

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

Historic Architectural Review Board Regular Meeting June 15, 2023

The Historic Architectural Review Board met in formal session at 1:00 P.M., Thursday, June 15, 2023, in the Alcazar Room at City Hall, St. Augustine, Florida. Catherine Duncan, Chairperson, called the regular meeting to order, and the following were present:

1. ROLL CALL:

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

City Staff:

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

2. General Public Comments for Items not on the Agenda

(None)

3. Approval of Minutes

MOTION

MOVED to APPROVE the April 20, 2023 minutes as presented. The motion was SECONDED by.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES:

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. Modification and approval of Agenda

Ms. Seymour advised that 317 St. George Street requested a continuance to August HARB meeting.

Ms. Duncan announced there were three expedited hearing items.

MOTION

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

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Benoit, Beach, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. Public Comments related to Expedited Hearing items:

5. (a) Certificate of Appropriateness

HP2023-0032– Meehan's Irish Pub - Applicant

Nofal-Smith, Inc. - Owner

51 Charlotte Street

To extend the existing masonry wall along the northwest property line for future flood mitigation efforts.

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 51 Charlotte Street with the finding that extension of the existing masonry wall meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation #9 as a compatible contemporary design.

Reggie Maggs waived his right to a public presentation.

The Board provided their ex parte communication.

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

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE application 2023-0032. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Beach, Weaver, Benoit, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. (b) Certificate of Demolition HP2023-0036– Renewal by Anderson of Florida - Applicant

Kenneth G. and Cynthia R. Langley - Owner

6 Bay View Drive

For partial demolition of a residential building constructed between 1917 and 1924 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 two (2) existing wood double casement windows, one with a transom, with windows of a different material and style.

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 6 Bay View Drive if the HARB finds that the proposed window removal and replacement will not negatively impact the building's contributing status in the Fullerwood Park National Register Historic District with the following condition:

1. The existing window pattern on the front elevation be replicated with a simulated raised muntin.

Kenneth Langley waived his right to a public presentation.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

16 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.

Mr. Weaver asked if the applicant would agree to the condition of adding a raised muntin.

Mr. Langley agreed to the condition and the window would simulate what was there.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE application 2023-0036, 6 Bay View Drive. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Beach, Benoit, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. (c) Certificate of Demolition HP2023-0037– Tri State Building & Remodeling, LLC – Applicant

Jamie Pantling - Owner

81 Coquina Avenue

For partial demolition of a residential building constructed c.1957 that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and not located in a district to include removal of the original one-story easterly portion of the building.

There was Board consensus to hear the application further in the meeting since the applicant was not present.

Heard after item 7(b)

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 81 Coquina Avenue because it is not a local landmark or otherwise designated as a historic building.

John Boback waived his right to a public hearing.

The Board provided their ex parte communication.

11 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.

Mr. MacDonald noted no issues with the demolition but encouraged the applicant to be cautious of the elevations on the front.

Mr. Boback advised they were moving the living space to the second floor to avoid flooding.

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE the Partial Demolition HP2023-0037, 81 Coquina Avenue. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Weaver, Beach, Benoit, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. Continued Items from Previous Meetings

6. (a) Certificate of Appropriateness HP2023-0011 Continued from March 16, 2023 REQUESTING CONTINUANCE TO AUGUST 17, 2023 MEETING

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 a continuance. See modifications to the agenda.

7. Certificates of Appropriateness

7. (a) HP2023-0002– Don Crichlow & Associates - Applicant **Diocese of St. Augustine, Inc. - Owner** **38 Cathedral Place**

To construct a shrine feature in the west courtyard along the north property line with associated new site features including gate access in the west masonry wall along St. George Street, metal fencing, benches, kneelers, landscape, lighting, and new paved walkways.

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 38 Cathedral Place if the HARB finds that the proposed shrine structure and associated site alterations, including outstanding details as clarified by the applicant, meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation #9 as a compatible contemporary design.

Don Crichlow reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:

- Beautiful project and a great addition to the Cathedral
- Suggested adding scallop shells since it was associated with the Santiago de Compostella
- Asked if applicant agreed with the watts recommended for lighting by staff
- Thought the scale fit with the side yard
- Did not compete with the main church but tied in with well with the materials
- Scale was correct and was a good location for it and liked the connection and relationship between the Diocese and Spain
- Thought the back of the statue would be visible from the adjacent property
- Suggested brining the pediment from the columns across front the front to the back
- Questioned the location of the plexiglass and where it would be attached
- Pedestal projected out in front of the columns and suggested making the inside a little deeper

Applicant response:

- Agreed to the lighting requirements; however, did not specific which bulb
- On the 25th of July the statue would be officially dedicated
- Back would be a stucco wall with a gable roof
- Willing to bring the columns around to the back
- Final construction drawings were not complete, but the plexiglass would be flush along the edge
- Wanted the statue to be sealed with weather stripping
- Could modify the pedestal to be a little deeper to have the plexiglass set in

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE with the bases that the pediment be taken around the back and make the entire assembly deeper to incorporate the plexiglass behind the columns. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Weaver, Beach, Benoit, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. (b) HP2023-0035– Cathedral Parish School - Applicant Diocese of St. Augustine, Inc. - Owner 267 St. George Street

To replace existing wood casement windows and transoms on the east elevation of the gymnasium building with new fixed-lite 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 take the following actions for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 267 St. George Street:

1. APPROVE if the HARB finds that the proposed window design meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation #9 as a compatible contemporary replacement for the existing windows with a more appropriate material as specified by the HARB; OR,

2. CONTINUE the application to allow the applicant time to provide additional information such as the muntin configuration and/or consider a more appropriate replacement material as directed by the HARB.

Ryan Ott, Chris Hale, Scout Smith, and Chris Rutherford reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:

- Had an issue with the vinyl window material even though the windows were non-historic
- Vinyl material was not in the guidelines for approval
- Thought these were a multilight casement window previously
- Not opposed to a fixed window but suggested using metal as a replacement material as that would meet the guidelines and fit the architecture of the building
- Unsure of the proposed window as there were two provided in the packet; however, would prefer the Marvin Ultimate window which was metal clad
- Wood was encouraged; however, these were replacement windows and metal was on the building
- Marvin window would be wood on the interior with an aluminum clad exterior
- Asked if the window configuration would have a transom on top
- Could eliminate the functionality of the casement but would want the install to resemble the same fenestration
- Concerned with how the windows would look when installed without the details
- Asked if three windows would be installed in every opening or one window mulled together
- Felt the one window would change the configuration
- Thought the first and second floor windows matched and should be maintained
- Cut sheets provided were contradictory to what was being proposed
- New windows should resemble what was currently there and it did not need to be operable
- Horizontal transom was essential and should emulate the pattern of what was present

- Needed to provide details drawings to staff to avoid having to return to the Board
- Asked if the casements over the transom were one over one with a mullion
- Should provide whole order prior to placing the order to staff for approval
- Color that would be used for the exterior would be bronze

Applicant response:

- Unsure why the Board felt vinyl windows were inferior
- Wanted to have a two-piece fixed window
- Transom and glazing beads over the years could deteriorate
- Wanted to have the least amount of metal to help avoid deterioration quickly
- Would have the three mulled together at the factory
- Concerned with the silicone failing on the mullion bars
- Waterproofing in the block wall would not leak
- Willing to do an aluminum window that had the horizontal transom with the vertical mullion to replicate the look that was present
- Window would be fabricated by Marvin and everything discussed could be provided to staff in a drawing
- Agreed with the coloring

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE HP 2023-0035 with the following conditions: have a metal clad exterior with transom to match the height of the existing transom, mullions to match the existing scale mullions being bars between the window units, muntin to match the existing muntin, and bronze color to match the existing windows. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

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

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**8. Certificates of Appropriateness for Ad
Valorem Tax Exemption**

**8. (a) HP2023-0034– Historic Property
Associates, Inc. - Applicant
Sanford Cedar LLC - Owner
30 Sanford Street**

Mr. Weaver recused himself from the
application.¹

**To review parts I and II of a Historic
Preservation Ad Valorem Tax Exemption
application, including restoration and
rehabilitation of existing architectural
elements for a residential building,
constructed c. 1880 and relocated to its
present site c. 1917, is recorded in the
Florida Master Site File, and is a
contributing building to the Lincolnville
National Register Historic District.**

Ms. Courtney read the staff report and said based on a review of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds the board can APPROVE a CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS for the Historic Preservation Ad Valorem Tax Exemption at 30 Sanford Street if the HARB finds:

1. This is a qualifying property since it is listed as contributing to the Lincolnville National Register Historic District

2. The proposed scope of work to the exterior and interior of the existing building has been clarified and complies or is generally consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation

3. The proposed work meets the criteria established by the Department of State (see #6 of attachments)

With the condition: If the extent of damage to the existing elements is too extensive for repair and more replacement is needed than is indicated or any alteration or new work is proposed, an amended project scope should be submitted for this ad valorem tax exemption application.

Steve Porter and Shankar Thayver reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

Mr. Benoit noted some work on the outside had been completed but more in terms of restoration would take place.

Ms. Courtney said a small portion of siding was replaced and the applicant provided a photo indicating the material was wood and matched the existing siding. She advised the Board did not hear that portion of the application up front.

Mr. Porter said the outside was finished; however, the inside was being worked on. He said the siding was approved through the computer system with photo documentation.

Ms. Courtney advised they were not informed upfront about the siding being fixed and thought it was appropriate to know how much was replaced. She said the applicant should have identified clearly if the work had already occurred. She said there were three steps to the Ad Valorem Tax Exemption and by step three documentation was needed in detail for both interior and exterior items that had been replaced, restored, or rehabilitated.

¹ Recusal form attached to original minutes

The Board discussed:

- Primarily the house was lap siding and novelty was used on the addition
- Felt this was a successful case as it was not demoed
- Questioned if the Ad Valorem Tax Exemption was for the interior and exterior
- If wanted to have both, all work would have to meet the Secretary of the Interior Standards (SOIS)
- Liked that the integrity of the house was being maintained with minor spot repairs
- Trying to salvage the windows and keep as much as possible
- Felt there was more documentation needed than provided

Applicant response:

- Was applying for both interior and exterior

Ms. Courtney said the applicant needed to provide what had been replaced or repaired and suggested documenting the work while it was ongoing before it was complete. She said if it was completed the applicant would have to clearly identify what had been replaced. She said for federal tax credits to be approved, documentation was needed.

Mr. MacDonald clarified the applicant would work with staff to make sure all documentation and information was supplied. He said then the applicant would return to the Board for approval and then it would move onto the state.

Ms. Courtney replied HARB reviewed the tax exemption for the City and the County determined their decision based off HARB and the City Commission. She said then it would be an 'active' project; however, the state did not have a program, but it would be reviewed by the National Park Service (NPS). She continued when the home was reviewed in July, a structural report noted major foundation work was required. She

said the scope of work outlined did not cover any of that. She felt more details were needed for part three as it was basic.

Mr. Porter said nothing else on the outside needed to be replaced. He said the siding that needed to be replaced was and the foundation was not in bad shape besides other tuck pointing.

Board discussion:

- Advised if any other work needed to take place should bring it to the staff's attention
- Liked the wood left on the third floor as it looked to be original material
- Questioned if that had been covered up with drywall
- Asked if the red floor color were an original paint color and if the rest would be the same
- Felt that could help make the interior authentic
- Asked if casing was around the windows and if it was replicated where the new dry wall was installed
- Questioned if the exterior was finished including paint
- Thought more work on the outside would have been done
- Concerned with the original report completed on the foundation
- Questioned the hardy lap siding and if it would be removed and the original be added
- Suggested documenting each stage of the project
- Asked if the flooring would remain and be refinished
- Questioned if there were issues with the porch as it looked to be sagging
- Questioned the ceiling materials

Applicant response:

- Most everything inside besides some floor joists were in good condition
- Wood was there and not covered

- Would paint the rest the same color if it would help the application
- Drywall was installed in patches only where it was needed, and significant drywall was where the new air condition system was installed
- Window trim was exactly the same as they were
- No missing trim around the windows
- Exterior had not been painted but woodwork was finished
- Foundation was examined and there were no issues
- All the hardy that was on the building had been removed and replaced with wood cedar lap and novelty wood siding
- Flooring upstairs would be refinished but the downstairs had existing plywood and new wood would be added on top
- Ceilings were tongue and groove and in good condition

Mr. Benoit stated based on the age and history of the building it should qualify; however, the inside had been gutted but that would be reviewed.

Ms. Courtney said a building permit was filed in January mainly for interior work. She said Ms. Seymour requested exterior photos which were obtained, and they also had one or two of the work after.

Ms. Duncan asked what the permit was for in January

Ms. Courtney replied it was mostly interior work: to remove and replace toilet, inset showers, vanity's and replace with new, remove and replace kitchen cabins, sink, appliances and replace, remove old flooring and replace with new, replace interior doors paint interior, remove damaged siding and replace with new, repair step boards, paint exterior of the house, and noted siding was limited to areas in the attached photographs.

Ms. Duncan asked if they did the work on the property.

Mr. Porter replied all that had been completed before they were the builders. He said the doors had been removed and base boards were taken off.

Mr. Benoit stated the application would have issues as the point was to keep as much as possible original.

Mr. Thayver said the property was bought as it was and when demolition was denied by HARB, he contacted John Valdes for assistance.

Ms. Courtney advised the permit was issued February 3, 2023 and the demolition applicant was July 2022.

Mr. MacDonald confirmed the floors and doors were removed while Mr. Thayver owned the building.

Mr. Thayver said the building was purchased in 2021. He said the pictures provided was how it had been purchased.

Mr. Benoit said the photos from 2022 application had a red floor which was original and in the new photos it was no longer there. He said the third floor was now drywall and not wood.

Mr. Porter said on the third floor there were two bedrooms, one was wood and the other had been covered in drywall.

Ms. Duncan suggested providing a room by room layout with photos to know the original materials in each.

Mr. Thayver said the tile was on the second floor and the next picture was the third floor.

The Board continued to discuss the elements of the home and noted the process was extremely cumbersome for an investment. They advised there was an ad valorem tax exemption for inside and outside or just either one, which could be considered.

Ms. Duncan asked if Mr. Thayver owned the home when the first foundation report was provided.

Mr. Thayver said the report stated the foundation needed stabilization.

Mr. MacDonald noted the report stated the building was unsafe and needed to be demolished. He said the Board was hearing two different stories and felt the truth was trying to be avoided.

Mr. Porter said when he started the work, the doors, windows, base boards, and flooring were not there. He noted the red floor was still in the home but covered since it had been damaged.

Mr. MacDonald suggested coming back to the Board and apply for the exterior as the damage to the interior had been done. He asked if the Board could approve the application for exterior only or would the applicant need to reapply.

Ms. Lopez advised it had been done in the past and it could qualify to some percentage, unless the applicant felt the interior could be salvaged to obtain both.

Mr. Benoit asked if the applicant wanted a continuance.

Mr. Thayver thought this was for the exterior and not the interior. He said it was about how the exterior looked and had invested a lot of money on the plumbing and electric work and felt the Board did not want to provide a benefit.

Mr. MacDonald said they could evaluate the exterior and the inside could be however the applicant wanted. He said the values would have to be reset as it was not the whole building as it had been applied for.

Mr. Thayver asked where plumbing and electrical work fell either interior or exterior.

Mr. MacDonald replied the mechanics were interior; whereas, exterior was the shell and structure.

Ms. Duncan said this was not guaranteed. She said the project had to be completed before moving forward.

Ms. Courtney pointed out items to consider in the application. She said damaged floors would be repaired and some materials were changing which was noted. She said rehabilitation for the Ad Valorem Tax Exemption was the most lenient ways to preserve a building as new materials could be used, which was different from a restoration.

Ms. Duncan said it needed to be documented; however, most of the historic materials had been removed without any and what had been done did not respect the original materials that could have been retained.

Mr. MacDonald said the wood floors had bug damage according to the owner but if it were removed it should be replaced with a wood floor and not vinyl. He said that was his interpretation, as it should be replaced 'in kind'.

Ms. Lopez asked if this subset of the Ad Valorem Program allowed for non-replication in terms of material.

Ms. Courtney said this was rehabilitation, which spoke about compatible substitute material. She noted "repairing also included the limited replacement with in kind or with compatible substitute material of extensively deteriorated or missing parts of features when there were surviving prototypes. Although using the same kind of material was always the preferred option; substitute material is acceptable if the form and design as well as the substitute material itself convey the visual appearance of the remaining parts of the feature and finish". She said this was outlined from the SOIS for rehabilitation.

Ms. Duncan pointed out the guidelines noted the preferred option was to be replaced with the same material.

Ms. Lopez asked if the applicant wanted to continue the application to July to add more information to potentially have the interior cost included or would they only want the exterior and update the financial information.

Ms. Courtney said the program did not have extensive detailed guidelines regarding plumbing and electrical work and perhaps a percentage could be given to the interior but that would have to be confirmed with the state. She said that work was a significant investment.

Mr. Porter said the entire house had to be rewired and replumbed.

Mr. Benoit asked if the walls were insulated. Mr. Porter said what could be insulated was completed. He said the attic was sprayed with insulation as well.

Mr. Benoit said insulation was an exterior improvement as it helped retain paint and create building efficiency to the building envelope.

Ms. Duncan reiterated any additional work would need to be approved by staff before taking place and documenting the work.

Mr. Thayver said he did not feel the second and third floor were historic and asked for the Board to view the home if they were able. He said the first-floor interior was not touched and exactly the same.

Mr. Porter reiterated the first floor had the original floors, doors, and plaster; however, the second floor was in disarray.

Ms. Courtney added if there were any photos of the second and third floor prior to any changes those would be beneficial to the application.

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to CONTINUE application HP2023-0034 to July 18, 2023 HARB meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, MacDonald, Beach, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY²

9.Certificate of Demolition and Partial Demolition

**9. (a) HP2023-0038– Kroll Construction - Applicant
Michele A. Fouts & Jeffrey E. Clark - Owner
129 Washington Street**

For partial demolition of a residential building constructed between 1917 and 1924 that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and a contributing building to the Lincolnville National Register Historic District to include removal of the front porch and a rear addition related to elevation and renovation of the structure.

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 129 Washington Street for partial demolition of the front porch and rear addition because these features are not original to the building, with the following condition:

1. Original coquina concrete block foundations be salvaged during the building elevation for use in other projects as feasible.

Albert Kroll reviewed the application.

² Break from 3:02p.m.-3:16p.m.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

15 certified notices were sent, 2 were returned in favor, 1 was returned opposed and 1 had comments.

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

The Board discussed:

- Challenge was raising the home eight feet and what to do with the space between, which looked unclear
- Not an original feature and did not have an issue with it
- Questioned what the elevation would be
- No issue with lifting out the flood zone and the additions fit the fit the building
- Thought the height could be an issue as there would be a lot of space in between and was concerned with how it would be screened
- Building was quite small and would look like it was on stilts

Applicant response:

- Home was elevated twenty-four inches already and wanted to raise it an additional six feet for a total of eight feet
- Elevation now was right under nine feet and new homes were required to be at ten feet to obtain flood insurance and be permitted
- Would be adding on top of the existing piers

Ms. Lopez asked for clarification regarding the elevation.

Ms. Seymour clarified the Board was discussing the finished floor elevation, and from the base flood elevation, it would be a total of fourteen and half feet.

Board discussion:

- Board did not have purview over the elevation; however, wanted to provide guidance since it was a historic property
- Suggested if it were lowered one or two feet, it could be better

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE the partial demolition as proposed for application HP2023-0038, at 129 Washington Street finding that the proposed additions to be removed were not original to the structure. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Weaver, Beach, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

10. Planning and Building Staff Communications

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

(Provided for informational purposes)

Mr. MacDonald asked about 320 Charlotte Street.

Ms. Courtney said it was a code enforcement issue and there were some items that were permitted but others that were not.

11. Other Business

11. (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 by Jessica Beach, Chief Resilience Officer)

Ms. Beach provided information regarding resiliency and sustainability and discussed projects taking place throughout the City.

Ms. Beach and the Board discussed:

- Thought the program was great and was glad the City was working on it
- Flood Mitigation Assistance (FMA) was a yearly program
- Was one of the few programs that offered to help elevate on an annual basis
- There were other programs that could possibly help homeowners, but current programs had long lead times
- Wondered if homeowners could obtain monies retroactive if they had already lifted their homes
- Should have more of the hard discussions about fixing the neighborhood
- Should have community outreach to ensure all information possible was available
- People needed to have more access to information, but a lot of time was spent collecting data
- Back Bay Study would review each neighborhood to show the flooding scenarios
- Should be aware of the social equity

Ms. Beach provided an update about the Resilient Heritage Study and noted the money had not yet been acquired.

Mr. Weaver asked if there had been push back on the FEMA designation for Historic Structures.

Ms. Beach replied flood proofing would be allowed; however, she was not as familiar with that specific program. She said historic structures could apply for assistance under the FMA program.

Mr. Benoit asked if there was a Coastal A zone in the City.

Ms. Beach said it was mainly AE; the building inspector, Richard Schauland, would have that information.

Ms. Courtney replied that information could be found on a map provided by GIS. She said the map detailed the flood zones for the City.

Ms. Beach said they had discussed holding a Flood Expo with St. Johns County and noted hurricane guides and flood mitigation newsletters were available.

12. Next Scheduled Meeting Date(s):

a) Tuesday, July 18, 2023 - Regular Meeting (Date changed due to scheduling conflict)

Ms. Courtney said the Main Street Conference was the same week as the July HARB meeting and encouraged the Board to submit their documents if they wanted to receive any assistance for attending.

Ms. Courtney mentioned the Planning and Zoning Board Special meeting would take place on June 27, 2023 and partial demolition would be discussed. She encouraged the Board to attend.

13. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:31 P.M.³



Catherine Duncan, Chairperson

³ Transcribed by Elyse Wiemann