

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

Historic Architectural Review Board Regular Meeting May 18, 2023

The Historic Architectural Review Board met in formal session at 1:00 P.M., Thursday, May 18, 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 (left at 5:07p.m.)

City Staff:

Julie Courtney, Historic Preservation Officer
Candice Seymour, Historic Preservation Planner
Ron Brown, Attorney
Elyse Wiemann, Recording Secretary

2. General Public Comments for Items not on the Agenda

BJ Kalaidi
Charles Pappas

3. Approval of Minutes

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE the March 16, 2023 minutes as presented. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, MacDonald, Beach, Benoit, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. Modification and approval of Agenda

(None)

5. Public Comments related to Expedited Hearing items:

(None)

6. Continued Items from Previous Meetings

6. (a) Certificate of Appropriateness HP2023-0017 Continued from April 20, 2023– Sweet Spot Augustine, LLC– Applicant St. George Street Properties, LLC– Owner 32 St. George Street

To construct a new pergola in the south courtyard and replace the existing wood gate along St. George Street with a new 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 Appropriateness at 32 St. George Street if the HARB finds that the proposed pergola as modified based upon comments at the previous HARB meeting, meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation #9 as a compatible contemporary design.

Dror Zanani reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:

- Proposed pergola looked to be to scale
- Planter boxes were more of a modern feature and suggested using free-standing planters
- Suggested no lattice but smaller lumber or purlins on top the pergola
- Liked the round timbers and hardware used
- Would rather have the plants separate

Ms. Seymour asked for clarification regarding which plant types would be used on top the pergola.

Applicant response:

- Would use plant that was in the preapproved list
- Planters would have a wood base; however, was willing to eliminate and have a free-standing planter

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE a Certificate of Appropriateness HP2023-0017, 32 St. George Street to construct a new pergola and preserving the wooden gate with the conditions that the planters be free-standing, wooden purlins based on standard dimensions replace the lattice work at the top of the pergola, and select a preapprove plant. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Beach, Benoit, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. (b) Certificate of Appropriateness HP2023-0011 Continued from March 16, 2023

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).

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 with the following findings and/or condition:

1. A finding that the evidence provided by the applicant is sufficient to justify wholesale replacement of wood siding; AND,
2. A finding wholesale replacement of existing siding will not negatively impact the architectural integrity of the residence:

- because the wood composite material meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation #9 as a compatible substitute material that closely matches the existing board width, length, and exposure; OR,
- with the condition that real wood siding is used to replace existing.

Alan Frez and Maria Gandarez reviewed the application.

The Board provided their ex parte communication.

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

Mr. Weaver asked if the proposal was to recycle wood from the garage and use it on the east and north elevation of the main structure.

Mr. Frez said they wanted to use that but would use the south wall if needed. He said the entire north wall would have to be new

because it was large. He said this would provide enough wood to cover the front the house, south elevation and the addition.

Mr. Weaver asked how much of the existing wood would be applied to the building.

Mr. Frez replied the wood would be applied to the east elevation and the addition on the back of the main house. He said there was a dividing board that designated where the original house and new addition began which would be maintained.

The Board discussed:

- Assessed the site and the back had novelty wood siding but most of the damage was lower
 - HP-1 required wood, but the east end of the building was covered in trex composite which was not being replaced like for like
 - Porch and east end were more than likely completed under this permit within the last four to six months
 - Window trim, case work, and corner boards could lose the shape and shadows if plywood were used
 - Something had to be done or the moisture would continue and exacerbate the issues
 - Only in favor of using real wood siding as it was part of the guidelines
 - Suggested using open air foam for installation
 - Questioned if there was evidence proving the building was balloon framed as the home was built in 1910, and thought it was more platform framing
 - Could not have composite siding as it was not appropriate or allowed within the guidelines
 - Would rather have repurposed the original wood as much as possible
 - Felt to fix the home correctly should use installation, sheathing, vapor barrier and siding
 - If replaced new it would need to have the same shadow lines
- Building should be documented with photographs and notes in order to have a clear understanding of what was there
 - Questioned when the trex decking was replaced on the porch
 - Should have been replaced with like for like as trex was a non-wood product and should have been approved by the HARB
 - Should salvage and reinstall as much as possible
 - Garage that was approved at prior meeting was not replaced as approved

Applicant response:

- Trex decking was installed last year due to the water leaks
- Trex decking was not approved by HARB but pulled a permit from the building department and inspection was done last week and passed

Ms. Seymour said on the application, the applicant noted it would be replaced as like for like; however, the material was not stated in the motion, so it was presumed to be like for like.

Board discussion:

- Should only approve what was allowed in the guidelines

Ms. Gandarez said at the prior meeting the composite was approved and that was why it was used. She noted they felt everything was completed with HARB approval.

Ms. Duncan said if a product were approved by the Board it would not be changed; however, this was about the deck material and any other composite material that was not approved. She questioned how this should be dealt with.

Ms. Seymour said this application was only for the siding. She said it was at Board discretion. She said the applicant could submit a new application for the trex material

and the materials on the porch as it was not advertised with this application.

Ms. Duncan said anything regarding the garage could be reviewed and followed up on by the next meeting.

Mr. Benoit asked if sheathing would be behind the siding.

Mr. Frez replied no, sheathing was on the original house only, but the addition was insulated and sheathed with a mix of plywood and OSB. He said the trim was a mixture of different sizes and what was pulled off was cut new and reinstalled.

Mr. MacDonald thought it was reasonable to allow wood for wood and salvage the original wood then return next month with more information regarding the materials.

Ms. Duncan said documentation of the exterior dimensions was key and should be provided to staff for the record. She said this should be done before the removal.

Mr. Frez said they were working on the back of the house since they were working on doors, windows, and the garage apartment.

Ms. Duncan asked if the addition was the area with the banding that already had sheathing, which was right of the front porch.

Mr. Frez replied that was the sunroom and had not been opened. He said if there was nothing broken with the windows, it would not be touched.

Ms. Duncan said that needed to be reinstalled and as it was. She said the trim/casing would have to be removed to add sheathing.

Mr. MacDonald felt the applicant needed to return with elevation information and there should be clarification regarding the past meeting approval as the application had become ambiguous.

Mr. Weaver was concerned the Board was trusting the applicant to match materials without documentation.

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to CONTINUE HP2023-0011 317 St. George Street, to come back next month with clear elevation shown, what was to be modified, wanted to have photos of existing windows trims for the record, and would gather information about the previous approved materials and could be approved again at the July 15, 2023 meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Weaver, Beach, Benoit, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. Certificates of Appropriateness

7. (a) HP2023-0024– ReadyRebuild, LLC – Applicant
46 Avenida Menendez, INC. - Owner
46 Charlotte Street

To replace existing wood lap siding on the north elevation with new wood lap 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 take the following actions for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 46 Charlotte Street:

1. APPROVE the application if the HARB determines that evidence provided by the applicant is sufficient to justify replacement of the existing siding on a secondary elevation and with a finding that the proposed replacement siding meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation #6 for replacement of a

deteriorated architectural feature and #9 as a compatible contemporary material; OR,

2. CONTINUE the application to allow the applicant time to provide additional evidence that full replacement of the north elevation siding is warranted.

John Robins reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:

- Would be replaced wood for wood
- Anything that did not need to be replaced would not be
- Thought it was important to match the dimensions and the exposure lap siding
- Not the original material but liked that it would be matched

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE application HP2023-0024 finding the purposed replacement wood siding is compatible with the existing with two conditions: match the reveal of the exposure the height visible of the siding to the existing and provide a pictorial representation of the casing around the windows including how wide, tall and thick it was to assist with the replacement. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Beach, Weaver, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7.(b) HP2023-0025- Southern Construction - Applicant

Baijanti Estates, LLC - Owner **54 Charlotte Street**

To construct a new exterior stair and add a new exterior door to the second floor on the west elevation.

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 54 Charlotte Street because the proposed alterations meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation #9 as a compatible contemporary design being installed on a secondary elevation with the following condition:

1. New door design is clarified, and the material is confirmed to be wood.

Douglas Cotham reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:

- Thought the design fit the building, but could have a negative impact on parking
- Would not be visible from the street
- Felt the design should integrate it into the architecture that was present
- Proposed door would match one of the existing doors as existing and all three doors would be the same
- Would be a nine lite half lite door wooden door
- Did not feel the change would impact the current features

Applicant response:

- All three doors would match when completed

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE application HP2023-0025 finding the application is compatible with the City guidelines with the condition that the one new door matched the first door which was half lite nine lite wood entry door. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Weaver, Beach, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. (c) HP2023-0023– Les Thomas Architect, Inc - Applicant
Partners Team One LLC - Owner
26 Toques Place

To construct a new porch on the front facade/west elevation, install new windows, and replace the roof and areas of wood siding on the existing building; to review design elements related to the previously HARB approved proposed partial demolition, elevation, and relocation of the building (under HP2023-0012 to HP2023-0014); and, to construct a two-story rear addition with two-story porch and stairs.

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 Appropriateness at 26 Toques Place:

1. APPROVE if the Board finds the following:
a. The concerns noted in the staff analysis above have been properly addressed at the meeting

b. The proposed design meets the applicable Secretary of the Interior's Standards 2, and 9 With the following conditions: That all materials and finishes, including for the siding, roof, windows, doors, and paving materials be compatible with the AGHP.

2. CONTINUE to allow time for the applicant to address any design concerns, including parking that follows the AGHP recommendations.

Les Thomas reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi said she was concerned with the additional five proposed parking spaces as they were contrary to the memo from Jacob Fredriksson Planning and Building Senior Planner. She said the parking at this location could be an issue or the applicant would need to meet the requirements.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Proposed parking could cause an issue but would depend on Public Works ingress and egress
- Architecturally, the addition was compatible; however, felt it should be differentiated
- Questioned if the proposed new windows would be wood
- Questioned if the finished floor would be four feet above grade
- Roof was dropped on the addition which made it more compatible
- Suggested using a novelty siding in the back; however, not required and the addition was subordinate to the main house
- Building was being put back to a residential use
- Porch design was based on historical evidence
- Asked how many of the original windows were left on the building
- Entry stairs could be wider since it was raised 48 inches

- Questioned if coquina concrete would be used for the sidewalk on the north side
- Asked what percent of siding would be replaced

Applicant response:

- New windows would be wood
- Finish floor would be four feet above grade which was approved at the last meeting
- Thought there were two original windows left
- Wanted to use those two windows on the side of the building
- New windows would replicate original windows
- Awning windows were smaller since they were overlooking the bar next door
- Tried to meet the parking condition and that was why it was thinner but was around four feet
- Coquina concrete would be used and was shown on the site plan
- Did not have a percent as replacement was unknown but would use the siding in the back for replacement if in good condition
- Thought the majority of the siding on the existing building was in good condition and the siding on the back would be able to be used
- Would have all new wood on the proposed addition

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE application HP2023-0023 26 Toques Place as set forth in the plans as it stands. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Weaver, Beach, Benoit, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY¹

Break

¹ Break from 3:10p.m. – 3:21p.m.

8.Opinion of Appropriateness

8. (a) HP2023-0030– Sarah Ryan Architect - Applicant

Lions Beach Capital LLC - Owner
171 Cordova Street

To construct a new two-story multi-family 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 an Opinion of Appropriateness at 171 Cordova Street if the HARB finds that the general concept, preliminary construction plans, details or specifications of the project meet the architectural requirements of the AGHP.

Sarah Ryan reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

Public hearing was opened.

Thomas Scheirer spoke in opposition to the application and said the property was a one-story home which matched the other homes on the street. He said there were seven one story and three multi-family two-story homes on the street in HP-1. He said adding this would not make sense and would change the streetscape. He said he did not feel he would have bought the home if a two-story home would have been next door. He said the HARB guidelines showed what was appropriate and this was not. ²

Mike Skjerning said his concern was the height, width, massing of the building. He said he was happy this home would be removed, and another would be established in its place; however, it sat twelve feet above sea level which looked more like a three-story building from street level. He understood the flooding issues in the

² Documents attached to original packet

downtown area but thought adding another seven feet seemed excessive.

Lynn Scheirer spoke in opposition to the application and said this new structure would be thirty-five feet and would be extremely close to her home. She said trees would have to be removed and felt there was not enough space in between their properties. She said the streetscape was seven one-story bungalows to the north all allowing ten to twenty feet between the houses and felt it should be maintained. She said the proposed new structure would devalue her property and the ability to enjoy the property. She did not understand why a single-family home was not being added back as the street did not need more density.³

Arthur Neigbert said it was a plus for the neighborhood to for the home to be removed; however, felt the neighborhood did not want another duplex or student housing. He said there was a parking problem in the area and felt it would increase the parking issues. Karen Smith spoke in opposition to the application and said she would be disappointed if this large multi-family home was built across the street from where she lived. She enjoyed the neighborhood as it was and thought the Board should consider a smaller home instead.

BJ Kalaidi spoke in opposition to the application and thought multi-family homes should not be built. She said this should not be allowed and felt the character of HP-1 was being lost.

Public hearing was closed.

Board Discussion:

- Felt the proposed building was in a transitional area between the buildings from the north and south
- Suggested having the front portion lower and the rear portion larger

- Concerned with the height and verticality of the structure
- Understood the height of the building was due to the flood requirements
- Suggested making modifications to conform to the setbacks and side setbacks of the surrounding buildings
- Suggested masking the foundation to make it resemble others in the area
- Suggested breaking down the scale but keeping the same square footage could be a benefit to the neighbors
- Could differentiate the wall height between the first and second floors which would create personality and uniqueness
- Should review the recommendations from the streetscape guidelines and should meet at least four of the seven provided
- Other two-story buildings in the neighborhood had a smaller projection and this should resemble those
- Building would be seven feet above curb and not twelve feet; however, the code required ten feet
- Felt the structure was too large for a transitional piece in this location
- Thought the scale and mass was the main issue
- Ceiling heights did not have to be ten feet on each floor
- Suggested flipping the structure around which would allow it to be fifteen feet from the property
- Felt the tree canopy was important to the area and should be incorporated
- Windows on the south elevation looked to be the wrong size; however, the windows on the front had the best proportions
- Questioned if the easement could be used or changed
- Suggested having a drive aisle for parking in the back which was similar to others in the area
- Thought the parking provided opportunities to add landscaping instead of a wall

³ Documents attached to original packet

- One story porch and direct stairs into the building were consistent throughout the elevation and that should be considered

Applicant response:

- Windows that were smaller were in a kitchen area
- Could not change the easement but could change the placement of the house
- Felt they needed to do a full redesign
- Easement was not allowed to be used for anything

Ms. Ryan asked if the application could be continued to a date certain as they would not be ready by next month.

Ms. Courtney said staff was requesting the meeting in July be moved to July 18, 2023 which was a Tuesday.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED CONTINUE Opinion of Appropriateness 8(a) HP2023-0030 171 Cordova Street to the July 18, 2023 meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Beach, Benoit, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

9. Certificate of Demolition and Partial Demolition

9. (a) HP2023-0029– Sarah Ryan Architect - Applicant

Lions Beach Capital LLC - Owner
171 Cordova Street

To demolish a residential building constructed c. 1950 that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and located in the St. Augustine National Register Historic District as a non-contributing structure

and in the Historic Preservation-One (HP-1) zoning 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 take the following actions for a Certificate of Demolition at 171 Cordova Street:

1. CONTINUE the application until a Certificate of Appropriateness application is submitted and can be heard concurrently with the Certificate of Demolition per the AGHP; OR,

2. APPROVE because the building is not a local landmark or otherwise designated as a historic building with the condition that the demolition permit only be issued with the building permit for the replacement structure which will first require approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness.
Sarah Ryan reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

32 certified notices were sent, 5 were returned in favor, 0 were returned opposed and 0 had comments.

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

The Board discussed:

- Not opposed to demolition as the building was a noncontributing structure
- Compared to the other historic buildings this one was out of character
- Could not be torn down until there was a building permit issued for the replacement structure
- Questioned if demolitions had a time limit

Ms. Courtney advised demolitions had a one-year expiration date and the Opinion of Appropriateness was continued to July. She

said she wanted to make sure the applicant could request an extension for the demolition if needed.

Ms. Ryan asked when the time would start.

Ms. Seymour replied, if approved it would be one year from the approval date. She said in HP-1, the AGHP required the demolition and building permits to be issued simultaneously.

Ms. Ryan asked if the application could be continued until July.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to CONTINUED Certificate of Demolition and Partial Demolition 9(a) HP2023-0029 171 Cordova Street to the July 18, 2023 HARB meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Beach, Benoit, MacDonald, Benoit

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

9. (b) Certificate of Partial Demolition HP2023-0019 Continued from April 20, 2023- 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 8 existing wood windows 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 and Mehl Hart reviewed the application.

The Board provided their ex parte communication.

Notices were sent for the prior meeting; however, an email was attached.

Public hearing was opened.

Charles Pappas spoke in favor of the application and agreed with the staff recommendation. He said this replacement would not alter the character of the home and the windows were not easily seen from the street.

BJ Kalaidi asked if what was being proposed would continue to keep the building as a contributing building to the historic district. She said it was important to keep the designation.

Ms. Seymour replied that was the decision today to see if the Board felt it would impact the contributing status in the future.

Public hearing was closed.

Mr. Chambers clarified they were not having sliding windows and all windows would look the same and be one over one windows instead of two over two.

The Board discussed:

- Windows were an important feature to the building; however, did not feel it would change it from being a contributing building
- Replacement would be similar to the original windows

- Encouraged the applicant to keep the original windows that were in good condition
- Thought it would change the look of the house and how it would fit with the neighbors; however, not opposed to the application
- Questioned if the windows would be trimmed inside and outside or inserted into the existing frame
- Board did not have purview regarding what was installed
- Felt the owner should have the opportunity to change the windows
- Questioned why the replacement was not the two over two windows

Applicant response:

- Would install full frame if needed; however, if in good condition would be more of an insert
- Was a preference choice to use the one over one windows

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE Item 9(b) Certificate of Partial Demolition HP2023-0019, 36 Park Avenue to do the partial demolition on the nine existing historic windows in the building. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

Mr. MacDonald suggested salvaging the windows that were being removed.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, MacDonald, Beach, Benoit, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

9. (c) HP2023-0033– Renewal by Anderson of Florida - Applicant Stephanie Hollis and Brian Bosley - Owner 57 Bay View Driv

To partially demolish a residential building constructed c. 1959 that is recorded in the Florida Master Site file and a contributing building in the Fullerwood Park National Register Historic District including replacement of original wood windows with windows of a new design and material.

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 57 Bay View Drive for partial demolition including replacement of 6 existing wood windows if the HARB makes the following finding:

1. That removal of original windows and replacement as proposed will not impact the architectural integrity of the contributing building to the Fullerwood Park National Register Historic District with the condition that window elements such as full sashes be salvaged for use in other projects in accordance with Sec. 28-89(2) d.6.

Stephanie Hollis and Todd Chambers reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

18 certified notices were sent, 2 were returned in favor, 0 were returned opposed and 1 had comments.

Public hearing was opened.

Charles Pappas spoke in favor of the application and did not feel the change would affect the home.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Building reflected post World War II development

- Felt there was justification for the partial demolition
- Did not feel it would make the building nonconforming
- Home was more modern and felt the composite window would fit with the context of the house
- Original front façade had been modified

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE application HP2023-0033 finding that the window replacements should not materially affect the houses ability to be a contributing structure to the Fullerwood neighborhood. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Beach, Weaver, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY⁴

9. (d) HP2023-0026– 1565 Woodworks, LLC - Applicant
The Elaine Straub Investment Trust - Owner
39 Phillips Street

For partial demolition of a residential building constructed c. 1940 that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and not located in a district, including proposed removal/replacement of existing west elevation siding, character defining features of the front porch, and all windows.

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 for partial demolition at 39 Phillips Street because it is not a local landmark or otherwise designated as a historic building.

Amber Halcrow reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

19 certified notices were sent, 1 was returned in favor, 0 were returned opposed and 0 had comments.

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

The Board was in favor of the application and had a brief discussion regarding the property not being a contributing building or local landmark.

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE application HP2023-0026 finding that the structure in question was not a local landmark or otherwise designated as a historic building with the condition of a good faith effort to salvage any materials. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, MacDonald, Weaver, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

9. (e) HP2023-0027– Sarah Ryan Architect - Applicant
Fountain Youth Lodge #649 - Owner
100 Washington Street

For partial demolition of a building constructed c. 1958 that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and eligible for inclusion in the Lincolnville National Register Historic District, to include modifications to the window/door fenestration and removal of the entrance and stairs on the front facade/east elevation; to remove the chimney on the

⁴ Mr. Beach left after Item 9(c)

north elevation; and, to cover some window openings and replace windows on the south elevation.

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 for partial demolition at 100 Washington Avenue with the following finding:

- That partial demolition of features as proposed will not impact the architectural integrity of the structure to the extent that it may no longer be considered building eligible as contributing to the Lincolnville National Register Historic District.

Sarah Ryan reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

23 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 this would change the eligibility of the building for it to be included in the National Historic District.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Updates were being done partially with a state and the City grant
- Questioned if the plans and proposed work had been reviewed by the State
- Individually, the building could be considered for the National Register and local landmark as Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. visited the location
- State would review the building using the Secretary of the Interior Standards

- Was preserving the jalousie windows on the building
- What was being proposed would not make the building individually ineligible
- Did not have design purview; however, thought the front was not matching compared to the sides

Applicant response:

- As part of receiving funds, the final plans had to be provided and reviewed before construction could start
- Not opposed to making the columns and pickets on the front simpler

Ms. Courtney said the Board could review the overall design and determine if the building was significantly altered by what was being removed. She said they could not dictate the design but could comment on the building's integrity.

Mr. Weaver asked if the front stair was original or an addition. He said it looked like it should be on the back of the building and it read as a later addition; however, that was the reason for questioning it.

Ms. Seymour replied the exterior stairs were not shown on the San Born maps, although, San Born maps did not always show stairs.

Ms. Courtney said the Board should consider the reason it could be individually listed was probably not because of the architecture, but because of the historical significances.

Mr. Weaver said the front stair was not on the San Born maps and was a non-historic feature. He said the jalousie windows were being kept, which was important to the building. He asked if a condition could be added to include approval of the design.

Ms. Courtney replied that it could not be added as a condition; however, a condition could be to include an approved building permit application, which could not be issued until approved by the state.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE HP2023-0027 demolition with the condition they have an approved building permit before able to proceed with the demolition. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, MacDonald, Benoit, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

9. (f) HP2023-0028 – John Valdes & Associates, Inc - Applicant **Richard and Tina Torres - Owner** **112 Carrie Johnson Way**

To demolish a residential building constructed ca. 1904-1910 that is recorded in the Florida Master Site file and a contributing building to the Lincolnville National Register Historic 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 112 Carrie Johnson Way if the HARB finds that evidence of deteriorated structural integrity and/or undue economic hardship as provided by the applicant is sufficient to justify demolition of the National Register District contributing structure with the following conditions:

1. For any salvageable historic materials to be salvaged, if possible, 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.

2. To limit the time that the lot is vacant, the applicant shall submit the demolition permit application and the building permit

application for a replacement structure simultaneously.

Les Thomas reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

20 certified notices were sent, 5 were returned in favor, 0 were returned opposed and 2 had comments.

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi pointed out this was a contributing building to the Lincolnville Historic neighborhood, and felt it was a shame the Board did not have purview over what could be rebuilt. She said this was a special area and most of the demolition was through neglect.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Had an expert opinion regarding the structure with evidence
- Building was in very bad condition and beyond repair

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE HP2023-0028 finding that the buildings current condition is beyond repair with the condition that demolition be allowed when submitted for the new building permit. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Weaver, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY⁵

**9. (g) HP2023-0031– Direct Home Buyer 1
Inc - Applicant & Owner
118 Lincoln Street**

For after-the-fact full demolition of a residential building, constructed ca. 1958, that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and is a non-contributing building in the Lincolnville National Register Historic District. (Previously heard under HP2023-0020 and denied by HARB as a partial demolition).

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 because it is not a local landmark or otherwise designated a historic building.

Christa 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 asked if the Board was allowed to deny an after-the-fact demolition. She said this was in Lincolnville and asked how many buildings were being removed from the district.

Charles Pappas said it seemed that the Code Enforcement Board did not understand how HARB worked. He said the building was so far gone it was difficult for them to know what could be done. He said he just wanted to let the Board know this case was difficult

for them to understand the authority of both Boards.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Noncontributing structure and felt if it would have been reviewed by HARB as shown in the 2019 street view felt it would have been approved if non-contributing
- Structure was constructed in 1959 but was outside the period of significances
- Questioned if outside the period of significances how the structure would be an eligible contributing structure

Ms. Courtney said there was an update in 2021 of the National Register districts; however, the update had not been official formalized. She said once the home had reach fifty years old it was considered a contributing structure.

Mr. Benoit asked if any building over fifty years old in Lincolnville automatically become eligible. He asked what was seen in the building that was considered architecturally significant.

Ms. Courtney said it was based on the architectural integrity and this building had been reviewed but it was not eligible due to the age but was in eligible in 2021. She said the period of significances was reviewed and in Lincolnville it started in 1800's and with the 1991 nomination it ended in 1941. She said that period was updated in 2021 and expanded to around 1970's.

Mr. Benoit asked if the property flooded during the recent hurricanes.

Ms. Courtney replied it was possible, but the applicant may have better information.

Ms. Guthrie said the home was purchased in distress during a foreclosure, and not much information was provided. She said she

⁵ Mr. Weaver left after item 9(f)

spoke with the City and it was not deemed historic; however, she learned today that it was eligible to be historic. She said it was bought as it was and none of that information was provided.

Board discussion:

- Would have been in favor of the demolition not knowing it could be a contributing structure
- Thought the issue was the home was not fifty years old when the update was done and felt it could have been contributing
- New buildings being built were completely different from the one-story buildings that were in Lincolnville
- Application had been reviewed by Code Enforcement, but was unsure what to do next with the home
- Home needed to be brought to code and did not see much architectural merit

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE application HP2023-0031 finding that the building was and is beyond repair and at present was not a contributing building with the constraint that the demolition permit be issued with the submittal of building plans for a building permit. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY⁶

10. Planning and Building Staff Communications

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

(Provided for informational purposes)

11. Other Business

11. (a) Review of FDOT project to replace the portion of the seawall along Avenida Menendez (A1A) between the Bridge of Lions and the Castillo de San Marcos

Ms. Courtney introduced the topic to the Board and noted FDOT would be providing a presentation.

Michael Brock FDOT, reviewed the project scope with the Board and said they were here providing the Board with more information and to gather feedback.

Board discussion:

- Questioned the life span of the new wall and were there opportunities to assist with future resiliency issues
- North of the Bridge of Lions by the fort was the weak point
- Elevation to the south of the bridge was at seven feet, but liked that eight feet six inches would provide protection again some water events like Hurricane Matthew
- Having the taller wall would not allow for the view of the water from the road
- Questioned why the sidewalks would be lowered if the taller wall were used
- Asked if partial demolition would be required for character defining features, such as the chains and bollards along the bayfront

Applicant response:

- Typical structure had about a 75-year life expectancy
- Construction funding was not obtained yet
- Was working with the National Park Service to try and rebuild that location to provide protection
- Was the way to get rid of the older wall as the new wall would be built in front

⁶ Break from 6:02p.m.-6:18p.m.

- Had to keep a forty-two-inch barrier and keep the height of the proposed wall

Ian Pawn FDOT, advised they could enter into an agreement to salvage them for other usage. He said the wall was constructed in 1957 or 1958 and was deemed ineligible for the National Register.

The Board continued to discuss the two options presented by FDOT. There was consensus by the Board that proposed plan A was the better option for protection of the City and suggested that the wall only be as tall as the other walls in the area.

Mr. Pawn noted this was more of an informational sharing for HARB to understand what was going on and what could potentially take place.

11. (b) Review of FDOT project for Lighting and Signalization (Ph IV King Street to Castillo Drive)

Ms. Courtney introduced the project by FDOT for lighting and signage. She noted there were several items that could be a concern from a HARB standpoint and negative effects in the proposed areas.

CJ Youmans and Courtney Hence reviewed the project with the Board.

Board discussion:

- Thought the concept was good but the aesthetics of town would be ruined
- Unsure if the cause of the traffic was the pedestrians or was it clearing traffic from the Bridge of Lions
- Questioned what was really trying to be achieved with this addition
- Asked if a timer could be added to the yellow crosswalk devices that were already on the bayfront or have one location for pedestrians to cross the street
- This was mostly for tourist but if locals were to agree, FDOT should show how

this would clear the bridge traffic; however, the proposed plan did not look like it would help the situation

- Questioned how the same mistakes with the yellow crosswalks would not be made with the proposed option
- Felt the proposed plan aesthetically did not work for the bayfront
- Hoped this was part of a bigger plan for the City
- Did not feel the lighting in the downtown area was an issue
- Questioned where this fit into the bigger problem and the bigger effort to solve it

Applicant response:

- Felt it was a balance between pedestrians and vehicle traffic

Xavier Pellicer Mobility Coordinator for the City of St. Augustine advised the new light proposed would be coordinated and traffic would not have to stop at each one of them. He said the yellow crosswalks sometime provide pedestrians with a false sense of security and these could provide more safety.

Mr. Youmans clarified the coordination would be between the intersections. He said this would be the solution for the long term and make the systems could be customized based on what was needed and it could be adjusted as necessary.

The Board continued to discuss the topic and other solutions along with FDOT.

11. (c) Request for HARB's support of the City's Division of Historical Resources grant application

Ms. Courtney reviewed the topic with the Board. She said they were asking for the Board's support the two grant projects.

There was Board consensus to offer support regarding the two grant projects.

11. (d) Upcoming training opportunities to be held in Sanford, FL with May 26, 2023, registration deadline:

1. June 8, 2023 (Full Day) - National Alliance of Preservation Commissions (NAPC) Resilience and Disaster Planning CAMP (Commission Assistance and Mentoring Program) training: CLG staff, HARB members, and local government disaster/emergency management staff encouraged to attend.

2. June 9, 2023 (Half Day) - Division of Historical Resources (DHR) training: Role of DHR in disaster response and how to interact with their office, and general Q&A session.

11. (e) Consideration of moving the date of the July 20, 2023, HARB regular meeting to Tuesday, July 18, 2023 to allow staff and board members the opportunity to attend the 2023 Preservation on Main Street Conference (July 19-21)

Ms. Courtney reviewed the topic with the Board. She said this event would take place in Ocala. She encouraged the Board to inform staff if there was another conference they wanted to attend. She let them know there was a discount if they signed up under the City.

Ms. Courtney asked if there was an issue with moving the July HARB meeting from July 20, 2023 to July 18, 2023 for everyone to be able to attend the conferences.

There was Board consensus to move the Board meeting from July 20, 2023 to July 18, 2023.

(f) Window Workshop (May 13) in conjunction with the St. Augustine History Festival follow-up

Ms. Courtney thanked the Board members that were able to attend and support the

workshop. She said it would be great to have the Board feedback regarding what they liked and what could be improved.

12. Next Scheduled Meeting Date

a) June 15, 2023, Regular Meeting

13. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:44 P.M.⁷



Catherine Duncan, Chairperson

⁷ Transcribed by Elyse Wiemann