

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

Historic Architectural Review Board Regular Meeting September 15, 2022

The Historic Architectural Review Board met in formal session at 1:00 P.M., Thursday, September 15, 2022, in the Alcazar Room at City Hall, St. Augustine, Florida. Catherine Duncan, Chairperson, called the regular meeting to order, and the following were present:

1. ROLL CALL:

Catherine Duncan, Chairperson
Gaere MacDonald, Vice-Chairperson
Jon Benoit
Paul Weaver, III
Brad Beach

City Staff

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

(None)

5. Public Comments related to Expedited Hearing items:

5. (a) HP2022-0062– All Aboard Holdings, LLC– Applicant & Owner 290 St. George Street

Mr. Benoit recused himself.¹

To modify the site at the rear/west with proposed clay brick pavers and coquina concrete apron to replace the existing granite gravel driveway accessed from Cordova Street and to add new landscaping.

Ms. Seymour read the staff report and said based on a review of the AGHP, and without

the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds that the Board can APPROVE a Certificate of Appropriateness at 290 St. George Street because it meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation #9 as a compatible contemporary design which utilizes recommended and pre-approved paving and plant materials.

Andy Clark waived his rights to a presentation.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

Board discussion:

- Conforming and had no issues
- Questioned the pattern of the brick and if it would be broken up

Applicant response:

- Pattern would match what was appropriate with the City Code

¹ Form attached to minutes

- Brick paving already existed, and they were matching what was there

Ms. Seymour noted the application stated it would be a bonding pattern matching what was existing on property.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE 5(a) HP2022-0062, 290 St. George Street. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, MacDonald, Beach, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. (b) HP2022-0063– Erik Ostrander– Applicant & Owner 26 Sebastian Avenue

For partial demolition of a residential building constructed c. 1885-1894 that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and not located in a district, to include replacement of all existing windows, alteration of window fenestration on the south and east elevations, and replacement of existing aluminum siding.

Ms. Seymour advised she had received an email from the applicant, and he waived his rights to a presentation, agreed to staff recommendations, and that the Board was able to proceed with a motion without his presence.²

Ms. Seymour read the staff report and said based on a review of the AGHP and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds that the board can APPROVE a Certificate of Demolition for partial demolition at 26 Sebastian Avenue because it is not a local landmark or otherwise designated as a historic building.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

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

Mr. Weaver said normally the Board would not proceed if the applicant was not available; however, this item was expedited and had communicated with staff, he felt it was appropriate to proceed. He noted the windows were being replaced but they were not historic.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE Item 5(b) HP2022-0063 26 Sebastian Avenue for the partial demolition as proposed. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Benoit.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Benoit, Beach, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. Certificate of Appropriateness

6. (a) HP2022-0061– Thompson Awning and Shutter Company, Inc. – Applicant The Flagler Resort, Ltd. C/O Kessler Enterprises, Inc.– Owner 95 Cordova Street

To install a new awning over a service entry door on the south elevation.

Ms. Seymour read the staff report and said based on a review of the AGHP, and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds that the Board can CONTINUE a Certificate of Appropriateness application for

² Letter provided and attached

95 Cordova Street to allow the applicant time to provide the required owner's authorization documentation and clarifications requested by staff related to awning fabric material, color, and clearance height.

Ed Shafer reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:

- Asked if there was a material sample or picture
- Bottom of the canopy was eight-foot above finish grade
- Felt the canopy should not protrude beyond the side wall of the building
- Shop drawing provided had a column which looked to be on the wrong side
- Unsure if a column could be installed with the position of the walk-in cooler
- Board did not want the canopy to project past the side wall
- Projection was ten feet and should be recessed and align with the side wall
- Asked if the column would be in the walkway
- Asked the size of the column
- Asked if the column was needed since it would be attached to the wall
- Felt the awning could be considerably lower than proposed
- Suggested the lowest point should be the in line with the recess of the door
- Shop drawing had the bottom of the beam at eight feet
- Questioned the color and fabric
- Asked why it had changed from the other awnings on the building
- Felt the awning should be utilitarian and not resemble a main entrance

Applicant response:

- It was two feet six inches from the top of the awning to the bottom and the height would be restricted
- Installation of the canopy would be attached to two sides of the building and would be on top of the walk-in cooler
- Would have one support column on the right side at the far end of the canopy
- Canopy ended flush with the rear of the building and did not surpass it
- Was designed to not protrude and the column would be on the inside not the outside
- Column would be a little past the support post but not past the outer part of the building
- Would be in the walkway and against the building in order to not obstruct the walkway
- Column would be 4x4 and was to add general support and would have a white powder coat
- Was recommended by the company who was doing the installation
- Had a recessed area when the door was located inside the building and there was approximately twelve to eighteen inches from the top to the ceiling
- Felt the photo depiction was not accurate and the elevation could come down but needed to be above the sliding door
- Could be lowered to be less intrusive
- Would be white with a vinyl fabric

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE HP2022-0061 finding that the proposed awning was minimally visible from the public right-of-way, could be removed, and does not materially affect the significance of the building. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

**AYES: Benoit, Beach, Weaver,
MacDonald, Duncan**

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**6. (b) HP2022-0060 – St. Augustine
Foundation, Inc – Applicant & Owner
91 St. George Street**

To construct a new wood gate in the existing wall opening on St. George Street and a wood picket fence along the north property line to match the existing fence.

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 91 St. George Street:

1. APPROVE the application for construction of a new wood gate in the existing masonry wall opening along St. George Street if the HARB finds it meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation #9 as a compatible contemporary design with the condition that the color be an appropriate pre-approved color or be specified by the HARB.

2. CONTINUE the application for installation of a new picket fence, to match the existing, unpermitted picket fence to allow the applicant time to consider an appropriate alternative.

Joy McMillian and Darryl Samples reviewed the application.

Ms. Duncan noted there was a question regarding the color and asked for clarification.

Mr. Samples replied the color for the gates would be BM62 which was an 1812 Spanish Colonial color which matched the other dark green color. He added the fence in the rear,

that was not permitted, was on three other properties of theirs and was successful.

Ms. Duncan asked for clarification regarding the process on the unpermitted fence.

Mr. Birchim said the Board would direct the applicant to fill out an after-the-fact HARB application and then they would be able to appear before the Board. He said the applicant would not need to go through a formal Code Enforcement proceeding unless the applicant chose not to file the HARB application, then it would be followed up by Code Enforcement.

Ms. Duncan said it would need to go through the formal process similar to gate but for the new fence and the existing fence. She said the fence had been before HARB and then withdrawn.

Ms. Seymour advised in 2010, the application was continued and then withdrawn, so HARB had not made a final decision.

Mr. Samples added there was a corner lot on Cuna Street and Spanish Street for a fence that was approved and permitted, and this was the same.

Ms. Duncan said the Board was not saying it could not be approved but it would have to go through process.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:

- Front gate fit and design was compatible, and the colors were preapproved
- Existing fence was not permitted and lower than allowed in the guidelines

- Pickett style of the fence was allowed maybe slightly different but there was a height shown
- Felt there were two issues, the fence was not permitted and the other was the proposed style from 2010 was continued by HARB
- Asked what the issues were when the application had been first submitted

Ms. Seymour said the proposed style picket fence seemed more appropriate for a Victorian Style home because of the height and spacing of the pickets.

Discussion continued:

- Felt it should be more of a vertical board and closer together
- Should be around six feet six inches and that height was more appropriate
- Fencing that was there could have been bought off the shelf
- Thought there was an issue with the spacing as it was not proportional
- Agreed the point at the top of the pickets was more of the Victorian style and this was in HP3
- Staff recommended to approve the gate and the fence could be continued with a new application for the existing fence
- Concerned with how the fence would interact with the sidewalk as those needed to be addressed with proper gates
- Should take in account the hardscape
- First Spanish periods were more of a fortress with a six foot six inches walls around it and the openness in this area was not appropriate
- Perhaps continue the fence and bring both back together to be a more cohesive application
- Asked if the proposed fence came back with the proper height and matched the guidelines could that be approved

Ms. Seymour said she would have to do a little more research but since it was a new fence, it might have to be presented to the

Board for approval. She said if it met the criteria it could be an expedited item.

Mr. Weaver was in support of the fence being approved by administration but if staff were uncomfortable with approving it, then it could be presented as an expediated item.

Ms. Duncan said if the owner raised the new portion to the proper height and met the criteria then administratively approving should not be an issue.

Mr. Benoit said the applicant wanted to keep it open since there was a retail space on the end and having a six-foot fence might not work for them.

Mr. Samples said there had been a bit of confusion with the first application and Flagler College had been contacted and they had not felt it had been lost in translation. He pointed out they needed this to deter shoplifting and to help keep out transients.

Ms. Duncan advised there were guidelines for fencing and landscaping, and they were required to follow the guidelines. She said the Board was proposing returning to the Board with an application for the fence since it was not permitted. She said at this time, the Board was in agreeance to approve the gate and postpone the fence.

Mr. MacDonald suggested if the fence height were too high perhaps landscaping could assist with what was needed and there was more flexibility.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to PARTIALLY APPROVE Item 6(b) HP2022-0060, 91 St. George Street to approve the construction of the new wood gate in the existing wall and CONTINUE the application for the wood picket fence along the north property line to match the existing fence to the October 20, 2022 HARB meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

**AYES: Weaver, Beach, Benoit,
MacDonald, Duncan**

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**6. (c) HP2022-0058 – Cutie Pies Bake
Shop, LLC – Applicant**
RESA Properties LLC – Owner
62 Cuna Street

To modify the east elevation and adjacent area with a proposed hood system with lattice panel screening, relocation of the existing wood fence and gate across the driveway, and a replacement door.

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 may take the following actions regarding a Certificate of Appropriateness at 62 Cuna Street with the following:

APPROVE if the HARB finds that:

The installation of the new hood system, proposed site changes and screening will not radically change, damage, or destroy the architectural integrity of the building
a lattice panel is an appropriate screening material

With the following conditions:

- Wood lattice in a more appropriate scale with a 90-degree pattern will be used
- Finish colors for the mechanical equipment and lattice to be approved by the HARB

Bethany Nelson and Rick Mitidieri reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:

- Should be intergraded with the building by color
- Felt it was noticeable and thought it was larger than it needed to be
- Asked if there was a way to do housing around it
- Perhaps use a running vine to add green scape and help it blend
- Top of the makeup air was twelve foot six inches above the ground
- Only saw it from a front approach as it was down the alley way
- Another option could be to tie it in with the features of the house
- Railings on the porch were vertical elements and the shutter elements were more horizontal elements
- The portion that was screening the makeup air be more of a header with a gate to be more of a feature and entry way to the backyard
- Felt the lattice was foreign to the house and it should resemble more of the home
- Design where the elements were taken from the railing to help form the gate would be beneficial to the home
- Create a gate with a picket system across the top that would match the porch around two feet and use the gate to hide it
- Existing fence and gate that was there was to the left and the fence was to the right
- Another option could be to move the gate to the right-hand side and plant something since twelve foot six inches was very high
- Other equipment being installed would disappear as it was further back
- Could use existing materials the applicant could plant plants as a way to soften the area
- Felt the lattice would be large

Ms. Nelson said Code Enforcement had informed them no one was allowed to walk under the mechanical equipment. She said the gate proposal was to move the gate but that was not allowed. She said they were open to creative solutions and a plant would be fine as well.

Mr. Benoit suggested a potted plant as that would help it grow faster and if needed could be removed.

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE application HP2022-0058 finding that the proposed mechanical equipment was difficult to see on portion of the building from the right-of-way; also finding that it was a temporary fixture that could be removed from the building and was not a permeant change to the structure with the following conditions: lattice work and the gate facing the street were painted to coordinate with the building and the lattice work would be either a square 90 degree pattern or infers the existing railing pattern on the house that referred to traditional details or typically with lattice and the applicant would install a potted plant in front of the screening to help add some screening capabilities to the mechanical equipment and a sketch showing this should be reviewed by staff for final review. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

Ms. Duncan asked if there would be another five feet of lattice above the fence.

Mr. Benoit said it did not need to be lattice but should be more in line with the railings that have the vertical rail.

Ms. Duncan thought the plant would take care of the screening, and there would be nothing above the fence. She asked staff if that was sufficient so that it would be blocked.

Mr. Weaver said one concept was to have lattice with a climbing plant and then another was to add a potted plant. He said the screening did not have to be lattice.

Mr. MacDonald felt either of those were appropriate.

Ms. Duncan agreed and said if a potted plant with lattice was used, it would need to be a climbing plant.

Mr. Weaver said the mechanical equipment should be the same color as the building and asked for that to be added to the motion.

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

VOTE ON MOTION:

**AYES: Benoit, Weaver, Beach
MacDonald, Duncan**

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**6. (d) HP2022-0067 – KRB Construction
LLC – Applicant
TEP, Inc – Owner
4 Aviles Street (a.k.a. 17 King Street)**

Mr. Benoit recused himself from the application as he was on the TEP Board.³

To modify the existing storefront along Aviles Street with new configuration and materials.

Ms. Seymour read the staff report and said based on a review of the AGHP, and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds that the Board can CONTINUE a Certificate of Appropriateness at 4 Aviles Street to allow the applicant time to consider materials and design more compatible to the existing commercial architecture of the building and existing storefronts.

³ Recusal form attached to minutes

Chad Schwaniger reviewed the application and provided a picture of the proposed double door request.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:

- Over time, more of the store fronts had been brought to the street and understood the value of store space
- Felt this change was not out of character and thought the concept was good
- Should match the shop track that was existing and did not have an issue with the double door
- Had prepared a National Register nomination for staff as the building was built by Morris Lapidus, Mid Century Architect in Florida
- Was originally called the Ponce de Leon Plaza and was from the period and that was what was there today
- Had plenty of street space
- Felt this was a character defining feature and was an important building
- Most of the materials were still there and was the traditional mid-century store front design that was on the building
- Proposed would alter a character defining feature and was not in support of the application
- Was a valid point but the east elevation at 6 Aviles Street there were some brought forward, and others were back
- Which made it even more important to keep as it could be one of the last original storefronts on the building
- Property had been missed on surveys due to the age, but it was an important building
- Agreed it should be saved as it was an original mall idea
- Unsure how the adjacent neighbor was approved; however, this would be

removing the character and the intent of the building

- People have viewed the building as a modern building and not historic, but it had character defining features
- Storefront had arches that were defined and had recessing which provided a different experience
- Not all of the storefronts had been updated

Applicant response:

- Biggest issues were the homeless that lived in the recessed area
- This was taking away from the owner's restaurants capability by 150 feet
- Other storefronts had been updated
- Would not be completely flat it would be angled
- The recess cuts into the owner's ability to serve people and seating

Discussion continued:

- Windows were not flat across, but that store would be joining the one in question
- More space was in the connecting storefront
- Did not feel 150 feet was a lot of extra space
- Had the ability to use the sidewalk for seating
- Board was not able to design the interior as that was outside of their purview
- The Board purview was to maintain the integrity of the historic building exterior
- Building was a cohesive building designed by a well-known Florida architect and would need to keep the architectural design
- Having no other store front that matched made keeping this one more important
- Building was of National Register caliber and this was a character defining feature
- Did not feel this feature to change
- Building was 50% recessed and 50% not recessed

- Building was mid-century modern and there was a lot of interior space in the adjacent bay
- Asked if the applicant wanted to have an up or down vote or a continuation

Applicant response:

- It was the same business and they would be connected
- There was no other store front that matched
- Because of HARB many storefronts had changed and this one was being required to stay
- Did not agree with this as others had changed and those had been allowed
- First 30 feet across of the storefront was unusable, and this was a restaurant and not a clothing store

Mr. MacDonald said the store front would stay the same and suggested coming back with a new plan that would work for them.

Mr. Schwaniger said he would speak to his client and understood the concerns. He said he would explain to his client that they were turned down and could come back with a new plan. He asked if there was a way to get approval for the glass because the frame and glass were very fragile.

Ms. Duncan suggested continuing the application. She said this would allow him to speak to the owner make changes as needed or if they decided on not making changes the application could be withdrawn.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to CONTINUE application HP2022-0067 4 Aviles Street (a.k.a. 17 King Street) to continue to the October 20, 2022 meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, MacDonald, Beach, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY⁴

6. (e) HP2022-0059 – A to Z Custom Homes Inc. – Applicant 46 Avenida Menendez, Inc. – Owner 70 Hypolita Street

To replace existing asphalt shingle, stamped tin shingle, and metal panel roof materials with new 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 70 Hypolita Street:

1. APPROVE the application for the replacement of the existing asphalt shingle material with 5-V crimp metal panels

2. CONTINUE the application to replace the existing stamped tin shingles to allow the applicant time to determine whether they could be repaired or replaced with new stamped-tin shingles that would match the existing.

Charles Mahone, A to Z Construction, reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:

- Felt the tin tab roof was recent based on the evidence provided
- Thought the 5-V Crimp was the most consistent material

⁴ Break from 2:35p.m.-2:41p.m.

- Was more of a Florida vernacular building and the adjacent buildings had the metal crimp
- Should keep the awning over the porch cedar shakes
- Leave the rest of the metal crimp to tie in the Florida vernacular building
- Metal crimp would be appropriate for the time and style of building

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE application 2022-0059 at 70 Hypolita Street to replace with 5-V metal roofing with the exception of the porch in cedar shakes. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Weaver, Beach, Benoit, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. Continued Certificates of Appropriateness from Previous Meetings

7. (a) HP2022-0042 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:

- Thanked the applicant for their effort and due diligence
- There was no Florida product approval number for the metal tin tab
- Not opposed to using the shingles as discussed at the prior meeting
- Felt the shingle was compatible as it provided texture similar to the wood shake roof
- Felt there was no perfect solution but was fine with the shingle and any of the three colors
- Unsure if the metal crimp should be used
- If the shingles were used, then driftwood coloring might be too dark
- Felt there might be lighter colors that were more appropriate
- Felt the metal crimp might be more appropriate
- If shingles were chosen a darker color may be best
- Color options were driftwood, estate grey and onyx black
- Estate grey color was closer to a tin coloring

Mr. Beck noted the owner was open to any color. He said the company made the shingles in a variety of colors but thought the driftwood would be better than the onyx black.

Mr. Beach suggested using the antique silver as it was a lighter grey tone and might be more in character with the home.

Mr. Weaver said the antique silver would weather and it was close to the metal tin.

MOTION

Mr. Beach MOVED to APPROVE item HP2022-0042 18 Cordova Street, to move forward with a shingled roof in antique silver. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Benoit.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Beach, Benoit, Weaver, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. (b)) HP2022-0045 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.

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 123 St. George Street:

1. Approve the proposed replacement of the after-the-fact replacement that currently exists, 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.
or

2. Continue if the HARB finds that the proposed replacement 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, to allow the applicant more time to make changes to the design and/or materials.

Sarah Ryan and Duncan Daily reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

Ms. Duncan asked why they were unable to go with the original design.

Ms. Ryan said they were unable to contact the original storefront person. She said they now had Brad's Glass and was unable to go with the original one. She noted the original was thin and did not have a Florida product approval number.

The Board discussed:

- Was going back to a simple clean finish
- The bottom was stucco and then glass from there up
- Base was block and asked if it could be pushed back with a piece of the metal added to the front
- Original storefront had metal at the base
- Instead of stucco could have a metal panel

- Had been suggested previously to go with masonry as it was industrial
- The profile looking at the track was thinner than the old track and asked if those needed to be back to back or was there one that went both ways
- Asked the Board if the color was an issue
- Report noted there would be a clear anodized
- Appreciated the due diligence from the applicant
- Felt it was a compatible contemporary design with all the elements of a traditional storefront
- Felt the proposed design met the original intent
- Suggested moving the storefront forward or centered on the block to not have a two- or three-inch ledge
- Suggested pushing the block to the interior of the building to have the base of the cantilever centered on the block
- If a drip edge was done were they able to get a seamed and were they able to get a ten foot or eleven foot length
- Asked if metal panel would be better than stucco
- Metal would rust, stainless was not appropriate but stucco was bullet proof
- Thought the original base was metal but it was not, and the stucco was appropriate
- Asked if hurricane shutters were needed

Applicant response:

- Original in the photo was a wood frame with a wood bottom seal
- There was only metal holding it on the wood base
- There was a track that went both ways
- Would be centered on an eight-inch CMU block with two inches in front and back
- Storefront was canted and they were trying to make it as centered as possible
- Willing to push the block in to avoid the glass being close to the street
- Were able to get a twelve-foot length unobstructed

- Unsure how they could fasten it without a fastener seam
- Stucco would be painted the earthy color that was approved
- Was not in the zone as it faced west

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE HP2022-0045 at 123 St. George Street to replace the storefront with block and stucco on the lower section and leaving the shelf behind and inside the store visible with replacement of the track shown with a dimension of 1 ¾ inches in mill finish. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Beach, Weaver, Benoit, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. (c) HP2022-0057 Continued from August 17, 2022 – 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. 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 24 Cathedral Place:

1. Approve if the HARB finds that the proposed new equipment will not negatively impact the architectural integrity of this architecturally significant building, or the character defining cupola feature, and is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation 2, 5, and 9, with the following condition:

a. That the antennas, and equipment if applicable, will be finished to matching the terra cotta on the cupola or adjacent elements, or for the HARB to recommend another measure to mitigate the impact of the proposed equipment.

2. Continue if the HARB finds that a more detailed analysis of other potential locations or technology or more clarifying information on the proposed equipment is needed to determine other alternatives to the proposed or the real visual impact to the exterior of building and visibly prominent tower and cupola.

Bobby Jones, Hunter Hallett, and Courtney Barnard reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:

- Thanked the applicants for doing their due diligence
- Looked like the cabinets were set back and would be integrated through color and not easily seen
- Proposed cabinets were being exchanged in the same place and not encroaching on the roof wall line and setback

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE 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. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Beach, Benoit, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. Certificate of Demolition - City Owned Property

8. (a) HP2022-0066 – City of St. Augustine - Applicant and Owner 110 Carver Street E

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

STAFF DOES NOT PROVIDE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CITY PROJECTS AND LOOKS TO THE HARB FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT ON THIS PROPOSED CITY PROJECT.

David Birchim, Assistant City Manager reviewed the application and noted the building was inhabitable.

Ms. Duncan asked if the new building had to be higher since it was right next to the water.

Mr. Birchim stated it was in Flood Zone X, the maximum height would be twenty feet, and the site-specific text amendment to the future land use map went with the rezoning. He said that would also include a maximum lot coverage of 25% which was the existing maximum lot coverage, and the zoning issues would be covered by the Planning and Zoning Board. He noted if it could be saved, they would not be in front of the Board.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi spoke in opposition to the application and said this was a perfect

example of neglect as it had sat there since 2016 without care. She asked who in the City submitted the site plans and when they were submitted. She asked if this had been the plan since 2016. She encouraged the Board to deny the application.

Public hearing was closed.

Mr. Birchim said he had submitted the plans that were drawn up by the Yacht Club. He said they were submitted after the City obtained the deed and the date as recorded was August 23, 2022. He said the lease was not signed until the zoning was effective. He advised there was a revert clause and if the rezoning were not complete then the property would return to the prior owner.

The Board discussed:

- City had owned the building for less than a month
- City did not neglect the property and that was the responsibility of the previous owner
- Home had been damaged by the storm
- Building was not significant, and the demolition could not be stopped by the Board
- Demolition by neglect was something that HARB was interested in, but this was not the case
- Suggested turning the proposed building 180 degrees to create shielding for the neighbors and connect the parking lot

Applicant response:

- Homes condition had not changed since the City obtained the property three weeks ago
- Building was not contributing to a district listed in the National Register, or a local landmark
- Making a change like that would change the lease, but could presented

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE application HP2022-0066 finding that the building is not individually recognized as a historic building, not a contributing structure to a historic district, and not identified as a historic structure. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Weaver, Beach, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

9. Other Business

(a) Request for feedback regarding the proposed repaving of Cadiz Street from St. George to Avenida Menendez with brick pavers

Casen Tilden introduced the topic and provided more information to the Board regarding the proposed repaving and resurfacing of Cadiz Street from St. George to Avenida Menendez with brick pavers.

Public Comment was open; however, there was no response.

Board Discussion:

- Felt it was a good idea
- Was unaware this had happened over the last decade
- Felt that it was much needed, but unsure where the funding would come from

Mr. Birchim advised he was unsure of where this would fall on the timeline for capital improvements. He said it was flexible depending on the wishes or will of the City Commission. He said the condition of Cadiz Street needed to be addressed, and if HARB approved the resurfacing with brick that would be tied to this project. He said he could follow up with Reuben Franklin, Public Works Director, to see where this was on the schedule.

Board discussed:

- Would be in favor of the resurfacing
- Was affecting an important structure
- Questioned the convex design
- Design of the street was very important to think about
- Good for the water to drain away from the buildings

Mr. Birchim noted Spanish Street was in the last phase of being resurfaced with brick and was being rehabilitated. He advised that he mentioned this to Mr. Franklin.

Mr. Benoit asked what was needed from this discussion.

Ms. Lopez advised a consensus was needed as the details would come back before the Board once the City was able to move forward.

Mr. Birchim advised that, Mr. Franklin said it was not on the list and the question was if HARB was in support of the brick and if so, they could try to apply for grants.

There was unanimously Board consensus to support the bricking of Cadiz Street.

(b) Update related to FPL's LED program to replace existing street light fixtures and poles within the city limits

Marcus Pinson, Utility Plant Engineer, City of St. Augustine and Scott Tharp, Florida Power and Light provided the Board with an update regarding the LED street light fixtures and poles within the City limits.

Mr. Tharp said approximately 60% of the lights had been converted and any issues should be taken care of and completed in the middle of October. He said the shields were on backorder; however, if there were a shield request it would be a priority.

Mr. MacDonald asked how people could contact the City if they wanted a shield.

Mr. Pinson advised people could email him directly at mpinson@citystaug.com.

Public Comment was open.

Charles Pappas said he was speaking for the neighborhood in Fullerwood because they had all the wrong lights and they were too bright. He said most had been replaced but some were missed, and now there were some lights that did not go off. He said he was unsure if FPL was aware, but Mr. Pinson had asked for shields to be on all the lights in the neighborhood.

BJ Kalaidi asked if the double poles would be removed from all over the City. She said she loved the light and was very pleased with the brightness and thought it would help with the issues in some neighborhoods.

Public Comment was closed.

Mr. Tharp apologized and said the Fullerwood community had the wrong lights installed and they were correcting the issue and would be happy to install the shields. He asked for patience as they were waiting on the manufacturer. He said he was not involved with the double poles and was unable to answer that.

Ms. Duncan asked if shields would be installed on all the lights, or did they need to be requested.

Mr. Tharp advised unless shields were requested by the City they would not be installed.

Mr. MacDonald asked if this could be advertised on News and Notes as that was sent out each week.

10. Planning and Building Staff Communications

a) Planning and Building Staff Approved Permits Report

(Provided for informational purposes)

11. Next Scheduled Meeting Dates

11. (a) Tuesday, September 20, 2022, 1:00 p.m. - Special Joint Meeting with the Planning and Zoning Board to review a draft update of the Architectural Guidelines for Historic Preservation and discuss amendments to the 22-24 Cathedral Place Planned Unit Development (PUD) to include amending the PUD narrative, site development plan, building elevations, and exhibits.

(b) Thursday, October 20, 2022 1:00 p.m. - Regular HARB Meeting

12. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:08 P.M.⁵



Catherine Duncan, Chairperson

⁵ Transcribed by Elyse Wiemann