

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

Historic Architectural Review Board Regular Meeting June 17, 2021

The Historic Architectural Review Board met in formal session at 1:00 P.M., Thursday, June 17, 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
Paul Weaver, III
Gaere MacDonald

Absent:

Jon Benoit, excused

City Staff:

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

2. General Public Comments for Items not on the Agenda¹

Due to technical difficulties the meeting began at 1:30 p.m.

- BJ Kalaidi
- Charles Pappas

Ms. Duncan expressed appreciation for the letter Mr. Pappas wrote to the Board. She stated the Board would like to discuss the procedures for the HARB applications.

Ms. Duncan stated she was contacted by Mr. Marquis about materials being turned in late and extended his apologies to the Board.

Mr. Weaver agreed with Ms. Duncan and Mr. Pappas. He said he thought there were some procedural flaws.

3. Approval of Minutes

Ms. Wolfe asked for her title to be changed to, Vice President, Florida Trust Board of Trustees, as she was speaking during public comment, and not as a staff member.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE the May 20, 2021, minutes and the AGHP workshop minutes with the above corrections. The motion was SECONDED by Dr. Wingo.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Wingo, Macdonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. Modification and approval of Agenda

Ms. Wolfe noted that the applicant for item 9. (a) PL2021-0074, 112 Moore Street, requested a continuance to the July 15, 2021, meeting.

Ms. Wolfe asked the Board's consideration in modifying the agenda by moving the demolition applications items 9. (b), (c), and (d) to Expedited Hearings for Certificate of Demolition for 160 Blanco St., 63 Oneida St, and 251 San Marco Ave be moved to items 5 (c), (d) and (e) respectively, as they were

¹ technical difficulties 1:02p.m-1:28 p.m.

not local landmarks and not contributing to a district.

MOTION

MR. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE the Modifications to the Agenda to CONTINUE item 9. (a) to the July 15, 2021, meeting, and then to move items 9. (b), (c), and (d) to follow item 5 (a) and (b) of the agenda. The motion was SECONDED by Dr. Wingo.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Wingo, Macdonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. Public Comments related to Expedited Hearing items:

Applicants for the expedited items were all sworn. All applicants waived their rights to a presentation.

Ms. Duncan reviewed each item.

Public Hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi commented on several of the expedited items. She said she hoped what they were agreeing to at 75 King Street was in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation. She advised that the 160 Blanco Street property was purchased January 25, 2021 for \$168,800 and the transaction was handled by an attorney because it was not a contributing structure in Lincolnville, she considered this a problem. She stated that 63 Oneida was purchased by another attorney January 2016 for \$125,000 and a quit claim deed and now was being demolished. She said 251 San Marco Ave was purchased in November 2020. She said she was unsure of what was more important, money or preservation.

Charles Pappas spoke regarding the 251 San Marco Ave property. He stated he

understood this would have no bearing on the decision but was concerned about what would be recreated in the space and hoped it would fit.

Mark McConnell represented 251 San Marco Street and addressed the previous public comment. He stated the owner of the building spent lots of money on the interior and exterior of the building. He said the owner noticed the building was low-lying and subject to flooding and structurally unsalvageable. He continued the intent was to put the building back as it was and to keep the character of the area.

5. (a) PL2021-0078– Les Thomas & Associates– Applicant Sisters of St. Joseph– Owner 34 Aviles Street (241 St. George Street)

To replace the existing single doors with a double door on the west elevation of a building constructed c. 1940s and to construct a covered entry between the subject building and an adjacent campus building to the west (Lourdes Hall).

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 APPROVE a CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS at 34 Aviles Street (241 St. George Street) to alter the existing single door openings with one set of double French doors as detailed in Alternative #1 and add the proposed portico because the work meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation 9 and 10.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE item 5. (a) PL2021-0078, 34 Aviles Street with alternative number one as listed in the staff report and without any further conditions. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, MacDonald, Wingo, Duncan
NAYES: NONE
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. (b) 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 for modifications to the existing fountain.

Ms. Courtney read the staff report and said based on previous HARB discussion, a review of the AGHP, and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds that the HARB can APPROVE a CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS at 75 King Street, because the proposed revised modifications to the fountain meet the applicable Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation 9, & 10

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE item 5. (b) PL2021-0047, 75 King Street to modify the South Garden with the revised plan for the modifications to the existing fountain again without conditions. The motion was SECONDED by Dr. Wingo

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Wingo, MacDonald, Duncan
NAYES: NONE
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. (c) PL2021-0075– Kolsen and Associates, LLC– Applicant
J Russell Collins, Trustee– Owner
160 Blanco Street

To demolish a residential building constructed c.1917-1924 that is recorded

in the Florida Master Site File and located within the Lincolnville National Register Historic 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 160 Blanco Street because it is not a local landmark or otherwise designated as a historic building with the following condition:

1. 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 to include pine paneling and other salvageable wood materials

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

19 certified notices were sent; however, none were returned.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE Certificate of Demolition 5. (c) PL2021-0075 at 160 Blanco Street with one condition: if feasible to salvage any architectural materials that might be repurposed into another building. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, MacDonald, Wingo, Duncan
NAYES: NONE
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. (d) PL2021-0076– Kolsen and Associates, LLC – Applicant
63 Oneida St. Land Trust and J. Russell Collins, Trustee – Owner
63 Oneida Street

To demolish a residential building constructed c. 1925 - 1947 that is not recorded in the Florida Master Site File and is located within the Lincolnville National Register Historic 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 63 Oneida Street because it is not a local landmark or otherwise designated as a historic building.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE application PL2021-0076, at 63 Oneida Street for the demolition of the building and any salvage if possible. The motion was SECONDED by Dr. Wingo.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Wingo, Weaver, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. (e) PL2021-0079– Sarah Ryan, Architect LLC – Applicant

Clukey & Tebault, LLC – Owner
251 San Marco Avenue

To demolish a commercial building constructed in 1945 that is not recorded in the Florida Master Site File or 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 251 San Marco Avenue because it is not a local landmark or

otherwise designated as a historic building with the following condition:

1. In accordance with Sec. 28-89(2)d6 the salvage of reusable wood and preformed coquina concrete elements and documentation of the structure in the Florida Master Site File inventory

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

14 certified notices were sent, 3 were returned in favor.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE modified agenda item 5. (e) PL2021-0079 251 San Marco Ave with the condition as expressed in the Staff report to salvage any reusable wood and preform coquina concrete elements and documentation of the structure in the Florida Master Site File inventory. The motion was SECONDED by Dr. Wingo

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Wingo, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. Continued Items from Previous Meetings

6. (a) 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.

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 APPROVE an OPINION OF APPROPRIATENESS at 308 St. George Street with the following modifications to the plans for an approvable Certificate of Appropriateness:

1. For the window openings on the north and south elevations of the existing historic house to remain
2. That a break in the south elevation wall be added
3. For the design of the first-floor porch area under the balcony to have Bungalow references, while still being differentiated as a new building
4. That all proposed elements will be in materials compatible with the AGHP

Peter Hotz presented the application. He was concerned with the windows to the South of the building as they were not able to be seen. He asked the Board if those were necessary to be kept.

Ms. Duncan responded in the affirmative. She said the goal was to preserve the history of the building and keep the integrity of the windows and layout.

Mr. Hotz stated there were nine windows on the North side of the home. He stated six of the windows were part of an addition to the home several years back and the Western three windows were part of the original structure, but the six on the East side were not.

Ex Parte Communication:

(none)

Public hearing was opened; however, there was none.

The Board discussed:

- Well completed designs and modifications
- Separation from addition and original structure identified

Ms. Courtney stated the additions on the south elevation did not have a break and were disproportionate to the historic house. She stated while she understood the home would not be visible from St. George Street; however, it would diminish the character when attached to the historic house.

Mr. Hotz stated there was a defined break on the north side where the addition was located. He said the addition was a straight line, which enabled the site to keep the trees.

The discussion continued:

- Keep windows to help break up the linear side of the home
- Home would lose character if windows were removed
- Home should maintain the bungalow feel
- On target for keeping the windows and the South elevation
- Solid siding did not meet guidelines
- Option could be to use plate glass in place of the existing windows
- Extra slight break would help keep the style of the historic home
- Not appropriate to close in the porch
- Reducing of the addition size was good
- Delineation of space showed what was added and what was not
- Use a different finish on the addition to differentiate between the two buildings
- Should be easy to distinguish between Bungalow and the addition
- Delineation should be complementary to design
- Looked institutional and plain
- Make balcony look more like a bungalow on rear of home

Mr. Hotz pointed out the bungalow was four foot above grade. He said for access to the garage, he dropped it one foot higher than the existing grade. He stated the porch to the south would need to be at the same height and it would be hard to duplicate a higher porch. He said he could give the porch the appearance of replication with the columns and the brick from the front.

Ms. Duncan commented that the addition did not feel like a garage. She said the windows made it feel like a house. She suggested revising the plan to make the addition look more like a garage apartment.

Mr. Weaver summarized with input from the Board to provide Mr. Hotz with better direction.

- Preserve the historic windows on the original portion of the home
- Setback for addition should reflect the correct setbacks needed
- Have garage reflect a similar setting described on Cordova Street

Mr. MacDonald added that breaks between the house and the addition was a natural way to demonstrate separation, but he suggested using a different wall finish like shingles or board and batten. He said with those two things combined, separation would be achievable.

Ms. Duncan stated this fell under a recommendation that all proposed elements and materials would be compatible with the Architectural Guidelines for Historic Preservation (AGHP).

Mr. Weaver agreed that it should be compatible but slightly differentiated for the addition.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE Opinion of Appropriateness PL2021-0030 at 308 St. George Street with the conditions that

were outlined in the staff report and that were stated by the Board members. The motion was SECONDED by Dr. Wingo.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Wingo, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Mr. Hotz asked clarification for on what type of materials should be used for the addition.

After a brief discussion, the Board advised that the goal should be to use materials that would provide a subtle distinction between the two structures.²

6. (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.

Ms. Courtney read the staff report and said based on a review of the AGHP, the previous discussion of the HARB, and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds that the board can CONTINUE a CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS at 42-1/2 St. George Street because the revised submittal does not sufficiently address the HARB concerns from the previous meeting and does not meet the applicable Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation 3 and 9.

Jeremy Marquis, Bruce McGuire and Emily Finn presented the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

² Break from 2:52p.m. -3:00pm

Public hearing was opened; however, there was none.

The Board discussed:

- Scope was diminished
- Pergola looked more like the Manucy model
- 2x4 joist across top was too small for being on top of a 6x8
- Acrylic not a historic material
- Standard joist would help give lattice effect

Mr. Marquis responded that a 1x4 was being added on top of the 2x4, and that mass together felt more appropriate. He stated the acrylic was to be used for shelter for school groups and outdoor dining. He understood that it was a more contemporary material but was trying to conceal with historic form.

The board continued:

- Pergola was reduced in one direction by 15 inches
- Pergola did not apply to the time period
- Grape Arbor would be acceptable for time period
- Structure should be similar to Manucy's drawings
- Handicap ramps required for ADA accessibility, although not historic or First Colonial
- Project was more of a rehabilitation than reconstruction
- Open to covering acrylic with honeysuckle as proposed
- Plants unable to grow with acrylic
- Should be practical, safe, and compatible
- Concrete should be made of coquina shell or tabby to fit time period
- Differentiate between requirements of accessibility and the choices of the owner/renter of property
- Pergola too large for garden feature
- Pergola covering would be a modern material

- Acrylic unable to be left out in UV light as it would deteriorate and fog
- Not waterproof for shelter
- Plants could serve as an educational tool

Mr. Marquis referred to what had been done at the Colonial Quarter with the use of acrylic. He said it was held down by lattice. He confirmed the usage of acrylic was not a watertight situation but was effective with providing some protection. He wanted to keep the look light and airy similar to Manucy's drawing.

- Consider a retractable awing for coverage
- Could have full effect of an arbor and deployed during a rainstorm
- Pergola not attached to a structure allowing for air circulation
- Should not raise the top elevation above the Spanish Bakery
- Nine-foot pergola
- Should look structurally sound
- Acrylic would make pergola more like a greenhouse
- For air circulation would need to be kept completely open
- Light would be diminished with vines growing on top even with acrylic
- Acrylic could be inconspicuous if covered by grape vines or honeysuckle
- Present detailed design to show the incorporation of the acrylic
- Even if acrylic could not be seen still should fall within guideline of the AGHP
- Plan should be provided in greater detail

Mr. Marquis stated the plants would be in planters on the corners of the pergola. He said the AGHP approved plants selected was the trumpet honeysuckle which would grow underneath the acrylic. He confirmed that the material under the pergola would be coquina concrete.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to CONTINUE PL2021-0057 Certificate of Appropriateness for 42 ½ St. George Street to July 15, 2021. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Wingo.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Wingo, McDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Bruce McGuire expressed his dissatisfaction with the Board continuing the application. He asked for the Board to approve the structure and omit the acrylic until the Board could come to a resolution.

Ms. Duncan responded for the next HARB meeting if the acrylic was an optional piece to leave it off the next application. She stated the application could become less controversial.

Ms. Lopez interjected that the Board had taken its vote and unless there was a motion to reconsider per Robert's Rules the item had been heard.

6. (c) PL2021-0059 – CD + Urban–Applicant 44 Avenida Menendez, LLC–Owner
44 Avenida Menendez³

To construct a new two-story building and courtyard with outdoor seating to replace the one-story drive-through building.

Mr. Weaver recused himself from the application.

Ms. Wolfe read the staff report and said based on a review of the AGHP, the previous discussion of the HARB 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 revised submittal does not sufficiently address the HARB concerns from the previous meeting.

Clifford Duch, John Arbizzani and Jeremy Marquis presented the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi agreed with Staff that the application should be continued. She indicated the revised submittal did not address the HARB concerns from the previous meeting.

Public hearing was closed.

Mr. Duch stated the building showed the growth over time of the First, Second, and British period influences. He stated they were trying to be consistent with the differences over time. He determined through interpretation as an architect, this would be an appropriate solution for the site.

The Board, Mr. Duch and Mr. Marquis discussed:

- Unsure how design fit into AGHP
- Building should reflect Manucy's drawings
- Walls too strong of a presence on the street
- Building should maintain the integrity of St. Augustine

Mr. Marquis informed the Board they had studied the recent addition of the Hilton Bay Front. He pointed out the different solutions for the balconies and setbacks. He said they favored the tall sight wall on the corner and

³ Form attached to original minutes

thought there was enough evidence over time to support the difference.

The discussion continued:

- Buildings from other time period had fences not walls
- Balcony unable to be built due to DOT easement
- Questioned balcony over wall line or back off the wall
- Recreation should work within the first and second Spanish periods

Mr. Duch replied there were two different balconies, the bracketed balcony provided more space, and the other balcony had the main façade which was about six feet away from the street. He said the bracketed balcony above it was right on the line, and the building was moved within the guidelines of DOT. He indicated Harry's Seafood had a balcony, although it was a different era with different rules. He confirmed that the building would be pedestrian friendly, and it was brought as close to the edge as possible.

Ms. Duncan confirmed that the wall was five to six feet from the property line.

Mr. Duch pointed out the building had been dormant, and they would be able to revitalize the area with a historical courtyard and the components for the building from Manucy's book. He said this was the solution they had developed and asked for solutions specific to the front street.

The discussion continued:

- Show what was referenced in Manucy's drawings
- Wall height could be six or seven feet and include cut outs
- Entrance normally in Spanish Colonial was on the North side of the perimeter but did not have to be
- Suggested to keep wall on the very edge of the road, then the balcony on

front of the building could be recessed under the roof

- Project well designed just not within scope of Manucy's drawings
- Would not be as welcoming or modern but needed to fit within AGHP and time frame

Mr. Duch stated he thought the evolution of the building was more interpretive as to what had occurred in the space previously in history. He said they were telling a story by adding a 21st century building into the site with respect to history. He added that the wall height and moving the building forward could be done if the Board were more inclined to approve the design.

Ms. Duncan said it was based more on the era.

Mr. MacDonald said by moving the building forward, it would fit within the time period but would lose the large doors. He stated with what was presented, they were able to have a better flow in the front and perhaps the building should not move. He said normally large doors were not seen in a Colonial style building, but he did not want to restrict the applicant from having an engaging environment.

Mr. Duch stated the team had considered the following: building staying in current location or moved back a little, build the wall straight across, or move the building forward and engage the wall but lose the seating out front.

Ms. Duncan suggested examining the plans from the time period because they provided different configurations, and to reference Manucy's book. She asked them to demonstrate the usage of the guidelines.

Mr. Duch stated the larger openings would be relevant to the property as that was where mercantile and goods from the river would have entered the site.

In response to Mr. Duch, Ms. Duncan stated that even though this had taken place in

other Spanish Colonial, towns it needed to be relevant to St. Augustine.

Dr. Wingo agreed the applicant needed to come back to provide information as to where this would fit in with the Manucy drawings. She stated this was a critical part of the Board's job to make sure the reconstruction was appropriate for the site.

Mr. MacDonald suggested that the applicant come back to the next meeting and asked for two options to be presented:

- One, with the wall all the way across with the dining behind it
- Second, with the building toward the street which was classic Colonial

Mr. Duch stated they would explore both the options.

Ms. Wolfe stated that although the wall height would hide the building it would still need to fit within the guidelines.

Mr. Duch stated they had brackets holding up one of the balconies. He said if the wall were to go across it could hold up the balcony. He continued it would add some variety and would be consistent with some of the buildings in the area.

Ms. Duncan confirmed they were looking for the consistency with St. Augustine. She stated the brackets were not appropriate as presented.

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to CONTINUE application PL2021-0059 for further work on the front façade, wall, and building engagement to the street. The motion was SECONDED by Dr. Wingo

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Wingo, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY⁴

7. Certificates of Appropriateness

7. (a) PL2021-0061– Natural Beauty Inc.– Applicant
Daniel Pingel and Robert Geibeig– Owner
112 St. George Street

To add an awning across the storefront window and door of front façade / east elevation.

Applicant was not present for application. Item heard after 8 (a).

MOTION

Dr. Wingo MOVED to CONTINUE application PL2021-0061 to the July Meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Wingo, Weaver, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. (b) PL2021-0072– Don Crichlow & Associates– Applicant
All Aboard Holdings, LLC– Owner
290 St. George Street

To alter existing windows and doors on the main residential building, to make modifications to the detached rear building constructed c. 2016 including a porch, deck, and openings, to replace existing siding with wood shingles, and other details including a finish color that is not pre-approved on both buildings.

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

⁴ Break from 4:53 p.m. - 4:57 p.m.

APPROPRIATENESS at 290 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 replacing the existing aluminum windows on the historic c. 1910 house with wood windows that maintain the same size openings
 2. The existing board and batten siding on the detached studio building should be retained or to select another appropriate siding material that differentiates the newer studio building from the historic house
 3. The use of historic architectural details like decorative corner brackets on the detached studio building should be removed from the design, to avoid creating a false historical appearance,
 4. New windows on the studio building should have one-over-one wood sashes, to help differentiate from the historic house
 5. Materials and finishes of all materials including the siding, windows, doors, decking, railing, and steps should be wood and compatible with the AGHP, with applicable new doors and windows having exterior muntins with a raised profile
- Mr. Crichlow reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi stated that after reviewing the materials, the finish color had not been approved and asked if it would fall under the guidelines.

Mr. Crichlow stated they were not asking for approval on the colors. He said they would try and get the colors administratively approved with a pre-approved color.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed along with Mr. Crichlow:

- Design concept good
- Approved of the simpler brackets
- Showed the difference from the cottage
- Board and batten should be kept on the studio to show differentiation
- Indent on South Elevation to open up view from main house of the lake
- Changed out aluminum windows to wooden windows
- Window plan better than previous submitted
- Applicant submitted revised plans late but reacted to staff plan which addressed details
- On South elevation multi-light French door used
- No major last minute changes just changed details
- Decorative bracket created false image
- Simple utilitarian bracket advised
- Clearly defined and addressed issues
- West elevation porch had no brackets, but brackets were shown on the new taller porch
- East elevation revised plans indicated door was still the same at eight feet
- On main house, center window of bathroom to make historically accurate
- Window was centered between vanity and shower but not centered on exterior
- Windows not original to home were added during the 60's
- Four Panel front door and will remove top two panels to install lighting

Mr. MacDonald complemented Mr. Crichlow about changing out the aluminum windows for wooden as he felt that was a move in the right direction.

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE a Certificate of Appropriateness for application PL2021-0072 at 290 St. George Street to add the paint colors to be pre-approved and done after the fact. Also, with specified board and batten siding on the studio in the back would be maintained. The motion was SECONDED by Dr. Wingo.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Wingo, Weaver, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. (c) PL2021-0080– Paul J. Thompson– Applicant The French Connection, LLC– Owner 69 St. George Street

To replace a former window opening on the first-floor east elevation and existing window on the second-floor south elevation with single doors and to lower the front (west) property line wall that is adjacent to the south.

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 APPROVE a CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS at 69 St. George Street for the proposed project scope including the proposed west wall openings of Option 2, but inset with straight wood slats as found on the existing front gate openings, because it meets the applicable Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation 3 and 9.

Paul Thompson reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi reiterated the option that staff and applicant had chosen. She then questioned the Board on if it was to be wooden slats or wooden spindles trimmed in wood.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Staff and applicant both agreed with option two from staff report
- No issue with doors as it was a reproduction building
- Using correct materials and doors for space

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE Item 7. (c) Certificate of Appropriateness PL2021-0080 69 St. George Street for the items that were addressed in the agenda and with the condition that option two which maintains existing 76-inch height with wood spindles trimmed in wood be the appropriate treatment, and that the openings would be square cut in Spanish Colonial. The motion was SECONDED by Dr. Wingo.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Wingo, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. Opinion of Appropriateness

8. (a) PL2021-0077– Generation Homes, LLC– Applicant Dale Gallucci– Owner 305 A St. George Street

To construct a new Bungalow style two-story residential building on an empty lot.

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 APPROVE an

OPINION OF APPROPRIATENESS at 305A St. George Street because the overall design of the new residential building is generally compatible with the requirements of the AGHP.

Cora Johnston reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

Public hearing was opened; however, there was none.

The Board discussed:

- Seamless bungalow fit the area well
- Homes in area shared similar setbacks
- Material right for the period and seemed appropriate
- Easy to maintain

Ms. Johnston pointed out that she had reviewed the property setbacks, and the home was similar to the neighboring properties. She stated she was going to review this with the Board in the future.

The discussion continued:

- Present street scape
- Windows and doors appropriately used
- Hardie material not able to be used in HP1, as wood was required
- Stem walls good for grading but trying to get items off grade to avoid flooding issue
- Consider building off grade, although not required

Dr. Wingo asked since this was new construction, would it hold the same restrictions as a historic property.

Ms. Lopez referred to Ms. Courtney as it was addressed in the report.

Dr. Wingo confirmed there was information in the report stating, "fibrous cement materials were proposed for the siding, trim and soffits. Substitute wood materials were not commonly approved by the HARB on existing buildings but maybe considered as a compatible alternative for a new building".

Ms. Wolfe stated that in her experience, the Board had approved a fiber cement or Hardie board siding in numerous cases for new construction on Spanish Colonial type buildings. She referenced the bungalow description in the AGHP. She read "the exterior finishes were normally drop siding or weather boards with corner boards and less frequently stucco, coquina, artificial stone, or rusticated block". She noted it did not have to be wood. She said Spanish Colonial buildings required the wood shingled roofs, and the Secretary of the Interior's standards referred to existing historic structures.

Ms. Duncan added as an example, Hardie board tried to simulate the dimension and profiles of historic wood siding. She said if you were going to go in that direction it would need to be that product.

Ms. Johnston stated there were two brands and the most used was the 7.25 profile. She said there was a historical series where the product was not as wide. She stated they also had historical cells, which provided the shadow lines.

Mr. MacDonald encouraged Ms. Johnston to bring the application back before the Board once she had made changes. He stated somethings could not be changed as the Board was bound by the guidelines of the AGHP.

Ms. Johnston confirmed there was no garage as many of the homes in the area did not have a garage because there was not enough width or depth on the property.

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE an Opinion of Appropriateness for item PL 2021-0077 at 305 A St. George Street. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Weaver, Wingo, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

9. Certificate of Demolition and Partial Demolition

9. (a) PL2021-0074– Kolsen and Associates, LLC– Applicant
112 Moore Street Extra Lot Land Trust, J Russell Collins, Trustee– Owner
112 Moore Street

To demolish a residential building constructed c. 1904-1910 that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and is a contributing structure to the Lincolnville National Register Historic District.

Item continued to the July 15, 2021, meeting.
See agenda modifications.

10. Planning and Building Staff Communications

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

(Provided for informational purposes)

11. Other Business

11. (a) Report on the status of grant projects, the AGHP update, and building envelope/partial demolition review process.

Ms. Wolfe presented updates to the Board on grant projects and the AGHP.

Ms. Wolfe discussed:

- Two grants focused on Archeology and Digital Heritage

- Four Story Maps with Interactive components
 - Black and African Heritage Culture
 - St. Augustine 18th Century Mission Communities
 - Development and Growth of St. Augustine
 - Mapping and Monitoring
- Water Works Grant
 - Required extension, due to unforeseen circumstances
 - Internal meetings taking place on the usage of building once completed
- Three National Register District resurveyed
 - Updates for districts had been drafted
 - Architect to provide information on flood mitigation
- National Park Service
 - Grant to provide updating of the National Historic Landmarks nomination for town plan
- AGHP Update
 - Survey to be reviewed by Board before being distributed in the Fall
- Community Outreach Plan for Partial Demolition Document
 - Document name needed to be transparent
 - HARB authority on design review for partial demolitions
 - Review of partial demolition outside of HP districts
 - Only cover seven percent of landmass and less than 25% of City building inventory

Ms. Wolfe replied to Mr. Weaver stating HARB would be allowed to review the reconstruction for the partial demolitions. She stated for full demolition, the application had to be presented to the Board and if the applicant was not able to present their case, the Board could deny.

Mr. Weaver asked about the archaeological maps and if they were available for viewing.

Ms. Wolfe told Mr. Weaver the maps were still under review by the Division of Historical Resources for content and editing.

Mr. MacDonald asked for an agenda item to be added to the next meeting to discuss the HARB rules and procedures for review to avoid materials being turned in late.

Ms. Wolfe stated the Chair, Ms. Duncan, would not attend next meeting but she would speak to her about the HARB procedures for her feedback and have it on the agenda for the next month's meeting.

12. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:20 P.M.⁵



Catherine Duncan, Chairperson

⁵ Transcribed by Elyse Anderson