

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

Historic Architectural Review Board Regular Meeting February 16, 2023

The Historic Architectural Review Board met in formal session at 1:00 P.M., Thursday, February 16, 2023, in the Alcazar Room at City Hall, St. Augustine, Florida. Catherine Duncan, Chairperson, called the regular meeting to order, and the following were present:

1. ROLL CALL:

Catherine Duncan, Chairperson
Gaere MacDonald, Vice-Chairperson
Jon Benoit
Paul Weaver, III
Brad Beach

City Staff:

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

2. General Public Comments for Items not on the Agenda

(None)

3. Approval of Minutes

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE the January 19, 2023, minutes as presented. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Benoit.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Benoit, Beach, Weaver, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. Modification and approval of Agenda

Ms. Duncan announced Items HP 2023-0003 and HP 2023-0004 had requested a continuance to the March 7, 2023 HARB meeting.

Ms. Seymour noted one item under 'Other Business' would be added regarding the Back Bay Coastal Storm Risk Management Study. She said the Army Corp of Engineers

were doing a study and she wanted to inform the Board.

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE the modifications to the agenda and continue items HP2023-003 and HP2023-0004. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Beach, Weaver, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. Public Comments related to Expedited Hearing items:

(None)

6. Certificate of Demolition and Partial Demolition

6. (a) HP2023-0003 REQUESTING CONTINUANCE TO MARCH 16, 2023 MEETING— Ronin Construction Management, LLC— Applicant
Irene L. Lawrie Living Trust – Owner
224 Riberia Street

To demolish a residential building constructed ca. 1924-1930 that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and a contributing building in the Lincolnville National Register Historic District.

Applicant requested a continuance to the March 16, 2023 meeting.

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

**6. (b) HP2023-0004 REQUESTING CONTINUANCE TO MARCH 16, 2023 MEETING— Ronin Construction Management, LLC – Applicant
Irene L. Lawrie Living Trust– Owner
226 Iberia Street**

To demolish a residential building constructed ca. 1917-1924, including the post-1930 commercial addition extending from the front facade, that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and is a contributing building in the Lincolnville National Register Historic District.

Applicant requested a continuance to the March 16, 2023 meeting.

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

**6. (c) HP2023-0007– A.D. Davis Construction Corp– Applicant
Sisters of St. Joseph, Inc. – Owner
234 St. George Street**

To partially demolish "Villa Flora," a building constructed ca. 1898, located in the HP-1 Zoning district, recorded on the Florida Master Site File, and a contributing building to the St. Augustine National Register Historic District, limited to removal of the coquina parapet wall, two layers of brick below, and flashing on all but a portion of the east elevation, in

conjunction with proposed repairs and reconstruction with the same elements.

Mr. Weaver noted several years ago he worked on a state grant with the Sisters of St. Joseph but no longer had any professional business relations.

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 234 St. George Street with the following findings:

1. the partial demolition will be mitigated by the applicant's plans to restore the coquina parapet wall as existing; and,
2. the flashing related work which necessitates the partial demolition will protect the building from future water intrusion.

And condition:

1. That a mortar mix compatible with the original and with the historic coquina stone be utilized.

Mike Davis reviewed the application.

Ms. Duncan asked when the coquina was removed, how it would be protected.

Mr. Davis replied it would be on the roof and would be spread out to not damage the roof. He said each piece would be numbered in order to reinstall it correctly.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

12 certified notices were sent, 3 were returned in favor, 0 were returned opposed and 0 had comments.

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

The Board discussed:

- Applicant had performed this same work in 2017 and understood the specifications required
- Questioned the kind of flashing on the building
- Asked if this was the same as the work in 2017
- Questioned why it did not work in 2017
- Noted there was a covenant with the state regarding any substance work for the duration of ten years
- Felt the proposed demolition work was removing and being replaced with the same material was appropriate as long as it was reinstalled the same way
- This work would help maintain the building long term
- Asked if mortar testing had been done or if it was done on the previous repair

Applicant response:

- Had lead flashing on the outside that did not all the way through and lead flashing on the inside that did not go all the way through
- Between the bricks was completely deteriorated
- Everything would be sealed and pinned and would repair identically
- Work being done was exactly the same
- Rest of the roof had not been touched; however, it has continued to leak and become worse and had to be fixed
- Would follow up on the covenant
- Testing had been done during the previous repair and the mortar mix had been used on the southside and on the parapet

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE application 2023-0007 finding that the partial demolition was towards repair and replacement in kind and would protect

the building for the future with the one condition that the compatible mortar mixture would be used. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Beach, Weaver, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. Certificates of Appropriateness

7. (a) HP2023-0005– Les Thomas Architect– Applicant
32084 Properties LLC– Owner
320 St. George Street

Mr. MacDonald recused himself from the application.¹

To construct a new detached garage and driveway south of the existing residence.

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 320 St. George Street with the following findings:

1. There is limited view of the accessory building from the HP-1 zoning district.
2. meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation # 9 as a contemporary design that is both compatible with the existing main residence and reasonably compatible with the adjacent HP-1 zoning district.

and conditions:

1. The proposed driveway paver material is clarified and found by the HARB to be reasonably compatible with the AGHP and the HP-1 zoning district.

¹ Recusal form attached to original minutes

2. Window sashes on the garage are changed to the more appropriate 1/1 configuration and other ornamentation that the HARB may determine inappropriate, such as the Craftsman brackets, spindle details on the east and south elevations, and glazing on the garage door, be removed from the design or altered per HARB's recommendations to be more compatible with the AGHP.

Les Thomas reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi said she was concerned when HP-1 district came up as it was being destroyed. She encouraged the Board to stay within the guidelines of the HP-1 district.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Felt it was a mistake was calling this a garage and not a carriage house
- Recommended if it were based off the Secretary of the Interiors, the window should be one over one
- Should be more of a simpler utilitarian structure
- Would be new construction and outside the HP district and could have more flexibility with the siding material
- Staff was following guidelines with the brackets as they could be simpler
- Site was pushed back so the scale and portions worked with the main house
- No windows were in garage, paint colors were matching the house, brick driveway were per the requirements
- Hardie siding could be used but should maintain a profile similar to the main house

- Accessory structure should be simpler in nature and agreed a simple one over one window was better
- Wanted to simplify the structure to avoid it competing with the main structure
- Felt it met the overall threshold of reasonable compatibility
- Unsure why the windows in the garage were being removed as other had been approved
- Felt the brackets could be decorative as that was similar to other Victorian style homes
- Felt the design was thoughtful and the proposed details were appropriate
- Had used alternative materials when outside the HP-1 district but still compatible
- Felt the home was a period piece and asked when it was built
- During that time period the home would have had a carriage house
- A garage would have built post World War 1
- Design was nice with the existing house but preferred it without the windows as they did not look historic whereas all wood did
- Felt the building was simple with elimination of the windows and the bracket would tie into the main structure

Applicant response:

- Would submit the type of siding to staff for it to be part of the permit application
- Originally built in 1894
- Questioned which brackets were being referenced

Ms. Seymour noted it was the front bracket supporting the roof over the garage. She said they were currently a more craftsman style and should match the house.

Mr. Thomas said they would have to be a bracket because it held the roof.

Ms. Duncan said the ones on the garage were appropriate.

Ms. Seymour said the recommendation was for them to be more simplified.

Ms. Courtney said the windows were specified in the craftsman style and used in the addition. She said if they were trying to replicate the Queen Ann architecture the window on the house was different and staff did not recommend repeating that on the garage as it should be kept as simple as possible.

Mr. Thomas said they were willing to do what was needed and those were simple things to change. He said they agreed to the windows, no glass in the garage door, and would use that pattern as indicated.

Ms. Duncan asked if there was a recommendation regarding the pavers.

Ms. Seymour replied the AGHP recommended it should be a natural clay brick.

Mr. Thomas said the pattern would be the same as the existing sidewalk on the property.

Mr. Weaver said he thought there was consensus on some items: brackets were fine, there was no objection to the use of the Hardie board and suggested using the Artisan Hardie.

Ms. Courtney questioned if the Artisan Hardie board was being manufactured because it was not on the recent list.

Mr. Weaver asked if they could approve it and if there were an issue the applicant could report to staff.

Ms. Courtney noted it would not have to be that specific brand but should be that profile.

Mr. Beach noted it should have the same exposure.

Mr. Thomas agreed it would have the same exposure, except the shape maybe slightly

different; however, the exposure would be like the existing house.

Mr. Weaver said the condition would be it should resemble the traditional weather board siding found in St. Augustine. He noted the pavers would be the clay brick and should have one over one light windows.

Mr. Thomas agreed.

Ms. Seymour asked about the frieze board over the porch area.

Mr. Thomas said the height was kind of high and he lowered it by adding the frieze board a little more wall. He said it was only four feet wide and six or seven feet long. He said it was to lower the entry and make it feel more like a porch.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE Certificate of Appropriateness 7(a) HP 2023-0005 320 St. George Street to construct a new detached garage and driveway south of the existing residents with those four conditions. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Beach, Benoit, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**7. (b) HP2023-0006– Les Thomas
Architect– Applicant
Mikma Properties, LLC — Owner
21 Hypolita Street**

To make exterior alterations to the existing commercial building, including replacing railings for the existing ADA ramp and stair, installation of a canvas awning on the north elevation, and relocation of the hood vent on the south elevation roof; and, to construct a new pergola in the paver courtyard with associated changes to landscaping and hardscape.

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 21 Hypolita Street with the following findings:

1. The overall project, as presented or with alterations recommended by the HARB, meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation #9 as a compatible contemporary design; and,

2. The applicant provides evidence and the HARB determines that the proposed wide awning meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation #10 as a reversible new alteration.

Les Thomas reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:

- Was not in favor of the awning as it did not fit the architecture of the building
- Looked to be more for a commercial building
- Suggested adding post calling it a side porch which would blend better with the architecture
- Did not associate an awning with a vernacular style building but was more for commercial and Mediterranean style architecture
- Rather than having post it would be more of a shed roof that would have brackets and would match more of the vernacular feel of the building; however, was more intrusive than an awning that could be removed
- Would fit more with the architecture than what was proposed

- Scale of the awning looked little and not deep
- An entry feature should signify the entrance and having an awning over a ramp was not typical as that was more of a transition feature
- Suggested having the canopy be more dedicated to the entry doors and the landing at the top
- With it being slopped, rain will come back on to the ramp
- Using the brackets or awning to cover only the porch area would look better
- Having the long awning did not look right next to the long set of windows

Applicant response:

- Thought the awning would be more of an asset and easier to do
- Problem with the post was that it was not a porch
- Would be a covering for the handicapped ramp
- Would be held up as per the awning company specification but could add brackets to it
- Awning was seven feet wide
- Main goal was to cover the ramp for safety
- Only covering just, the porch was a great idea

Douglas Bow was sworn in and reviewed the application.

Mr. Bow said originally the awning was five feet by twenty-five feet and was supposed to cover the handicap ramp. He said the front porch was not a front porch but more of a walkway from the steps to the front door. He said this covering would allow people to be out of the elements.

Board discussion:

- Instead of the aluminum brackets and canvas awning to match the architecture and could have a wood structure with wooden brackets

- Could have more of a bracketed covering to cover those waiting in line
- Long awnings were not typically seen along a residential house
- Awning could be placed over the entrance
- If shortened, it could be centered on the door and the window above and would be more appropriate to solve the challenges
- Screened area in the back would be the reference and should be balanced in both directions
- In favor of the pergola as it matched the period
- All the other proposed items were acceptable, wood railing matched the main porch, and the exhaust was on the backside
- Thought the awning should be lowered by six inches
- If handicap ramp were covered, applicant would need to commit to a vernacular style porch
- Felt the color should be darker, not matching the building
- Darker colors would be better for maintenance and weathering
- Could have a darker color that was on the house
- Color of the awning should accent the building and suggested the cranberry

Applicant Response:

- If post were added they would obstruct the handicap ramp
- Asked if the awning could be shortened
- Asked what size needed to be determined
- Doors were six feet and would want to go a foot and half beyond
- Wanted to make sure the doors cleared but it could be dropped some
- Coloring of the awning was almost an exact match to the color of the building
- Agreeable to any color the Board choose as there were many colors available

Ms. Courtney stated the color would have to match the era and the style and the building

was built in 1924 which would be post Victorian.

Mr. Weaver suggested working with staff for the awning color and if unable to find a pre-approved color, then the applicant could return to the Board.

Mr. MacDonald said now that the canvas was smaller having it more like a feature was not a bad idea and it could have stripes, as the building was a little flat.

Mr. Bow agreed to obtain samples and provide the colors to staff for a decision.

Ms. Courtney noted historically some awnings had stripes.

Mr. Weaver noted the awning colors were being delegated to staff and asked for clarification for the dimensions of the awning.

Mr. Bow said the new awning was five feet out and eight feet wide and would be under the windows.

Ms. Duncan suggested the awning be dropped about six inches and keeping the end away from the windows to the right of the door and then bring in six inches on each side for it to be centered.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE 21 Hypolita Street HP2023-0006 to approve all elements with the condition that the awning would be eight feet wide and lowered a little bit. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

Ms. Seymour asked if there were any changes being made the landscaping and hardscaping that was existing.

Mr. Thomas said it would be cleaned up and left alone.

VOTE ON MOTION:

**AYES: Weaver, Beach, Benoit,
MacDonald, Duncan**

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY²

**8. Continued Certificates of
Appropriateness from the previous HARB
meetings**

**8. (a) HP2022-0078 Continued from
November 17, 2022 – Grace Contracting,
LLC– Applicant
Zigiz Holdings, LLC– Owner
28 W. Castillo Drive - Lot 14**

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 inground 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.

Josiah Duff and Alan Register reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

Public hearing was opened.

Yvonne Puckett spoke in opposition to the application and said she had lived in the area for the past sixty-eight years and was active in the community. She said there was no traffic flow to Grove Avenue from this property and it was a narrow street and easily flooded due to the type of City drainage. She said the developer of the property had maximized the buildings, including pools for large group rentals. She said these issues might not be in the Board's purview but hoped they could limit the negative impact to the neighborhood.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Proposed each property had five bedrooms
- Would need to have one vehicle per bedroom
- Wanted to know how the vehicles would be positioned on the property
- Questioned the maximum lot usage and impervious ratio

² Break from 2:16 p.m.- 2:24 p.m.

Mr. Benoit said depending on the site plan the buildings had two numbers: building coverage was 50% and they were at 35% and for impervious was 70% but depending in which site plan, it varied; option one was 54% and option two was over 60%.

Board discussed:

- Building design was better than previous and was moving in the right direction
- Asked if there was a consensus on which site plan was better
- Option two had the vehicles off the street and had a driveway
- Felt option one did not encourage traffic off Grove Avenue and helped with the drainage but could be an issue with the traffic on Castillo Drive
- Suggested for option one could be to deed a connection between the two of the driveways since owned by same owner and it would provide and way in and out from Castillo Drive
- Questioned if all the vehicle would fit on the property in option one
- Did not have a parking plan showing how parking would work on site
- Wanted to see the vehicles layout but wanted the vehicles off the street and on the property
- Could the driveways be eliminated or flipped the houses to have the driveways together to provide more parking for both houses and access
- Felt the Board had a lot of control over the two lots and driveway versus no driveway
- Most buildings predated the automobile and the original look was not to have curb cuts
- Was important to limit the traffic on Grove Avenue
- San Borne maps showed that garages were setback
- By maneuvering the lots would be able to lessen the visual impact on Castillo Drive
- Noted aluminum was a suitable material; however, should read as a wood window
- Questioned the fenestration pattern but was more in favor of option one from a traffic and aesthetics point of view
- Preferred option one, but did not think the garages could be turned as there was not enough space
- Edge of driveway was supposed to be three feet from the property line, and this was less than sixteen feet but normally wanted twenty-three feet from edge of structure to property line for side entry garage
- Option one helped mitigate the impact to Grove Avenue
- Felt leaving and entering off Castillo Drive would be very tricky
- Suggested the front setbacks could be moved forward by two feet to be in line with the rest of the properties on Grove Avenue
- Would help gain more space in the motor court for both garages
- Had a crawl space foundation design in terms of flood mitigation this was the more sensitive approach
- If it were a rental; should be clearly noted there would be no parking allowed in front and there would not be a curb cut; all parking would come off Castillo Drive
- Suggested making the garages a few feet smaller each way which would help with parking
- Could slide the second story garage over the steps and help maintain the footprint of the garage apartment
- Concerned there was not a sidewalk and questioned the way people would enter the main house
- Suggested putting the walkway between the two buildings, through the center

Mr. Beach asked if there was Board consensus to use the site plan for option one as long as the vehicles could be off the street and not parking on Grove Avenue.

Ms. Lopez said the parking would have to be provided when applying for a short-term rental. She said parking was supposed to be contained on the property; however, if unable

to there were other options available per code.

Mr. Weaver asked what the current parking situation was for Grove Avenue.

Ms. Seymour replied closer to US 1 had some street parking; however, the majority of Grove Avenue was yellow curb which did not allow parking.

Mr. Weaver said he did not want to encourage parking on Grove Avenue as it did not sound feasible.

Ms. Duncan said the adjacent properties shown did not have parking and historically, parking was not on Grove Avenue.

There was Board consensus to use site plan option one and noted if there were any changes from the other Boards the applicant would have to return to HARB.

Mr. Weaver asked if the application should be continued until the parking details could be worked out before final approval or should they continue working out the other details since the applicant was present.

The Board decided to work through the architecture details.

Board discussion:

- Asked for clarification regarding the small individual windows on the right elevation as they did not fit the building
- Floor plan should adjust to make the interior and exterior work together and with the historic context of the area
- Historically, windows were larger to open and vent the home for air flow
- Scale of the windows on the left elevation were more appropriate
- Should develop a fenestration pattern that resembled the neighborhood
- Window did not need to be operable as long as it looked like a historic window
- Aluminum was a fine material to use but it needed to resemble wood with the scale and details
- Questioned what type of windows were being used
- Noted it would have a clad exterior aluminum outside but wood on the inside
- Suggested switching the stove with a sink to add a window which would help add balance
- Small windows were related to bathrooms, staircase, and closet but the upper drawing on A6 in the bedroom could add a double hung window
- Front elevation; the pairs of windows should be pinched in to allow for more wall space on the corners
- Asked if the finish floor would be at ten feet and if that was shown in the drawings
- Asked what the existing grade versus the proposed ten foot
- Questioned the difference between the porch on the and the grade
- Felt there was a need for more steps from the porch
- Asked how this would be contained on Grove Avenue and how it could affect the neighbors
- Suggested using a retaining wall on the sides and asked if it was shown on the site plan
- Should understand how these would fit compared to the other buildings
- Suggested providing a contextual drawing with several other buildings or street view
- Friday Review comments noted the applicant would have to provide elevation notes ten feet into adjacent properties
- Had to choose which street to send drainage and there was not a split option and Castillo Drive was the better of the two
- City's review process was extensive
- Felt the water could be contained and felt there were lots of ways to solve the issue
- Ceiling heights were nine foot and felt the windows could be larger in height

- Suggested using a 2x4 window and in some spaces a 2x6 window
- Drawings were fine but concerned about the accuracy
- Like the differentiations provided for the two lots on Grove Avenue
- Suggested having the hip roof on lot 14 extend over the porch and covered which would help differentiate even more and the cost to build would not be significantly more
- Felt the vernacular buildings on the street would have the fenestration patterns the Board was looking for
- Proposed soffits were vinyl asked if there was an opportunity to have exposed rafter tail or solid
- More in favor of rafter tail as it could add more character but suggested to look at the neighborhood to see what was there
- Encouraged the materials to be wood and not vinyl
- Suggested having one lot as an exposed rafter tail and the other lot solid
- Felt it was important to tie in both buildings with the hardscape
- Needed to clarify the pattern and asked if there was a way to break it up either by creating new pathways between buildings or hardscape or landscape between the buildings
- Felt it should be more inviting with landscape even if not in public view should be screened
- Asked if cocoa color was the paver for the pool
- Felt that color would not be best as it could be difficult to stand on Florida as it would be too hot
- Keeping the trees would help it feel more part of the context
- Asked if there was a copy of the landscape plan provided

Applicant response:

- Wanted to spread windows out but had had to keep in mind the existing floor plan and wanted to minimize the cost

- Most windows were fixed and in places where they should not be as tall as others
- Could make adjustments and operable
- Was a Pella wood window and would provide the information to staff
- Existing grade was at six plus or minus but proposed to raise the grade towards the front of the house to provide positive drainage to Castillo Drive
- Thought the porch on the front was at thirty- two inches
- Would have the raise the proposed grade from five to closer to seven and a half to provide the positive drainage to Castillo Drive
- Provide a street view of how it would look; however, the typography was not shown
- Wanted to have feedback and work towards a more wholesale solution; the proposed drawings were not the final proposal
- Asked if the Board accepted cementitious or solid panels
- Asked what the acceptable materials were
- Cocoa was the color for the paver and clay based

Board discussion:

- Questioned if the existing trees were at the back of the property
- Asked what type of trees they were
- Asked if there was a preferred landscape plan
- Questioned the pattern of the pavers
- Tree in the middle could cause an issue if going with the site plan one
- Asked for the trees to be incorporated when the applicant returned to the Board

Applicant response:

- Lot 14 had a large Oak tree and at the front there were three existing trees
- Trees were Magnolia, Palm and Cedar tree with the Oak tree at the rear
- The proposed driveway plans were rotated to avoid removal of trees

- Landscape plan was provided on A0.4 and they were trying to meet the new tree requirement
- Color of the pavers would be addressed; however; the pattern would be herringbone

Ms. Seymour noted the front elevations from Grove Avenue and the garages both had an option one and option two. She said if the Board were able to confirm which they preferred it would be beneficial to the applicant in a subsequent application.

Mr. Duff said lot 14 option one was a Dutch hip roof concept covering the porch with the scallop siding and option two was eliminating any kind of skirt and bringing the gable end forward. He said they had different forward massing.

There was Board consensus that Lot 14 would be front elevation option one.

Mr. Duff said for Lot 15 the difference was center door or the right-hand entry.

Mr. Benoit said the elevation drawings were placeholder but asked if they would be different and asked what the intent was for the doors.

Mr. Duff said it was the same on both lots but that was an easy change.

Mr. Benoit said they should be different since they faced the street. He said the magnolia arch was not the most traditional, but it should be included in the drawings.

Ms. Seymour noted lot 14 garage had the plain magnolia without the arch.

There was Board consensus for Lot 15 option one for the garage would be used.

Ms. Duncan asked if the foundation would be brick for the main house.

Mr. Duff replied in the affirmative.

Ms. Duncan asked if the applicant could provide a sample of the brick veneer, or what would be used.

Mr. Duff said he could do two in order to differentiate between the two structures.

Ms. Lopez asked if the applicant was able to have all the materials requested prior to the March deadline if the application was continued.

Mr. Register asked if there were anyway to move forward since there were other items that needed to be addressed before coming back to the Board.

Ms. Duncan said they should address the questions from the Friday Review and working through the drainage would be an important part of moving this to the next step.

Mr. Benoit said the applicant could work with the Public Works Department and once approval from HARB could move forward to the Planning and Building Department.

Mr. Benoit stated the City had options for parking if all the parking could not be contained on site.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to CONTINUE HP2022-0078 20 West Castillo Drive Lot 14 to the March 16, 2023 HARB meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Benoit.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Benoit, Beach, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**8. (b) HP2022-0079 Continued from
November 17, 2022– Grace Contracting,
LLC – Applicant
Zigiz Holdings, LLC – Owner
28 W. Castillo Drive - Lot 15**

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

Discussion was heard simultaneously with item 8(a).

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.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

Peter Kline provided an email to the Board and it was provided in their response packets.

There was Board consensus to use option two for the main elevation and option one for the garage.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to CONTINUE HP2022-0079 to March 16, 2023 HARB meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Benoit.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Benoit, Beach, MacDonald, 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

Ms. Courtney provided information regarding the St. Augustine Back Bay Coastal Storm Risk Management Study. She stated a charrette would take place at the St. Johns County Emergency Operation Center which the Board was invited to attend.

Ms. Lopez advised the Attorney General's office provided guidance (not a formal opinion) that if the Board were to take official action on this then the Board should not participate in the breakout charrette activity.

Mr. Benoit expressed his displeasure for not being able to attend.

Ms. Lopez said a known violation of Sunshine by a Board member was a crime. She suggested perhaps the best option was to allow the public to attend the charrette and have the consultant provide the information to the Board.

Mr. Weaver asked if they were able to attend the charrette and not participate.

Ms. Lopez advised that reduced the risk but advised not participating in order to not violate the Sunshine Law.

Ms. Courtney advised the Planning and Zoning Board was having a special meeting on February 21, 2023 regarding parking and sea level rise. She told the Board if they wanted to attend, they were able to, but it was optional.

Ms. Lopez suggested if not able to attend perhaps Jessica Beach, City Chief Resiliency Officer, could provide an update regarding the sea level rise.

Ms. Courtney noted the St. Augustine History Festival was scheduled May 12-14th and the City would be participating in a window workshop at the Water Works building on May 13, 2023.

Ms. Lopez said the Board could attend as it was an informational session. She said they were able to speak directly to the presenters and participate in public comment.

Ms. Courtney announced there was a media release advising Paul Weaver would be receiving the 'de Aviles Award. She said the

award ceremony would start at 4:30 p.m. prior to the City Commission Meeting on February 27, 2023.

Mr. Weaver invited his fellow Board members to attend if able.

11. Next Scheduled Meeting Date

(a) Thursday, March 16, 2023, at 1:00 p.m.

12. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:19 P.M.³



Catherine Duncan, Chairperson

³ Transcribed by Elyse Wiemann