

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

Historic Architectural Review Board Regular Meeting
May 16, 2024

The Historic Architectural Review Board met in formal session at 1:00 P.M., Thursday, May 16, 2024, in the Alcazar Room at City Hall, St. Augustine, Florida. Gaere MacDonald, Chairperson, called the regular meeting to order, and the following were present:

1. ROLL CALL:

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

City Staff:

Julie Courtney, Historic Preservation Officer
Candice Seymour, Historic Preservation Planner
Isabelle Lopez, City Attorney
Michele Fudo, Recording Secretary

<u>2. General Public Comments for Items not on the Agenda</u>	<u>5. Recommended Expedited Hearing Items (to be recommended one week in advance)</u>
None	<u>5. (a) HP2023-0031 – RCZ LLC- Applicant and Owner 118 Lincoln Street</u>
<u>3. Approval of Minutes</u>	To consider a one-year extension request for a Certificate of Demolition allowing demolition of a residential building, constructed ca. 1958, that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and is a non-contributing building to the Lincolnville National Register Historic District, originally approved on May 18, 2023
MOTION Mr. Beach MOVED to APPROVE the March 21, 2024 minutes as presented. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver. <u>VOTE ON MOTION:</u> AYES: Beach, Weaver, Duncan, MacDonald NAYES: NONE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY	Ronald Rideman, Chase Rideman, and Zachary Rideman Ex Parte Communication: none
<u>4. Modification and approval of Agenda</u>	Public hearing was opened; however, there was no response.
MOTION Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE the Agenda as presented. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.	The Board discussed: After a brief discussion including an explanation of the reason behind continuing the Certificate of Demolition the Board was in support of an approval.
<u>VOTE ON MOTION:</u> AYES: Weaver, Beach, Duncan, MacDonald NAYES: NONE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY	

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE expedited item 5.a. HP2023-0031 at 118 Lincoln Street. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Duncan.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Duncan, Beach, MacDonald

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. Certificate of Appropriateness

6. (a) HP2024-0017 – A.D. Davis

Construction Corp – Applicant

Edmiston Family Trust – Owner

17 Cordova Street

For after the fact approval and continued replacement of second story wood windows with aluminum clad windows of the same 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 for after the fact and continued replacement of second story windows at 17 Cordova Street if HARB finds that the proposed aluminum clad windows meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation #9 as a compatible contemporary replacement that duplicates the design size and overall appearance of the original wood windows on the non-historic structure.

Ex Parte Communication: none

Mr. Davis and James Black reviewed the application.

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

The Board discussed:

- Clarified that one second floor window would be replaced with aluminum clad,

- and on the first-floor wood replacements would be used
- Original second-floor windows were wood and were replaced with aluminum clad that had not technically been approved
- A letter provided in the packet from 2021 listed the requirements for windows in HP-3
- Understood at the time that what was allowed was to replace second floor and keep first floor wood
- Understood city code which required a wood window replacement
- Original building was constructed in the spirit of HP-3 where the materials should be historic
- There was a higher standard in HP-3 district
- The letter included in the packet advised that HARB approval was needed for project
- There were other buildings near this property that had aluminum clad windows; however, the properties were a PUD
- Any PUD was decided on a case-by-case basis
- Felt that the timing of first replacement was during a time when communications were difficult.
- Written evidence was not in favor of the applicant
- Comparing other buildings was not a reason to avoid HARB review
- Viewed from the street the difference in the windows was not noticeable
- Building was constructed in 1988
- There were other circumstances such as new construction, upper floor location, that could lead to an approval
- Windows appear to follow the spirit of the windows that exist currently and were on the second floor
- Wood windows were very challenging
- Authenticity of the wood for HP-3 would maintain the spirit of history
- After the fact was challenging for the Board

- Would use a wood sash at the street level on the front of the building as a compromise
- The sash compromise would be acceptable to the Board, and was a viable compromise
- The color and the sheen of the sash had to match existing sashes

MOTION

Ms. Duncan MOVED to APPROVE HP2024-0017 at 17 Cordova Street with the change of replacing the sashes with real wood sashes to match the original configuration of the windows, the paint must match the color and sheen of the aluminum on the frame of the existing windows so that the two are seamless and any new windows would have to be all wood unless approved by HARB. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Duncan, Weaver, MacDonald

NAYES: Beach

MOTION CARRIED 3/1

6. (b) HP2024-0022 – Les Thomas

Architect – Applicant

Ocean Breezes Real Estate, LLC – Owner

50 Marine Street

Mr. MacDonald recused himself from the item.¹

To install a new paver patio and construct a pergola at the rear of the building; and, to construct a new low wall along the front property line.

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 50 Marine Street if the HARB makes the following findings:

1. The proposed masonry wall and pergola meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation #9 because:
 - a. The masonry wall, as proposed or modified at the Board's recommendation, was a compatible contemporary feature designed to limit obscuring visibility to and from the property.

- b. Impacts of the proposed pergola were mitigated because it would not be visible from the street.

Les Thomas reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication: none

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

The Board discussed:

- Pergola in the back seemed fine
- Continuity of the height of the wall with the neighboring property would be a good feature
- There was a limited amount of repurposed block available for the wall
- There was a post-colonial setback system in place
- Proposed height of the wall would not obscure the character of the building
- Pergola was in a logical place

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE item 6.b. HP2024-0022 50 Marine Street to install a new paver patio and construct a pergola at the rear of the building and to construct a new low wall along the front property line to the height proposed in the application. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Duncan.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Duncan, Beach

NAYES: NONE

¹ Recusal form attached to original minutes

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. Certificate of Demolition and Partial Demolition

7. (a) HP2024-0018 – Kenan Wang – Applicant Lindsey M. Davis & Michael P. Casto– Owner 12 Palmetto Avenue

To demolish a residential building constructed c. 1917-1924 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 take the following actions for a Certificate of Demolition at 12 Palmetto Avenue:

1. CONTINUE the application and direct staff to provide a follow up report at a subsequent meeting to explore if there is sufficient integrity and significance to warrant local landmark designation, which would make the building eligible for preservation incentives;
2. APPROVE the application because the structure is not a local landmark or otherwise designated as a historic building, and the board finds that the structure is not a candidate for local landmark designation, that there is no economic hardship, and that the building's demolition does not impact the architectural/historical integrity of the city;
3. If approving, the HARB can consider the following conditions:
 - a. For exterior and interior salvageable historic materials to be salvaged, 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.

- b. Archival documentation per Section 28-89(2)d6: In accordance with Sec. 28-29 (2)d6 the board may also require at the applicant's expense the recording of the structure for archival purposes prior to demolition. The recording may include, but shall not be limited to, photographs and measured drawings.

Matt Stevens and Kenan Wang reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication: none

22 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:

- Typical cottage for the area
- Felt that the existing structure could be renovated
- Concerned about what type of building would replace the current structure
- Current house was raised
- Proposed house was similar in typology
- Questioned the finished floor elevation
- Thought this was a great house that needed renovation
- Porch was separating from the house
- There were possibilities for adding on to the house in the back
- Front had a nice scale and there was value in the scale of the windows
- Felt that the character of the lighthouse area would be lost with the new building
- Thought the project should be reevaluated
- Needed to follow the code and the applicants' rights
- This was a unique area with a rich history
- Would be easy to correct the lean of the house

- Consider not using slab on grade construction

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE item 7.a. HP2024-0018 12 Palmetto Avenue to demolish a residential building constructed c. 1917-1924 that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and not located in a district; and having considered the evidence presented before the Board by staff, finding that the building did not appear to meet the criteria of a historic landmark, adding item 3.a. and 3.b salvage of significant historic materials and archival documentation of the structure prior to demolition. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Beach, Duncan, MacDonald

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. (b) HP2024-0023 – Lighthouse Roofing

L.L.C. – Applicant

Leonard Masters & Norman E. Masters Jr.

– Owner 26 Fullerwood Drive

To partially demolish a residential building constructed c. 1950, that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and a contributing building to the Fullerwood Park National Register Historic District, including replacement of existing diamond pattern asbestos roof shingles in a different design and material and permanent removal of existing barrel roof ridge details.

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 26 Fullerwood Drive if the Board makes the following findings:

1. Permanent removal of the roof material, including the barrel ridges and hips, will not compromise the overall historic character of the structure.

2. The proposed substitute materials and design are compatible with the historic structure's building envelope.

3. Alteration as proposed would not impact the building's ability to be considered a contributing structure to the National Register Historic District in a future update.

Lucas Bond reviewed the application

Ex Parte Communication: none

19 certified notices were sent, 3 were returned in favor, 0 were returned opposed and 2 had comments.

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

The Board discussed:

- Roof ridge had a barrel tile look
- Ridge cap gave nice texture to the roof
- Asbestos roofing created an environmental issue
- Felt that it was unreasonable to try to save the roof
- Consider keeping the ridge cap feature on the roof
- Current roof material was very deteriorated and brittle
- There were no diamond shaped shingles available in the marketplace
- There were problems with a diamond shaped shingle
- Architectural style shingle would provide some character

MOTION

Ms. Duncan MOVED to APPROVE application HP2024-0023 at 26 Fullerwood

Drive. The motion was **SECONDED** by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Duncan, Weaver, Beach, MacDonald

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. (c) HP2024-0024 – Gerard P. & Delia M. O'Hare – Applicant & Owner
50 Weeden Street

To partially demolish a residential building, constructed c. 1904-1910, that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and a contributing building to the Lincolnville National Register Historic District, including removal and replacement of an existing rear addition, wholesale replacement of wood windows with new in a different design and material, and other modifications to the existing fenestration related to building renovations and construction of a new garage.

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 for Partial Demolition at 50 Weeden Street:

1. APPROVE if the HARB makes the following findings:
 - a. Removal and replacement of the historic windows and addition will not compromise the overall historic character and integrity of the structure
 - b. Replacement materials, designs, and fenestration changes as proposed or modified by the HARB, are compatible with the historic structure's building envelope and maintain the historic character and integrity of the structure
2. CONTINUE the application to make modifications to the proposed

design/material that will reduce impacts to the historic character and integrity of the structure.

James Lee, Delia O'Hare, and Gerard O'Hare reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication: none

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

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

The Board discussed:

- Did not see the demolition plans as part of the package
- Wanted to know the scope of the demolition
- The plans did not clearly show where the addition had been placed
- The front porch had not been touched
- The owner wanted to unify the structure with the same vintage style windows
- There were three different types of windows currently
- The plan was to move entrance to the front so that it would face Weeden street
- Typically, the Board would like to see more specific delineation on the plans so that any additions would stand out
- Looked at the foundation plan and asked if there was an addition on the side
- Old back porch addition would be removed and replaced with new

Mr. Weaver asked if the Board was going into an area that was not permitted, such as the post demolition work on the house.

Ms. Seymour explained that the Partial Demolition Ordinance allowed the Board to discuss future plans, such as the rear addition and the windows.

Discussion continued:

- The windows appeared to be the only historic feature of the house
- A full window survey had been provided and showed the need for replacement
- Confirmed the 2 over 2 window detail
- Muntin detail on the proposed window was very close to the original detail

- Reviewed the south elevation for the proposed porch
- Mullied windows offset the proportion of the original design of the house
- The addition looked more like part of the main structure, not an addition
- Gable roof end implied symmetry as opposed to a hip roof
- The double pair of windows on the addition and the random placement did not seem to add character to the rear elevation
- The side elevation looked off from the rest of the house
- From the actual plan, could the pair of windows next to the door be changed to a single window
- On the back, try to get the three windows to be more symmetrical
- The fenestration did not appear to be historic
- If the double window could be made one and the bathroom window be made smaller then shift upstairs windows to create symmetry
- Suggested changing gable roof to hip back

Mr. MacDonald gave a drawing to the applicant to better illustrate the changes the board was looking for.

MOTION

Mr. Beach MOVED to APPROVE application HP2024-0024 50 Weeden Street to demolish existing windows and replace with the proposed Anderson window two over two; the addition to the existing house would be based on the sketch that Mr. MacDonald provided

marking the approximate window locations and the back hip roof, the window locations were shifting on the rear and south elevation becoming single punched window openings. The motion was **SECONDED** by Mr. Weaver.²

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Beach, Weaver, Duncan, MacDonald

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. Certificates of Appropriateness – City Project

8. (a) HP2024-0020 – City of St. Augustine – Applicant
St. Johns County School Board– Owner
40 Orange Street

To make modifications to existing sidewalks and dirt paths around the Visitor Information Center's circular driveway.

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

Stephen Slaughter reviewed the application

Ex Parte Communication: none

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

The Board discussed:

- Typically, during construction, areas for sidewalks were determined
- If there was going to be any excavation, an archeological review should be conducted
- The Ordinance stated that three inches deep and over 100 square feet would require an archeological review

² Break 3:09 – 3:23

- North of Orange Street, historically, was a moat for the CUBO line, that area contained fill only

MOTION

Mr. Beach **MOVED** to **APPROVE** application HP2024-0020 40 Orange Street as designed with the condition that any excavation over three inches must have an archeological review. The motion was **SECONDED** by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Beach, Weaver, Duncan,
MacDonald

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

9. Planning and Building Staff Communication

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

(Provided for informational purposes)

10. Other Business

10. (a) Historic Preservation Month

Ms. Courtney provided a brief presentation informing the Board about the May Historic Preservation Month going on in the city. She reminded the Board they were eligible to attend conferences related to history and that there was a stipend available for individuals that wanted to attend. She said that there were also scholarships available that would cover the cost of the registration.

11. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:50 P.M.³



³ Transcribed by Michele Fudo

Gaere MacDonald, Chairperson