

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

Historic Architectural Review Board Regular Meeting August 19, 2021

The Historic Architectural Review Board met in formal session at 1:00 P.M., Thursday, August 19, 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
Gaere MacDonald

Absent: Paul Weaver, III-absent, 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 Agenda

(None)

3. Approval of Minutes

Dr. Wingo stated she had made several comments before and most were taken into consideration; however, she had others that needed to be address:

- Mr. Benoit was not present
- Item four starting with "Ms. Wolfe asked the Boards" sentence structure needed to be addressed
- Item five under public comment BJ Kalaidi sentence structure needed to be addressed
- Page eight starting with "Mr. Duch...growth over time" should be First and Second Spanish period
- Page twelve Motion representation, was incorrect or just awkwardly phrased

Mr. MacDonald confirmed the motion was accurate.

Ms. Duncan asked for "spoke to Mr. Marquis" to be changed to "he contacted Ms. Duncan"

Ms. Wolfe stated the clerk would make the revisions.

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE the June 17, 2021, minutes with the above corrections. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Duncan.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Duncan, Benoit, Wingo

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Dr. Wingo thought there should be an explanation as to what was stated in the minutes since they were mostly paraphrased, and some sentence felt to be a direct quote.

4. Modification and approval of Agenda

Ms. Wolfe stated there were requests for a continuation to the September 16, 2021, HARB meeting on the following items:

- Item 6. (b) 112 Moore Street
- Item 7. (a) for 24 Cathedral Place

She stated item 6. (c) for 144 Martin Luther King Avenue had been withdrawn and did not need action; however, the applicant for item 6. (b) 112 Moore Street had been contemplating a continuance or to withdraw; however, she did not have confirmation from the legal registered owner, and without that confirmation, she suggested a continuance. She stated with Board approval, she recommended adding a discussion item that would be 10. (c) "Preservation Awards".

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to CONTINUE Item 6. (b) PL 2021-0074 and Item 7. (a) PL 2021-0102 to the September 16, 2021, HARB meeting and add 10. (c) to the agenda to discuss Preservation Awards with Staff. The motion was SECONDED by Dr. Wingo.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Wingo, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. Recommended Expedited Hearing items:

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

Ms. Duncan reviewed each item.

5. (a) PL2021-0103 – Cathedral Parish School– Applicant Diocese of St. Augustine, Inc– Owner 259 St. George Street

To construct a free-standing canopy over the existing concrete playground court on the northeast corner of the property.

Ms. Courtney read the staff report recommendation 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 to add a canopy covering a portion of the school playground at 259 St. George Street because it meets the applicable Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation 9 and 10.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

Public hearing was opened; however, there was none.

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE application 2021-0103 finding that it does meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards 9 and 10. The motion was SECONDED by Dr. Wingo.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Wingo, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

5. (b) PL2021-0106 – Open City Architecture, LLC – Applicant Trinity Episcopal Church of St. Augustine– Owner 215 St. George Street

To add a new sidewalk along the ADA parking spaces adjacent to Artillery Lane and curbing to match the existing curb, to restripe existing parking lot and paint curbs to match, and to convert 3 sets of exterior steps, located under covered walkways around Hindry Hall, to ADA ramps.

Ms. Courtney read the staff report recommendation 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 215 St. George Street because the proposed new sidewalk with curbing and work on the existing parking

area meet the applicable Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation 9 and 10.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

Public hearing was opened; however, there was none.

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE application 2021-0106 finding that the proposed ADA ramps and sidewalks meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards or 9 and 10. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Macdonald, Wingo, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. Continued Items from Previous Meetings

6. Certificate of Appropriateness

(a) PL2021-0061 – Natural Beauty, Inc– Applicant

Daniel Pingel and Robert Geibeig Jr – Owner

112 St. George Street

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

Ms. Duncan stated for several meetings the applicant had not been present. She asked how to proceed with the application.

Ms. Courtney informed the Board the applicant was the business owner and resided in Canada and did not provide an owners authorization form to allow another representative to come to the meeting on his behalf. She informed the Board they could hear item without the applicant present, but that was not normally done.

Mr. MacDonald stated it would be difficult to hear the application without the applicant due to having questions and thought the applicant should be present to make their case.

Ms. Wolfe stated in the past they have had guidance from the City Attorney that after several times it should be readvertised for fairness to the public. She said it could be readvertised or the application could be denied, and they could reapply at any time.

Ms. Courtney stated there were adjacent buildings with the similar tile and awnings and she had included those in the report. She stated there were awnings that existed on St. George Street with architectural tile without noticeable damage.

There was Board consensus that the applicant had several opportunities to be present or sign an authorization form to have someone else represent them.

Ms. Lopez stated if the Board were to deny the application, they had to hold a public hearing.

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi stated she was pleased the Board thought it was important for the applicant to be present not only for the application but also for the public.

Public hearing was closed.

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to DENY application PL2021-0061 with the expectation that the Board did not have the opportunity to clarify the attachment of the new awning to the existing building. The motion was SECONDED by Dr. Wingo.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Wingo, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. Certificate of Demolition

(b) 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.

Motion to CONTINUE under Item 4

6. Certificate of Demolition

(c) PL2021-0091 – Synergy Construction & Maintenance – Applicant

H&H Real Estate Investing, LLC– Owner
144 Martin Luther King Avenue

To partially 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, including the front and rear porches.

Application was withdrawn prior to meeting.

7. Certificates of Appropriateness

7. (a) PL2021-0102 Network Installation Specialists, LLC— Applicant

Kasam Hospitality, Inc. — Owner
24 Cathedral Place

To install new antennas on cupola of the building's tower and mechanical equipment to platform on the flat roof, as part of a wireless antenna upgrade.

Motion to CONTINUE under Item 4

8. Certificate of Demolition and Partial Demolition

8. (a) PL2021-0104 – Trinity Independent Methodist Church, Inc.– Applicant and Owner

84 Bridge Street

To partially demolish a church building constructed in 1913, limited to the belltower, that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and is a contributing structure to 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 CONTINUE a Certificate of Partial Demolition at 84 Bridge Street because the scope of work is not clearly defined in order to determine the impacts of the partial demolition of the structure.

Ms. Wolfe reviewed documentation that was submitted by the day prior of the meeting.¹ Pastor Gregg Anderson was present and reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

Public hearing was opened; however, there was none.

The Board discussed:

- Recognized the significance of the belltower
- Belltower was unsafe and facility could not be used
- Would need to be rebuilt exactly the same
- Recommendation for bell to be strapped down if removed in case of a hurricane

¹ Documents attached to the original packet

- Not entirely sure as to what was being removed
- Not removing the entire bell tower

Pastor Anderson explained that the sanctuary of the historic church is unusable due to its condition. He stated that the plan was to remove the top portion of the belltower and several layers of the brick to refurbish and replace them. He said the process would be lengthy as they raised funds to complete it. He stated the intent was to fortify the interior with steel and cable. He said the belltower and balcony would be reconstructed.

Pastor Anderson and the Board discussed:

- Key to the project would be a Structural Engineer
- Would need to work with the engineer and contractor when applying for a permit
- Contractor would implement the design from a structural engineer
- Previous assistance from City but the timeframe changed, and the church declined
- Unsure if able to use previous plans that were signed and sealed
- AES information was to brace structure
- Could accommodate the removal of tower but would need a reconstruction plan
- Plan would have to be completed first before moving forward with the removal

The discussion continued:

- Board had two approaches from two different engineers
- Contractors were not recognized in Florida as an engineer
- Would need a registered licensed engineer for the project
- Plan from AES had an expiration date, unsure if they could still be used

- Structural engineer would develop a concept of how to remove and replace the belltower
- Foundation work was completed and now needed to work on the walls of the tower
- More issues could arise and would want a solid plan before removing the tower
- Plan to stabilize the inside was a steel frame
- Could be other options for stabilization of the belltower
- Lack of stability was from first opening to top of the door
- Could save money by not removing the top and stabilizing in place

Pastor Anderson thanked the Board for their time and stated he would proceed in a different direction.

Ms. Wolfe asked the Pastor Anderson if he wanted the application continued for another month or withdrawn.

Pastor Anderson stated he understood they were not able to remove the tower or balcony as it could be too fragile, and he thought they would take another approach.

Mr. MacDonald suggested to continue the application and for the applicant to speak with an engineer instead of withdrawing the project.

Pastor Anderson stated he would agree to a continuance on the application.

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to CONTINUE application 2021-0104 to the October 21, 2021, HARB meeting.

Ms. Lopez stated Pastor Anderson had only agreed to one month but if he agreed to October then that was acceptable.

Mr. Benoit asked Pastor Anderson if he would be willing to continue his application to October to have plenty of time to consult with his team and an engineer.

Pastor Anderson agreed.

The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, MacDonald, Wingo, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

9. Planning and Building Staff Communications

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

(Provided for informational purposes)

10. Other Business

10. (a) Presentation and discussion regarding the drafted "Flood Guidance for Historic Properties" and "Flooding Adaptation for Coquina Structures" being prepared in accordance with two grants awarded to the City of St. Augustine from the Florida Division of Historical Resources and National Park Service.

Ms. Wolfe presented the topic to the Board and said there were two National Park Service grants that went through the hurricane mitigation program and the City qualified through hurricane Irma. She said they applied for the projects and looked at two:

- Town Plan National Historic Landmark
- Older National Registered Historic Districts

She stated these programs worked with the Historic Preservation Master Plan and would help guide them in the future knowing they would have more hazards that would be

approaching. She said this would provide mitigation guidance for homeowners. She said the grant components were, the survey and inventory, update National Landmark Nominations, and provide in reduction in flood losses for the future. She stated these projects had been completed and wanted to have the Boards feedback on the printed materials that would be distributed to the property owners. She stated one was an in-depth packet and the other was a brochure that could be sent out before hurricane season.

The Board discussed:

- Was more appropriate to replace with garage instead of basement
- Idea for pamphlet was excellent
- Provide homeowners with a priority list of actions that could be completed easily
- Flood mitigation was complied with hurricanes
- Hurricanes presented more issues besides flooding
- Provide list in pamphlet to make structures more flood resistance and what could be done afterward for repair
- Document for Flood Mitigation was excellent but needed to be condensed
- Coquina pamphlet provided good points on metal anchors and repairing damage to coquina

Dr. Wingo said they were trying to keep the historical fabric of the buildings under the Secretary of the Interiors Standards guidelines and raising buildings could lose the historical fabric of that building.

The discussion continued:

- Page 2.4 under Elevation Certificate should only be a surveyor
- Page 3.5 under Installation of Secondary Power Sources should

advise people to let the home dry out before turning on the power

- Page 2.8 clarify that HARB would use the flexibility within the guidelines for all properties
- Would be helpful to obtain contractors opinions
- Provide resources to the homeowners like a public agent to help assess their properties
- Anticipate questions from homeowners
- Should share information with other communities as it was valuable
- Could be useful to provide a Frequently Asked Question section
- FEMA provided grants and paid for the damages created by the floods
- Perhaps provide FEMA information to help with the return investment for providing educational resources
- Being in the building business, packet and brochure were easy to understand
- Perhaps charge a fee for assisting homeowners with most affordable options that would aid with flooding
- Should have stipulations with raising buildings but keeping with the streetscape
- New codes require roofs be covered in peel and stick that helped prevent leakage
- Information provided for boarding up windows focus on the negative and positive pressures of a home
- Great information provided on Coquina and lime wash
- Many masonry sealants were matte and provided help with waterproofing
- Wet proofing was great to mention
- Hard to conform document to each home as every home was different
- Page 2.6 under Property Flood Insurance provide homeowners with claim information and what flood insurance entails
- Add renters' insurance
- Sellers in Florida not required to disclose flood damage

- Excellent information for anyone not just Historic District
- Photograph contents before and then directly after for insurance purposes
- Boarding options could use fabric, clear plastic panels or even storm windows because plywood was not rated or impact windows

Mr. MacDonald stated he thought disclosure when selling a home was required.

Mr. Benoit stated that if damage was done during occupancy, then yes; however, if an investor owned the property, they were not required to disclose even if it was disclosed to them. He said that was a State of Florida's standard and not a national.

Ms. Lopez stated after Hurricane Matthew she sent a cover letter with each address that had been certified by the City building official of flooding to the Board of Realtors.

Mr. Benoit stated each community should know the Community Rating System (CRS) as he thought that was the key to FEMA being able to provide financial assistant.

Ms. Duncan pointed out that flooding was not just caused by hurricanes it was now seasonal flooding caused by several environmental factors.

The Board thanked Ms. Wolfe and the team for preparing the documents and thought they had done a great job.

Ms. Wolfe stated the City was offering workshops to provide information on flood mitigation on August 24th and 25th.

10. (b) Discussion and recommendation regarding revised HARB Rules of Procedure

Ms. Wolfe stated there was a draft in the packet and if the changes from last months were amenable there was a red line version

for viewing. She asked for comments for further changes or a motion to adopt.

The Board discussed:

- Refrain from reorganizing the agenda based on Staff recommendation
- Keep agenda organized based on type of application to not set an expectation of what would and would not be approved
- Stand firm when applicants present changes to their application for acceptance or not
- Most applicants were design professionals who made changes, consider continuing application for two months to allow more time
- Small changes would be acceptable but major change would create a challenge

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE the modifications to the HARB conduct meetings. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Benoit.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Benoit, Wingo, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

10.(c) Proposed Preservation Awards Program²

Ms. Wolfe presented the topic on the potential Preservation Awards. She said this would take place during Preservation Month and was a great way to celebrate the achievements in the community.

Mr. Benoit asked who would facilitate the program once a year.

Ms. Wolfe stated they were working on that, and she hoped the Historical Society might assist. She said she thought this was a way for the City to recognize the citizens for their hard work.

The Board discussed:

- Consider reducing the number of awards
- Continue the discussion at the next meeting
- Great project

11. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:59 P.M.³



Catherine Duncan, Chairperson

² Attached to Original Packet

³ Transcribed by Elyse Anderson