

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

Historic Architectural Review Board Regular Meeting
June 18, 2025

The Historic Architectural Review Board met in formal session at 1:00 P.M., Thursday, June 18, 2025, in the Alcazar Room at City Hall, St. Augustine, Florida. Brad Beach, Chairperson, called the regular meeting to order, and the following were present:

- 1. ROLL CALL:** Brad Beach, Chairperson
Linda Potter, Vice-Chairperson
Paul Weaver, III
Catherine Duncan
Gaere MacDonald

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 expressed her appreciation of the Board and said that she was disappointed that some members of the public were not considerate of the work the boards do.

3. Approval of Minutes

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE the April 17, 2025 minutes as presented. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Potter.

VOTE ON MOTION:

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

4. Modification and approval of Agenda

Item 5.a HP2025-0025 requested continuance to the July 15, 2025 meeting

Item 7.b HP2025-0033 requested continuance to the July 15, 2025 meeting.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE the Agenda with the following modifications: to continue item 5.a HP2025-0025 and item 7.b. HP2025-0033 to the July 15, 2025 meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

VOTE ON MOTION:

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

5. Certificate of Demolition - Full

**5. (a) HP2025-0025 – AVS Builders, Inc – Applicant
Elliot C. Pacetti & Wanda L. Wicker – Owner
24 Macaris Street
REQUESTING CONTINUANCE TO JULY 15, 2025**

To demolish a residential building, constructed c. 1924-1930, that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and contributing to the Fullerwood Park Residential National Register Historic District.

This item requested continuance to the July 15, 2025 meeting. See item 4.

5. (b) HP2025-0041 – John Valdes & Associates, Inc. – Applicant
Danmac LLC – Owner
156 Avenida Menedez

To demolish a residential building, constructed c. 1839, that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and contributing to the St. Augustine National Register Historic District.

Ms. Courtney read the staff report and said based on a review of the AGHP, discussion at the previous HARB meeting, additional information gathered for this meeting's review, and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds that the board can take the following actions related to a Certificate of Demolition at 156 Avenida Menedez (59 Marine Street) which includes the remaining c. 1839 building that contributes to the St. Augustine National Register Historic District, with the following finding(s):

1. To APPROVE if the Harb finds that the burden of proof has been sufficiently met by the applicant, in combination with the other evidence provided, in making the case that the structural soundness of the remaining structure is in such a condition that it is not feasible to rehabilitate for continued use or justifies the need for demolition, and/or the case for undue economic hardship has been made, and that the demolition will not be detrimental to the historic and architectural character of the city (per City Code, Sections: 28-29(1)d; 28-89(7); 28-89(3)b.
 - a. with the condition that archival documentation by the applicant as specified by the Board will be submitted to the City, and historic architectural materials will be salvaged (per City Code, Section 28-89(8)
2. To CONTINUE if the HARB finds that the case has not been sufficiently made that the structure is in such a condition that justifies demolition or that rehabilitation is not feasible and/or the burden of proof for undue economic hardship has not been met by the applicant. Plans sufficient for a Certificate of

Appropriateness for the replacement building(s) should also be submitted for concurrent approval with this Certificate of Demolition.

3. To DENY if the HARB finds that a sufficient case has not been made by the applicant (per City Code 28-89(7) and 28-29(1)d, and/or that enough evidence has been provided by the independent structural engineer's report and follow up response that the remaining historic building can be stabilized temporarily before it is rehabilitated, and/or that the full demolition of the structure will be detrimental to the historic and architectural character of the city if the applicant had not proven the denial will cause undue economic hardship (per City Code, Section: 28-29(3)b).

Mr. Beach reviewed the certified notice responses and emails received for the application.

The Board presented their Ex Parte Communication.

John Regan, Les Thomas, and John Valdes were sworn in for the record. James Whitehouse was also present representing the applicant.

Ms. Courtney reviewed the staff report. She advised the board that the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) states that seventy-five percent of the external structure and fifty percent of the internal structure should remain for a structure to be considered contributing.

Mr. Weaver wanted to confirm if Mr. Kostage would be attending the meeting. He had a procedural concern and wanted to know if it was essential that Mr. Kostage be present for questions.

Ms. Lopez advised that if determination was based on the competence of a particular individual then the testimony had to be on record.

Mr. Weaver felt that the scheduling was important and prior to testimony, it needed to be confirmed that Mr. Kostage would be in attendance.¹

Ms. Lopez advised that Mr. Kostage was forty-five minutes from the meeting and she had confirmed the applicant agreed to move the item further down the agenda.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to CONTINUE item 5b until an appropriate time for Mr. Kostage to be available for questions and to hear item 6.a at this time. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Duncan and PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

This item was heard after item 6.c.

Mr. Kostage was sworn in for the record.

Mr. Richard "Buddy" Schauland reviewed the emergency demolition request he had received. He said that his review was to determine if life would be threatened should the building collapse and he advised that he had not granted the request. He said he asked the engineers if the building would survive a hurricane, and engineers stated that the building would not survive a significant wind event. He advised the board of the time frame of hurricanes reaching Florida starting in Africa and the Gulf because he wanted to point out the time needed to bring the building down if necessary.

Mr. Regan explained how he had become involved in the project. He provided his background to show his area of expertise with historic preservation. He recapped the process by which the property at 156 Avenida Menendez had come before the board and followed the timeline of the project. He said that two separate structural engineers had the same findings; however, they had different conclusions; one favored

demolishing the building and the other favored preservation. He presented photos he had taken as examples of the poor condition the building was in (1839 portion). He went on to describe the process of shoring the building.

Mr. Thomas presented his plans for the reconstruction of the territorial building.

Kostage reviewed the engineering questions from the board.

- Confirmed the total square footage of the building to be approximately 1,200 square feet
- Needed to consider the time it would take to strengthen the building because of the neighboring buildings that could be harmed in the event of strong winds
- How much of the building was savable
- This building might be a candidate for an emergency demolition
- Timing was important
- It would take several weeks to shore up the building from a structural standpoint
- The foundation was in very poor condition and not salvageable
- The first floor was not salvageable
- The lap siding would probably disintegrate when removed because it was so old
- The expense to reinforce the building would be considerable
- Tearing down the Avenida Menedez building was a mistake because approval had been predicted on the statement that the building at 59 Marine could be saved
- The value versus saving a territorial building was worth the cost
- Thought it was a good idea to stabilize and reevaluate

Public hearing was opened.

Becky Smith said she was extremely invested in the community and had remodeled or restored several homes on

¹ Break 1:30 – 1:37 pm

Marine Street. She thought that in the future, there should be more information for historical buildings so that when they are purchased, the buyer had an understanding of the building. She was concerned that the building, as it stood was not safe.

Mr. Beach confirmed that the shoring would remain within the current footprint of the building.

Kevin Smith said that he understood the passion to save the old houses in the area. He said that the area was unique.

BJ Kalaidi said that she appreciated that the board had not discussed the application prior to the actual meeting. She felt that this was demolition by neglect.

Ms. Courtney advised that Mr. Kostage was the engineer that had been hired by the city.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

Mr. MacDonald asked if the building would qualify for any funding through SHPO.

Mr. Weaver said that grants were not available because this was privately owned. He said that there might be funds available through other historic foundations.

Mr. Regan told the board that the demolition approved in January had been conducted in March. He said that the materials were not available to make a restoration sensible. He focused on the economic analysis, stating the difference between the cost and the market value was significant. He reviewed the cost analysis that had been presented to the board prior to the meeting.

The discussion continued to include the cost of the project, economic hardship, and the concerns of the neighbors.

Mr. Beach wanted to know if there was a way to compromise.

Mr. Kostage told the board that there would have to be emergency shoring first and then shoring to allow for the reconstruction to occur.

Mr. Whitehouse told the board that they had been asked to provide the information for the economic hardship. He read from the criteria. He told the board that the economic analysis had been provided in the staff report and the board had the responsibility to review that report.

Mr. Regan presented a compromise saying that each piece of the building that could be reused would be labeled and placed where it had been originally.

Mr. MacDonald liked the idea of the deconstruct/reconstruct process for the building.

Ms. Lopez said that the board needed to be very specific to add all the details in the motion if the board was going to use the deconstruct/reconstruct method.

Mr. Regan made a proposal to include deconstructing the building, inventorying all materials and include Mr. Kostage. He said they were asking for an opinion of appropriateness to rebuild the territorial period building as presented in the plans to include the porches from the 1890 version of the building.

Regan asked for a brief recess to confer with the owner.²

Mr. Regan advised that the owner agreed to the proposed plan of deconstruct/reconstruct.

MOTION

² Break 5:28 – 5:43

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE application HP2025-0041 at 156 Avenida Menendez to approve the demolition in the form of deconstruction with effective labeling and inventory of all components to be reconstructed in the same territorial design, utilizing all labeled and salvaged components in the place from which they came. Any other salvageable elements that can be milled down for other repairs shall also be used. This program will be by agreement from the owner to be overseen by an independent city appointed engineer, the cost of the engineer will be the responsibility of the owner. There should be accurate photographic documentation of the house as it stands now to ensure that the structure is reassembled in the correct manner. There should be as built drawings of the structure. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonal, Weaver, Duncan, Potter, Beach

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. Certificate of Appropriateness

6. (a) HP2025-0037 – Patricia Dobosz – Applicant
My Tato, LLC – Owner
105 Marine Street

CONTINUED FROM MAY19, 2025

For after-the-fact and future window replacement and fenestration changes.

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 for after-the-fact and future window replacement and fenestration changes at 105 Marine Street:

1 CONTINUE the application to allow the applicant time to complete the requested window survey; or

2 APPROVE the application if the HARB finds that the new proposed replacement windows, as proposed or modified by the HARB, meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation #9 as a compatible contemporary design with the following conditions:

- a. A window survey detailing existing window types, materials, and conditions be provided to staff prior to any additional window replacement
- b. Mitigation for the unapproved windows and sliding glass door be completed per HARB specifications.

Ms. Dobosz reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication: none

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

The Board discussed:

- Typically, wood was required on at least the front (streetside) of the building
- Vinyl was not acceptable in HP-1
- The other windows could be aluminum clad
- The vinyl windows in the building should be removed
- Before any work was completed, a window schedule should be completed
- The proposed replacement window was an improvement
- The proposal appeared to be good
- Aluminum windows were allowed on secondary elevations

Ms. Dobosz wanted to continue with the current application and apply separately for future renovations.

Mr. Beach asked if there could be a condition in the motion that would cover the desire of the applicant.

Mr. MacDonald explained how to complete a window survey and agreed that the slider should be replaced.

Mr. Beach recapped the discussion; wood windows on the front elevation; aluminum clad on all other elevations was acceptable. The sliding glass door needed to be replaced as well as the fiberglass doors.

Mr. Weaver asked when the windows on the third floor had been installed and was advised that it had been three years prior. He felt that the statute of limitations had run out on the third-floor windows and thought leaving them in place would be acceptable.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE application HP2025-0037 at 105 Marine Street to allow the existing vinyl windows to be grandfathered in; the sliding door and the new vinyl door to be mitigated through drawings of appropriate replacement door to be submitted to staff; to allow the replacement of 4 pairs of windows on the south elevation with the JELWEN W5500 aluminum clad double hung sash windows one over one light configuration and continue the remainder of the window replacement until the window survey was submitted to staff and the approval could be done administratively. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, MacDonald, Duncan, Potter, Beach

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**6.(b)HP2025-0016- Casi Tafuri – Applicant
Chip Shot Properties L.L.C. – Owner
32 St. Francis Street**

CONTINUED FROM MARCH 20, 2025

For after-the-fact fenestration changes, including wholesale window replacement on the sides and rear; and to replace an existing canopy on the east elevation,

modify front balcony decking, reconstruct the rear access stairs with a new configuration, change stucco finish from rough to smooth, and modify the existing detached garage structure.

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 32 St. Francis Street if the HARB finds that the proposed work, as proposed or modified by the HARB, meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation for #9 as a compatible contemporary design.

Mr. John Ahman reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication: none

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi said that she was fairly certain that the applicant had completed the due diligence.

Public hearing was closed.

Mr. MacDonald thought that the new information provided had brought the application into compliance

Ms. Potter reminded the applicant that there should be an application for an A-14 archeological review prior to construction.

There was consensus with the Board that all requested information had been provided.

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE application HP2025-0016 at 32 St. Francis Street in its entirety as presented. If there was more than one hundred square feet of ground disturbance, archaeology would be informed. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Duncan.

VOTE ON MOTION:

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

**6.(c)HP2025-0042- Johns Valdes &
Associates, Inc – Applicant
Partners Team One LLC – Owner
26 Toques Place**

For after-the-fact approval of modification to the previously approved design and for review of new landscape and hardscape plans.

Ms. Courtney read the staff report and said based on a review of the AGHP, the previous COA reviews and approved proposed designs for the property, 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 26 Toques Place:

1 To APPROVE the after-the-fact modification to the design/orientation of the front porch steps and the other as built changes to the previously approved plans that are listed in the scope of work, and the proposed hardscape and landscape design features, if the HARB finds that these alterations and proposed new designs are compatible with the character and design of the historic building, thereby meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation 9.

- a. With the condition that the plantings be changed to either Florida native plants or species recommended by the AGHP, the vinyl trellis be changed to a wood material, and the landscape lighting is within an acceptable temperature/color range.

And/or

2 To CONTINUE the proposed new hardscape and landscape designs if the HARB finds that they are not compatible with the historic property, to allow the applicant time to make modifications to the plans more

compatible with the AGHP and recommendations of the HARB.

This item was heard before returning to item 5b.

Nick Freeman and Steve Porter reviewed the application.

Les Thomas reviewed photos of the original structure and then advised the board why the steps were moved to the side instead of keeping them out to the front.

Mr. Freeman reviewed the landscape plan advising the board of the proposed brick area that would be used for loading and unloading. He said that changing the trellis to wood would be done. He told the Board that the landscape would be placed around the proposed brick pavers.

John Valdes explained that raising the building had presented the problem with the stairway, and the concern that one parking place would be lost.

Ex Parte Communication: none

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi thought that special treatment was offered to certain applicants.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Any changes to any approved plan should come before the board
- The change in the orientation of the stairs changed the character of the building
- The door could be an acceptable contemporary design
- Wanted to see the justification for the change from single light doors to panel doors
- The landscape design was not historic in nature as proposed

- Suggested a hexagonal paver to soften the look
- The building should convey a sense of time and place.
- The building had to be raised
- The intent was to maintain the residential feel of the area
- The stairs should go back to what had been approved in the past
- Concerned that the changes had not been presented to the HARB prior to completion
- Thought that gravel would be a good substitute for the brick and would soften the look
- The changes made caused the building to no longer look like the residence that it had been in the past
- The stairs should be reoriented to retain the residential feel
- Lessen the hardscape

Mr. Valdes advised the board that they would reorientate the stairs He said he agreed that the character of the building had been changed.

Discussion continued to determine what would be appropriate for landscaping in the front of the building.

Mr. Valdes suggested recycled brick for the pavers. He told the Board that the front door had been recycled from another building.

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE application HP2025-0042 with the following conditions: landscaping on the north of the house, three parking spaces with clay pavers integrated into one space, with a separation and a pathway coming from the house with the stairs reorientated coming from the front door, a wood arbor near the Toques Place parking lot, a gable vent (faux) at the top, the six panel doors in the back of the building would stay, landscaping in the southwest quadrant and a revised

landscape plan presented to staff. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Weaver, Duncan, Potter, Beach

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. Certificates of Demolition and Partial Demolition

7. (a) HP2025-0036 – Reiter Roofing – Applicant

Peter Schirduan – Owner

19 Sevilla Street

CONTINUED FROM MAY 19,2025

For partial demolition of a residential building, constructed c. 1917-1922, that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and contributing to the Model Land Company National Historic District, including replacement of existing roof material with a different material and 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 Demolition for Partial Demolition at 19 Sevilla Street if the HARB finds that the proposed metal panel roof material maintains the historic character and integrity of the structure and is compatible with the historic structure's building envelope per the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation #9 (Compatible Contemporary Design).

Peter Schirduan reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication: none

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

The Board discussed:

There was consensus with the Board for approval.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver **MOVED** to **APPROVE** application **HP2025-0036** at **19 Sevilla Street** to replace an existing roof material with a different material and design, specifically **5 v crimp metal roofing**. The motion was **SECONDED** by Ms. Duncan.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Duncan, MacDonald, Potter, Beach

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. (b) HP2025-0033 – Gloria Daniele – Applicant & Owner

58 Riberia Street

CONTINUED FROM MAY 19, 2025

REQUESTING CONTINUANCE TO JULY 15, 2025

For partial demolition of a residential building, constructed c. 1962, that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and contributing to the Model Land Company National Historic District, including replacement of the existing decorative metal porch posts and railings with a new material and design.

This item requested continuance to the July 15, 2025 meeting. See item 4.

7. (c) HP2025-0046 – Craig and Stephanie Kiker – Applicant & Owner
66 Sanford Street

For partial demolition of a residential building, constructed c. 1905-1910, that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and contributing to the Lincolnville National Register Historic District, including wholesale replacement of existing siding with a different material and 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 Demolition for Partial Demolition at 66 Sanford Street if the HARB finds that the proposed replacement material maintains the historic character and integrity of the structure and is compatible with the historic structure's building envelope with the condition that a smooth finish Hardie material be utilized.

Craig Kiker reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication: none

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

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi asked if the building would still be contributing after the work was completed.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- This was long leaf yellow pine siding
- The Hardie board was not appropriate
- Try to retain as much of the original siding as possible
- Cedar siding could be used
- It was important to match the profile of the siding
- The original material should be used in areas that were smaller
- In order to have a uniform finish, do not use any Hardie board siding

MOTION

Mr. Weaver **MOVED** to **Deny** application **HP2025-0046** the **Hardie Board** was not an appropriate material. The motion was **SECONDED** by Ms. Duncan.

VOTE ON MOTION:

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

**7. (d) HP2025-0039 – Robert and Nancy
Irving – Applicant & Owner
93 Kings Ferry Way**

For partial demolition of a building, constructed c. 1849-1899, that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and contributing to the Lincolnville National Register Historic District, including replacement of existing siding, windows, and reconstruction of the existing 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 can CONTINUE a Certificate of Demolition or Partial Demolition at 93 Kings Ferry Way to allow the applicant time to finalize project details, determine what may be administratively approvable, and provide clear plans for those portions of the scope of work that will require HARB review.

Nancy Irving and Dan Fedeli reviewed the application, providing a sample of the proposed window for replacement.

Ex Parte Communication: none

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

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

The Board discussed:

Ms. Duncan asked if there was a window available with a more historic appearance.

Ms. Seymour said that the window company was aware of the requirements in the historic districts and worked with staff. She said that because this was not a National Historic

District, the replacement windows did not have to be wood as long as the depth and shadow lines could be matched.

Mr. Weaver felt that the windows and the siding could be administratively approved after careful review.

Mr. Weaver suggested that the applicant complete an analysis of the porch, specifically the knee wall, and provide construction drawings for the staff to review.

Ms. Seymour advised that the application could be administratively approved if there were no changes in the fenestrations.

MOTION

Ms. Potter MOVED to CONTINUE application HP2025-0039 he July 15, 2025. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Duncan.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES:

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. Certificate of Appropriateness- City Owned Property

**8. (a) HP2025-0011 – CBVR Telecom Design Group and Cellco Partnership Successor in Interest to Verizon Wireless – Applicant
City of St. Augustine – Owner
Toques Place Parking and various areas within/adjacent to existing City rights-of-way within Historic Preservation Zoning District 1 through 5**

To install new cell antennas and related cellular equipment in proposed locations.

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 take the following actions for a Certificate of Appropriateness at the proposed location adjacent to 12

Charlotte Street, 69A Cordova Street, and Toques Place Parking:

1. CONTINUE the application for all proposed antennas to allow for an analysis of other potential designs, locations, or other technology that would be less visibly impactful, or to provide more clarifying information on the real visual impact if located in this or other historically significant areas.

Or

2. DENY the application if the HARB determines any of the following:

- a. The proposed overall design of the cell antennas and related equipment is inappropriate within the historic context of its proposed location and the high visibility within the right-of-way will have a negative impact to the architectural, historical, and cultural integrity of the significant Town Plan National Historic Landmark (NHL) area and the St. Augustine National Historic District (NRHD)
- b. The cellular equipment does not meet the criteria of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SOIS) for Rehabilitation 2, 5, 8 or 9
- c. The proposed design and location cannot be mitigated in a desirable way that would meet the requirements of the AGHP and/or the SOIS.

Per State Statute 337.401(7)(k), HARB's authority is not limited to enforce historic preservation zoning regulations consistent with the preservation of local zoning authority under 47 U.S.C.s.332©(7) (see language in attachments).

Courtney Barnard and Chris Milne reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication: none

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

The Board discussed:

There was a discussion regarding the placement and appearance of the cell antennas being placed in the historic district.³

It was determined that the Toques Place parking lot and Cordova Street were acceptable locations, with additional locations to be determined at the next meeting.

MOTION

Weaver MOVED to CONTINUE application HP2025-0011 to the July 15, 2025 meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Duncan.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Duncan, Potter, Beach

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) Unlawful Demolition Bill

Ms. Courtney thanked Ms. Lopez for her work on the bill.

Florida Trust Advocacy

Ms. Courtney advised that the new state budget had removed many of the grants for historical preservation.

11. Next Scheduled Meeting Date(s)

11.(a) Tuesday, July 15, 2025 – Regular Meeting (day moved due to conflict)

³ Mr. MacDonald left the meeting at 7:13

12. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting
was adjourned at 7:31 P.M.⁴



Brad Beach, Chairperson

⁴ Transcribed by Michele Fudo