

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

Historic Architectural Review Board Regular Meeting May 20, 2021

The Historic Architectural Review Board met in formal session at 1:00 P.M., Thursday, May 20, 2021, 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
Barbara Wingo, Vice-Chairperson
Jon Benoit
Paul Weaver, III
Gaere MacDonald

City Staff:

Jenny Wolfe, Historic Preservation Officer
Julie Courtney, Historic Preservation Planner
Isabelle Lopez, City Attorney
Candice Seymour, Recording Secretary
Elyse Anderson, Recording Secretary

2. General Public Comments for Items not on the Agenda

Jenny Wolfe, Vice President, Florida Trust Board of Trustees, Monday, May 10th National Historic Preservation Month was declared. She spoke about the different activities, online tool kit, and how the public could get involved with Historic Preservation.

(Closed)

3. Approval of Minutes

3.(a) Draft minutes from April 15, 2021, HARB meeting

Dr. Wingo noted a typographical error and stated "too far gone" was informal.

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE the April 15, 2021, minutes with the above corrections. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Weaver, Benoit, Wingo, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. Modification and approval of Agenda

Ms. Duncan noted that applicant for item 6(a), PL 2021-0030, requested a continuance to the June meeting.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE the modifications to the Agenda. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Benoit

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Benoit, MacDonald, Wingo, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. Public Comments related to Expedited Hearing items:

6. Continued Items from Previous Meetings

**6. (a) Opinion of Appropriateness
PL2021-0030 – Peter Hotz, Architect of
Peter Hotz, Inc. – Applicant
Michelle D. Ruby – Owner
308 St. George Street**

To construct a two-story addition to the rear of the residential building, renovate the existing residence, and modify the site and landscape features to include an in-ground pool, patio, driveway, and retaining wall.

Prior to the meeting, the applicant requested a continuance to the June 17th Meeting. See modification of the agenda for approval for continuance.

**6. (b) Certificate of Appropriateness
PL2021-0047 – Marquis, Latimer +
Halback, Inc. – Applicant
Lightner Museum of Hobbies Inc. –
Owner
75 King Street**

To modify the south garden with a revised plan to the previously approved wall adjacent to the sculpture peninsula and to add a new fountain spray pattern to the existing fountain.

Ms. Courtney read the staff report and said based a review of the AGHP, and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds that the HARB can take the following actions on a CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS at 75 King Street, because elements of the proposed work do not meet the applicable Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, & 10:

1. Approve fountain lighting and spray, with the applicant providing details that the lighting is soft and downward oriented and the nozzle equipment being reversible
2. Deny the tile proposed for the fountain basin and any refinishing with a "new

material in order to create a uniform, or 'improved' appearance," which is an inappropriate treatment according to the SOIS

3. Approve the revised plan for the perimeter wall and iron fence around sculpture peninsula with the applicant providing details on any revision of the sculpture peninsula area.

Jeremy Marquis and Elijah George reviewed the application.¹

Staff Report was given after the applicants gave presentation.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi spoke about how we should try to preserve and not change things. She stated the applicant had presented several times before and giving the board the presentation the night before to decide was unfair to the board as well as the public.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Excellent analysis of material very well put together by Staff
- Fountain and restoration concerns could alter the appearance of the fountain overall.
- Could cause a different texture and difficult to maintain if you were to add individual tiles, recommended to keep what was already there
- Patch work would be seen would be a consistent finish throughout, would not be a tile look.
- Applicant trying to take advantage of 2021 technology with something

¹ Revised plans attached to original packet

being submerged in water 100% of the time

- The cleanest way to get a monochromatic under the water line tile but able to deal with any cracking

Mr. Marquis gave further explanation to the Board regarding the fountain. He apologized for materials being late but that was their way of responding to the Staff report.

Ms. Duncan stated there were too many unknowns, and there was no sample of the tile the applicant wanted to use. She stated even though the products being presented may have a lifetime warranty. The fountain needed to be restored using the proper historic materials.

Mr. Weaver pointed out that the statue and fountain was not something that is typically dealt with amongst the Board. He noted the project was a challenge. He stated would want to make sure the garden was protected just like other properties in St. Augustine.

Mr. MacDonald reiterated the board wanted the fountain restored and protected. He said the color match and the concept the applicant presented was good; however, acrylic paint was not the answer. He suggested using a type of stucco to give it more of the correct look. He stated that the Board would like to see the issues within the fountain, to see what kind of solutions could be used. He said while he understood why the new materials were turned in late, he agreed with public comment.

Ms. Lopes clarified the parking was still within the existing footprint since it was not able to be expanded.

Mr. Marquis confirmed the space was still expected to be within the existing footprint, but it was narrow.

Ms. Duncan claimed the height of the wall was supposed to be continuous around the property; however, it was not. She stated

she did not see a drawing showing what was done, because what was approved was completed differently.

Mr. Marquis briefed the board about with the changes.

Ms. Courtney advised the accurate elevation drawing was on L-2.2 in the packet.

Mr. Marquis stated the parking lot crowns in the middle, and there was about an 8-inch drop from one section to another. He said the wall was consistent with not making the wall higher, which did not comply with what was previously approved by the Board.

The Board continued discussion:

- Wall now a stepped wall, not shown in renderings
- Was not approved by the Board
- Would stepped wall need to be retro approved
- Could have been reasonable modification made in the field after laying footing depending on which elevation either higher or lower
- Should have had approval of drainage and elevations to get permits—applicant should have known all elevations

Mr. MacDonald questioned as what was discovered to make the changes with the height. He stated if there was a change staff, or the Board should have been notified to approve changes.

Mr. Marquis responded that the wall was already poured, and he listed the three factors that went into the decision:

- Commitment made to HARB and the Commission on approved section wall height and metal work on top and should continue to be a welcoming engaging space not a walled off garden

- Tiered coquina concrete took away from the quality of bands when top angled
- Used columns that were part of the approved plan to adjust the grade

Ms. Duncan asked if the height from the higher point of the parking lot had changed. She questioned what the actual height of the wall was including the metal work.

Mr. Maquis answered that the wall was 30 inches and the metal work on top would be 16 inches. He said Ms. Courtney told him the board needed to see what had been completed. He said his intent was to be clear and as transparent as possible with the board.

Mr. Weaver pointed out that the wall height that was presented was the same; it was the elevation that changed with the center portion being the high point.

Mr. Benoit stated the fountain did not have a hard edge or coping line, and when looking at photos of the original to the fountain the paint line goes above the water line. He said anything not painted would need some sort of detail added around the water line, and the applicant needed some direction or to select the paint color.

Ms. Duncan stated she would not approve anything about the fountain until the applicant was able to show exactly what was being done, unless it was being repainted which was historically accurate.

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to PARTIALLY APPROVE application 2021-0048 (2021-0047) finding that number one we approve the purposed wall and proposed fence around the statuary finding they are architecturally compatible material, design, and scale to the rest of the courtyard, finding the improvements are not permanent in nature are not affixed to the primary building or the statue, as

relates to barring wall heights as identified by Staff and submitted by applicant approve as field adjustments to the purposed plan and CONTINUE the design discussion around the fountain for the next meeting June 17, 2021 application 2021-0047 The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

The board discussed:

- Condition three the staff recommended continuing the revised plan with the sliding gates
- Expectation to have a sliding gate to the statue and the fencing was around the peninsula
- Flood prevention was something that would be done after the fact not a fixed or permanent piece
- Wanting to make sure what were the staff conditions

Ms. Wolfe identified what had taken place so far with the order. The staff conditions that are in the staff report do not reflect the current conditions. Ms. Wolfe said what was to be approved was as follows:

1. Approve the revised wall the statuary and the drawing dated May 20th with the improvements not a fixed to the statuary. Varied wall heights as altered in the field are approved.
2. Continue all fountain improvements to June 17, 2021

Mr. Marquis stated the Lightner Museum realized that the finish might not be approved, so the fall back was to restore the paint which would give time to work out the detail of the finish; however, could approval be given for the fountain display and the small up-lights on the fountain.

Ms. Duncan stated the board wanted to approve the whole fountain as one piece.

Ms. Courtney corrected the file number on the application as 2021-0047 instead of 2021-0048.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Weaver, MacDonald, Wingo, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. Certificates of Appropriateness

**7. (a) PL2021-0055 – Meehan's Irish Pub–
Applicant Nofal-Smith, Inc. – Owner
20 Avenida Menendez**

To replace existing ventilation system on north elevation and add additional ventilation system units on roof of southwest elevations.

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 the proposed placement of exterior mechanical equipment does not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards 5 and that the board can take the following actions on a CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS at 20 Avenida Menendez:

1. Continue because the proposed location on the Hypolita elevation is not compatible with the AGHP.
2. Consider a different visible location proposed by the applicant
3. Discuss with the applicant a location that is not visible or prominently visible that could be approved administratively.

James Whitehouse and Reggie Maggs reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:

- Understood the window being important, painting same color of the building would help make it less intrusive
- Relocate the second exhaust fan around the corner facing Charlotte Street to be in line with the end of the hood
- Two on the south side was hidden but not from the street

Keith Jenkins and Sonny Elliott addressed the technical issues of the application.

Mr. Jenkins reviewed the existing and proposed additions of the ventilation and exhaust system.

Mr. Elliott stated that if the exhaust fan were relocated, there was a clay roof and a steel platform that would also adhere to the roof that could rust. He noted that you should not walk on clay roof tiles making it hard to service and clean.

There was a brief discussion regarding the existing chimney and weather it could be utilized; however, it was determined that the applicant's proposal would be the least intrusive.

Mr. Whitehouse spoke to the fire marshal, and the location would need to have sufficient air flow. he said the fire marshal asked that the air go up from the hood and protrude out. Being lower to the road could potentially cause other issues.

The Board continued:

- Did fire marshal cease work or were changes being done to be brought up to code
- Inline fan would be an alternative as it would be less intrusive on the exterior architecturally
-

Mr. Whitehouse stated the fire marshal had not shut the establishment down; however, has been encouraged them to bring establishment up to code.

Mr. Jenkins stated an inline fan would not work in the space and could cause several issues.

Board confirmed this may be the best solution even though it did not look aesthetically pleasing.

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE application PL2021-0055 at 20 Avenida Menendez for the installation of north ventilation of two exhaust fan motors one to the right of the window that is currently there and one between the chimney and the corner of the same façade. On the south side in the space that is back along the main building the installation of another exhaust fan and make up air also the installation and makeup air unit on top of the clay tile pan on the west side of the building. The two motors will be painted the color of the building. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Weaver, Benoit, Wingo, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY²

**7. (b) PL2021-0057 – Marquis Latimer + Halback, Inc. – Applicant
TIITF/Department of State – Owner
42-1/2 St. George Street**

To modify site features in the courtyard north of the one-story building at the rear of the property to include the addition of a covered pergola, coquina concrete paving, a wood platform stage, and landscape features.

² Recess from 3:04p.m to 3:10p.m.

Jeremy Marquis reviewed the application.³ 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 on a CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS at 42-1/2 St. George Street because the project scope as designed does not meet the applicable Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation 3 and 9:

1. Consider a pergola that is reduced in size, with the scale to the level that is compatible with the former kitchen building and an alternative cover that is a compatible material
2. Coquina concrete paving should be buffered with landscape materials or a variation of other appropriate materials should be incorporated (could be removed from recommendation)
3. The well cover should be based on historical evidence
4. Proposed site features such as the metal railing finish color (has been addressed) and the outdoor furniture should comply with the AGHP.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi felt that applicants turned in revised plans too late and the plans were not compatible with the AGHP. She said the public was counting on the board to help the applicant to comply with the rules. She stated this needed to stop and the guidelines need to be followed.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

³ Revised plans attached to original packet

- Future session may need to address the public comment about turning in materials
- Pergola was an adequate solution to provide shade within the courtyard
- Acrylic-glass and diagonal lattice on top of the pergola not recommended because they were contemporary materials
- Fencing installed to cover the mechanical equipment if opportunity arises
- More research on the well cover— with more research could have justification to what was currently in place
- Approved items should be followed through when they were approved
- Diagonal lattice was not of the time period preference was more of a box lattice
- Reduce the square footage of the pergola
- Pergola looked like 2x8 floor system being used instead of purlins which would be flat a 2x6 would give the feel of a pergola
- Changing the poles could reduce the scale and make it look less heavy, also keeping with the character and feel of the site
- Match colors that were appropriate
- Acrylic covering not a historic material; however, it did provide openness
- No dimensions on renderings hard to tell how close it was to the bakery
- Needed a garden feature and maybe soften the area with plants which will offer more shade
- Well covering seemed too large, like a tabletop and not a simple covering

Mr. Marquis responded to items brought up by the board and said sheet L2.2 went over the dimensions for the coquina concrete, the stage and sizing of the pergola. He noted the well covers are similar to the ones in the plaza and the Colonial Quarter.

Board Continued discussion:

- Salcedo House was the primary structure should make the other structures subordinate to it, not by the smoke house
- Classic first period Spanish Colonial layout where you had the main structure then other smaller buildings around
- More shade from the vertical standing timbers on a pergola
- Maybe add more greenery to help offset the portions of items
- The size of the proposed pergola would not look historic and would appear to be more of a modern feature,

Mr. Marquis spoke about adding a tree but could compromise the site being that it was an archeological site. He stated they were going to add herbs and other various potted plants to the area. He said they could scale the pergola back in size giving more room to move around.

The discussion continued:

- Good to have a variety of perspectives on the different views of the area
- Key component of downtown was to have outdoor seating
- Would be willing to move forward with the concession of making the pergola shorter, also not willing to approve 'plexiglass' on top being modern material
- Maybe add a climbing vine for some sort of solution
- Area was conjectural, there were two photos and a sketch of what the well would look like
- Capability with some aspect as to an archeology site
- Still need to make sure it was ADA accessible
- Would like to see in scale, elevations, and dimensions

Mr. Marquis referenced L2.3 in the packet showing the 9' as well as the dimensions of the trellis covering. He added that the 'plexiglass' would make the pergola useable

Mr. Weaver stated that the pergola was the least intrusive and it the most sensitive to the archology of the site. He said trees would be a good option, but that would create another issue.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to CONTINUE item 7. (b) PL2021-0057 42 ½ St. George Street to continue the application to June 17,2021 meeting the motion was SECONDED by Dr. Wingo.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Wingo, MacDonald, Benoit, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Before item 8. (a) Mr. Weaver recused himself. ⁴

8. Opinion of Appropriateness

8. (a) PL2021-0059 – CD+ Urban – Applicant
44 Avenida Menendez, LLC – Owner
44 Avenida Menendez (also known as 110 Charlotte Street)

To construct a new two-story building and courtyard with outdoor seating to replace the one-story drive-through 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 CONTINUE an OPINION OF APPROPRIATENESS at 44 Avenida Menendez because the plans are not

generally compatible with the requirements of the AGHP.

John Arbizanni and Joseph (Joe) Cronk presentation the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi felt that the applicant was not compliant with the AGHP as stated in the staff report. She suggested continuing the application, since the applicant brought in new materials not privy to public .

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Staff report valid modifying the existing colonial building was way out of the scope of the AGHP
- The architecture did not reflect the requirements of the AGHP, most designs issues would need to be rethought when going to respond
- Board should decide on material that was presented
- Clear style of the building: first would be more restricting in space, second was British Colonial.
- Layout of buildings in Colonial style were normally built on the street and north lot line however, not advised because of Treasury street
- Concerns regarding proposed loggia location
- Design did not fit within the guidelines for British or Spanish colonial nor the location
- Not the job of board to assist with esthetics but to fit within the AGHP guidelines
- Original building deserved to be protected as there were not many left

⁴ See form attached

Mr. Cronk asked for board feedback to the new design in response to the staff report. He outlined the changes as follows:

- Not bringing building out to the street wanted to create a space on the front of the building that engaged with the public
- Desire to create an extension of the dining area that already existed, adding a 6' strip and a wall would provide extra life in addition to the loggia
- First building 35' high about the same size as Harry's Seafood, second building 15' high aligning with the secondary building of Harry's Seafood
- Address the colonnade—did not want to have the loggia towards the street, moved it to the courtyard.
- Arch pattern was similar to the arches that are of Espinosa
- Desire to maintain traditional façade of a Spanish Colonial building
- Single projection on the front of the building from the base of the building
- Turned the entry back to the North as a traditional Spanish entry—will have two entries with outside areas to experience the bayfront and courtyard
- Point of conflict having an extended porch off another porch.

Before coming back to the board Mr. Cronk wanted to have clear specific guidelines on how to move forward.

The board discussed:

- Referring to the houses of St. Augustine porches the scale and quality even though simplistic added to the entry corridor that was very import for St. Augustine
- Prime location on the bayfront
- Needed to be in the constraints of the guidelines of the AGHP

- Not able to add more outdoor dining since the guideline did not allow

Mr. Cronk replied saying that most buildings on street looked roughly the same. He appreciates having an outline of what was here in the past; however, when did it become too much. He noted some areas that were different, the Hamblin House, Harry's Seafood, and the new Hilton.

Mr. Benoit commented that the guidelines state new construction should not replicate historic styles unless in a different district.

Ms. Wolfe clarified that was from the Secretary of the Interior's standards and St. Augustine had a unique guideline for historic preservation, which had to come first before the Secretary of the Interior's standards. She advised that the zoning code specifically states about the Spanish and British styles where setbacks were supposed to be. She continued saying that if the applicant wanted the flexibility, the applicant could appeal to the City Commission, which can go outside of the parameters.

Mr. Benoit responded saying that they must look at setbacks, footprints, and property lines, which would be imperative instead of design details. He stated the bayfront, in his opinion, was becoming monochromatic.

Dr. Wingo said this was an argument to change the ordinances. She stated that Historic Preservation had different standards than the ordinances, but the board was legally constrained by the ordinances. She advised Mr. Cronk that he had three different periods and could take different ideas that could help make the building more interesting; however, these were the constraints.

Ms. Duncan agreed that the board was here to uphold the guidelines and must use the same standards for anyone who comes before the board.

Mr. MacDonald referred to the workshop a few days prior, and with this being a blank slate as new construction they must adhere to the constraints.

Mr. Cronk indicated that the guidelines seem to have leeway for interpretation with the help of the board to help create good architecture. He made it clear that he wanted to find creativity while also adhering to the code.

Ms. Duncan questioned the FEMA flood elevation level, and what was needing to be met.

Mr. Cronk gave FEMA explanation stating they were challenged with a variety of factors. The street was at 5, whereas the kitchen would be at 10. He indicated they were trying to find the correct balance.

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to CONTINUE Opinion of Appropriateness application 2021-0059 to allow the applicant and the team to address staff concerns to the discussion today and come back with a revision. The motion was SECONDED by Dr. Wingo.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Wingo, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY⁵

9. Certificates of Demolition and Partial Demolition

**9. (a) PL2021-0056 – St. Johns County Hurricane Housing Recovery Program– Applicant
Cathy Peck– Owner
45 Coquina Avenue**

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

Ms. Wolfe 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 45 Coquina Avenue because it is not a local landmark or otherwise designated as a historic building.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

18 certified notices were sent, 2 were returned in favor, and 1 had comments.

Catelyn Tide gave additional information stating they were in the environmental review stage pending approval from the board. She noted that there was one more contact regarding the application, and once done it would go to the state for final approval.

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

After a brief discussion, it was determined that the board had no issue with the application.

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE the demolition application 2021-0056 at 45 Coquina Ave. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Weaver, Benoit, Wingo, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

⁵ Break from 5:18p.m.- 5:21p.m.
Ms. Courtney left during break.

9. (b) PL2021-0060 – Darnell Pollard
General Contractor, Inc.– Applicant
Judy Rente – Owner
331 St. George Street

To partially demolish a residential building constructed c.1886 -1888 that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and not located in a district, including porches related to a building elevation and rehabilitation (after-the-fact).

Ms. Wolfe 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 (partial) at 331 St. George Street because it is not a local landmark or otherwise designated as a historic building.

Darnell Pollard was in attendance, however, had no comments.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

18 certified notices were sent, 5 were returned in favor, and 4 had comments.

Public hearing was opened, however there was no response.

Mr. Weaver questioned the reason for the partial demolition, and was it completed due to flood mitigation purposes.

Mr. Pollard stated it had been flooded during the recent hurricanes and to get it above the flood elevation, a partial demolition was necessary.

Mr. Benoit said the removal of the porches are part of the lifting process but asked if the porches would be put back and close to the original design.

Mr. Pollard replied he believed so; however, did not have the designs for the porches

yet. He noted the roofs for the porches were still there.

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE application PL2021-0060 for partial demolition as required to get the house safely lifted to a better flood elevation. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, MacDonald, Weaver, Wingo, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

10. Planning and Building Staff Communications

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

(Provided for informational purposes)

11. Other Business

(None)

12. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:37 P.M.⁶



Catherine Duncan, Chairperson

⁶ Transcribed by Elyse Anderson