

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

Historic Architectural Review Board Regular Meeting April 20, 2023

The Historic Architectural Review Board met in formal session at 1:00 P.M., Thursday, May 20, 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
Brad Beach

Absent:

Jon Benoit, 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

(None)

3. Approval of Minutes

(None)

4. Modification and approval of Agenda

Ms. Duncan announced item 8(a) requested a continuance. She noted two other items 8(d) and 8(e) had been administratively withdrawn.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to CONTINUE item HP2023-0011 to the May 18, 2023 HARB meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

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

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

VOTE ON MOTION:

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

5. Public Comments related to Expedited Hearing items:

5. (a) HP2023-0018 – Les Thomas Architect - Applicant
Ocean Breezes Real Estate, LLC - Owner
50 Marine Street

Mr. MacDonald recused himself.

To modify previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness HP2023-0010 to extend the proposed eight-foot-tall masonry wall along the south property line.

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 the previously approved COAs 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 reviewed the staff report and said this was a modification to something the Board had approved.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE item 5(a) HP2023-0018 50 Marine Street. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Beach, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. Certificate of Appropriateness

6.(a) HP2023-0017– Sweet Spot Augustine LLC - Applicant

St. George Street Properties, LLC - Owner
32 St. George Street

Item heard after 7(a).

To construct a new pergola in the south courtyard and replace the existing wood gate along St. George Street with a new design.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to hear the item later in the meeting as the applicant was not available. The motion was SECONDED by

Mr. Beach and approved through a UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

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 32 St. George Street if the HARB finds that the proposed pergola and gate meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation #9 as a compatible contemporary design with the following conditions:

1. That the gate window openings be barred with wood spindles in a simple design.
2. That the proposed pergola be stepped back from the gate at a distance to be determined by the HARB to lessen its visual impact from the street.

Dror Zanani reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi said since the applicant was agreeable to the staff recommendations and changes, she was in favor, and pleased the applicant was willing to change the design to be in line with preservation.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Thought the portions of the design were slightly off
- Gate and scale were wider than what was expected
- Questioned the type of hardware that would be used on the gate
- Pergola felt heavy as the sizes of the members were large

- Pergola were basically grape arbors and anything larger than 4x4 was an out of character in the Colonial district
- Pergola should not be seen from the street
- Gate and pergola post should not mix
- Would have more shade if the pergola members were smaller and closer together
- Black iron was the correct hardware for the Colonial period
- Questioned the finish of the wood once built
- Suggested using Cypress wood as it was heavily used here as opposed to Douglas Fur wood was not
- Telephone poles were pine which grew here; however, they were soaked in creosote which would not age the same
- Felt item should be continued to provide exactly what was being done onsite
- Should eliminate the first bay of the pergola and the round post
- Should use a square post for the gate to be latched
- Questioned the distance from the wall to the post
- Felt the post should have an eight-foot width to allow for people to move around the pergola and provide a more historic feel
- Scale should be brought down as it was too high
- Asked if plants would be installed on top the pergola
- Pergola should start beyond the gate and not hinder it from opening
- Felt the concept of the gate and the patina were appropriate
- Would not add a beam on top of the 6x6 round post that was larger than six feet
- Beam on a 6x6 round post cross members could be 3x10 or a full 2x10
- Height should not exceed the tip of the eve of the roof suggested around eight feet and no larger than the structure

Applicant response:

- Willing to use the hardware recommended by staff and would be black
- Willing to match the requirements but wanted to stain the wood to meet code
- Was willing to change the wood not opposed to using telephone poles similar to others in the area
- Spacing was around two and half feet from the wall and then there was a gate
- Wanted to add plants to make it look more like a garden space
- Not opposed to leaving the gate the same and willing to push the pergola back if necessary
- Asked the recommended height of the pergola

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to CONTINUE application HP2023-0017, at 32 St. George Street construction of a pergola to the hearing on May 18, 2023 without the gate. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Weaver, Beach, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. Certificate of Demolition and Partial Demolition

7. (a) HP2023-0019– Renewal by Anderson of FL - Applicant Mehl Duane & Debra Ann Hart - Owner 36 Park Avenue

To partially demolish a building constructed ca. 1949 that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and a contributing building to the Fullerwood Park National Register Historic District to include replacement of original wood windows with new windows of different material and design.

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 36 Park Avenue for partial demolition including replacement of 9 existing wood window if the HARB makes the following finding:

That removal of original windows and replacement as proposed will not impact the architectural integrity of the already-altered building.

Todd Chambers reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:

- Window was historic; however, questioned if it was appropriate
- Window survey submitted noted the windows were all in good condition
- Building had been heavily altered but the windows were original
- Building was contributing and felt this modification would not change that designation
- Removing a wood window and replacing with a different material
- Fenestration pattern was unusual on the home
- Questioned the reason why they wanted to change them
- Asked if there were two types of existing windows

Applicant response:

- Unsure why the homeowners wanted them changed but thought it was because of the functionality and efficiency

- From the pictures one looked to be vinyl and others wood

Ms. Seymour commented there was one window on the rear elevation that had been replaced with a vinyl window; however, the owner was not pleased with the work and found a new company.

Board discussion:

- Based on the condition and unique pattern felt they were important to the fabric of the building
- Would help to have a raised muntin if a window had to be replaced; however, did not feel the windows should be removed
- Questioned if all windows were being replaced or was it only the nine windows
- Two out of three windows on the front were being replaced and most of the rear windows were being replace but not all
- No issue with changing the aluminum window but did not want the wooden ones removed
- Did not feel efficiency was a reason to remove the windows
- The windows were a character defining feature of the building and were in good condition
- Would suggest repairing the windows instead of replacement
- Survey indicated windows were in good condition

Applicant response:

- Asked if they could mimic the pattern of the muntin could a different material be used
- Did not think all the windows were "good condition" and if one or two needed to be changed, would want consistency for the home
- Insurance companies were also raising rates dramatically

Public hearing was opened.

Charles Pappas said allowing HARB to expand their purview outside the historic preservation (HP) districts was a fear the Planning and Zoning Board had. He said if the home was not in the HP area, the Board should be mindful of the area and homeowners. He encouraged the Board to think about the design and instead of the materials.

Public hearing was closed.

Ms. Lopez said the Partial Demolition Ordinance referenced had not been adopted. She said it went before PZB and received a positive recommendation, but it had not been codified.

Mr. Weaver said the Board could consider continuing the application to give the homeowner the opportunity to provide more information.

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to CONTINUE application HP2023-0019 at 36 Park Avenue to continue until the May 18, 2023 HARB meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Weaver, Beach, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. (b) HP2023-0021- Les Thomas Architect - Applicant
Juliet Whiskey Investments LLC - Owner
307 Minorca Avenue

For partial demolition of a residential building, constructed ca. 1925- 1927 that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and designated a Local Historical Landmark, including elements of the front porch and alterations to the existing house in relation to renovations and a proposed addition.

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 Demolition at 307 Minorca Avenue, limited to Partial Demolition only, with the following conditions:

1. Care should be taken to avoid damage to the existing coquina detailing that is behind the existing porch roof and all other existing building materials during the approved removal of elements, including the porch roof and columns, and proposed construction of the addition.

2. For all exterior and interior salvageable historic materials including those listed under the Staff Analysis to be salvaged, in accordance with Sec. 28-89(2)d6: The board may require, at the applicant's expense, salvage and preservation of significant building materials, architectural details and ornaments, fixtures, and the like for reuse in restoration of other historic properties.

Les Thomas and Gary Alligood reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication :

(None)

13 certified notices were sent, 4 were returned in favor, 1 was returned opposed and 1 had comments.

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

Mr. MacDonald asked for clarification on the Boards purview of local landmarks.

Ms. Lopez replied once it was deemed a National Landmark it was under the same rubric in the code regarding demo applied.

The Board discussed:

- Felt the removal of the porch was less than the gains that were being done with the additions
- Proposed addition was respectful to the architecture
- Front was opened by the removal of the porch and felt the proposed design was good
- Porch violated the standards when it was installed and felt removing it was great since this was a true restoration
- Should follow the staff recommendations in the staff report

Mr. Alligood said a lot of the barrel clay tile was busted up. He said they wanted to match it but with it being weathered that would be difficult and thought replacement was best.

Mr. MacDonald advised that was partial demolition; however, he would rather a clay tile be used as the replacement instead of a concrete tile.

Mr. Alligood agreed it would be clay, and there was no consideration for any other material.

Ms. Courtney noted in the original application they were informed the roof was staying.

Ms. Duncan explained it would be better to match what was there. She said a clay tile roof was a significant feature.

Mr. Alligood replied it would be difficult to match.

Mr. Weaver said he trusted the applicant would do a good faith effort to salvage the materials.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE application HP2023-0021 to approve the removal of the porch, and other non-significant features of the building with the condition that the tile including the

porch tile be recycled if possible. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, MacDonald, Beach, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY¹

7. (c) HP2023-0020– Direct Home Buyer 1, Inc. - Applicant and Owner **118 Lincoln Street**

For after-the-fact partial demolition of a residential building, constructed ca. 1958, that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and is eligible to be a contributing building to the Lincolnville National Register Historic District, including removal of the roof; and, for additional proposed partial demolition including but not limited to the chimney, window fenestration, and replacement of the existing porch and carport roofs related to renovations and additions.

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 may APPROVE an after-the-fact Certificate of Demolition at 118 Lincoln Street if the HARB can make the following findings:

1. The after-the-fact and proposed demolition does not exceed the threshold of partial demolition

2. Documentation of structural conditions and/or economic hardship provided by the applicant are sufficient to justify partial demolition Alternatively, the Board can DENY a Certificate of demolition at 118 Lincoln Street if the HARB makes the following findings:

1. That the after-the-fact demolition of the structure exceeds the threshold of partial

¹ Break from 2:35p.m.-2:45p.m.

demolition and permanently impacts the structures eligibility as a contributing structure to the Lincolnville National Register Historic District.

2. The documentation of structural conditions and/or economic hardship provided by the applicant are insufficient to justify demolition.

Christa and Anthony Guthrie reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi spoke in opposition to the application and noted this was happening too often and pointed out that this was Lincolnville and did not understand how the applicant did not know. She was concerned with the after-the-fact applications and felt there were no consequences when wrongdoings were done.

Public hearing was closed.

Mr. Weaver understood the Board did not have purview over the post 1930's buildings until there was an amendment. He asked if they had the authority over buildings that were not included in the National Register. He said this building was no longer eligible for the National Register and was a moot point. He asked based on the fifty-year rule, would this had come to the Board for a partial demolition.

Ms. Seymour replied yes, HARB would have heard the application because it was fifty-years of age even it was not contributing to the district. She said the only difference would have been the depth of the application. She said the applicant did file a partial economic hardship form.

Mr. Weaver said it was not a contributing building at this point and since it was not, they did not have authority over it. He said it was a historic building; however, what had been done rendered it ineligible. He said it had completely lost all character, even though there was unpermitted work.

The Board discussed:

- Thought this exceeded partial demolition
- Board could have approved things that the applicant wanted done prior to this application as this was a problem
- Very disappointing to be in this situation with a home that could have been contributing
- In support of denying the request per the staff recommendations

Applicant response:

- Willing to pay any fines associated with the project
- Home had existing vinyl windows

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to DENY application HP2023-0020 118 Lincolnville as it had been substantially demolished without any permit or addressed by HARB and exceeds a partial demolition. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

Ms. Lopez asked the Board to reference the code in section 28-89 subsection 2. She said it needed to be tied back to the criteria.

Ms. Courtney said the Board was denying the application as a partial demolition and not as a full demolition.

Mr. Weaver said it was also because of a procedural basis as well since the Board did not have a chance to view the evidence.

Ms. Lopez asked if the applicant could apply as a full demolition.

Mr. MacDonald said it was being denied based on the circumstance. He said to fully demolish the building, the applicant would have to return. He said the Board did not have purview over what was built, but he could not support unasked for work or permitting.

Ms. Lopez advised that would be a Code Enforcement issue. She said in section 28-89 should be referenced in the motion.

Mr. Weaver replied that it was based it on the staff report's denial recommendation.

Ms. Seymour said if the Board felt the application was not a partial demolition then the Board could deny the application and the applicant would have to apply for a full demolition instead.

There was Board consensus that the application was not partial demolition and the applicant would need to return for a full demolition.

Ms. Lopez clarified that the denial for the application was that it was not a partial demolition and the applicant would need to apply for what was deemed a full demolition even though portions of the home could be kept.

Mr. Guthrie asked what the code stated as a partial demolition.

Mr. MacDonald said it was contributing historic features to a building, such as a chimney, or change in windows. He said a full demolition was the whole house being removed; however, it was difficult to define.

Mr. Weaver said there were measures the Board used. He said the roof had been removed.

Ms. Duncan referred the applicant to the Code, and noted the applicant was changing the whole building, which was more of a full demolition. She said compared to how the

building was and the proposed plans, the building was not the same.

Mr. Weaver said he thought the Board had made the case and the applicant could chose to appeal.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Weaver, Beach, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. Continued Items from the previous HARB meetings

8. (a) Certificate of Appropriateness HP2023-0011 Continued from March 16, 2023 REQUESTING CONTINUANCE
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. (Garage apartment approved at March 16, 2023 meeting).

Applicant requested continuance to the May HARB meeting.

8. (b) HP2022-0078- Certificate of Appropriateness 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. Window muntins are confirmed to be a raised simulated divided lite

b. Color options are approved by the Board as submitted or modified per HARB recommendations.

c. Square lattice (90 degree) is used in areas where lattice is proposed unless otherwise directed by the HARB.

Josiah Duff and Gary Alan Register reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:

- Window muntins were raised with a semi-divided lite
- Color options could be confirmed by the Board as submitted
- Square lattice was used in areas where lattice was proposed
- Felt the application had progressed and come a long way
- Questioned the intent of car diagram
- Questioned if a wall would be at Grove Avenue with the entry

- Questioned if the grading was existing which was 5.47 because there was a retaining wall at 6.5
- Should show the proposed grades on the grading plan instead of the existing
- Did not want water to drain towards Grove Avenue
- Questioned how the water would not drain to the neighboring properties

Applicant response:

- Willing to comply with the staff recommendations, for the windows to have muntins
- Color had been submitted by the owner
- Lattice was used to differentiate the two lots but if square lattice was recommended was not opposed to switching it back
- Garage would park two vehicles and the rest would be in the lot having a total of five vehicles
- No wall would be added, it would be left open
- Grading plan was around 5.5 which was existing, but it varied per corner between Lot 14 and Lot 15 in the far corners
- Intention was to have raise it about 18 feet back from the front property line of Grove Avenue and gradually have it graded back down
- Most of the roof line was at a grade that pointed towards Castillo Drive
- Proposed grades were shown on the grading plan
- Only water towards Grove Avenue would be from the gable ends as those could not have a gutter
- Had a retaining wall along the sidewall
- Felt they tried to accommodate the rainfall as best as it could be dealt with, with the rain from the gable ends draining towards Grove Avenue and the rest towards Castillo Drive

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE Item 8(b) a Certificate of Appropriateness,

application HP2022-0078, 28 West Castillo Drive Lot 14 as submitted; with the two conditions as discussed and applicant agreed to, window muntins would be a raised simulated divided lite and square lattice. The motion was **SECONDED** by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Beach, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. (c) HP2022-0079 Certificate of Appropriateness Continued from November 17, 2022
Grace Contracting, LLC - Applicant
Zigiz Holdings, LLC - Owner
28 W. Castillo Drive - Lot 15

Item heard simultaneously with Item 8(b).

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. Window muntins are confirmed to be a raised simulated divided lite.

b. Color options are approved by the Board as submitted or modified per HARB recommendations.

c. Square lattice (90 degree) is used in areas where lattice is proposed unless otherwise directed by the HARB.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE a Certificate of Appropriateness HP 2022-0079, 28 West Castillo Drive Lot 15, with the same conditions. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Beach, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. (d) HP2023-0003 Certificate of Demolition
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.

Application was administratively withdrawn.

8. (e) HP2023-0004 Certificate of Demolition 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.

Application was administratively withdrawn.

9. Planning and Building Staff Communications

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

(Provided for informational purposes)

10. Other Business

10. (a) Upcoming Events and Learning Opportunities

Ms. Courtney noted the St. Augustine History Festival was taking place in May and the public was welcome to join. She said the City was hosting a window workshop at the Water Works building.

Ms. Courtney noted an Educational opportunity that the Board could attend in July and the City would provide a small stipend and another opportunity in DC in November.

Ms. Courtney mentioned the legislative bills that were taken place regarding demolition and flood zones.

Ms. Lopez provided an update and said she would keep the Board updated as the bills progressed.

There was a lengthy discussion regarding the legislative bills and how it could affect the City.

11. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:53 P.M.²



Catherine Duncan, Chairperson

² Transcribed by Elyse Wiemann