

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

Historic Architectural Review Board Regular Meeting March 21, 2024

The Historic Architectural Review Board met in formal session at 1:00 P.M., Thursday, March 21, 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

BJ Kalaidi asked how many contributing buildings were left in the Lincolnville area. She said that it seemed that there had been so many demolitions in the area that the city was on the verge of losing the Historic designation.

3. Approval of Minutes

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE the January 18, 2024 minutes as presented. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

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

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE the February 15, 2024 minutes as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Beach, Weaver,
MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES:

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. Modification and approval of Agenda

MOTION

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

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Weaver, 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) 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.

Item was heard after item 8.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 take the following actions for a Certificate of Demolition at 56 Carrera Street:

1. CONTINUE the application to allow that applicant time to provide additional information including replacement window and door specifications for the front elevation.

2. APPROVE the application with proposed mitigation of the front elevation with the following conditions and findings:

a. Conditions:

i. That specifications for the doors provided by the applicant during the meeting are sufficient and consistent with the architectural design of the building; AND,

ii. Any future window replacement being considered is addressed or additional HARB review may be required; AND,

iii. Documentation is/will be provided to ensure that the proposed windows will be installed within the window openings in a manner that matches or is compatible with the previously existing windows.

b. Findings:

i. That the proposed mitigation for the front elevation windows and doors as well as the replacement of windows on other elevations is consistent with the previous condition of the building, or compatible with its architectural style; AND,

ii. Mitigation, along with existing replacement windows on secondary elevations, if not being modified, will not impact the architectural integrity of the building in such a way that it may no longer be considered a contributing building to the Model Land Company National Register Historic District in a future update.

Ms. Duncan suggested moving this item to later in the meeting since the applicant was not present.

There was Board consensus to move the item to later in the meeting.

Josh Strickland reviewed the new information for the Board.

Ms. Duncan asked for clarification for the window. She wanted to know if the muntins were going to be raised.

Mr. Strickland advised that the photograph shown was a sample and did have raised muntins, however he would be using one over one windows, so there would be no muntins.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:

- Anderson wood clad would be a good selection for the replacement
- Every window would be one over one on the entire house

- Double door on the front porch would be like the original, fiberglass instead of a wood door
- Fiberglass was okay
- Front door was the original door that had been restored
- Anderson had a few color selections that would be more appropriate
- The screens would be held in place with clips
- Would not support a vinyl window for this project
- Windows on the side elevations would be the same

Ms. Courtney gave clarification to the Board that there were still historic windows in the house that would remain.

Discussion continued:

Mr. Strickland explained that he would have the glass reglazed and would trim the window so that it would look more like historic windows, one over one with no muntins.

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE application HP2023-0062 with the following conditions: 1. The ten wood windows that make up the second-floor old sun porch would be replaced with wood windows; 2. The old railings would be redone and reextended up as they were before; 3. The two over two sashes would be replaced with one over one PGT sashes; 4. The double doors on the front porch would be reduced in size to match the original size, they would be solid panel doors of fiberglass; 5. The front door would be restored and reinstalled; and 6. Wood screens would be installed on the front and sides. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, MacDonald, Beach, Weaver, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. Certificates of Appropriateness

7. (a) HP2024-0009 – Scott DeGregorio – Applicant Macquire Land Corp. – Owner 275 St George Street

For after the fact work including reconstruction of a previously existing second story porch and enclosure of a previously existing window 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 an after-the-fact Certificate of Appropriateness at 275 St. George Street if the HARB finds that the alterations do not significantly alter the architectural and historic character of the non-contributing building and the reconstructed second-story porch meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation #9 as a compatible contemporary design

Scott DeGregorio reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication: none

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

The Board discussed:

Mr. Weaver described the building as an ancillary building with no architectural significance. He felt that the proposed work was acceptable.

Mr. Beach noted the cantilevered style of the porch and agreed with Mr. Weaver's characterization. He asked Mr. DeGregorio to give some history of the project and how it came to the Board.

Mr. DeGregorio explained to the Board that the project had started as simple repair work but as it progressed, because of the deterioration of the structure, they had decided to replace the entire original porch.

Ms. Duncan confirmed that the railing would be reinstalled on the porch. She advised the applicant that when there was a change in the scope of a project it was important to return to staff and advise them of the change.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE application HP2024-0009 275 St. George Street for after the fact work including reconstruction of a previously existing second story porch and enclosure of a previously existing window on the west elevation. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Beach, Benoit, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. Certificates of Demolition and Partial Demolition

8. (a) HP2024-0013 – Sarah Ryan Architect – Applicant Greater St. Mary's Missionary Baptist Church Inc – Owner 69 Washington Street

For partial demolition of an institutional building, constructed c. 1920 that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and is a contributing building to the Lincolnville National Register Historic District, including replacement of doors and windows with fenestration changes on the west, north, and south elevations.

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 69 Washington Street if the HARB finds that the proposed design modifications and replacement of features, including historic materials as well as compatible substitute materials, maintain the historic character and integrity of the structure and are compatible with the historic structure's building envelope.

Sarah Ryan reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication: none

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

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

The Board discussed:

- Water was coming into the structure through windows
- No major water proofing would be done inside
- Elevated window would be paired with door dams
- Basement space was used as a common room
- History of the church was important
- Canopies above the doors looked forced
- Door did not match the window above
- Awning was added for protection
- Anything attached to the building should be whimsical and light
- The church was associated with Dr. King
- Very supportive of the project
- There was a grant in place for the work
- Canopy over the doors seemed inappropriate
- How frequently did flooding occur
- There was a pumping system in place
- The windows were very deteriorated, however not character defining
- Stucco product would be similar
- Bars on the windows were being removed

MOTION

Mr. Beach MOVED to APPROVE application HP2024-0013 69 Washington Street based on solid basement front doors, no awning, raising the basement windows as designed, infilling the base of the windowsill with a material that matches the surrounding existing material, and floodproofing it as prescribed. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Beach, Weaver, Benoit, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. (b) HP2024-0014 – Millard Builders Inc. – Applicant Josephine Amato – Owner 181 Blanco Avenue

For partial demolition of a residential building constructed c. 1910-1917 that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and a contributing building to the Lincolnville National Register Historic District, including after the fact removal of front and rear porches and proposed wholesale replacement windows and siding with new.

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 181 Blanco Street if the HARB find that the proposed partial demolition and replacement features, including historic materials as well as compatible substitute materials, maintain the historic character and integrity of the structure and are compatible with the historic structure's building envelope.

Alec Millard reviewed the application.

The Board presented their Ex Parte Communication

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

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

The Board discussed:

- Removal of the asbestos cement shingle was a positive step
- Some of the elevations appeared to be in fairly good shape
- Salvage as much wood as possible and reuse in a less conspicuous area

Mr. Millard advised the Board that all of the windows were damaged and were not able to be salvaged. He said that the siding was worse in some areas than others.

Mr. Weaver said that once the fifty percent threshold was reached, wholesale replacement was acceptable.

- Front area had been opened up and looked nice
- House would be lifted
- Sheeting would be added, and house would be insulated properly
- Match the window details as they were currently, including the trim
- Roofing would remain as is
- Decking material for the front porch would not be tongue and groove
- Supportive of the project
- There was sufficient evidence that the siding was not salvageable
- Would use 2x4 window corners to have the same reveal
- Maintain the 32-inch width window opening
- Wood rot was evident on the house
- Advantage of removing the wood would be having an underlayment on the house for protection
- Should HARB review applications in the historic districts before permitting process starts

- The Development Review Committee was available for applicants
- Lincolnville was under a different review authority because of the location
- The structure was noted as a contributing structure in the Lincolnville area
- As long as the mass of the building remained the building would still be considered contributing per the National Park Service.
- Replacement windows would have exterior muntins

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE application HP2024-0014 with the following conditions and/or confirmations. 1. The replacement siding would be the Hardy Lap Siding; 2. The lap reveal would be such that it match the existing reveal; 3. The trim around the windows and the corner trim would be 2 by material to the same width of the existing casings to provide the same reveal that was there originally; 4. The gable end facing the street would be restored or replaced with wood cedar shakes; 5. The house would be elevated per the plans provided; and 6. The applicant will confirm the window proportions existing versus what is provided in the window sheet. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Beach, Weaver, Duncan

NAYES: MacDonald

MOTION CARRIED¹

9. Planning and Building Staff Communications

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

Ms. Courtney addressed the upcoming changes that would be occurring in the permitting process due to the changes in the state statutes.

Mr. Benoit asked how the staff wanted to address violations that were observed informally in the future, as they seemed to be cumbersome after the fact, when they did come before the Board.

Ms. Courtney said that there was no code enforcement officer specifically tasked with identifying violations, however reported violations could potentially become a code enforcement issue.

Mr. MacDonald said that when he saw a flagrant issue he sends an email to report the problem. He agreed that after the fact was more difficult to work through, however he added, that if these issues were not dealt with, there would be more in the future.

Mr. Benoit asked how the Board could help to develop a better line of communication between city planning and the homeowner or contractor. He said that the portal was an option but did not always give the updated information needed.

Ms. Duncan felt that the system would be less cumbersome if there was a way to have a conversation with an official.

Mr. Benoit and Ms. Duncan thanked the Board for the opportunity to serve.

Ms. Courtney thanked Mr. Benoit and Ms. Duncan for their service.

10. Other Business

Mr. Weaver nominated Mr. MacDonald as Chairperson and Mr. Beach as Vice Chair for the Board.

There was consensus among the Board for Mr. Weavers nominations.

¹ Break 2:40 to 2:51

11. Next Scheduled Meeting Date(s):

a) April 18, 2024

12. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:51P.M.²

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Catherine Duncan', written over a horizontal line.

Catherine Duncan, Chairperson

² Transcribed by Michele Fudo