

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

Historic Architectural Review Board Regular Meeting March 16, 2023

The Historic Architectural Review Board met in formal session at 1:00 P.M., Thursday, March 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
Paul Weaver, III
Barbara Wingo, Alternate

Absent: Jon Benoit, excused
Brad Beach, excused

City Staff:

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

2. General Public Comments for Items not on the Agenda

BJ Kalaidi

Ms. Duncan announced that Mr. Weaver received the de Aviles Award from the City of St. Augustine. She expressed her gratitude and thanked him for his continued work.

3. Approval of Minutes

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE the February 16, 2023 minutes with the above corrections. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Weaver, Wingo, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. Modification and approval of Agenda

Ms. Seymour announced the changes to the agenda. She noted item for 50 Marine Street was expedited. She said there were several

continued items from previous meetings that were asking for a continuance which were Certificate of Demolition 2023-0003, 224 Riberia Street, 2023-0004, 226 Riberia Street and Certificate of Appropriateness 2022-0078, 28 W. Castillo Drive Lot 14 and 2022-0079, 28 W. Castillo Drive Lot 15. She said there was a continued item that had been withdrawn by the new owner which was Certificate of Appropriateness 2022-0083 and the Board would be hearing the new application at 26 Toques Place.

MOTION

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

Ms. Lopez advised that it was best to have a separate motion for each item.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to have item 5(a) 2023-0010 to be an expedited item for today's agenda. The motion was SECONDED by Dr. Wingo and APPROVED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to CONTINUE Item HP2023-0003, 224 Riberia Street to the April 20, 2023 HARB meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver and APPROVED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to CONTINUE Item HP2023-0004 226 Riberia Street to the April 20, 2023 HARB meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver and APPROVED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to CONTINUE Item HP2022-0078 28 W. Castillo Drive Lot 14 to the April 20, 2023 HARB meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver and APPROVED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to CONTINUE Item HP2022-0079 28 W. Castillo Drive Lot 15 to the April 20, 2023 HARB meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver and APPROVED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

5. Public Comments related to Expedited Hearing items:

5. (a) HP2023-0010– Les Thomas Architect– Applicant Ocean Breezes Real Estate, LLC– Owner 50 Marine Street

To modify previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness application HP2022-0073 to utilize a stucco finish where wood lap siding was proposed on dormer additions to the main residence and the new detached garage, extend the proposed eight-foot

tall masonry wall to part of the north property line, and remove a previously proposed gate on the west property line wall .

Mr. MacDonald recused himself from the application.

Ms. Seymour read the staff report and said based on a review of the AGHP, and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds that the Board can APPROVE a Certificate of Appropriateness at 50 Marine Street for modifications to previously approved COA HP2022-0073 because they meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation # 9 as a compatible contemporary design.

Les Thomas waived his right to a presentation.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

Mr. Weaver said he reviewed the staff report and the application complied with the architectural guidelines.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE expedited item HP 2023-0010 50 Marine Street. The motion was SECONDED by Dr. Wingo.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Wingo, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. Certificate of Appropriateness

6. (a) HP2023-0008– Southern Construction– Applicant J Prabhu II LLC — Owner 226 Charlotte Street

To modify previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness HP2022-0092 to replace an existing second story north elevation wood window, previously indicated to remain, with a new, smaller wood window.

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 226 Charlotte Street because the proposed work meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation #9 as a compatible contemporary design with the following finding:

1. The proposed window replacement will not impact the architectural integrity of the contributing building due to the limited visibility of the change on an already altered structure.

And condition:

1. The applicant confirms the use of an unclad wood window with a 2/2 divided lite pattern with raised muntin profile to match existing.

Dave Grande reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:

- Was a non-historic window which provided more flexibility
- Helped read the building's interior functions
- Asked if the applicant would be abiding by the condition placed in the staff report to use an unclad wood window with a two/two divided light with a raised muntin profile

- Questioned the manufacture of the window

Applicant response:

- Was willing to abide by the term of the staff report
- Would be using Manning Supplies and the window was made by Koble

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE Certificate of Appropriateness 6(a) HP2023-0008 226 Charlotte Street, to replace an existing non-historic second story north elevation wood window with a new smaller window. The motion was SECONDED by Dr. Wingo.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Wingo, MacDoandl, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. (b) HP2023-0011 – Alan J. Frez Construction, Inc.– Applicant
Maria F. Gandarez– Owner
317 St. George Street

To replace all existing wood novelty siding on the main residence and garage apartment with new wood novelty siding.

Ms. Seymour read the staff report and said based on a review of the AGHP, and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds that the Board can APPROVE a Certificate of Appropriateness at 317 St. George Street if the HARB finds that wholesale replacement of existing siding will not negatively impact the architectural integrity of the residence and garage apartment because it meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation #9 by utilizing a compatible contemporary siding material and design.

Alan J. Frez reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:

- Insulation, plywood and vapor barrier were a plus with the new installation
- Asked what percent of the siding was original and what was new
- Was sensitive to the removal of original material
- Instead of replacement in totality, could be done as a repair and then sheathing would not be required
- Siding was common and new siding would not last like the old siding
- Understood there was damage on the lower sash and corner boards had rotted but felt the wood could be milled to the right profile for a repair
- Questioned how the evaluation was done that concluded that sheathing was needed

Applicant response:

- The main structure was at least 60% original and the addition was insulated and had a combination of OSB and plywood; however, if there was an issue would need to fix
- The garage apartment had more damage than the main structure
- Felt a permit would not be issued if sheathing was not installed
- Thought that only applied to 25% of the siding similar to the roof
- Had been told the amount of damage present would require sheathing
- All repairs would need sheathing and then surrounding areas would be recessed by half inch

Ms. Courtney asked if the building official was the one who provided the guidance.

Mr. Frez said it was the building inspector.

Ms. Courtney replied there would need a more in-depth discussion as this was considered a repair and repairs did not have to meet all the code requirements.

Mr. Weaver noted this was a historic structure under the Florida Building Code which was a special category.

Mr. Weaver said all the photos were of the newer structure and the older structure was in reasonable shape.

Ms. Courtney said if there were water issues then there were normally other issues besides the siding.

Mr. Frez stated there were not roof leaks found. He said there was one leak around a window with a plexiglass panel; however, that was replaced.

Maria Gandarez owner of the property noted the old siding was rotten. She said the siding was easily punctured.

Mr. Frez said he knew they needed to match the original as closely as possible; however, it was very pricy.

Board discussed:

- No issue with changing out wood for wood
- North side of the house was in rough shape
- No issue with fixing the newer structure but a wanted more detailed evaluation of the damage on the main structure
- Questioned if the novelty siding available for purchase was not the same as the material on the house
- Felt the siding could be milled if the siding were being repaired
- The Boards responsibility was not to replace the material but preserve the material that was present

- Felt the applicant had not provided a clear understanding of the damage
- Wanted an assessment of what could be salvaged and should preserve more of the structure
- Felt the siding was a character defining feature
- Felt more of the wood siding could be saved
- Information could be provided in writing with explanations

Applicant response:

- Did not believe the material could be matched with the materials available
- Would have to have a router bit made which could be costly
- Had provided many photos for review and unsure how to provide more information

Ms. Duncan said the goal was to have the building last in its original condition.

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to CONTINUE item HP2023-0011 at 317 St. George Street to April 20, 2023 hearing of HARB with the exception of the building in back constructed in the 1990's that work can continue and provided a survey of the main structure. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Weaver, Wingo, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. (c) HP2023-0009– Frank Reubel Fine Jewelry Inc – Applicant
TEP, Inc– Owner
29 King Street (a.k.a. 17 King Street)

To install signage with colors that are not pre-approved.

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 at 29 King Street:

1. CONTINUE the application to allow the applicant time to consider more appropriate signage colors based upon AGHP recommendations and existing pre-approved colors; OR,

2. APPROVE the application if the HARB finds that the sign colors, as presented or modified based upon HARB recommendations, are generally appropriate to the architectural style of the building and the district; and, all other requirements of the Sign Code and AGHP will be met.

Kate Miser reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:
(None)

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi spoke in opposition to the application and suggested allowing the applicant to choose one of the preapproved colors for their rebranding. She said did not want to set a precedence and felt the owner should adhere to the preapproved colors.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Building was a Morris Lapidus building and had more earth tones
- Adding the blue color did not make sense
- Purpose of the sign code and color code was to avoid franchise architecture from entering St. Augustine
- Businesses should adapt to the color pallet approved
- Asked if the sign was standard with the logo and lettering

- Building was important and the sign should fit

Applicant response:

- Had been working with a consultant and they were pushing for the color that represented their brand
- Material and size of the sign would not change
- Was a small family business and not a franchise
- Asked if the approved colors were used, then the sign could be changed

Mr. Weaver said if the approved colors were used then the Board would not need to approve the sign.

Ms. Miser said they could use the approved colors, shutter blue and rainstorm.

Ms. Seymour pointed out the preapproved blues that were listed were not for a Mediterranean Revival style building but for different time periods; however most Mediterranean Revival colors were earth tones.

Board discussion:

- Felt blue was not an appropriate color for the building
- Earth tones were more appropriate for the building
- Questioned the font and the raised image of the lettering
- Picture shown was different than what applicant's explanation
- Did not have an issue with the proposed fonts
- Color of the building, when originally built was green
- Out of the blues shown the rainstorm was more of an earth tone
- Suggested testing the colors on a smaller scale before moving to a larger scale

Applicant response:

- Raised letters would be around a quarter inch but less than an inch
- Another business in vicinity was white with shutter blue lettering and asked if that could be an option for their business
- Current sign was black but was weathered
- Thought it might be better to match a neighboring business

Ms. Seymour said if the Mediterranean Revival colors were being used it could be administratively approved.

Ms. Miser asked if they were able to replicate the sign on the other business.

Mr. Weaver asked if that sign was permitted.

Ms. Seymour said she was unable to determine when that sign was approved.

Ms. Miser asked for clarification on what could be done to the sign. She said the business was trying to rebrand and the colors would either need to be white, grey or some sort of blue.

Dr. Wingo noted that the Mediterranean Revival tiles used blue.

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE application HP2023-0009 at 29 King Street to use shutter blue as a preapproved blue and the lettering font was fine but could not project more than half inch off the sign. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Weaver, Wingo, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY¹

¹ Break 2:30p.m.-2:40p.m.

6. (d) HP2023-0012– Les Thomas
Architect – Applicant
Toques Land Trust – Owner
26 Toques Place

To elevate the structure, construct a new covered front porch and pier foundation to replace the existing, and alter the site configuration related to proposed relocation of the building. (See companion applications HP2023-0013 & HP2023-0014).

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 26 Toques Place to elevate the building 4' and construct new piers, if the Board determines the following:

Findings:

1. Based on the required 1.5' minimum height necessary to raise the building out of the current floodplain, elevating the structure 4' is an appropriate flood mitigation strategy to protect the building from future flood related damage that will not negatively impact its architectural integrity.

2. The proposed foundation treatment with new piers extending at a taller height meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards #9 (Compatible Contemporary Design for New Alterations and Additions)

Conditions:

1. The building permit applicant for the building's elevation and relocation should ensure that the structural stability of the building is maintained during this work.

2. Piers must be clad with an appropriate material as outlined in the AGHP. Final materials selection must be approved by the HARB under this or a future COA (as detailed under condition #2).

3. HARB approval is still required for other elements shown on the elevations including the new front porch, balustrade, and exterior steps (design and orientation), screening between piers, and the specific pier cladding, as well as any alterations to the site.

Les Thomas reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

Ms. Courtney clarified what the Board was to review in this application.

Mr. Thomas noted the concrete block were the piers in the middle and the brick cladding would be the exterior of all three sides.

The Board discussed:

- Questioned if the chimney would be affected when raised
- Did not see any issue with lifting the building and felt it would not be out of context
- Finish floor elevation would be around eleven and half feet with the four-foot lift
- Thought it was odd to enter the porch from the side when the door was in the middle
- Questioned if the building flooded in the past
- Asked why lifting the building four feet
- Felt the building should be raised to the minimum as it could change the scale of the building

Applicant response:

- The chimney would not be an issue but would be raised
- Building had flooded with the past storms
- Building was a little over seven feet high
- Was why a sketch was provided as it would change the look of the building, but it did not look inappropriate

- Was under thirty-five feet and there were other two-story building surrounding it

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE application HP2023-0012 at 26 Toques Place to raise the existing structure four feet from its current elevation which should match the range of eleven and a half feet. The motion was SECONDED by Dr. Wingo.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Wingo, Weaver, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. Certificates of Demolition, Partial Demolition, and Relocation

7. (a) HP2023-0014 – Les Thomas, Architect– Applicant Toques Land Trust – Owner 26 Toques Place

To relocate a residential building, constructed c. 1910 that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and located within the St. Augustine National Register Historic District and the Historic Preservation-Three (HP-3) Zoning District, westward/forward on its current lot. (See companion applications HP2023-0012 and HP2023-0013).

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 for a Certificate of Relocation at 26 Toques Place:

1. APPROVE the proposed relocation of the existing house with the following findings:

a. The proposed plan overall meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation #2 (retention of distinguishing architectural characteristics)

b. The decreased proposed front setback/new location on the lot is minimal and will not have a negative impact to the historic building, context of the property, or streetscape.

2. The 2016 St. Augustine Inventory identified the property being potentially eligible as contributing to the St. Augustine National Register Historic District. The HARB may direct staff to move forward with requirements for the board to consider at a subsequent meeting whether the building has the integrity and significance to warrant local historical landmark designation, so that building can be eligible for preservation incentives.

With the condition:

1. The building permit applicant for the building's elevation and relocation should ensure that the structural stability of the building is maintained during this work.

Les Thomas reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

20 certified notices were sent, 2 were returned in favor, 0 were returned opposed and 0 had comments.

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi asked for clarification about the three different applications for the same project. She said it was a bit confusing and encouraged the Board to be careful when making changes.

Ms. Duncan said the first application was to raise the building, second application was to move it back and the third application was for a partial demolition.

Ms. Courtney explained the different certificates required different approval by the Board. She said raising the building was a

Certificate of Appropriateness, relocating the building was a Certificate of Relocation, and the Certificate of Demolition would cover any partial demolition that was proposed which included the windows, porch, and a small shed building which was to be demoed if approved.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Questioned if the original porch was five foot wide
- Asked if it was the same size and if the steps were in the same direction and location

Applicant response:

- That was the correct size; however, it was changed ten to fifteen years ago
- Wanted to take it back to what was originally there, and the original steps were on front

Ms. Courtney said, in the staff report, the photo showed the porch was half as wide.

Mr. Thomas noted when it was a restaurant the porch went all the way across, and it had been added on to several times.

Board discussion:

- Felt the building could be contributing to the district and could be administratively included
- If all the changes were made to the building, it could question the integrity for it to be a local landmark
- Building could be able to have the Ad Valorem Tax exemption
- Moving it forward was not an issue as it would be oriented towards the street
- A lot of the original fabric was gone but if it were a local landmark it would encourage the owner to restore it properly
- No issue with moving it forward and designating it as a local landmark or

somehow getting the building in the Ad Valorem Program which would provide more control over the building

- Unsure if it was a local landmark especially if an amendment could bring it into the historic district
- Unsure what was unique about the homes history or architecture that would make it a local landmark
- Was a contributing building to the district and not so much individually but collectively
- The building could be considered as secondary importance

Applicant response:

- Felt the building had been moved before according to the insurance maps
- Thought bringing the building forward was the best option

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE application for relocation 7(a) HP2023-0014 26 Toques Place to relocate the building forward eight feet forward from its present location. The motion was SECONDED by Dr. Wingo.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Wingo, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**7. (b) HP2023-0013– John Valdes & Associates, Inc.– Applicant
Toques Land Trust– Owner
26 Toques Place**

To partially demolish a residential building constructed c. 1910 that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and located within the St. Augustine National Register Historic District and the Historic Preservation-Three (HP-3) Zoning District to include after-the-fact

removal of original wood windows; and, for work related to the elevation, relocation, and rehabilitation of the building, including the front porch, rear exterior stair, and rear outbuilding. (See companion applications HP2023-0012 and HP2023-0014).

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 for a Certificate of (Partial) Demolition at 26 Toques Place:

1. APPROVE the partial demolition of elements proposed in relation to the relocation and elevation of the building for flood mitigation, including the front porch with ADA ramp, exterior rear stairs, and outbuilding, with the finding that based on evidence, they are not original or historic elements to the house.

2. In regard to the after-the-fact permanent removal of the historic windows which have been discarded, which was an irreversible alteration of the building, the HARB can:

a. Approve with the condition that a historically compatible window replacement be approved first by the Board before a building permit application can be applied for to install the new windows.

b. Continue to allow the applicant time to submit the proposed window replacement with a new Certificate of Approval application, so the two applications can be heard by the board at the same meeting.

c. Deny until the Code Enforcement Board hears the case and decides on a mitigation strategy, which may be to go back the HARB for approval of replacement windows.

John Valdes reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

20 certified notices were sent, 2 were returned in favor, 0 were returned opposed and 0 had comments.

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi asked if the after-the-fact was only for the removal of the original wood windows. She said since the applicant had to go to Code Enforcement if it would be better to take care of the pending case and come back for approval at the next HARB meeting.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Front porch was not historic, and stairs were added on
- Not opposed to removal of the outbuilding
- Applicant should not be held accountable for wrong doings by a previous owner
- Were two original windows left and felt a high-quality window that matched the original windows should be used as a replacement

Applicant response:

- Had completed work on the building several times

Ms. Lopez clarified that if a property was noticed with the owner at the time in a Code Enforcement matter, that would run with the land. She said that process would have started and could be a lean against the property.

Board discussion:

- In support of the application
- Felt it was important to have Code Enforcement involved to help with the enforcement of the issues from the previous owner
- Questioned who the responsible party by Code Enforcement would be

Ms. Lopez said it would be whoever the owner of record with the property appraiser and who was noticed at the time the violation occurred. She stated she assumed it was the prior owner but was uncertain.

Mr. Weaver asked what the consequences were.

Ms. Lopez said it could be a fine.

Ms. Duncan agreed something should be done; however, felt when something was done to a building that was wrong, the building should not be allowed to be sold without taking responsibility. She asked if this application was approved today, would there still be a Code Enforcement case.

Dr. Wingo replied no there will still be a case with Code Enforcement.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE Certificate of Demolition 7(b) HP2023-0013 26 Toques Place to partially demolish a residential building to include existing front porch with the side ADA ramp, rear exterior stair and outbuilding related to the elevation of the building. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

Mr. MacDonald asked if the windows were being approved after-the-fact.

Ms. Courtney said the windows were an after-the-fact partial demolition and it should be clarified. She said there should be five original historic windows left.

AMENDED MOTION

Mr. Weaver AMENDED the MOTION to include the windows that were removed and assumed demolished but to preserve the five existing windows. The AMENDED motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, MacDonald, Wingo, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. (c) HP2023-0016– Big Joe Realty, LLC– Applicant & Owner 19-1/2 S Leonardi Street (a.k.a. 17 S Leonardi Street)

To demolish the southernmost residential building on the lot, constructed c. 1924 - 1930; and, for after-the-fact approval of a rear detached garage building over 50 years of age, that are both recorded in the Florida Master Site File, and not located in a district.

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 19.5 Leonardi Street (a.k.a. 17 Leonardi Street) for the residential building and an After-the-Fact Certificate of Demolition for the rear detached garage because they are not local landmarks or otherwise designated as historic buildings with the following conditions:

1. For any salvageable historic materials, including the window sashes, interior fixtures such as the sink, and coquina concrete block to be salvaged if possible.
2. To limit the time that the lot is vacant, the applicant shall submit the new building permit simultaneously with the demolition permit.

Michael Morucci reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi felt it was discouraging to hear applications for after-the-fact buildings. She

said hopefully the applicant would do what he stated.

Public hearing was closed.

Mr. Weaver said he did not think HARB had review authority over auxiliary buildings like garages.

Ms. Courtney replied according to the ordinance if it was on the Florida Master Site file and over fifty years old that was the threshold for a HARB review.

The Board discussed:

- Did not feel this could be denied as it was only a garage not a garage apartment
- In favor of the application as the building was in bad shape
- Felt this was more of a technicality

MOTION

Dr. Wingo **MOVED** to **APPROVE** application HP2023-0016 at 19-1/2 S Leonardi Street (a.k.a. 17 S Leonardi Street) to demolish the southernmost residential building and approve the after-the-fact of a rear detached garage. The motion was **SECONDED** by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Wingo, Weaver, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. Continued Items from the previous HARB meetings

8. (a) Certificate of Appropriateness HP2022-0083 Continued from December 14, 2022– Duval Master Construction– Applicant
26 Toques Pl, LLC– Owner
26 Toques Place

To remove an existing ADA ramp, install a new porch railing to match the existing,

and repair and/or replace existing wood windows and wood siding.

Application was withdrawn by new owner.

8. (b) Certificate of Demolition HP2023-0003 Continued from February 16, 2023– 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.

See MOTION under item 4. Applicant requested a continuance.

8. (c) Certificate of Demolition HP2023-0004 Continued from February 16, 2023– Ronin Construction Management, LLC - Applicant
Irene L. Lawrie Living Trust – Owner
226 Riberia 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.

See MOTION under item 4. Applicant requested a continuance.

8. (d) Certificate of Appropriateness 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.

See MOTION under item 4. Applicant requested a continuance.

**8. (e) Certificate of Appropriateness
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.

See MOTION under item 4. Applicant requested a continuance.

**9. Planning and Building Staff
Communications**

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

(Provided for informational purposes)

10. Other Business

**10. (a) Information related to City
initiatives regarding Resiliency and
Sustainability, including the Federal Back
Bay Study, updates to the Vulnerability
Assessment data, Resilient Shoreline
concepts and other projects.
(Presentation to follow at a later HARB
meeting)**

Ms. Courtney reviewed the topic and noted PZB had a special meeting in February and they wanted to share the same information related to resiliency and sustainability. She said updates for the Back-Bay study would be provided by the City Chief Resiliency Officer in May or June as she would have more defined information at that time. She noted the power point from the PZB meeting was in the packet for review.

Ms. Courtney asked if 26 Toques Place needed to be advertised as a local landmark.

Ms. Lopez asked if the property owner requested it to be a local landmark.

Ms. Courtney replied in the affirmative. She said she had spoken to the property owner about reaching out to the National Park Service and they asked if there were other options, and they mentioned the local landmark status.

Mr. Weaver said National Park Service would be around sixty days and possibly the same for the local landmark status, but he thought a landmark would be more elaborate.

Ms. Lopez advised the Board there were two bills in the Florida Legislature which were Demolition of buildings, even National Register ones if found to be in coastal high hazard area and the other was the idea of raising structures. She noted owners would be able to raise their property in coastal high hazard areas to nine feet.

11. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:10 P.M.²



Catherine Duncan, Chairperson

² Transcribed by Elyse Wiemann