

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

Historic Architectural Review Board Regular Meeting February 15, 2024

The Historic Architectural Review Board met in formal session at 1:00 P.M., Thursday, February 15, 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 December 21, 2023 minutes as presented. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Beach, Weaver, Benoit, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. Modification and approval of Agenda

MOTION

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

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, MacDonald, Beach, Benoit, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. Public Comments related to Expedited Hearing items:

None

6. Continued Items from Previous Meetings

6. (a) Certificate of Demolition (Partial) HP2023-0062 – RKS Construction & Design, Inc – Applicant BCS Acquisition Group, LLC – Owner 56 Carrera Street Continued from September 21, 2023

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.

Staff recommends DENIAL of the application based upon the number of continuances already allowed. If the proposed replacement windows meet the requirements of the partial demolition ordinance for administrative

approval, HARB approval will not be required. The applicant can reapply to HARB for partial demolition if the updated scope of work does not meet the requirements for administrative approval. The Board may also choose to CONTINUE this application to a date uncertain. This would require the applicant to submit new information on the application deadline for a future meeting (30 days prior to the meeting) so the application can be re-advertised at that time.

Ex Parte Communication:

None

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

The Board discussed:

There was consensus with the Board to continue this application as they had seen positive progress with the applicant.

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to CONTINUE application HP2023-0062 to the March 21, 2024 HARB meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Weaver, Beach, Benoit, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. (b) Certificate of Appropriateness HP2023-0087 – Jason Canning Architect, Inc – Applicant Bishop of the Diocese of St. Augustine – Owner 35 Treasury Street Continued from December 21, 2023

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.

Item 6.b. was heard after Item 7.a.

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 35 Treasury Street if the HARB finds that the proposed alterations meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation #9 as a compatible contemporary design.

Jason Canning reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

None

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi questioned the requirement of the ADA ramp as related to churches.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Accessibility codes did not apply to churches as they did to other public buildings
- Scope of the work in question had been reduced
- The applicant had addressed the concerns the Board had put forth satisfactorily
- Hardware for the doors should be reviewed by staff prior to installation
- Matched the style and number of lites around the French door

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE application HP2023-0087 finding that the revisions to the application met the Secretary Standards for the District. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

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

7. Certificates of Appropriateness

7. (a) HP2024-0001 – John Valdes & Associates – Applicant Partners Team One LLC – Owner 26 Toques Place

To replace existing siding with new.

Ms. Courtney read the staff report and said based on a review of the AGHP, and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds that the board can APPROVE a Certificate of Appropriateness at 26 Toques Place if the Board can make the following findings:

1. That the replacement of the existing cedar wood siding with new on the side and rear elevations, will be mitigated by salvaging the original siding to install on the front façade/west elevation.

2. That the new cedar siding meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation 2 and 9.

Steve Porter reviewed the application and provided physical samples of the deteriorated siding as well as the proposed replacement siding.

Ex Parte Communication:

None

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

The Board discussed:

- Added sheathing and moisture barriers would add significant longevity to the structure
- Supported salvaging and reusing as much siding as possible

- Presentation was very helpful for understanding the condition of the structure
- Either of the 2 wood replacements would be acceptable
- Pressure treated KDAT would be the best replacement for the siding
- Important to maintain the window trim and the window reveals of the outside casing on the windows
- Window details were important
- The Board expected to be able to see those details
- Complete architectural details needed to be available in the record for review
- The old windows were casing, and the replacements should match that design
- Needed to maintain the original profiles regarding the windows
- Use the correct width for the casing on the windows

MOTION

Mr. Beach MOVED to APPROVE application HP2024-0001 26 Toques Place based on the following items 1. Adding exterior sheathing and moisture barrier to all existing exterior walls, 2. Salvaging and reusing existing siding materials, 3. Maintaining the exposure of the salvaged reused siding and the new siding, 4. Maintaining the exterior casing of the windows and trim on the entire house including all openings and corners. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

VOTE ON MOTION:

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

7. (b) HP2024-0002 – John Valdes & Associates, Inc – Applicant Daniel Cava – Owner 160 Avenida Menendez

To elevate the existing building with a new pier foundation.

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 160 Avenida Menendez if the Board determines that it meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation #9 as a compatible contemporary design with the following findings:

- Proposed brick veneer and square lattice infill is an appropriate pier foundation finish
- Proposed finished height is sufficient to protect the structure with minimal impact to the streetscape.

Mr. Valdes reviewed the application.

The Board presented their Ex Parte Communication.

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi expressed concern that the character of the Avenida Menendez had changed because all the houses were being raised.

Public hearing was closed.

Ms. Seymour read an email from a neighbor at 63 Marine Street voicing concerns regarding information that indicated that the home at 160 Avenida Menendez was not only being raised but also being moved forward towards Avenida Menendez, which would block their view of the Bridge of Lions as well as the water view.

Ms. Duncan asked Mr. Valdes to respond.

Mr. Valdes confirmed that the home was being raised only.

The Board discussed:

- Compared the elevations of some of the homes in the area
- Looked at the street scape rendering to compare the height of the buildings
- Fenestration patterns did not line up, however, there was no way to avoid the issue
- Visual would be further back because the house sat further back on the property
- Suggested adding landscaping to bridge the gap
- All have had concerns regarding the street scape, however, it was unavoidable
- Needed to do a better job with the piers that were used to eliminate the stringy, vertical appearance
- Brick would be recycled and if needed, augmented with new brick
- Shared best practices

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE application HP2024-0002 to elevate the existing structure in its current location as submitted. The motion was SECONDED by MacDonald.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, MacDonald, Beach, Weaver, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. (c) HP2024-0006 – Les Thomas Architect – Applicant Darrell and Heather Barnhart – Owner 64 Marine Street

To construct a new two-story garage apartment building at the rear of the property with associated site features.

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 64 Marine Street:

1. CONTINUE to allow the applicant time to clarify details including building heights and setbacks and consider an architectural style/design more consistent with the existing Frame Vernacular style of the existing residence.

2. APPROVE if the Board determines that the applicant has provided sufficient clarification of details noted by staff and the proposed design, as proposed or modified by the HARB, meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation #9 as a compatible contemporary design.

Les Thomas reviewed the application.

The Board presented their Ex Parte Communication.

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi pointed out that Mr. Thomas had not mentioned a kitchen. She wanted to know if this garage apartment was going to be a short-term rental or used as an air B&B.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Lot depth was 144 feet
- Design was attractive
- The concern was the scale and the mass of the proposed structure
- Building was a long way from the street so visibility would not be a problem
- This was the only district in the city where Short Term rentals were not permitted
- Masonry on the ground floor and wood frame on the second floor seemed to be compatible with the downtown area
- Liked the character that the new building had
- Metal seemed like the more appropriate material to use
- Shutters needed to be wide enough to cover the windows

Mr. Beach questioned if the structure was an accessory building.

Ms. Seymour confirmed for the Board that this was an additional primary structure, which was allowed if the structure occupied the rear fifty percent of the property.

Discussion continued:

- Supported the proposed design
- First floor was nine feet as was the second floor
- Cathedral ceilings inside would facilitate taking some height off the roof line

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE application HP2024-0006 the garage apartment behind the house at 64 Marine Street as put forward in the plans. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Benoit.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Benoit, Beach, Weaver, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY¹

8. Certificates of Appropriateness – City Owned Property

8. (a) HP2024-0004 – Sarah Ryan Architect – Applicant City of St. Augustine – Owner 75 King Street

To replace existing non-historic windows with windows similar to replacements previously installed elsewhere on the building.

Staff does not make recommendations regarding city projects. The HARB should make a determination based on evidence provided.

¹ Break 2:37pm – 2:48pm

The Board provided their Ex Parte Communication.

Mark McConnell reviewed the application. He highlighted the fact that over two hundred windows had already been replaced with the proposed window on display.

Ms. Duncan asked where to find the window schedule and drawings that go with the project to see how the windows would be installed. She was concerned about what the Board was supposed to approve. She felt that each window needed to be looked at in detail to be sure that the replacements would be appropriate. She wanted to be able to look at pictures or drawings of the original windows as this was a very important historical building. She asked if there were any photos available that showed the original windows in the building.

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi expressed confusion with the actual project. She asked how many kinds of windows already existed in the building and would the installers have a proper guide or model to do the job correctly.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- There were no original windows in the building
- The replacement windows installed in the seventies did not bear any resemblance to the original windows
- Various types of windows would be necessary to match the historic windows
- In 2008, windows were ordered and replaced without HARB approval and there were still approximately one hundred additional windows in storage
- Felt that the city had not handled the project properly in the past

- Drawings were so important to show the profile and the jambs and how the window would sit in the wall
- Would not approve the windows until the details had been provided
- Kolbe windows had been approved in the past because of the raised muntin
- Seeing the original drawings for the building would help to see what had existed when the building had been constructed
- Needed baseline documentation
- This was a state appropriation that was being administered as a grant, and approval had been given by the Bureau of Historic Preservation so that the dollars could be used to pay for the replacement of the windows

Ms. Courtney read from the section of the Architectural Guidelines for Historic Preservation (AGHP) that stated; "When the historic windows were completely missing; the replacement may be an accurate restoration using historical, pictorial, and physical documentation; or may be a new design that is compatible with the window openings and the historic character of the building."

Mr. Weaver said that this was not a restoration project. He did not disagree that more information was necessary to go forward but felt that the applicant was in compliance based on how the state had given approval. He added that the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation allowed for the replacement of a non-historic window with a compatible contemporary design.

Discussion continued:

- Florida Bureau of Historic Preservation holds a lot of weight for this project
- Gathering information was difficult regarding this project
- Windows would match what had already been installed
- Kolbe made three standard muntin styles

- Best presentation possible given the way the state was monitoring the grant
- All can agree that something needed to be done with the windows
- What was being proposed was a rehabilitation
- Proposal was to match the windows that were used in the 2008 rehabilitation

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to CONTINUE application HP2024-0004 75 King Street to the April 18, 2024, HARB meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Beach, Benoit, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Mr. MacDonald asked where the Board could go to look at the old windows.

Ms. Courtney advised that there were examples on the fourth floor.

Mr. McConnell added that there were examples also where there was no finish on the inside.

8. (b) HP2023-0086 – City of St. Augustine – Applicant and Owner 143 St. George Street

Continued from December 21, 2023

To remove and replace the existing roof and gutter system to include layers of roofing and limited rotted structural framing, trim, and details; correct areas of improper flat roof slope; and change finished galvanized metal roofing material to a copper roof.

Staff does not make recommendations regarding city projects. The HARB should make a determination based on the evidence provided.

Barbara Moore reviewed the application and provided additional information to the Board regarding the options available for the replacement of the roof.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:

- It appeared that due diligence had been completed
- Historically speaking the roof was painted to prolong the life of the roof
- Proposed material did not require painting
- Historical pictures showed that the roof was painted in 1885
- Consensus was that the roof should be painted
- Felt that copper was the best selection for the roof material
- Ken Smith in a previous project, had detailed for future consideration that a brush application be used to paint the roof

Ms. Duncan asked how much progress had been made with a set of drawings for the project.

Ms. Moore advised the Board that they had not completed any drawings at this point as they wanted to be sure that the Board would approve the project. She said that the entire scope of the project would be provided for the record. She advised the Board that the project had been sent out for bids.

Ms. Duncan listed items she felt should be included in the motion such as roof detail, gutter detail, ridge detail, wall details, the fascia, and the roof to wall detail and how it worked. She said there should be enough information so that in the future the same

style and color and the way products were applied was available.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE application HP2023-0086 143 St. George Street to remove and replace the existing roof and gutter system to include layers of roofing and limited rotted structural framing, trim, and details; correct areas of improper flat roof slope; and change finished galvanized metal roofing material to a copper roof painted red using a brush application. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

After additional discussion Mr. Weaver AMENDED the MOTION to include providing architectural drawings of the details of the roof, as well as permission for the applicant to raise the windows up to eight inches to accommodate proper flashing. Mr. MacDonald SECONDED the amendment.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, MacDonald, Beach, Benoit, 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. Lopez provided a legislative update for the Board.

11. Next Meeting Scheduled Date(s)

11.(a) March 21, 2024

12. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:39 P.M.²



Catherine Duncan, Chairperson

² Transcribed by Michele Fudo