

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

Historic Architectural Review Board Regular Meeting August 17, 2022

The Historic Architectural Review Board met in formal session at 1:00 P.M., Wednesday, August 17, 2022, in the Alcazar Room at City Hall, St. Augustine, Florida. Catherine Duncan, Chairperson, called the regular meeting to order, and the following were present:

1. ROLL CALL:

Catherine Duncan, Chairperson
Gaere MacDonald, Vice-Chairperson
Jon Benoit (left at 4:39p.m.)
Paul Weaver, III
Brad Beach

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 noted a few minor scrivener's errors for the clerk to review.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE the June 16, 2022 minutes with the above corrections. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

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

MOTION

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

VOTE ON MOTION:

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

4. Modification and approval of Agenda

Ms. Duncan announced there was one item that had a continuance, HP2022-0045, Certificate of Appropriateness at 123 St. George Street asked for a continuance to the September 15, 2022. She noted a special meeting was held for Item 7(g); HP 2022-0039 22-24 Cathedral Place had been continued to the October 20, 2022 HARB meeting. She said one item had been added to "other business" which was in reference to a sign.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE the modifications, noted by Chairperson Duncan, to 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:

5. (a) HP2022-0055 Certificate of Demolition– 1565 Woodworks, LLC– Applicant
Craig Anderson– Owner
63 Smith Street

To demolish a residential building constructed ca. 1917-1924 that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and not located in a district.

Craig Anderson waived the right to the presentation and agreed to the conditions in the staff report.

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

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

Public hearing was opened; however, there was none

Mr. Weaver noted there was not a condition to salvage any materials.

Ms. Seymour said based on the condition of the structure they were unsure there would be any salvageable materials; however, the Board could add that condition.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE Item 5(a) HP2022-0055, 63 Smith Street to

approve the demolition based on the staff report and no evidence being found this was a historic structure with no conditions. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Beach, Benoit, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. Administratively Continued Items

6. (a) HP2022-0051 Certificate of Demolition (Continued from July 21, 2022)– K.A. Morrison – Applicant
Kenton Andrew Morrison Revocable Trust– Owner
36 N. St. Augustine Boulevard

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

Mr. Beach recused himself from the application.¹

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 36 N. St. Augustine Boulevard because it is not a local landmark or otherwise designated as a historic building if the HARB finds that the building is not architecturally significant enough to meet the threshold of a historic local landmark 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.

¹ Recusal form attached to minutes

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.

Michael Davis reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

14 certified notices were sent, 2 were returned in favor, 0 were returned opposed and 1 had comments.

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

The Board discussed:

- Applicant provided a list of items that could be salvaged and repurposed
- Property was boarder lined for flooding and was in support
- Did not met the threshold to be a historic landmark or a designated historic building

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE application HP2022-0051 at 36 N. St. Augustine Boulevard finding the existing structure is not in a historic district and is not designated a historic building. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

Mr. Weaver asked that the staff report condition be added to the motion.

Mr. Benoit AMENDED the motion to include that the applicant salvage existing materials as possible. The AMENDED motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, MacDonald, Weaver, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. (b) HP2022-0044 Certificate of Appropriateness (Continued from July 21, 2022)– Les Thomas Architect– Applicant
Ocean Breezes Real Estate, LLC– Owner
50 Marine Street

Mr. MacDonald recused himself from the application.²

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 driveway, patio, walkways, and masonry property walls.

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 50 Marine Street:

1. APPROVE the application if the HARB finds that the proposed new detached building and alterations to the existing building and site are consistent with the AGHP and the scope of work meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards #9 for compatible contemporary design; OR,

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

Les Thomas reviewed the application.

² Recusal form attached to minutes

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

Public hearing was opened.

Lauren Giber spoke in favor of being able to do renovations on the home as long as it was within the HARB guidelines and questioned if the garage with the apartment would be a short-term rental which would need to be certified by the City.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Felt the plan overall was a compatible, sensible restoration and retained the original character of the home
- Sensitive to the architecture
- Matched the red asphalt shingle and it seemed to be appropriate and resembled a tiled roof
- Questioned the eight-foot high wall on the back of the property
- Asked if the neighbors had been informed as to the height of the wall
- In support of the gate as it broke up the eighty-five-foot wall
- House modifications were compatible and sensitive to the existing house
- Proposed renovations fit within the context of the building and the surrounding district
- Infill of the back porch made it more monolithic and permeant
- Thought it was good to identify materials being used
- Part of the existing roof would remain and would be patching and tying in as needed with the new
- Asked why the wall was not being carried on all sides of the property
- Building was nice but renovations were an improvement
- Unsure of the twelve-foot wide gate and the purpose
- Garage was setback as far as possible and concealed by a fence

- Felt gate size could be determined on a case-by-case project
- Beneficial that the wall and gates would be setback on the property and not on the street
- Was in favor of the front elevations and the details on the balcony and dormer
- Questioned the height of the existing front door
- Questioned the wall on the front
- Asked the color of the wall and the color of the wood rafter

Applicant response:

- Neighbors were informed about the wall
- Wanted to have the highest wall possible and the guidelines allowed eight feet, but wanted a gate to communicate with their neighbors
- Would be reroofing the new balcony and the dormer in the rear
- Fencing was on the north and south side
- Neighbor was close in the rear and agreed to have the wall since the garage was close to the property line
- Wall on the south side was decorative wood and north wall was a low wall and allowed in HP-1
- Felt it did not make sense to have a fifty-foot gate for a vehicle as it did not fit and thought that should not apply to garages and the area showed otherwise
- Door height was six-foot eight inches without lighting above
- Front wall was five-foot six-inches and the eight-foot wall was in the back of the property
- Garage to its peak was fifteen feet high and garage doors were seven feet
- Color of the wall would be white stucco and the wood match the color of the house in the approved red

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE HP2022-0044, 50 Marine Street finding that the modifications to the existing residences, new garage and proposed walls are

compatible with the historic district guidelines and with the applicant answering staff questions regarding colors as submitted. The motion was **SECONDED** by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Beach, Weaver, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. Continued Items from the previous HARB meetings

7. (a) HP2022-0042 Certificate of Appropriateness (Continued from July 21, 2022)– KRP Properties V of Valdosta, LLC– Applicant & Owner
18 Cordova Street

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 reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:

- Questioned if the metal shingles met the approval for the Miami Dade uplift rating
- Asked the difference in pricing to install the metal or the shakes
- Questioned if there was a decking or cedar shakes when looking from the attic area
- Product was not waterproof but water shedding
- Would need a water shield underneath
- Financially not much of a difference for the quality of roof and the compatibility
- Decking described seemed to be consistent with the original roof
- Thought to be a first-generation metal roof based on City code at the time
- Questioned how difficult it would be to find an installer for the metal
- Felt this roof could last 100 years similar to the original roof
- Roof was a character defining feature and had a texture and pattern
- Would be in support of using the metal tin as long as there was a Florida Product approval number
- Asked if it did not have the Miami Dade uplift rating could the alternative material present by the applicant be approved by staff or should it return to HARB
- Asked if the company could refer an installer in Florida
- Felt there was time to choose the material which could be the solution for the next 50 to 100 years

Applicant response:

- Unsure if they were hurricane rated but could find out
- Best Buy Metals shipped throughout the country and was a commercial supplier

- Unable to look from the attic but under the existing product from the roof appeared to be tongue and groove decking with some variation but was very old-style deck work
- Contract for the shingled roof was \$20,000.00 and metal roof were \$20,000 for the materials package and the labor per square foot would be an additional \$11,000 or \$12,000 plus any other cost
- If the metal were feasible would be in support
- Had a representative that provided the quote but had not asked about an installer but would reach out for a subcontractor if necessary

Mr. Weaver asked if the applicant replaced the roof in kind would he need to return to HARB if the application were continued.

Ms. Seymour replied the applicant were to replace the roof in kind that could be administratively approved; however, the reason he was before the Board was because there was request for a material change.

Mr. Weaver suggested continuing the application and if there was an issue the applicant could return. He said he proposed replacing using the metal shingle and replace in kind.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to CONTINUE HP2022-0042, 18 Cordova Street proposal to replace existing metal possibly tin shingled roof with an asphalt shingle material taking into consideration that the Board was recommending replacement in kind that could be approved administratively. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, MacDonald, Beach, Benoit, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY³

Mr. Benoit asked if it needed to meet the Miami Dade rating.

Ms. Duncan replied it needed to have a Florida product approval number.

Ms. Courtney stated the City Building Official would also accept a sealed letter from a structural engineer as an alternative.

7. (b) HP2022-0040 Certificate of Appropriateness (Continued from June 16, 2022)– Len Weeks Construction Design Development – Applicant Lightner Museum of Hobbies– Owner 75 King Street

To replace four (4) original terra cotta columns on the south terrace to match existing; and, to replace existing flagpoles and hardware on the south elevation. (Flagpoles approved at June 16, 2022 meeting).

Ms. Courtney read the staff report and said based on a review of the AGHP, previous discussion at the June 2022 meeting, and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds that the HARB can take the following actions for a CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS at 75 King Street:

1. Continue to allow the applicant time to gather additional information, as requested by the Board, and develop a more comprehensive implementation plan for the proposed work.

Or

2. Approve if the Board can make the following findings: a. The overall proposed project scope will not negatively impact the architectural integrity of the historic building,

³ Break from 2:04p.m.-2:13p.m.

b. The proposed replication of the terra cotta columns and decorative elements meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation 6 (Repair or Replacement of Deteriorated or Missing Architectural Features Based on Historic Evidence), c. The proposed replacement and reconfiguration of the existing copper gutters meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation 9 and 10 (Compatible Contemporary Design for New Alterations and Additions / Reversibility of New Alterations and Additions)

With the following conditions:

1. Work will be done in coordination with a professional conservator, preferably one trained in Architectural Conservation, and remnants of the historic terra cotta columns and detailed elements will be retained by the Lightner Museum.

2. That the applicant can show that the materials, finish, and dimension of the replacement gutters match the existing.

Schaffer Weeks and Mark McConnell, architect, reviewed the application.

Ms. Duncan asked if a professional conservator had been found for the work recommended.

Mr. McConnell stated there were four on the east coast that could assist but did not have a recommendation at this time.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

Public hearing was opened.

Leslee Key spoke regarding the application and provided information about the building and materials. She felt they were trying to do a great job with the research but wanted to provide extra information for the Board.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Thanked the applicant for providing the additional information requested and an expert
- Information provided could be used as a publication as it was very informative
- Wanted to salvage two columns but understood that might not be feasible
- Questioned what would happen to the salvaged materials if not able to be saved
- Effort put in by applicant provided the foundation needed for the project
- Questioned if the gutters were to be heard or if that was a separate discussion
- Felt more information was needed to make an informed decision

Applicant response:

- Materials would be saved and held in the Lightner Museum and be reused or in a future exhibition

Ms. Courtney said more information was provided regarding the gutters, and which was an addition to the application and not noticed. She said the flagpoles had been approved at the previous meeting, but the applicant noted a gutter reconfiguration that needed to be done due to the new flagpoles.

Ms. Duncan asked since they had been approved why were they being changed.

Mr. Benoit said his expectation was the gutters were strapped to the wall and thought there were some field modifications that needed to be done; however, the gutters were not a premade material that could be purchased.

Mr. Weeks referred to a drawing submitted of the flagpoles and said there was not enough room for the flagpole to sit and proposed the gutters be rerouted as shown. He said the gutters were in bad condition and pulling off the wall and were not diverting the water as

intended. He said they need to return to what was originally there and would have the same shape, material, and size but needed to be rerouted to be below the abutments.

Ms. Duncan noted the new design was less intrusive.

Mr. Beach asked if the down spouts connected to a storm system or discharged on grade.

Mr. Weeks replied discharge on grade. He said the final location would stay the same and the water spill out to a landscaping bed.

Mr. Beach felt if there was storm drain available instead of discharging on grade would be better.

Mr. Weeks said there was not a storm drain in the area to tie into and the water was only from the terrace and not the entire building.

Board discussion continued:

- Asked for more information regarding preparing the coquina walls behind the columns
- Questioned the life span of the new terracotta
- Asked if staff would be able to review the samples received
- Questioned if the urns were all gone and would need replacing and if it were one piece
- Wanted to prevent future damage to the terracotta
- Anything that could be saved or held should be as it was a part of history
- In favor of the columns and flagpoles but questioned if there was a need to have more information provided on the gutter system
- Questioned if the continuous gutter projected into the stair well

Applicant response:

- Gladding McBean would design the armature needed to reattach the columns
- Shell aggregate concrete would be recreated to match, and the opening would be the correct size to hold the armature
- Would be replicating the mortar as closely as possible
- 1974 mortar was crushed shell sand
- Terracotta was unglazed and would last around 200 years but shear cracking and removal and installation from the terrace replacement had caused damage
- Would share the samples of the terracotta and mortar
- Was a single piece and the top finial would need to be interpreted as there was not a complete one to use for replication
- Drawings in the report were suggestive and would use a photo for replication or an early 1888/1889 catalog
- All the downspouts went straight down and spilled out on to the terrace
- In the 1970's, they ran in many directions and that would be done but lowering it down to be less intrusive
- Went around the flagpole abutment and would not be in anyone's way and would be four inches above from the tread nosing for cleaning
- Handrails were rounded to go around the abutments to not be in the way for the future and the down spout would be tucked
- Water intrusion and the stairs was a concern and wanted to divert water away from the scupper that overlooked the stairs

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE HP2022-0004, 75 King Street to repair or replace four original terracotta columns on the south terrace to match the existing, to approve the modifications to the flagpoles, and approve the replacement

of the copper gutter system, including retaining a professional conservator, and to include the plan as documented in the HARB report. The motion was **SECONDED** by Mr. Benoit.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Benoit, Beach, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. (c) HP2022-0045 Certificate of Appropriateness (Continued from July 21, 2022)– 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.

Applicant requested a Continuance to September 15, 2022.

7. (d) HP2022-0052 Certificate of Demolition (Continued from July 21, 2022)– KP Meiring Company– Applicant Meiring Trust– Owner 103 South Street

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).

Ms. Courtney read the staff report and said based on a review of the AGHP, the previous HARB reviews and COD approvals (under

F2018-0005 and F2019-0109), and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds that the board can take the following actions for a Certificate of Relocation and Demolition at 103 South Street:

1. APPROVE based on the past HARB approval for a full demolition in 2018 with the finding that the condition of the remaining portion of the substantially damaged structure has not improved since that time.

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

2. Continue the application to allow the applicant time to provide an updated structural assessment and undue economic hardship information if the HARB determines that more information is needed to justify approving the full demolition of a contributing NRHD building.

Kemper Meiring reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

Public hearing was opened.

Lauren Giber spoke in opposition of the application and said for the past five years, the home had been boarded up but over the past few months the owners opened it up to the elements. She said the owners should have to rebuild the home as it was and restore it as the shape was unique.

BJ Kalaidi spoke in opposition to the application and said the applicant should have to prove their economic hardship. She asked if the Board could require the new owners to build in the footprint that was there with the same height to fit within the

neighborhood. She said if there was any way the developers could be held to preserving history and keep developers from over building. She felt this was neglect and thought the application should be continued to prove their hardship.

Ms. Duncan advised the Board did not have authority over what could be built.

Charles Pappas noted the City needed help in the Lincolnville neighborhood as there were many demolitions. He said he went by the structure and it was in very poor condition. He said he was in favor of preserving the structures in Lincolnville and a full demolition was granted in 2018 and since it had been deteriorating. He encouraged the Board to approve the demolition.

Public hearing was closed.

24 certified notices were sent, 1 were returned in favor, 0 were returned opposed and 1 had comments and email attached

The Board discussed:

- Was in support of the demolition as the building had not improved
- Questioned if the new structure would have to meet the existing zoning requirements for the property

Mr. Meiring thought the proposed plans could be used since they had been approved.

Ms. Courtney noted the applicant had a year to build within the existing footprint; although, the applicant was building within the footprint he was adding on to the structure.

Mr. Benoit said he was surprised the garage had been approved as it had a living space over it ceased to be an accessory structure. He said it could not be within three-feet of the property line and needed to meet the ten-foot side yard setback. He said he was unsure how that had been approved.

Board discussion continued:

- Structure on site had not changed since 2018 and was in very rough shape
- By keeping the original structure, it was grandfathered in for one year
- Felt the gambrel roofline was a very important feature
- Full demolition was granted in 2018 and the partial demolition was approved in 2019
- Full demolition had expired and that was the reason for returning to HARB for the partial demo in 2019
- Prior research by the applicant showed the gambrel roof covered a hip roof
- Building official determined in 2017 it had been substantially damaged due to the hurricanes
- Questioned if construction had started at the property
- Asked if the existing building was being incorporated in the new design
- Questioned if the previous proposal was within the setbacks and the new proposal was new construction and that would need to adhere to the current guidelines
- Applicant had one year to build within the footprint
- Additions were within the ten-foot setback and were allowed to add to a grandfathered setback
- Did not feel the two-story garage was in the zoning for the district
- Garage was larger than the main house; however, not in the Boards purview
- Asked why the first approved demolition expired
- Thought it was difficult to question the previous approved demolitions

Applicant response:

- Wanted to keep the design that had been developed
- Felt the architect did a good job of designing a house that fit in the neighborhood

- Floor plan indicated by bold lines was the original structure that would be incorporated
- Facing South Street everything except for the covered porch was original and would be rebuilt with brick piers
- Did not want to do a full demolition and was the intent from the start
- Had come back for a partial demolition but that had expired

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE based on the decision made in 2018 and evidence submitted today to approve HP2022-0052 finding that the building had deteriorated beyond repair and the Board does not have purview of replacement construction and with the request if there is anything that could be salvaged and repurposed to do so. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Weaver, Beach, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. (e) HP2022-0020 Certificate of Appropriateness (Continued from April 21, 2022)– Grace Contracting, LLC– Applicant
Zigiz Holdings, LLC– Owner
28 W. Castillo Drive - Lot 14

Application Item 7(e) and Item 7(f) were heard together

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 .

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 applications at 28 W. Castillo Drive – Lot 14 (HP2022-0020) & Lot 15 (HP2022-0021):

1. CONTINUE to allow for further clarification and/or modifications as recommended by the HARB necessary for the design to be consistent with the AGHP and appropriate for the Historic District.

Alternatively, if the application is found generally compatible with the district but not to the level of detail required for a COA, the Board may consider approval of the application as an Opinion of Appropriateness and encourage the applicant to submit a new Certificate of Appropriateness application with fully updated drawings modified per HARB's recommendation and all material and design details as required.

Allen Register reviewed the application.

Letter was received regarding application 7(e) and 7(f).

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

Public hearing was opened.

Michelle Ward spoke on behalf of her mother Yvonne Puckett who owned two properties directly across from the properties in the application. She said there were two concerns, water drainage and adequate parking. She said her properties and Lots 14 and 15 were at the end of the street where the water drained into a single storm water drain, and flooding occurred and Lots 14 and 15 absorb a vast amount of rainwater which helped mitigate the problem. She asked if the lots could be prepared to where the water flowed onto Castillo Drive where a larger storm drain was located. She said Grove Avenue was a narrow street, and if the

homes were turned in to short-term rentals without enough parking, people might park on street or in front of her driveway hindering her from getting out. She said at the April meeting there was a question about the stairway from the garage apartments encroaching into the setback and she wanted to know if that was answered.

Public hearing was closed.

Mr. Weaver said the applicant was a no show at the last meeting and had not provided a reason for not being present.

Ms. Seymour replied in the affirmative and said the applicant informed them that he had the date wrong.

The Board discussed:

- Board had no staff report and felt it was unfair to ask for a decision when new documentation had just been provided
- Staff was unable to respond to the new material
- Staff had asked for material, but the applicant did not respond in a timely manner
- Did not feel the Board had enough time to develop a conclusion
- Suggested continuing the application and return with a complete package and staff report
- Wanted to have a clear site plan and elevations and felt the latest information should be provided
- In favor of denying the application
- Needed to review the fenestration patterns and two homes should be differentiated as it was not compatible with the history of historic homes or the neighborhood
- If applicant wanted, they could return with a new application and encouraged the applicant to broaden his team
- Felt the application was incomplete and it did not respond to the comments that were provided

- Asked for a civil drawing showing where the water would be going which would be beneficial to the neighbors
- Questioned where the vehicles would be parking if there was not enough space on the lot
- Felt the applicant should integrate off street parking
- Public deserved to know what was to be done on the property
- By providing new material on the day of the meeting, the public was unable to review it

Mr. Weaver asked how soon the applicant could reapply if denied.

Ms. Courtney said the City Code did not have a time limit for the HARB's review. She said he could return next month but would have to submit a new application.

Mr. Benoit stated he was not trying to be difficult; however, continuing the application provided mixed messages. He said the application was not one he could support as the fenestrations, scale, materials were off and there was a lack of clarity in the drawings. He said he did not want to burden the applicant with extra expenses but did not feel this was an application he could support at this time.

Mr. Register said he had been sick and understood there was a lot of documentation that had been provided today. He thought he resubmitted the application but agreed it needed to be cleaned up. He said he had requested design work from an architect, but it had not been received.

Mr. Weaver said the application had been continued since April and asked how much longer the applicant needed.

Mr. Register said he would work with another architect and get the application sorted and over to staff within the next ten to fifteen business days.

Ms. Seymour confirmed the deadline to submit documentation was September 5, 2022.

Mr. Weaver said the Board could continue the application to October to provide more time.

Mr. MacDonald noted if the application were denied, the Board would get a clean and clear application.

Ms. Lopez advised there needed to be two motions since it was two different applications.

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to DENY HP2022-0020, Lot 14 28 Castillo Drive the application based on multiple continues, lack of clarity, and if brought back should be concise. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

Mr. Weaver asked to add lack of compliance to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

Mr. MacDonald AMENDED the MOTION to include the lack of compliance to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and the AMENDED motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Beach, Weaver, Benoit, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

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

Application heard with Item 7(e), please see discussion under item 7(e).

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.

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 applications at 28 W. Castillo Drive – Lot 14 (HP2022-0020) & Lot 15 (HP2022-0021): 1. CONTINUE to allow for further clarification and/or modifications as recommended by the HARB necessary for the design to be consistent with the AGHP and appropriate for the Historic District.

Alternatively, if the application is found generally compatible with the district but not to the level of detail required for a COA, the Board may consider approval of the application as an Opinion of Appropriateness and encourage the applicant to submit a new Certificate of Appropriateness application with fully updated drawings modified per HARB's recommendation and all material and design details as required.

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to DENY HP2022-0021, Lot 15 28 Castillo Drive to reapply with a clean document and lack of confusion taking into consideration the AGHP standards, window designs, and materials used and should differentiate between the two buildings to have more character on the street . The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Beach, Weaver, Benoit, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY⁴

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

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 .

Special meeting took place on August 11, 2022 and the Item was continued to October 21, 2022 HARB meeting.

8. Certificate of Appropriateness

8. (a) HP2022-0057– Tower Engineering Professionals, Inc.– Applicant Kasam Hospitality, Inc.– Owner 24 Cathedral Place

To install new antennas on the cupola of the building's tower and mechanical equipment to the platform on the flat roof as part of a wireless antenna upgrade.

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 find that the Board can CONTINUE a CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS at 24 Cathedral Place because more clarifying information on the proposed equipment is needed to determine the impact to the exterior of this architecturally significant building and visibly prominent tower and cupola.

Bobby Jones and Jared Jackson reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

Public hearing was opened.

Leslee Key spoke regarding the project and noted the existing pieces had been painted in a terracotta color to camouflage. She asked if this was state of the art technology as most were getting Wi-Fi off satellite and felt this might not be necessary for the long run.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Supportive of the application and noted existing mounts could hold the newly proposed equipment
- Was similar to what was already there, and no new holes would be needed and the integrity to the cupola would not change
- Would not change how it would be seen from ground level
- Questioned the height and footprint of the cupola and the flat roof
- Questioned if what was being removed and the proposed was equal and would be painted the same terracotta color
- Questioned if there was a photograph or an elevation drawing of the east side of the building where the equipment was located
- Asked if the one shown on the roof deck was an accurate depiction and if the equipment was presently visible
- Wanted a plan to know exactly where it was located
- Asked for a floor plan of the flat roof
- Questioned how tall above the parapet was the equipment

⁴ Break from 4:02p.m. – 4:13p.m.

Applicant response:

- All equipment would be painted to match the existing building
- The proposed would be going into the exact location as the existing
- Heights were exactly the same inside the cupola
- Battery cabinet on the flat roof was slightly larger in width with a four- inch difference
- Platform was behind the architectural structured wall
- Was not visible above the parapet and looking from the east, the equipment was on the backside
- Equipment was not able to be seen from ground level but unsure of the actual height

Ms. Courtney said her concerns with the new plan was the location of the antennas looked slightly different and would be mounted closer to the exterior of the cupola. She said she had been asking for information and had not received it and that was the reason staff could not recommend approving without having the correct information.

Mr. Jackson noted he had a revised drawing.

Mr. Weaver said he provided a technical bulletin to staff which addressed how this was to be done. He said there were measures and the benchmark would be what was existing. He advised working with an architect and have a mockup done. He understood the plan was to match what was existing which was fine, but nothing was grandfathered in and it needed to be reviewed. He felt this was incomplete.

Board discussion continued:

- Needed to have a visual measurement for example the Bayfront as it should not been seen from every angle ⁵

⁵ Mr. Benoit left at 4:39p.m.

- Units seemed to be further forward in the opening on the plans
- Felt more details needed to be provided
- Questioned the spacing of the area in general
- Asked if it could be moved back
- Suggested providing a mockup and the height and mass needed to be elaborated and should provide sightlines from each angle the new antennas could be seen from
- Preferred cupola if it were able to setback a tad and not into the cupola openings
- Would be painted the terracotta color or painted black to blend in with the shadows
- Felt there were measurables that could be used based on the bulletin provided to staff
- Board wanted site lines from the existing platform in relation to the existing parapet
- Architects could do a site line study but thought photographs or a mockup would be the most cost-efficient way
- Should clarify exactly what was being done as this was one of the most prominent buildings in the City

Applicant response:

- Proposed now matched the existing in the new set of drawings
- A person could stand up inside the cupola
- Could provide a roof plan with measurements

Mr. Weaver asked if continued, did the applicant want the September or October meeting.

Mr. Jackson stated the October meeting would be best.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to CONTINUE Item HP2022-0057, 24 Cathedral Place to

install new antennas on the cupola of the building's tower and mechanical equipment to the platform on the flat roof as part of a wireless antenna upgrade to the October 20, 2022 HARB meeting. The motion was **SECONDED** by Mr. MacDonald

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, MacDonald, Beach, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

9. Certificate of Appropriateness – City owned property

9. (a) HP2022-0056 City of St. Augustine - Applicant and Owner
111 Avenida Menendez

To rehabilitate and raise a portion of the existing seawall to match existing seawall heights to the north and south, and to replace the existing post and chain with railing.

Staff does not provide recommendations for city projects and looks to the HARB for review and comment on this proposed city project.

Jessica Beach, City of St. Augustine Chief Resilience Officer and Angelina Fairchild reviewed the application and Brett Kuzoian was available for questions.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:

- Location was close to White's Wharf
- Questioned if the check valves that were being installed had an override for rain situations

- Asked if the bollards with the chain could be integrated but thought the railing should all match
- Thought the stucco would look better in shell
- Southern portion was coquina concrete and material were part of the City and provided texture
- Shell was close but it did not patch well
- Felt the southern look would be more seamless
- Asked what the south side looked like
- Should move towards a nicer finish instead of matching
- The one that was being replicated had an eased edge to the top
- Should keep in mind people will lean up against it
- Asked if the picture with the caps and shell could be used on top of the wall instead of the railing
- Asked if shell should be on the water side
- Questioned what was done further south on the water side
- Should come down enough to where it was not noticed
- Asked what the standard high-water line was
- Felt they should match what was done on the furthest south and be consistent and upgrade the whole thing
- Asked if the railing had a cap or was it flat top
- Questioned if the valves would protect more of the street flooding
- When the post was removed would they be patched
- Was added in 1991 to match more to the north
- Felt the ball and chain was a nod to the historic seafront

Applicant response:

- Would be just north of White Wharf
- Sidewalk would come up and match the side of the wall
- Check valves were a permeant solution but would keep the salt water out from

the water side, but if there was a high tide with a rain event, the water could be trapped on the street; however, it would be fresh water

- Not a perfect solution but would help with keeping the road more passable
- Railing on the top was matching but asked for guidance if the concrete should be painted to match
- Different levels of stucco and needed to decide if it should be smooth or textured
- Where they were tying in that was not near them as the restaurant was in between and was unsure as to what they would do
- Two way could have a slurry mix on the face of it or could do a veneer
- Questioned if the veneer would be on the water side because it would leave a distinct debris line on the water face or only the visible side on the sidewalk
- Everything to the south was stucco and would not match if the Board chose coquina
- Could match the seawall further south
- Could add a chamfered edge that would break it up and add visual interest and feel like individual blocks
- From the sidewalk the top of the cap was seven feet and if went another three feet that was elevation ten and the vista would not be blocked
- Was shell but only the part above the water and below was concrete
- Suggested doing a coquina eased edge with railing but keeping stucco on the water side
- Understanding the 2013 wall was what should be matched
- Project was FEMA funded and some items would be outside the grant
- Was outside the scope but could look into it as a City project
- Railing was a flat top like a handrail
- Would help protect under most conditions like lower level storms
- Post were bolted in and Marina requested that City staff remove them and those would be patched

- Monies were for flood protection and not for beautification
- Marina improvements from 1991 and the historic sea wall was much further to the north and was not consistent

MOTION

Mr. Beach MOVED to APPROVE HP2022-0056 the seawall City owned property 111 Avenida Menendez based on project architecture and engineering assessments from the Board: match closely the southernmost wall along the Bayfront using coquina dash stucco, using concrete coquina caps, matching railings, continuing the finish on the waterside of the wall, and make it continuous from one side to another. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Beach, MacDonald, Weaver, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

10. Other Business

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

Ms. Courtney provided a brief overview of the project and said since they were a Certified Local Government (CLG), St. Augustine had a role in commenting on Federal and State projects when applicable. She said the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) would present plan related to a storm water project to minimize flooding across King Street and Avenida Menendez.

Ian Pawn, Culture Resources Coordinator from Department of Transportation (DOT) District Two, provided an overview of the project and the purpose, which was to help limit flooding. He showed the Board the proposed improvements and noted to maintain the feel, they had committed to the

following : metal stanchion and chains would be removed and reinstalled in kind, one existing lighting pole would be removed and reinstalled, coquina sidewalk stanchions, concrete masonry walls pergola, landscaping and irrigation would be replaced in kind. He said they had been working with the Historic Preservation Department, Archaeologist and SHPO.

Public Comment was open.

BJ Kalaidi asked if she heard correctly. there were residents buried under the area.

Mr. Pawn stated not residents but remnants. He said there had been preliminary test that done to identify what was there and during the testing nothing had been found.

Public Comment was closed.

Board Discussion:

- Asked if there was a check valve going on the opening of the wall
- Area had been filled in the 1950's and was happy there had been an archaeological study
- Was very thought out and everything impacted would be replaced in kind

Applicant response:

- A check valve would be installed

10. (b) Request by City Staff to place bollards along the sidewalk on the west end of the Bridge of Lions adjacent to the lion sculptures

Ms. Courtney provided a brief overview of the topic and pointed out the bollards proposed were thirty-six inches tall, ten-inch diameter at the top, and twelve- inches at the base. She said they were made of coquina concrete and the Public Works department had been in contact with FDOT to have permission to place the bollards.

Xavier Pellicer, Mobility Manager with the City of St. Augustine, provided a brief presentation about the concerns and the need for the bollards. He noted they wanted to provide a layer of protection for the lion statues at the Bridge of Lions.

Board discussion:

- Asked if these were the same bollards throughout the City
- Asked if there could be a bench where people could sit down but could be a safety issue
- Suggested using a concrete planter box as a barrier
- Questioned if the bollards would stop a moving vehicle
- Questioned if they were solid or hollow and if they were cast
- Could add a pipe into the ground that would help stop a vehicle
- Bollards would take away from the area
- Planter would enhance the space and could be as effective
- Square bollards behind with the chain would be more cohesive and match
- Felt the plants would soften the area
- Felt the square bollards would make it look more correct and related to what was already in there
- Change to the smaller square bollards and a pipe could be added to help stop vehicles
- Could add a chain to two of them and leave one open which made it look like a plaza
- Have the statue as the center line and work from that

Mr. Pellicer response:

- There were several of the proposed types of bollards throughout town
- Bollards would add an additional layer of protection
- Bollards were solid and cast; done by the City staff
- A four-inch pipe that was in the center

- Trying to keep it simple as this was an iconic vista but needed the added protection
- Instead of the three round bollards replicate the square bollards in the same location as the photograph with or without the chains
- Still had to apply and have approval to install the bollards from FDOT

Ms. Courtney asked if the Board would consider a bike rack in the middle of Anderson Circle; however, since the information was not in the packet the Board could postpone if they wanted more information.

There was Board consensus to review the proposed bike racks.

Mr. Pellicer said there was a grass/dirt patch located near Anderson Circle and Avenida Menendez where they had proposed to add a bike rack. He said the racks would match the one that were throughout the downtown area. He said the triangular shaped area would be filled in with coquina concrete and the other would have grass and coquina concrete with the bike racks. He stated there was a request for more bike racks in the plaza; however, they did not want to add more bike racks to that area and this location was very close. He said they would be in a row and would be about half-a-dozen. He asked for the Boards guidance.

Board discussion:

- Bike racks were on the south side and had no problem with adding more
- Could be removed if not the right spot in the future
- Felt the location was good as bikes were the future with the traffic
- Adding more by the plaza was a great idea
- Ensure the racks would not hinder the pedestrian right-of-way
- Place the racks at an angle

10. (c) City Clerk Presentation of Isaac Barrett Marker

Darlene Galambos, City Clerk, presented the Isaac Barrett marker at the Visitors Information Center. She informed the Board that the marker had been approved by the City Commission and that the site would have a contextualization marker and beautification as needed. She said the marker was identical to the State historic markers except for the colors and the State seal was not on it.

Board discussion:

- Bench would be behind the marker and it looked great
- Nice concept, suggested exploring the landscape to soften it
- Beautiful marker, but ashamed the history was dark
- Location would have more visibility
- Asked if it would be the blue color and where the bronze plaque would be placed

Ms. Galambos replied the color would be blue and the bronze plaque would be on the angled pedestal in front of the marker with the information displayed.

Mr. MacDonald noted if Mr. Barrett's family was alive, they should be invited to the unveiling.

11. Planning and Building Staff Communications

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

Ms. Courtney updated the Board regarding Florida Power and Light (FPL) and said they were was invited per the Board's request and would attend the October HARB meeting regarding the LED street light conversion project.

(Provided for informational purposes)

12. Next Scheduled Meeting Date

Ms. Courtney announced there would be a joint HARB and PZB meeting to discuss the Architectural Guidelines of Historic Preservation (AGHP) on Tuesday September 20, at 1:00 p.m.

12. (a). Thursday, September 15, 2022, at 1:00p.m.

13. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:17 P.M.⁶



Catherine Duncan, Chairperson

⁶ Transcribed by Elyse Wiemann