under Item 8(a).

To construct a new 1-1/2 story single family residence along Grove Avenue and a two-story detached building with a garage and residential space above to the rear along W. Castillo Drive 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.

8. (c) HP2022-0039 Opinion of Appropriateness (Continued from June 16, 2022)– Troy Blevins– Applicant
Kasam Hospitality, Inc. – Owner
22-24 Cathedral Place

Motion under Item 4.

To construct three-story commercial buildings on the west side of Charlotte Street and south side of Treasury Street to flank a new parking garage on the existing parking lot and to modify 22 Cathedral Place with an elevated roof structure with columns all related to an adaptive use project on the existing buildings.

9. Planning and Building Staff Communications

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

(Provided for informational purposes)

10. Other Business

There was a brief discussion about providing the Board of Realtors with proper information regarding homes being sold in the downtown area.

Ms. Seymour said it would take time, but a Realtor Education Program could be created to help encourage realtors to attend.

Ms. Courtney felt it was not about being in a historic district, but any building fifty years or older in the City limits for partial or full demolition had to have HARB approval. She said there was a lot of information on the City's website, but they could be more proactive with informing people about the tax incentive programs available especially for full demolition in the historic area.

There was a brief discussion regarding alternates for the Board in case of an illness or requested vacation in order for the public to be served.

**10. (a) Review of FDOT Project: SR5A
(King Street) from SR A1A (Avenida
Menendez) to Bay Wall**

Mr. MacDonald discussed the lighting installed by FDOT. He said Marcus Pinson was the contact with the City and he was working on this. He suggested a report in August from Mr. Pinson regarding the lights as there had been complaints.

11. Next Scheduled Meeting Date

**(a) Wednesday, August 17, 2022 at
1:00p.m. (date moved to accommodate a
scheduling conflict)**

12. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:35P.M.³



Catherine Duncan, Chairperson

³ Transcribed by Elyse Wiemann