

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

Historic Architectural Review Board Regular Meeting October 20, 2022

The Historic Architectural Review Board met in formal session at 1:00 P.M., Thursday, October 20, 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 (arrived at 1:02p.m., left at 3:00p.m.)
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

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE the August 11, 2022 Special meeting and the August 17, 2022, meeting minutes as presented. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

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

4. Modification and approval of Agenda

Ms. Duncan announced the modifications to the agenda which were as follows:

- 6(a) HP2022-0039, 22-24 Cathedral Place had been administratively continued for review by the Planning and Zoning Board
- 7(b) HP 2022-0067, 4 Aviles Street (a.k.a. 17 King Street) the applicant had

asked for a continuance to November 17, 2022 meeting

- 8(b) HP2022-0073, 50 Marine Street applicant had asked for a continuance to November 17, 2022 meeting

Ms. Seymour said she had a brief presentation regarding signage in the City that she wanted to discuss with the Board under 'other business'.

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE the modifications to the Agenda. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

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

5. Public Comments related to Expedited Hearing items:

5. (a) Certificate of Demolition – HP2022-0068

Colour Homes LLC – Applicant
Robert Sterk, Jr. – Owner
37 Florida Avenue

To demolish a residential building constructed ca. 1920 that is not recorded in the Florida Master Site File or located in a district.

Ms. Seymour read the staff report and said Based on a review of the AGHP and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds that the board can APPROVE a Certificate of Demolition at 37 Florida Avenue because it is not a local landmark or otherwise designated as a historic building with the following conditions:

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

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

Dawn Canan waived her right to a presentation.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

Ms. Duncan asked if the applicant agreed to the conditions in the staff report.

Ms. Canan replied in the affirmative.

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

Mr. Weaver and Mr. MacDonald pointed out they knew the owner but were able to vote impartially on the application.

Mr. Weaver noted it was an expedited item and there was no evidence indicating the building was historic.

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE application HP2022-0068 finding that the building was not individually a landmark building or a contributing structure to an existing historic district with the condition that the demolition permit be withheld until plans were submitted for a replacement structure. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Weaver, Beach, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. Opinion of Appropriateness Requesting a Continuance

6. (a) HP2022-0039Continued from June 16, 2022 ADMINISTRITVELY CONTINUED FOR REQUIRED PZB REVIEW– 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.

7. Certificates of Appropriateness
Continued from Previous HARB Meetings

7. (a) HP2022-0060 Continued from
September 15, 2022– St. Augustine
Foundation, Inc.– Applicant & Owner
91 St. George Street

For after-the-fact approval of the rear picket fence; and, to construct 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 a hedge to be planted as an alternative to the existing and proposed picket fence with height specified by the HARB because it meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation #9 as a compatible contemporary design; OR,
2. CONTINUE the application to allow the applicant time to consider an appropriate alternative design for the existing and proposed picket fences.

Joy MacMillan reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi noted this was an after-the-fact application which was happening too often within the City. She said this did not meet the guidelines and it could set a precedence. She encouraged the Board to following the guidelines and do what was required.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- St. Augustine was a walled City and had a walled streetscape
- Thought there had been a compromise with having landscape which would be appropriate to the area
- Proposed fence would not be a deterrent and was more for aesthetics and not appropriate
- In favor of having a hedge which should be in line with the height of what a fence would be
- Suggested moving forward with the landscape hedge and thought it was fitting for the site
- What was there now was not close to the guidelines, and should be removed
- Suggested putting the hedges in front of the fencing to help with the security issue
- Understood the need to have a hard edge and by adding the hedges in front that would conceal the fence and provide the extra needed security
- Application had previously been before HARB and was continued, then withdrawn; however, the project was completed without approval or permit
- Rules were the rules and should be followed
- Asked if the applicant had any latitude with the height of the hedges
- Questioned the sizes of the plants
- If the concern was for security the stockade
- If plants were used, should have all the specifications

Applicant response:

- Plants would not be spaced out or three feet tall, plants would be used to prevent people from entering
- Ligustrum plant or Boxwood plant would be used
- Preferred to keep the picket fencing and have the plants grow in front
- Fencing would be a barricade and hedges would grow through eventually and it would not be seen from the exterior

Ms. Duncan asked if the fence were removed, could they add plants instead of the stockade height.

Ms. Seymour said the AGHP did not specify a height for the plants.

Board discussion:

- Fence could stay for security and the picket fence would not be seen from public view
- In favor of the six-foot fence if it was for security but for aesthetics, use the plants
- Downtown community had a growing homeless problem, and this was an urban design to help with the problem
- Felt a full stockade fence for a retail business did not work
- People would not walk through a hedge if it were dense enough
- If hedge were used, did not need to review and staff could approve the hedge
- Guidelines should be maintained even though there was a homeless problem
- Hedge height did not need to be regulated at six feet
- Thought four and half feet was appropriate
- Asked if applicant could choose the height of the plants

Ms. Seymour advised the AGHP did not have a required height for the landscaping; however, landscaping over \$1000 required approval from the Board. She said it would be best if the Board provided a height for review.

Mr. Weaver suggested the landscaping be at the same height as the fence was which was four and half feet.

Ms. Courtney noted the Board was accepting the hedges as a replacement for the fence which had a height regulation, and she noted the Board had the right to establish the height or mature hedges.

Ms. Duncan asked if they were required to have a fence on their property.

Ms. Seymour said they did not have to have a fence.

Ms. Duncan asked how the applicant should proceed.

Ms. Courtney said if it were over \$1000 the applicant would need to provide a basic landscaping plan and indicate the species. She said the hope would be that a mature size plant would be used.

Mr. MacDonald suggested using four and half feet which was mature and would do what the applicant had intended.

Mr. Weaver said four and half feet was in character with the area and should be the baseline.

Ms. MacMillan said they would not have plants less than four and half feet as it was not only for aesthetics but creating a boarder to block transits from using to the property. She said she spoke to her landscaper who had suggested Viburnum, Ligustrum, or Boxwood.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE Certificate of Appropriateness HP2022-0060, 91 St. George Street for a hedge with the plant materials that were suggested with the condition the picket fence be removed and staff should be provided a drawing with the plant materials for administrative approval at four and half feet. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, MacDonald, Beach, Benoit, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**7. (b) HP2022-0067 Continued from
September 15, 2022 REQUESTING
CONTINUANCE TO NOVEMBER
MEETING— KRB Construction LLC—
Applicant
TEP, Inc.— Owner
4 Aviles Street (a.k.a. 17 King Street)**

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

8. Certificate of Appropriateness

**8. (a) HP2022-0071— Len Weeks
Construction Design Development—
Applicant
108 - 110 St. George Street, LLC – Owner
61 Spanish Street**

To construct a new pergola in the rear courtyard.

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 61 Spanish Street because the proposed pergolas meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation #9 for compatible contemporary design.

Schaffer Weeks reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi said the applicant brought up the post in front of a window; however, that was not advertised and asked if they would fix that as people did not know that was taking place.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Saw an advantage with the pergola in the rear
- Front pergola was not free standing went over the boundary side wall
- Asked if overhang could be past the property line

Ms. Lopez advised any overhang that went onto the City right-of-way there was a licensing process, which would need to take place.

Ms. Seymour noted it was a private parking lot. She said it would require site plan review to show it was not crossing the property line.

Mr. Weaver said it was encroaching onto someone else property.

Ms. Lopez said if the property was not City owned, they would need an easement with whomever owned the property.

Discussion continued:

- Would not be allowed to be outside the property during Spanish times as it was more regulated
- Should not go onto another property
- Normally, pergolas were free standing and not against a wall
- Issue with the one in the front as it was taller and larger scale than the one with the building originally
- Went to a higher elevation and was wider
- Concerned about seeing the hardware, which was problematic
- One previously approved was smaller and better than proposed
- Proposed pergola went from two post to three and was larger by a few feet; did not materially change it

Applicant response:

- Post would be on one side of the block wall with eight inches on the other side

- Willing to bring the post in to avoid being on someone else's property
- New plan proposed how the hardware would not be seen
- The ledger raised the height above the windows but was a tricky design
- Would make the entrance feel obstructed
- Proposed pergola was the same size and the post ran the same direction

Ms. Courtney pointed out the one dated 2019 was seemed to have the same elevation on the west as the one dated in 2022.

Mr. Benoit agreed and said it looked identical to the one that was proposed.

Mr. Weeks said that was the intent. He said the area was small and if the post were pulled in on each side it would shrink the entryway.

Mr. Benoit said on the original approved drawing it looked as the southerly columns were against the wall the height was over the window trim; however, it looked smaller in the plan view except for the top rafter which was a 6x8.

Mr. MacDonald said the pergola ran a different way and it had gained length.

Mr. Benoit said the west elevation was approved for both directions. He said with assurance the metal hardware would not be seen, he thought the changes in the front were reasonable; the one in the back was trying to match and was complementing what had been approved.

Mr. Beach said it looked tall; however, it had been approved at some point. He said the west elevation was at twelve feet six inches and he preferred to bring it lower, but it would interfere with the windows. He asked why a smaller size was being used.

Mr. Weeks said 2x10 was a better look and the tenant also wanted to use the same material on the front and back pergolas. He

said Les Thomas, the architect agreed that a 2x10 was the better choice.

Mr. Benoit said the front one was taller because it was over the windows, but the back section noted nine foot six inches to top of framing and the 2x10 would have it at ten foot six inches.

Mr. Beach said the back trellis felt more proportional.

Mr. Weeks clarified that sheet A3 of the new drawings noted the front was at nine foot six inches.

Mr. Beach asked if the trellis was at nine foot six inches, how tall was the masonry fence, was it six feet.

Mr. Weeks said roughly, he noted there was an ADA slope, which sloped up.

Ms. Duncan said the trellis was not lined up with the windows behind it. She said the two gates and the trellis were not centered. She asked if there was a way for that to be fixed.

Mr. Weeks said that wall would only be on the south side against the block wall with no post on the northern side, which was as far over as they could go with the gate. He showed the gates and noted that was why the post had to go there. He said this was mechanical equipment and was necessary.

Ms. Duncan said she was not suggesting being closer to the equipment; however, the post on the right-hand side could be centered on the window, so the center post was between the window.

Mr. MacDonald stated it went from twelve feet to fourteen feet making it off balanced, and if the post were pulled back two feet, it could be centered.

Ms. Duncan stated none of the equipment would be affected.

Mr. Weaver said it should be as low and with thin members as there should not be a heavy structure in the space.

Ms. Duncan noted the point was, it appeared to be twelve feet tall but if it were nine feet, she felt the 2x10 were probably better.

Mr. Weaver said historically, they were more utilitarian post as it was not for aesthetics but function.

Ms. Duncan said if it were larger in size and there were windows it should be centered.

Mr. Weaver said in this case it was about aesthetics as there would not be any plants on it.

Mr. Weeks said at this time plants were not part of the plan. He confirmed they would follow the plans that were submitted which showed it at nine feet. He said due to the mechanical equipment they had to put a post in front the window but adding another did not add any value. He said this was consistent with the roofline, the post fit in with the other post with the roof structure, and it all flowed. He said the reason for the change was for it to be more compatible with the one in the rear of the property.

Mr. MacDonald said it was not in front of the window it was ten feet away. He said one was in the middle of the window and the other was on the right side of the window. He suggested the one in the right side be in the middle of the window for symmetry from the street. He said the trellis would be bit shorter but would be more symmetric.

Mr. Weeks agreed. He said they would move the post and have the rafter tails to be consistent with the block wall.

Ms. Duncan asked if the rafters on the left-hand side were engaging the building on a ledger. She said because normally, they were standalone structures.

Mr. MacDonald noted there were no post on the wall, it was off a ledger, the post was above the windows, the courtyard was clear and there was symmetry.

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE application HP2022-0071, at 61 Spanish Street to construct two trellis one in the rear section at the walk-in as shown on the plan and the second at the west end at the entry on a ledger over the windows with three post: one which would be in the center of the windows to the west, second in the middle, third center of the window on the right, with the end of the bobbing of the tails with the outside of the masonry wall. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDoanld, Weaver, Beach, Benoit, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. (b) HP2022-0073– Les Thomas, Architect– Applicant
Ocean Breezes Real Estate LLC– Owner
50 Marine Street

To modify plans from a previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness, including altering the size of an approved window, adding an additional window of the same size on the front elevation, and reconfiguring the fenestration of an approved rear door.

Applicant requested a continuance to the November 17, 2022 meeting.

9. Certificate of Partial Demolition

9. (a) HP2022-0070– Abaco Services and Consulting Inc.– Applicant
William Bray– Owner
311 Oglethorpe Boulevard

To replace all existing windows and the front door with sidelight with different materials and window patterns.

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

William Bray 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.

Mr. Weaver asked why the Board was reviewing the partial demolition application as he thought the Board was focusing on National Register properties.

Ms. Courtney advised that had not been approved by the City Commission, and they were working under the current ordinance. She said what had been approved by Planning and Zoning would be presented to the City Commission with the updated AGHP guidelines.

The Board discussed:

- Understood the deterioration of the windows
- Highly suggested maintaining the muntin lines in the windows as they were significant to the home
- Was in support of the replacement
- Asked who designed the home

Ms. Seymour advised no architect was listed other than the owner, Ronald F. Jackson who was a local veterinarian.

Ms. Duncan said the lines in the windows were significant. She felt what was being put back would change the beauty of the home.

Michelle Tosha spoke in regarding the application and presented a photoshop rendering of what the home would look like with the change proposed. She said the vinyl would be thicker than the aluminum.

Board discussion:

- Felt was had been presented was the best option
- Glass next to the front door was important to the house and changing the door to a more modern light was not acceptable
- Was a mid-century modern, and the sidelight should be preserved

Applicant response:

- Sidelight was four separate panels and flooding occurred with the past hurricanes
- Wanted to make it more secure to avoid more flooding in the future
- Bottom panel had been replaced and did not match the top three

Board discussion:

- Felt the glass could be replaced in the bottom panel
- Could attach plywood during a hurricane to help prevent flooding and to be secure
- Understood the windows were not in good condition but wanted to keep the sidelights as that was an architectural feature
- Keeping a solid door like what was there was keeping with the mid- century
- These details provided extra beauty to the home

- Very impressed with the awareness of the applicant
- Felt the home was a jewel and well thought out
- Board had no purview on what was put back but hoped applicant would heed the suggestions

Ms. Courtney said with the partial demolition ordinance that might be approved, and if approved by the City Commission, buildings like this the Board would not review. She said it was very important as it was an outstanding example of mid-century modern and Davis Shores was where most were built in this style. She said she wanted the Board to have the opportunity to consider that as it was in the Board's purview to designate local historic landmarks.

Mr. Weaver said that was the main reason why the Board had the review. He said based on what had been shown, he did not feel there was enough information to make that decision. He noted he was in favor of the partial demolition.

Ms. Duncan asked if there was a waiting period since this was partial demolition in order to determine who the architect was.

Ms. Courtney advised there was a thirty-day delay.

Ms. Tosha said she was told by neighbors that Ronnie Jackson did the layout for the home on a napkin and he and his wife perfected it. He owned a vet clinic and worked on the heartworm vaccine. She said they were fortunate to have a lot of information regarding the history of the home.

Mr. Weaver said pattern books were plentiful at that time and that could be what had happened.

Ms. Duncan said the only thing was the front door but asked the applicant to maintain the look with the sidelights.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE Certificate of Partial Demolition, 311 Oglethorpe Boulevard HP2022-0070, replacing of all the existing windows and the front door with the sidelight but with the suggestion to save as much as possible. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Benoit.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Benoit, Beach, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

*10. Incomplete Items (as of Meeting Packet Publication)

10. (a) HP2022-0069– World Construction Co., Inc. – Applicant
St. George Street Properties, LLC– Owner
32 St. George Street

***Property survey and valid owner's signature needed.**

To construct a new pergola in the south courtyard and replace the existing wood gate with a new design along St. George Street.

Applicant was not present, and the application was incomplete.

Ms. Lopez stated the next meeting would be November 17, 2022 if the Board was in favor of continuing the application.

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to CONTINUE application HP2022-0069 to the November 17, 2022 HARB meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, MacDonald, Beach, Weaver, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

11. Planning and Building Staff Communications

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

(Provided for informational purposes)

12. Other Business

Ms. Seymour provided a brief presentation regarding sign review and the approval process.¹

Board and Staff Comment:

- Liked the graphics but felt the simpler the better
- Should keep it simple by providing three samples/options to help with consistency
- With graphics, less was more
- Felt this was more process orientated and was creating a burden for staff
- Cartoon drawings might not be appropriate on a Colonial building
- Signs should relate to the date and style of the buildings

Ms. Courtney said it was supposed to be like that; however, it was not. She said the challenge was fonts, colors, and graphics. She said that was why they were asking for their feedback.

Continued discussion:

- Staff approving the signs did not know the colors and fonts that went with the time periods for the buildings
- Suggested to break down in the time period of the building that could be beneficial
- Logos did not have to be on a sign since this was a historic district
- Simple signs should be in the historic district
- Signs were regulated no matter the area

- Should have specific fonts and colors and should match the colors of the building as those were the colors of the time
- More modern colors were not available at that time
- Most approvals could be done at the staff level but if not, those would need to be presented to HARB
- Should limit the number of colors and simplify the graphics

Public Comment open.

Nicholas Cuellar felt the signs helped with the charm of the area and brought the streets to life. He said the simple graphics would take away from the small businesses as that was what helped their businesses. He said keeping it simple made it stagnant.

Public Comment closed.

Mr. MacDonald noted if there was a sign presented not in the guidelines the applicant could present to the Board.

Ms. Courtney asked if there was Board consensus to recommend the limit to the three colors.

Board and Staff Comment:

- Felt four colors was more reasonable
- Asked if the Board should be more regulated with the type of graphics
- Felt the fewer colors the more difficult it would to have a very detailed graphic
- Was very difficult to interpret signs
- Three colors would help to keep it simpler and cleaner
- Questioned if replacing a sign that was previously existing was able to replace it without changing

Ms. Seymour said a sign that had been previously approved would be allowed to be put back 'in kind'. She said they were seeking

¹ Presentation attached to original packet

clarity for the staff to have the ability to advise people of the guidelines within the AGHP.

Mr. Benoit asked if there were examples of signs that were appropriate and examples of signs that were not.

Ms. Lopez suggested speaking with a graphic designer to have the correct vocabulary, and perhaps have them create a logo in three versions: one simplified, one with too many highlights, and another with too many highlights and shading. She said that would be a good way to provide an example without singling out a logo.

Ms. Duncan suggested looking at how another major historic district handled signs as a guide.

Ms. Courtney said signs were temporary and did not take away the historical significance of a building. She said they would continue to look at different examples and would note the issues were for staff.

Mr. MacDonald asked for an update regarding 9 May Street.

Ms. Courtney advised there had been a tragedy for the family; however, it was a Code Enforcement case to ensure the HARB ruling was complied with or it would go before the Code Enforcement Board.

13. Next Scheduled Meeting Date(s)

13. (a) Thursday, November 17, 2022 at 1:00 p.m. - Regular Meeting



² Transcribed by Elyse Wiemann

14. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:22 P.M.²



Catherine Duncan, Chairperson