

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

Historic Architectural Review Board Regular Meeting November 17, 2022

The Historic Architectural Review Board met in formal session at 1:00 P.M., Thursday, November 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
Brad Beach
Barbara Wingo, Alternate

Absent:

Paul Weaver, III

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

BJ Kalaidi

3. Approval of Minutes

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE the September 15, 2022, minutes as presented. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Benoit.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Benoit, Beach, Wingo, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. Modification and approval of Agenda

Ms. Seymour announced there were two additional 'Other Business' items to be added to the end of the meeting.

There was Board consensus to add the two additional items to the end of the meeting.

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE the agenda with the modification to add the additional items. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Beach, Wingo, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY¹

5. Public Comments related to Expedited Hearing items:

(None)

6. Continued Certificates of Appropriateness from previous HARB meetings

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

Mr. MacDonald recused himself.²

¹ Mr. MacDonald was not present for the vote.

² Recusal form attached to original minutes

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.

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 50 Marine Street for modifications to previously approved COA HP2022-0044 because they meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation # 9 as a compatible contemporary design.

Les Thomas reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

Board discussion:

- Asked if the two windows on the front of the home would be the same size
- Everything proposed was in the context of the house
- Was in favor of the changes and felt it was compatible

Applicant response:

- Windows would be the same size
- Windows were shown on the window schedule

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE application HP2022-0073 finding that the modifications to the prior approved application were consistent with the house and did not materially detract from

the architecture of the house. The motion was SECONDED by Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Beach, Wingo, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. Certificate of Appropriateness

7. (a) HP 2022-0075 – Sarah Ryan Architect, LLC– Applicant
Red Moon Properties, LLC– Owner
9 Aviles Street

To modify a previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness to include installation of gates within existing openings on the west and south elevations of the newly constructed commercial building.

Ms. Courtney read the staff report and said Based on a review of the AGHP, and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds that the board can take the following actions regarding a CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS at 9 Aviles Street:

1. To approve a simplified version of the proposed gates and fixed panels if the HARB determines the proposed materials and dimensions are otherwise appropriate and in keeping with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation #9 (Compatible Contemporary Design for New Alterations).

Mark McConnell reviewed the application.

Ms. Duncan asked for the sizing of the pickets.

Mr. McConnell replied the pickets were half inch square, the frame was three quarter by one inch, the pickets were half inch by half inch, the twist were half inch, and a three quarter by one-inch gate frame. He said baskets were meant to make it look better.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi said the staff was recommending the Board should follow the requirements of the gate and she encouraged the Board not to set precedence since this was in an HP area. She said everyone needed to follow the guidelines for history to be preserved.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Asked which way the gate swung
- Like the details that were added and felt it echoed the Mediterranean style
- Asked why the fence material was not wrought iron

Applicant response:

- Gate would swing in
- There was a four-panel configuration on the large gate for them to fold back symmetrically and smaller gate was toward the street side and projected on the porch but did not encroach on public right-of-way
- Felt wrought iron would not do well in a salty environment

Ms. Duncan said she thought the fence was required to be iron in the historic district.

Ms. Courtney replied the appropriate materials mention in the AGHP for Colonial fences and gates was metal or iron.

Mr. McConnell noted it was not without precedence in the area as the cemetery downtown had the same material. He said using the aluminum would last longer and look better.

Board discussion:

- Using aluminum had been done many times before
- Suggested having the aluminum powder coated
- Felt the squareness of the stock was important
- The fence was ornate which did not matter if Mediterranean style; however, this building was more Mission style
- Thought the light fixtures on the building were ornate and had similar details
- Fence added scale to the building and was transparent
- Felt the picket sizes needed to be heavier and suggested using three quarter inch and an inch for the horizontal rails
- The baskets could be removed to help simplify it and only have vertical pickets
- Felt the pickets were out of character for a Mission style building
- Mission style in St. Augustine was simple and it should fit in with the building
- Questioned the height of the gate
- Bottom and top panels were very decorative and if the twist was eliminated it would help simplify the middle piece

Applicant response:

- Felt the owner would agree to increase size of the members
- Baskets could be replaced with diamond shaped solid piece
- Fence opening on Artillery Lane was eight foot six inches and the opening on Aviles Street was seven feet tall
- Having the more ornate base had more metal to it which helped continue the base around the building

Mr. McConnell proposed changing the picket to three quarter by three quarter. He said step everything up one dimension, remove the baskets and replace with a solid collar.

Mr. MacDonald asked if the twist would be kept as the picket was almost eight feet. He suggested keeping the twist since there a

pattern on the top and bottom of the fence and that would bring it altogether. He said the top was a fleur-de-lis which was classic French and would not be seen in the Mission style, it would be more of a spike.

Ms. Duncan said perhaps the top should be removed and leave the twist.

Mr. McConnell said it could be changed to a spike, the baskets would be removed but replaced with a solid collar at the top and bottom of the twist and the members would be larger by a quarter inch.

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE application HP2022-0075 9 Aviles Street to put fixed gates and operable gates in the openings stated with the definition of three quarter stock for the pickets, with a volley twist in the center with a solid collar at the top and bottom, change the fleur-de-lis at the top to a spike with all other details to remain the same. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Beach, Wingo, Benoit, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**7. (b) HP 2022- 0077- Sarah Ryan, Architect LLC– Applicant
Cara and Allan Farquhar– Owner
272 St. George Street**

Mr. Benoit recused himself³.

To modify a previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness for a new detached garage building including changes to the design of the garage doors, entry doors on the south elevation, outdoor shower, and pergola; and, site modifications to include a screened pavilion, outdoor kitchen, inground pool,

and associated paved decks, fencing, gates, and landscaping.

Ms. Seymour read the staff report and said Based on a review of the AGHP, the previous discussion and approval of COA HP2022-0047, and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds that the board can APPROVE a Certificate of Appropriateness at 272 St. George Street because it meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation #9 as a compatible contemporary design with a finding by the HARB that materials and overall design are consistent with the AGHP.

Sarah Ryan and Cara Farquhar reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:

- Detached garage was increasing from two bays to four bays; however, it was not in the public view
- Asked if the columns on the pavilion could tie in better with the detached garage as the columns looked different
- Questioned why the windows on the garage had been removed
- Asked the height of the garage doors

Applicant response:

- Intent for the columns were for them to be the same scale and dimension
- Windows had been removed per the request of HARB and it was made solid
- Garage doors were seven feet tall

³ Recusal form attached to original minutes

MOTION

Mr. Beach MOVED to APPROVE application HP2022-0077 at 272 St. George Street proposed design as issued with changing two French doors to four French doors, making sure that the extensions was a wood pergola and not a synthetic material, all columns were consistent with the architecture and the paint colors were consistent with the architecture of the main house. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

Mr. MacDonald asked what material was being used for the surface around the pool.

Ms. Ryan replied it was a limestone surface similar to travertine or natural stone.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Beach, MacDonald, Wingo, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**7. (c) HP2022-0076 – Catch 27 Restaurant, LLC– Applicant
46 Avenida Menendez, INC– Owner
40 Charlotte Street**

To replace the existing ADA ramp with a lift, construct a covered outdoor bar on the south elevation, expand and cover a utility area on the rear elevation, and modify landscape beds 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 Certificate of Appropriateness at 40 Charlotte Street with the following finding and conditions:

If the HARB determines that the scope of work meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation #9 as a compatible contemporary design in a

minimally visible area on a contemporary building located in the HP3 Zoning District
With the following conditions:

1. An alternative roof material for the proposed covered bar roof unless the HARB finds that the proposed TPO material is appropriate based on its location that will be minimally seen from the right-of-way

2. Proposed new brick pavers are a true clay brick material.

Steven Hudson and Cliff Duch reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi felt the roof on the bar should not be there because the proper materials were not being used. She encouraged the Board to follow the AGHP guidelines.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Questioned if the new roof would meet the requirements for the district
- Asked how the roof, if added, would impact the lot coverage and impervious ratio
- Application noted a paver like tremron and the guidelines required a brick type paver
- Stamped brick shown was desirable
- Asked if the Thermoplastic Polyolefin (TPO) roof would be visible

Applicant response:

- Unsure of how that would impact the impervious ratio and lot coverage
- Wanted to redo the area for safety
- Wanted to create a grid with the pavers and infill with the existing materials

- Wanted to use the materials on site since they were in place already
- Current site had a 60/40 mix of the concrete and clay bricks
- Roof was only able to be seen from the two upstairs windows which was a 4x4 area; however, it was mostly covered by the second story balcony

Mr. Duch said the TPO was a more practical use for the equipment which would be properly screened, and the handrail would match the porch to avoid seeing the equipment. He said vantage points were limited and the justification for a handicapped ramp was to not see it from the street and the TPO could also not be seen from the street.

Board discussion:

- Asked the color of the TPO
- Clay pavers were required in the HP district and should match
- Unsure how there were concrete pavers on site as those were not an appropriate material
- Would gain seating by adding the ADA lift
- Asked if the utility shed would be elevated out of the flood plain
- Asked how this helped with flooding to the area
- Felt this would be over 70% lot coverage if being built today
- Condition could be added that anything that changed with the pavers would be replaced with clay brick and concrete pavers could not be reinstalled

Applicant response:

- Agreed to the grey coloring recommend by staff
- Concrete pavers were there when the property was leased
- Shed would have to be elevated too much and would alter the design
- Had practice protecting low lying area and would incorporate that into storm prep

- Compressor would be lofted up with the air conditioning
- Asked Board to accept the idea of using what was on site, the concrete pavers and brick as a border or be forced to use brick throughout the entire space

Ms. Courtney said previously there had a been a case where an after the fact approval was required or it could be considered existing. She said if it were left as existing then the concrete pavers could be left.

Board discussion:

- If not taking them up or changing them it, they were existing and was not asking for permission to change them
- If new material was being installed and not permitted it should be corrected
- Should be a true clay brick material

Applicant response:

- Wanted to reuse them in the planter beds
- Agreed to not using concrete pavers and would make a pattern out of the brick
- Asking to cut ribbon out of the paver and install brick in a geometric pattern

Ms. Courtney understood the pavers would be removed to cut only and then install the clay brick in a pattern. She said as long as the pavers were not being put in a different pattern or moved around it could be considered existing.

Mr. Benoit said the entire site was being impacted and asked if there was an impervious percentage requirement.

Ms. Courtney said that was not a requirement for commercial properties only residential.

Board discussion:

- The entire courtyard was being Impacted and it should come into compliance

- Would need a drawing showing the pattern and the percentage of brick to concrete pavers
- To avoid trip hazards, if impervious ratio was not an issue, suggested using coquina concrete

Ms. Courtney suggested starting new as this could potentially be a Code Enforcement case.

Mr. MacDonald stated each paver would have to be removed in order to establish a pattern or for ribbons to be added. He asked if the applicant would agree to only having clay pavers in the area.

Mr. Hudson said he would keep the clay bricks and in order to replace the concrete pavers that were existing, and he would purchase more clay bricks to complete the project correctly.

Mr. MacDonald asked why not using coquina concrete to tie in with the brick as that was used all over town, and it was easy.

Mr. Hudson said to keep it easier he would do the clay brick.

Mr. Beach asked if the Board was in agreeance with having the mechanical screened by a rail on the second level and horizontal slats on the first level and then vertical slats.

Mr. Duch said that was the condition now and they agreed to keep the vertical slat suggestion from staff. He said the equipment would be tucked back and it would difficult to see it from adjacent sites unless on the second floor.

Mr. MacDonald said horizontal slats were not done in Colonial style buildings and for it to be correct, it needed to be vertical.

Mr. Beach said the vertical pickets would be done on the first floor. He asked what needed to be done on the second floor to screen the equipment.

Mr. Benoit said he liked the railing as it matched the front porch and worked with the rest of the building. He did not think it would be seen when walking, driving or biking.

Mr. Hudson noted this was on the back of the property, not seen from the street, and would not have bright colors.

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE application HP2022-0076 with the following conditions: screening around the equipment at the rear would be a vertical plank instead of horizontal as shown, rear courtyard would be paved with a brick pavers using existing brick pavers or sourcing new clay brick pavers, the TPO as mentioned by staff was a compatible material given the location and condition that it would be a dark grey color as indicated by the applicant, all the new materials would be painted to match the existing colors on the building and finding all of these elements were removeable and would not have any effect on the historic building and finding most of the elements were at the rear and barely visible by the public. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

Mr. Duch noted this was not a historic building and was built in 1994; however, it was in the historic district.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Beach, Wingo, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. (d) HP2022-0080 – A.D. Davis Construction Corp.– Applicant
TEP, Inc.– Owner
10 Aviles Street (a.k.a. 17 King Street)

Mr. Benoit recused himself.⁴

For after-the-fact approval of a storefront replacement with a configuration different from the previously existing storefront.

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 10 Aviles Street to allow the applicant time to consider altering the new storefront design to be consistent with the historic window patterns of the building's Aviles Street elevations.

Mike Davis and Sammy Hale reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi felt the building should be put back the way it was before as it was an important street. She thanked Mr. Davis for apologizing.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Thanked the applicant for being corporative
- Building should be put back the way it was before it was changed as it was an important building
- Further down the replacement looked to be in line with other horizontal banding but the adjacent suite it was lining up with the hop of the door

- Asked if the scale of the mullion was the same as the others
- Felt this was the best solution and thought it should be taken back so that it all aligned across
- Should put back to what was there prior

Applicant response:

- New store front was unable to get the same material as it no longer met code, but it was the same material that had been used on King Street (same building) and approved by HARB
- Proposed matching the mullion that was next to the one directly next to it
- Suggesting keeping the doors at the lower height

MOTION

Dr. Wingo MOVED to APPROVE application HP2022-0080 to approve the applicant replacing the existing nonconforming windows with the previously existing storefront windows. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Wingo, MacDonald, Beach, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. (e) HP2022-0078 – Grace Contracting, LLC– Applicant
Zigiz Holdings, LLC– Owner
28 W. Castillo Drive – Lots 14

Application HP 2022-0079 was heard with item 7(e).

To construct a new 1-1/2 story single family residence along Grove Avenue and a 2-story detached garage with living space above along W. Castillo Drive with associated site features to include an in-

⁴ Recusal form attached to original minutes

ground pool with paver surround, front and rear driveways, fencing, landscaping, and associated mechanical and utility equipment

The applicant was not present.

Ms. Duncan asked if there was Board consensus to move the applications to later in the meeting. She confirmed this was for both HP 2022-0078 and HP 2022-0079.

Ms. Seymour replied in the affirmative and the two applications would be heard together.

Ms. Lopez advised that the applications could be moved to the end of the meeting in the hopes that the applicant would arrive.

Mr. MacDonald said Ms. Puckett, a citizen, had been to many of the meetings and it was no fair to the public to move the application when the applicant had not shown.

Ms. Lopez stated the applicant knew the hearing was taking place and the Board had the choice to move the item to later in the agenda or take legal action.

There was Board consensus to proceed with the application without the applicant present.

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 (HP2022-0078) & Lot 15 (HP2022-0079):

1. APPROVE the application if the HARB finds that sufficient information has been provided to determine that the proposed new construction meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards #9 as compatible contemporary additions to the streetscapes along Grove Avenue and W. Castillo Drive with the following conditions:

a. Color and pattern of clay bricks are clarified and determined to be appropriate by the HARB

b. Window muntins are confirmed to be a raised simulated divided lite design

c. An appropriate form of screening utility equipment is determined

d. Finish material/color for visible foundation piers is clarified and found to be appropriate;

OR,

2. 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 HP-5 Zoning District.

The Board provided their ex parte communication.

Public hearing was opened.

Yvonne Puckett spoke in opposition to applications and said the development was intense with a total of ten bedrooms. She said there was traffic on the street already and this was insensitive to neighbors. She said a site plan for parking was not available and was concerned about the curb cuts. She thought she would not have access to her property with the parking issues.

Michelle Ward spoke in opposition and felt the applicant would be renting these as short-term rentals. She noted there were ten bedrooms between the two homes and not enough parking. She said another concern was water drainage. She said the lots were in the lowest part of the neighborhood and these lots absorbed a tremendous amount of rainwater which helped mitigate the problem. She suggested the site be prepared to drain towards Castillo Drive where there was a larger stormwater drain.

H A Smith spoke in opposition to the application and said the water run-off should

be graded towards Castillo Drive and not Grove Avenue. He asked if there would be access to the properties from Grove Avenue. He said there were already obstructions on the sidewalk and thought these properties could exacerbate the problem.

BJ Kalaidi said the staff advised the application could be continued but asked if it could be denied. She said she was unsure if the parking issues were under the Board's purview. She said the Board needed to express what could and could not be done. She asked what items were provided to the Board and by who.

Ms. Duncan noted Peter Kline emailed Ms. Courtney and the letter was read in the record.

Public hearing was closed.

Gary Allen Register reviewed the application and provided new documentation to the Board.⁵

Public Comment was re-opened:

H A Smith spoke in opposition and said he was unsure how parking would take place on Grove Avenue and felt pedestrian mobility would be obstructed.

Michelle Ward spoke in opposition to the application and said she was concerned about the curb cuts for Grove Avenue. She said she thought there were regulations or restrictions for driveways. She asked if the applicant had been approved to have their driveway in the middle of the property. She asked why the pool had been reduced in size and why there was an exterior door to coming from the storage room.

BJ Kalaidi said parking would be the real issue especially, if these were short term rentals; however, they were close enough to the City parking garage to obtain parking off site.

Charles Pappas encouraged the Board to continue the application as there was not ample time to review the new documentation.

The Board discussed:

- Felt the applicant was trying to move in the direction as suggested by the Board
- Wanted a site plan that showed the neighborhood and the rhythm of sidewalks and driveways from both Castillo Drive and Grove Avenue
- Wanted to understand the parking arrangements as parking did not seem to be right in front of the home but rather to the side
- Should have a set of drawings consistent that showed the whole picture
- Neighbors were concerned with the intensity of use
- Curb cuts should be reviewed by Public Works or Planning and Building to alleviate concern
- Architecture of the homes had improved but needed to be different from each other
- Window scaling was improved but felt there was more that needed to be done
- Felt the Board should not design the properties
- Documentation provided same day of meeting was inappropriate and the public did not have time to review the materials
- Suggested attending the City's Friday Review meeting to understand the requirements and Codes
- Curb cuts and fencing would be addressed at that meeting
- Could provide 24x36 sheet and provide the day of meeting only if smaller ones had been submitted
- Asked if there was a five-foot setback in the front of the home or was that to the street
- Site plan should show the grading plan and the water flow

⁵ Applicant arrived at 2:44p.m.

- Backing a car out onto Castillo Drive was difficult, which mattered
- Might be able to qualify for parking in the City parking garage
- Moving in the right direction with materials
- Disappointed on the progress of the homes and felt they were cookie cutter
- Should look at the scale of the home compared to the garage
- Front door on both homes should not be the same
- Concerned with not having a driveway to get to the garage from Grove Avenue
- Home faced Grove Avenue and the garage did not and looked to have a subdivided lot
- Asked if all the vehicles were parked in front of the house
- Not many historic neighborhoods liked having vehicles
- There was no green space and it looked like a big parking lot
- Wanted to see the streetscape of the neighborhood to understand how these would impact the other homes
- Left elevation only had one window and felt the sides of the homes needed to be designed
- Should show the landscaping on the property
- Asked if the lot coverage was allowed to be at 50%
- Detached garage was as wide as the house
- City code allowed 500 feet for a guest suite on top a garage without cooking elements
- Suggested providing a scaled survey
- Questioned the height of the finish floor
- Felt the garage should look secondary to the main structure
- Questioned the target floor elevations
- Flood information should be reflected in drawings
- Surveyor could show the other homes and sidewalks in the area

- Suggested addressing the public issues as this was a project coming into an existing neighborhood

Applicant response:

- Fifty feet was required between driveways according to the Public Works Department
- Had asked the architect to make the windows symmetrical
- Had no luck finding an architect but had reached out to many
- Door was changed from a six-panel door to a two-panel raised door
- Was willing to attend a Friday Review meeting for guidance
- Wanted to provide larger scale documentations for better understanding
- Storage door should be on the inside and not the outside
- Pool was reduced to be more within the setbacks and provide more parking in the front
- Setback was only in the front with a fifteen-foot minimum setback on Castillo Drive and a ten-foot setback on Grove Avenue
- Was under 50% lot coverage and had a little bit of room left
- Property was improved and a driveway was cut on Lot 14 to the west that they would tie into
- Willing to provide an aerial of the lots
- Main house would be nine feet above grade and one foot above free board

Ms. Lopez advised the December meeting would take place on Wednesday, December 14, 2022 at 1:00 p.m. due to a conflict.

Mr. Register asked about the Friday review process and how to apply.

Ms. Skinner said he could apply and be on the next available Friday. She said it was a round table with each City departments. She asked if the applicant would be ready for the December meeting or did, he want to postpone to January PZB meeting.

Mr. Register stated he would be able to present at the December meeting.

Ms. Duncan advised if there was an issue he should communicate with staff.

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to CONTINUE application HP2022-0078 to either the December 14th or the January 19th meeting per applicant's ability to provide documentation. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Beach, Wingo, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. (f) HP2022-0079 – Grace Contracting, LLC– Applicant

Zigiz Holdings, LLC– Owner

28 W. Castillo Drive – Lots 15

Application was heard with item 7(e).

To construct a new 1-1/2 story single family residence along Grove Avenue and a 2-story detached garage with living space above along W. Castillo Drive with associated site features to include an in-ground pool with paver surround, front and rear 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- 0078) & Lot 15 (HP2022-0079):

1. APPROVE the application if the HARB finds that sufficient information has been provided to determine that the proposed new construction meets the Secretary of the

Interior's Standards #9 as compatible contemporary additions to the streetscapes along Grove Avenue and W. Castillo Drive with the following conditions:

a. Color and pattern of clay bricks are clarified and determined to be appropriate by the HARB

b. Window muntins are confirmed to be a raised simulated divided lite design

c. An appropriate form of screening utility equipment is determined

d. Finish material/color for visible foundation piers is clarified and found to be appropriate;

OR,

2. 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 HP-5 Zoning District.

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to CONTINUE application HP2022-0078 to either the December 14th or the January 19th meeting per applicant's ability to provide documentation. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Beach, Wingo, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY⁶

8. Certificate of Demolition and Partial Demolition

8. (a) HP2022-0074 – DSW Homes, LLC – Applicant

Sonya Jones – Owner

37 Weeden Street

⁶ Break from 3:40p.m.-3:51p.m.

For partial demolition of a residence constructed c. 1884 that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and contributing to the Lincolnville National Register Historic District, for work related to elevation and rehabilitation including removal of the existing front and rear porches and steps and replacement of existing wood lap siding.

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 Weeden Street: if the HARB determines that the work as proposed will not compromise the architectural integrity of the structure and not impact the building's contributing status in the National Register District.

Ryan Fischer reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi said the most important thing was for the building to remain on the Lincolnville National Register.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Had no issue with getting the home out of the flood zone
- Not in favor of having the siding removed
- Should provide photographic evidence

Applicant response:

- Siding had termite damage and was rotted

- Willing to provide the pictures requested
- Doing the work through St. Johns County and thought the photos had been provided

Ms. Seymour advised the photos had been included and were provided by the county showing the damage.

Board discussion:

- Felt the original fabric of the building should be kept as much as possible to avoid having it come off the National Register
- Felt the siding was important to keep
- Building was being raised by sixteen inches
- Asked if the T1-11 was being replaced like for like
- Felt the T1-11 would not adversely affect the house and was in support of the application
- Thought lap siding would be better than the T1-11
- Suggested raising the home higher if needed

Applicant response:

- Only removing the area that was termite damaged and rotted which was around 100 feet
- Would only lower the existing lattice but not adding any material

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE application HP2022-0074 finding that the partial demolition as outlined in the application would not significantly impact the integrity of the building. The motion was SECONDED by Dr. Wingo.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Wingo, Beach, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

9. Incomplete Items (as of Meeting Packet Publication)

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

Mr. Benoit recused himself.⁷

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

The applicant was not present to review the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:

- Applicant was not present, and the application was continued at the last HARB meeting
- There had been no communication with staff
- Board thought the building was important and changing the entry way would change the integrity
- Asked what the options were either to continue the application or deny

Ms. Lopez said the application could also be approved if the Board felt it met the criteria.

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to DENY application HP2022-0067 as it had two continuances and there had been no new information or notice requesting a continuance. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Beach, Wingo, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

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

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

The applicant was not present to review the application.

Ms. Seymour stated no new materials were submitted, and the application was not heard as it was incomplete at the last HARB meeting and no applicant was present. She said the existing gate was approved a long time ago; however, there were several concerns such as owner's authorization form which was received with the property managers signature, staff requested a survey site plan indicating the property lines; however, there was no response. She said at this time it was an incomplete application.

Mr. MacDonald asked if staff had been notified the applicant would not be in attendance.

Ms. Seymour replied no. She said there were two people she was communicating with the contractor who submitted the application and the property manager, who sent in the owner's authorization form.

Ms. Lopez advised since this application had not been heard, the Board needed to review the criteria and include if the application was permissible or not depending on the decision by the Board.

⁷ Recusal form attached to original minutes.

Ms. Duncan suggested continuing the application one more month and if there was no response at that time, they would not continue the application again.

MOTION

Mr. Beach MOVED to CONTINUE application HP2022-0069 to the December 14, 2022 meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

Mr. MacDonald suggested letting the applicant know of the date change.

Mr. Benoit asked if the entire application was only the one sheet of paper provided.

Ms. Seymour replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Benoit said he proposed a motion to deny the application because there was not enough information and the staff was not having any feedback. He said this was not an acceptable HARB application. He said he was in favor of not continuing.

Ms. Duncan asked for the motion to be amended to include all the missing materials as outlined by staff, in addition to proper drawings that reflect the design.

Mr. Beach AMENDED the MOTION to Continue HP2022-0069, 32 St. George Street, to include the application would provide additional plans, sections, elevations and details that show the proposed work and any missing materials as outlined by the staff. Mr. MacDonald SECONDED the amended motion.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Beach, MacDonald, Wingo, Benoit, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

10. Other Business

10. (a). Review of 2023 HARB Meeting Schedule

Ms. Courtney noted the dates for the 2023 HARB meetings had been provided to be Board. She said the Board needed to adopt them if approved.

MOTION

Mr. Benoit moved the APPROVE the HARB dates as presented. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, MacDonald, Beach, Wingo, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Ms. Courtney said a letter from the City Building Official Richard Schauland, approved an emergency demolition for 63 Hypolita Street. She said this was granted based on updated structural engineers report and a paper copy was available for review if requested. She said there was a structural member that compromised the integrity of the building and a noticeable change in the past year. She said anything proposed for redevelopment would have to be reviewed by the HARB for approval and the Planning and Zoning Board.

Mr. MacDonald said this building was compromised and unsafe and agreed it needed to come down; however, he did not want it to be used as a parking lot. He suggested having a fence around it and add landscaping.

Ms. Courtney said the code required a fence to be in place when a building was demolished but it was not allowed to be used as a parking lot. She said HARB did not have purview over emergency demolition and the reports were available and could be reviewed by the public. She said the Building Official was available to answer any questions.

Ms. Courtney advised the Architectural Guidelines for Historic Preservation (AGHP) consultant had provided options regarding

the color scheme of the document and asked for the feedback from the Board. She said these colors were from the preapproved paint color list.

There was a Board brief discussion regarding which colors scheme to use for the AGHP.

There was Board consensus to use the color scheme option A.

11. Planning and Building Staff Communications

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

(Provided for informational purposes)

12. Next Scheduled Meeting Date

a) Wednesday, December 14, 2022, at 1:00 p.m.

Mr. Benoit asked if an applicant provided an application that was incomplete, or they were unable to interpret the guidelines, was staff able to tell the applicant they needed to revise the application or provide more information before presenting to HARB. He asked if staff were able to provide feedback that the Board could hold the applicant accountable for specific items. He said over the past year there had been multiple applications that were not close to the guidelines and wanted to know how the process could be improved.

Ms. Lopez replied the applicant always had the right to have their application heard by the Board even if staff deemed the application to be insufficient due to lack of information in association with the City Code.

Mr. Benoit said applicants needed the feedback sooner rather than later instead of waiting for 30 days.

Ms. Seymour said there was a checklist attached to the application and staff

reviewed and checked off the items still needed and sometimes send the additional items requested via email within a few days after receiving the application in order for the applicant to have ample time to submit any additional documents.

Ms. Lopez suggested including in the standardize template said, 'failure to submit the materials by a certain date the application would be administratively continued', unless the applicant demanded a hearing.

Mr. Benoit said St. Johns County decided if the application was ready to be heard by the Zoning Board or not.

Ms. Lopez said that was typical and it would not be presented unless the applicant demanded their right to a hearing. She said that could be done but that was not the culture.

Ms. Courtney said they were instructed that they were unable to do that; however, staff could inform them it was incomplete and list it as an incomplete application. She said the sufficiency checklist was provided a week after and the agenda had to publish the following week. She said it was difficult to do all the work associated with the application when it might not be heard at the meeting due to missing an item.

Mr. Benoit encouraged everyone to think about the vocabulary 'your application was not ready and would not be heard by the Board and would not be presented until it was ready' unless the applicant demanded to be heard. He said he wanted to empower staff to have that ability.

Ms. Lopez suggested the Board could provide a recommendation through staff to administration and the City Commission that they would like a formal process with a formal notice. She said a motion would be beneficial and staff would then have something to present to their bosses. She said this was able to be done legally.

Ms. Courtney said elevations drawings were not required by code and the only requirements were to notice the applicant and most was not required by the applicant to do.

Ms. Lopez advised the Board could create a list of items required and the list could be blessed by the City Commission.

Ms. Seymour noted the AGHP was codified and adopted by Code and anything in the AGHP could be required.

Ms. Courtney said since the AGHP was being updated the section on how to apply could be revised to list the documents that were required. She said the timeframe required applicants to have all the information into staff was ten days prior and most of the information came in with not enough time to review it and provided feedback.

Ms. Lopez advised if that was an issue, codes were able to be amended. She said she would relay to the City Commission anything that was needed to help make the meetings more functional.

13. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:43 P.M.⁸



Catherine Duncan, Chairperson

for

⁸ Transcribed by Elyse Wiemann