

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

Historic Architectural Review Board Regular Meeting January 18, 2024

The Historic Architectural Review Board met in formal session at 1:00 P.M., Thursday, January 18, 2024, 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
Michele Fudo, Recording Secretary

2. General Public Comments for Items not on the Agenda

none

3. Approval of Minutes

MOTION

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

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Weaver, Beach, Benoit, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. Modification and approval of Agenda

a) HP2023-0087

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to continue item 6.b. 35 Treasury Street to the February 15, 2024, HARB meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

MOTION PASSED by UNANIMOUS Voice Vote

MOTION

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

MOTION PASSED by UNANIMOUS Voice Vote

Ms. Seymour advised the Board that the audio was not currently streaming but would be available on Friday for those who wished to listen on the website.

5. Public Comments related to Expedited Hearing items:

5. (a) HP2023-0091 – Colour Homes, LLC – Applicant Zeke D. Williams – Owner 82 Chapin Street

To demolish a residential building, constructed c. 1910-1927, that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and not located in a district.

Ms. Seymour read the staff report and said based on a review of the AGHP and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff

finds that the board can APPROVE a Certificate of Demolition at 82 Chapin Street because it is not a local landmark or otherwise designated as a historic building with the following conditions:

1. Any useable materials be salvaged as feasible in accordance with section 28-89(2)d

2. No permit be issued for the demolition until drawings sufficient for a building permit and all necessary requirements for the construction of a new building have been submitted for the new construction.

Jason Stantell 1724 Astoria Street St. Augustine was sworn in for the record.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi said the new construction in the West King area appeared too new and modern and did not fit into the character in the area.

Public hearing was closed.

Mr. Weaver confirmed that the applicant accepted the conditions provided in the staff recommendation.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE expedited item HP2023-0091 to include the following conditions 1. To salvage any usable materials and 2. There had to be a plan and obtain a permit prior to demolition. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, MacDonald, Beach, Benoit, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. Certificates of Appropriateness

6. (a) HP2023-0083 – Patrick and Gail Crocetta – Applicant & Owner 289 St George Street

To modify Certificate of Appropriateness 2020-0066 to utilize landscape materials to screen the masonry wall instead of the approved wood picket fence.

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 289 St. George Street with the following findings:

1. That screening the masonry wall with proposed plant materials meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation #9 as a compatible contemporary landscape design that is appropriate for the architectural style of the building

2. That the proposed plant materials, if not pre-approved or a Florida Native, are appropriate in size and scale for their use and the architectural style of the building.

The Board provided their Ex Parte Communication.

Mr. Patrick Crocetta reviewed the application.

Public hearing was opened.

Michelle Barber spoke in support of the applicant and commented that it was very attractive. She said that there were about 28 homes in the area, and she thought it was appropriate to have the masonry wall with the plantings.

Tara Owens showed photographs of the homes in the area that have masonry walls and commented that it was consistent with the character of the neighborhood.

Holly Pearce spoke in support of the idea and liked the character it brings to the area.

Jennifer Sullivan supports the plan for the masonry wall with vegetation coverage.

Gail Crocetta named the plantings on their wall for the Board.

BJ Kalaidi clarified that the applicant had decided to use vegetation instead of the picket fence. She cautioned that the height of the plants could exceed four feet.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Masonry wall was for flood mitigation
- The fence was a requirement of the AGHP guidelines
- Agreed that the landscaping would be more attractive than a fence in front of a wall
- Landscape type of screening was creative
- Picket fencing was redundant
- Met the spirit of the guidelines
- Dual fencing was unattractive
- Supported the idea of landscaping

Mr. Beach asked if the current landscaping was going to stay as is or was there another plan to add more or change the landscape.

Mr. Crocetta told the Board that they would like to cover the wall with what was there, and that the Creeping Fig that they had planted would accomplish that goal.

Board discussion continued:

- Agreed that additional plantings were needed

- Fencing wall guidelines were based on the architecture of the house that is on the property
- Vernacular buildings typically require a fence not a wall
- The wall was built to provide flood mitigation
- This was an exception to not have the fence
- The Board was supportive for the flood mitigation
- The wall on a neighboring property did not fit in the historical nature of the area

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE application HP2023-0083 289 St. George Street finding that the wall was a compatible measure given the flood resiliency requirement and added the staff constraint that any new plantings be on the pre-approved list or be designated as a Florida friendly plant. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Weaver, Beach, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. (b) HP2023-0087 Jason Canning Architect Inc.- Applicant Bishop pf the Diocese of St. Augustine – Owner 35 Treasury Street

Continued from December 21,2023

Requesting continuance to February 15-2024

To replace existing windows and doors, including changes to existing fenestration, expand existing covered balcony on the north elevation, and install new ADA accessible ramps with stairs on the north and east elevations.

7. Certificate of Demolition and Partial Demolition

7. (a) HP2023-0062 – R K S Construction & Design, Inc – Applicant BCS Acquisition Group, LLC – Owner 56 Carrera Street

Continued from September 21, 2023
Applicant requested a continuance.

To For after-the-fact partial demolition of a building constructed c. 1911- 1914 that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and a contributing building to the Model Land Company National Register Historic District, to include replacement of existing wood windows with windows of a new material and design as well as alterations to window and door fenestration on the front elevation.

Ms. Seymour advised the Board that the applicant would not be in attendance as they had requested a continuance. She said that the applicant is hoping to come into compliance and be able to get approval administratively. She told the Board that the work with a custom window designer is taking longer than expected.

Mr. MacDonald said that the applicant was making windows like kind out of wood and asked if anyone had seen any renderings of the windows being constructed.

Ms. Seymour told the Board that no new information had been submitted by the applicant.

Ms. Lopez advised that the Board if the item was going to be continued there was no need to open a hearing.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to CONTINUE application HP2023-0062 to the February 15, 2024, HARB meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Weaver, Beach, Benoit, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. (b) HP2023-0090 – Mario Cano-Applicant & Owner 57 Dumas Street

Continued from December 21, 2023

To partially demolish a residential building, constructed c. 1894-1899, that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and a contributing building to the Lincolnville National Register Historic District to include wholesale replacement of existing windows and doors in a different design and material, wood siding, and front porch.

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 a Certificate of Demolition for Partial Demolition at 57 Dumas Street if the HARB makes the following findings:

1. That the proposed replacement features are compatible with the historic structure's building envelope

2. The removal and replacement of existing windows, doors, siding, and porch elements will not compromise the overall historic character and integrity of the structure.

Mr. Cano reviewed that application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi felt that the partial demolition was due to neglect of the building. She had concerns about the improvement of the

properties and did not like the wholesale replacement of the doors and the windows. She encouraged the Board to deny this application.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Thirteen windows total and the applicant was keeping seven
- Encouraged the applicant to save as many of the original windows as possible
- Concerned with the amount of demolition on this building
- Pre-demolition try to fix the window detail
- Top of the window header detail
- There was no sheathing behind the current siding
- Talk to staff and find a way to preserve the window trim
- Could the siding replacement be kept in the back of the building and use wood siding on the front
- Front side and up to the back corners
- Detail in the headers on the windows was worth keeping
- If all new fabric was placed on the building the historic value of the building would be lost
- Building appeared to have been a small cottage
- Suggested that the front twenty feet of the original cottage should be saved to keep the historic value of the building
- Save the historic value of the front twenty feet
- Keep replacement to the back of the house
- Verified that a new HVAC had been installed in the house
- Felt that keeping the integrity of the house would add value
- Replacement in the back of the house was acceptable

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to PARTIALLY APPROVE application HP2023-0090 at 57 Dumas Street with the following conditions 1. Finding that the application will be revised such that the windows, door and siding are to be restored, repaired and replaced in kind on the front of the existing building to the rear of the original cottage/gable roof that runs front to back and terminates at a later addition, including two windows on the right side that have a decorative header and 2. From the point of the addition, the applicant has approval per the application to replace the windows, doors and siding as proposed. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

Mr. Weaver verified the conditions of the motion.

Mr. Benoit advised the applicant of the conditions and said that he should work with the staff to find the appropriate materials.

Ms. Courtney verified that this was a restore and replace in kind project.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Weaver, Beach, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. Certificate of Appropriateness – City owned property

8. (a) HP2023-0061 – St. Johns Regional Audubon– Applicant City of St. Augustine – Owner 1 Cordova Street a.k.a. 10 S. Castillo Drive

Continued from September 21,2023

To develop a native plant garden with informational signage and additional landscape features north of the Visitor's Information Center.

Ms. Seymour presented the staff report and advised that staff does not make recommendations for projects proposed on

City property. The HARB should determine, based on the evidence provided, whether the proposed scope of work is consistent with AGHP requirements and appropriate within the context of its location and the surrounding Historic Preservation zoning district.

Laurie Gilmore reviewed the application. She advised the Board of some changes in the original design regarding the edging materials. She described the signage and said that the colors of the signage could be changed if necessary.

Ms. Lopez advised that the signs needed to include the City seal to identify the markers as official signage for the city.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

Public hearing was opened.

Charles Pappas fully supported the idea and liked the chosen area better than the previously selected space.

BJ Kalaidi supported the garden and said this type of thing was needed.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

Mr. MacDonald asked who would be maintaining the garden, he also questioned the elevation as it related to the potential for flooding in the area.

Ms. Gilmore told the Board that she and others had visited the site after significant rainfall and felt that the area would be safe from flooding.

Mr. Weaver wanted to be sure that the city would be conforming with the sign ordinance.

Ms. Lopez restated that the applicant had said that the colors of the signage could be changed if needed.

Ms. Seymour told the Board that the selected colors were close to the approved colors and the Board had the option to approve the colors as presented or require a change.

Ms. Courtney said the staff would need direction from the Board regarding the color selection on the sign.

Mr. Weaver wanted to be sure that at least there would be an administrative review to be sure that all the guidelines were being followed.

Ms. Duncan said that this was an informational sign with photos, she asked if the criteria for this sign be the same as a sign in the historic district.

Ms. Seymour spoke about the sign code that is primarily reviewing signs related to businesses and there are examples of other signs that did not meet the AGHP requirements but had been approved by the Board. She said that the Board would determine what direction to take.

Ms. Lopez advised that government signs were exempt from the codes that regulate other signage in the historic district.

Mr. Beach asked if there was a way to alter the design to have the garden respond to the context of the area where it was located. He wanted the garden to engage with the surrounding sidewalks and the people that were passing by.

Tom Richardson responded and was open to the suggestions of the Board.

Mr. Beach encouraged the designer to increase the number of pathways in the garden and perhaps create some destination points with benches or fountains.

JB Miller gave perspective to the board for the size of the garden area.

Mr. Benoit asked if the barrier around the garden was mandated or just part of the design.

Mr. Richardson said that because the garden would be raised, they used the coquina rock as a barrier to contain the soil.

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE HP2023-0061 with the request that the design team and the applicant study the connectivity between the proposed path and the existing sidewalks, and a review of the sign for compliance with the review not being held to the same standard as the commercial or retail sign as this was an educational sign that is attached to the ground. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, MacDonald, Beach, Weaver, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

9. Planning and Building Staff Communications

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

(Provided for informational purposes)

10. Other Business

10. (a). Legislative Update

Ms. Courtney asked Ms. Lopez to provide a legislative update to the Board.

Ms. Lopez reviewed two bills before the state legislature; SB1526 proposed by Senator Avila and HB1647 proposed by

Representative Roach. She provided a brief explanation of each to the Board.

11. Next Scheduled Meeting Date(s):

11. (a) February 15, 2024 – Regular Meeting

12. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:10 P.M.¹



Catherine Duncan, Chairperson

¹ Transcribed by Michele Fudo