

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

Historic Architectural Review Board Regular Meeting October 17, 2024

The Historic Architectural Review Board met in formal session at 1:00 P.M., Thursday, October 17, 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
Linda Potter

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

Irene Areola, a local real estate agent, commented about metal roofing and how it was important to note that insurance companies did not view shingle roofs the same as metal roofs. She said that putting a metal roof on a house would effectively give the homeowner an additional ten years and up to twenty-five in total before the insurance company would require replacement of the roof.

BJ Kalaidi advised the Board that an application that had been before the HARB was mentioned at the city commission September 23, 2024 meeting. She asked the Board to watch the meeting and make themselves aware of the commentary.

3. Approval of Minutes

None

4. Modification and approval of Agenda

HP2024-0050 requested a continuance to the November 21, 2024 meeting.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE the Agenda as presented that included the continuance of item HP2024-0050. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Beach, Potter, Duncan, MacDonald

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. Public Comments related to Expedited Hearing items:

NONE

6. Continued Items from Previous Meetings

6. (a) HP2024-0039 – Jason Canning Architect Inc – Applicant Bishop of the Diocese of St. Augustine – Owner 35 Treasury Street
Continued from July 18, 2024

To construct two pergolas with retractable covers in the south courtyard between the existing rectory and the Cathedral Basilica.

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 it meets 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; however, there was no response.

The Board discussed:

- The allowed colors for the awnings were white, natural, or sail cloth
- The oyster color would be preferred as it was closest to the sail cloth
- Staff confirmed the choices available
- Needed to provide a sample for the staff to approve
- The posts and beams were painted a red copper color, should the beams and posts be stained a wood color to conform with the district
- This was a mediterranean style, and the selected color matched the existing columns
- Stain would be a better selection rather than paint on the columns, in a natural color and it would also be a good method of preservation
- The project had been brought into compliance

MOTION

Mr. Beach MOVED to APPROVE application HP2024-0039 at 35 Treasury Street, based on the proposal with the condition that the wood members of the pergola would be a wood stain color, and the canvas would be a material that met the code standards and both the stain, and the canvas would be staff approved.

The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Beach, Weaver, Potter, Duncan, MacDonald

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Mr. Canning asked if both sides had to be constructed at the same time and was told no as the Certificate of Appropriateness did not expire.

6. (b) HP2024-0050 – Liannys Sanchez – Applicant and Owner

65 ½ Saragossa Street

Continued from September 18, 2024

The applicant had requested a continuance to the November 21, 2024 meeting. See item 4

For after the fact partial demolition of a residential building constructed c. 1918-1920, contributing to the Model Land Company National Register Historic District, and recorded in the Florida Master Site File, including replacement of historic wood windows in a different material and design.

7. Certificates of Appropriateness

7. (a) HP2024-0063 – Brian Molony Sharkey – Applicant

Brian Molony and Shirley Anne Sharkey – Owner 56 Marine Street

To construct an in-ground pool toward the rear/west property line 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 APPROVE a Certificate of Appropriateness at 56 Marine Street if the HARB finds that the design meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation #9 as a

compatible contemporary design and because the proposed pool has minimal visual impacts from Marine Street.

Brian Molony Sharkey reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication: none

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

The Board discussed:

- The pool seemed very minimal
- No issues with the proposal
- There was concern with the archaeology of the area.
- Indian artifacts had been found at the site
- The pool equipment was screened
- The lighting on the wall appeared too contemporary
- Down lighting provided for safety
- In the future if there was going to be a deck installed, it would require a return to HARB
- An archeological review would be required
- Any artifacts found would belong to the property
- The board could give the option of raising the pool height if there were artifacts found
- Twenty-four inches would be the highest practical height for the pool wall
- Needed to do what was possible to minimize any damage to any old items that existed underground
- Reducing the depth on the deep end of the pool would be a better way to address the archeological issue

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE Certificate of Appropriateness HP2024-0063 at 56 Marine Street to construct an in-ground pool with a maximum depth of four- and one-half feet. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Potter.

Ms. Courtney advised that it was imperative that the contractor notify the city archeologist prior to starting the project.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Potter, Duncan, Beach, MacDonald

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. Certificates of Demolition and Partial Demolition

8. (a) HP2024-0065 – A. Kroll Construction – Applicant

Donna R & Scott G Wendler – Owner
132 King Street

For partial demolition of a residential building, constructed c. 1910-1914, that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and contributing to the Model Land Company National Register Historic District, including replacement of an existing window opening with a door on the front facade.

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 132 King Street if the HARB finds that the proposed alteration maintains the historic character and integrity of the structure, is compatible with the historic structure's building envelope, and will not compromise the overall historic character and integrity of the structure.

Allen Kroll reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication: none

12 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.

The Board discussed:

Ms. Potter asked about the justification for the additional door on the front of the building

Mr. Kroll explained that this would give access to the front porch from the bedroom suite on the other side. He described the way it would look upon completion with proper spacing and a windowsill for the other window.

Ms. Duncan said that the window on the front looked the most authentic. She did not think that it was appropriate to install another door. She felt that it would change the character of the building. She wanted to see drawings that would show how this would look upon completion. She said replacing the French door to match the original door on the west side of the porch was fine.

Mr. Beach agreed that having three doors was excessive and out of character for the area. He was concerned that there were a lot of unknowns and until there was more information, he was not comfortable moving forward.

Mr. MacDonald agreed that there was not enough information to decide. He made a modification suggestion to the applicant, that included using the existing door as an entry door to a vestibule.

Ms. Duncan felt that Mr. MacDonald's suggestion was the best option for the applicant as she thought that the plans presented by the applicant were too random.

Donna Windler was sworn in for the record and she described what she was trying to accomplish with the proposed modifications.

Ms. Seymour explained that if the replacement window matched what existed, staff could approve those windows.

Ms. Courtney reminded the Board that the windows had not been approved for replacement and with the appropriate

product, they could be in the future. She said that the building was contributing to a National Register Historic District, which allowed the Board to dictate what products were used in restoration efforts.

Mr. Weaver agreed that without proper design drawings, there was not enough to decide about potentially changing the front fenestration of the building.

Mr. MacDonald asked the applicant if a continuance was acceptable.

MOTION

Ms. Duncan MOVED to CONTINUE application HP2024-0065 at 132 King Street to the November 21, 2024 meeting for the applicant to determine if they want to proceed, and if they are going to proceed they need to bring back drawings and visuals for review. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Duncan, Weaver, Potter, Beach, MacDonald

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. (b) HP2024-0064 – Mary Garden – Applicant Mary B. & John A. Garden – Owner 44 Sylvan Drive

For partial demolition of a residential building constructed c. 1956 that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and contributing to the Fullerwood Park Residential National Register Historic District including replacement of the existing roof in a different design and material.

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 44 Sylvan Drive if the HARB

can make the findings that the proposed replacement roof material maintains the historic character and integrity of the structure and is compatible with the historic structure's building envelope; and, changing of the existing roof material will not compromise the overall historic character and integrity of the structure with the following condition:

1. The replacement metal panel be a more historically appropriate design as recommended by the HARB.

Mary Garden reviewed the application. She was concerned that another house in the area had installed a metal roof and had not appeared before the HARB. She did not understand why her house had to appear for the same work and was told that the other house had "slipped through the cracks".

Ms. Seymour explained that permits are routed to the HARB office from the building department after an initial review.

Ms. Courtney expanded on the explanation to the Board telling them that the permit had not been denied, it had been sent to HARB for review.

Ex Parte Communication: none

17 certified notices were sent, 8 were returned in favor, 0 were returned opposed and 8 had comments.

Public hearing was opened.

Charles Pappas said that changing from a shingle roof to the metal roof would bring back the history of the structure, as well as longevity. He noted that other homes in the area already had metal roofs.

Irene Areola stated that the city staff worked hard to preserve the city. Her concern was more about the insurance aspect of home ownership. She said that a metal roof would give a homeowner ten more years with the insurance companies.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

Ms. Courtney told the board that the applicant had been advised that if she chose a metal shingle roof then staff could administratively approve the application.

- Sympathetic to the applicant; however, the lowest possible profile should be used
- There needed to be a compromise with the integrity of the building and the reality of what homeowners were facing
- Metal roofs appeared to be common on ranch style homes in the area
- Roof replacement was a necessity
- Needed to address the profile of the metal roof that would be installed
- The metal shingle would not afford the desired look

Ms. Seymour described the different roof materials under consideration.

- The roof that had been replaced near the applicant's home, when looked at in context, had a much lower profile than the examples that had been provided
- The design of the proposed roof material was intended to extend the life of the roof and the look was very subtle
- The selected material was appropriate for the area

Ms. Lopez advised the Board that simply because someone obtained a permit without the entire process being completed, it would not set precedent.

Mr. Weaver concluded that the opinion of the Board was this was an appropriate replacement material for the roof in that area.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE Certificate of Demolition and Partial Demolition HP2024-0064 for 44 Sylvan Drive to approve a metal replacement roof

as presented by the applicant. The motion was **SECONDED** by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Beach, Potter, Duncan, MacDonald

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY¹

8. (c) HP2024-0066 – Arkon Builders Corp – Applicant

First United Methodist Church – Owner
118 King Street

For partial demolition and possible reconstruction of the west tower of a church building, constructed between 1910 and 1917, that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and contributing to the Model Land Company National Register Historic 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 **CONTINUE** a Certificate of Demolition for Partial Demolition at 118 King Street to allow the applicant additional time to provide necessary information including a structural condition assessment report and replacement plans.

Freddy Restrepo reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication: none

15 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.

The Board discussed:

- The top third above the cornice line appeared to be structurally unsound

- If the bad section was to be replaced, there needed to be drawings provided
- It did not appear that the tower needed to come down, but needed to have the brick repointed
- Thought the building was individually eligible for the National Register
- Felt that this was a very important building in the Gothic Revival style
- The tower was a very important feature of the building, and the board needed to be convinced that the demolition was necessary
- The structural analysis said there was mortar and grout loss between the bricks
- It would be less expensive to do the work on the brick than to take the entire section down
- The engineer report advised to take the structure down because of safety issues
- Suggested installing a steel four square attached with angle all around which would provide something to put the roof on
- The structure could easily be stabilized
- Needed to inform the church of the cost of the project
- The building would be eligible for an historic preservation grant
- Stabilization and renovation should be the focus of the project and maintaining the integrity of the building

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to CONTINUE application HP2024-0066 118 King Street First United Methodist Church to the November 21, 2024 meeting. The motion was **SECONDED by Mr. Beach.**

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Beach, Potter, Duncan, MacDonald

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

¹ Break 2:49 – 2:57 pm

**8. (d) HP2024-0057 – Kevin and Kai
Priester – Applicant and Owner
51 Florida Avenue**

To demolish a residential building, constructed c. 1959, 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 51 Florida Avenue because it is not a local landmark or otherwise designated as an historic building.

Kevin Priester reviewed the application

Ex Parte Communication: none

14 certified notices were sent, 2 were returned in favor, 0 were returned opposed and 1 had comments.

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

The Board discussed:

- Any plans for the new structure
- Intent was to live in the house; however, after a review by two contractors, demolition seemed to be the best plan and currently there were no plans for the new structure
- If approval was granted, the applicant would have up to two years to submit plans for a permit
- Would there be any materials that could be salvaged, like the wood flooring
- There did not appear to be anything that could be salvaged

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE Certificate of Demolition HP2024-0057 at 51 Florida Avenue to grant full demolition with the condition that the demolition be

delayed until a permit is pulled for the new structure. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Beach.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Beach, Potter, Duncan, MacDonald

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**9. Certificate of Appropriateness for a
Historic Preservation Ad Valorem Tax
Exemption**

**9.(a) HP2024-0059 – Elaine Darnold –
Applicant Elaine H. and Kenneth W.
Darnold – Owner 121 Kings Ferry Way**

To review parts I, II, and III of a Historic Preservation Ad Valorem Tax Exemption application, to certify completion of interior and exterior restoration and rehabilitation of a residential building, constructed between 1885 and 1894, that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and contributing 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 Parts I and II of the Historic Preservation Ad Valorem Tax Exemption at 121 Kings Ferry Way 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 scope of work to the exterior and interior of the existing building 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)

Elaine and Kenneth Darnold reviewed the application.

Mr. MacDonald asked for clarification of the part three portion of the review.

Ms. Courtney explained that part three would be reviewed when the project was completed to certify the completion according to the Secretary of the Interior Standards of Rehabilitation.

Ex Parte Communication: none

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

The Board discussed:

Mr. Weaver asked how close to completion the project was. He said that typically the application would come before the board prior to starting any work; however he supported the project, and it appeared that part one was complete with good documentation and the submitted plan had been partially executed.

Mr. MacDonald asked if everyone agreed that part 1 and 2 was complete, and would the applicant have to return to the board for part three.

Ms. Potter advised that if any ground was disturbed, the archeology department had to be contacted for an archeological review.

Ms. Duncan commented on the restoration of the building without raising the building. She thought the applicant should use this project as an example for others.

There was a brief discussion regarding how to proceed with an approval for this project.

Ms. Lopez suggested that the project be on the next agenda as an expedited application. She advised that there was a need for a motion for parts one and two for this presentation and part three would be done later.

MOTION

Mr. Beach MOVED to APPROVE HP2024-0059 for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Historic Preservation Ad Valorem Tax Exemption at 121 Kings Ferry Way, based on part one qualifies being a contributing property to the Lincolnville National Register District and part two that the rehab work is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior Standards for rehabilitation for the exterior and interior and the proposed work meets the criteria established by the Department of State. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Duncan.

VOTE ON MOTION

AYES: Beach, Duncan, Potter, Weaver, MacDonald

NAYES:

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

10. Planning and Building Staff Communications

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

(Provided for informational purposes)

11. Other Business

Mr. MacDonald revisited the church and said that it would be worthwhile to get the building listed on the register to facilitate them receiving grants.

Ms. Courtney agreed and advised that it was a lengthy process.

Mr. Weaver said that the building was already listed on the National Register for the Model Land Company as a contributing building.

12. Next Scheduled Meeting Date(s)

12.(a) November 21, 2024

13. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting
was adjourned at 4:05 P.M.²



Gaere MacDonald, Chairperson

² Transcribed by Michele Fudo