

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

Historic Architectural Review Board Regular Meeting
August 21, 2025

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

None

2.Approval of Minutes

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE the July 15, 2025 minutes with the following corrections: in the general public comments for items not on the agenda the address needed to be changed to 40 Sanford Street; for HP2025-0048 the condition for not changing the gable needed to be included. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Potter.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Potter, Weaver, Duncan, Beach

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

2.Modification and approval of Agenda

Item 7.a. HP2025-0039 was administratively continued to a date uncertain.

Item 9.a. HP2025-0011 was continued administratively to September 18, 2025.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE the Agenda with the following changes: item 7.a being administratively continued to a future date and 9.a being continued to September 18, 2025 meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Duncan.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Duncan, MacDonald, Potter, Beach

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. Certificate of Appropriateness

5. (a) HP2025-0055 – Len Weeks Construction.Design.Development, L.L.C. – Applicant
J. D. Adams, LLC – Owner
136, 138, & 138A St. George Street

To reconfigure existing storefronts with new materials and design, repair existing stucco, and install awnings.

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 152 St. George Street:

1 APPROVE as submitted or modified by the HARB if the Board finds that the storefront alterations meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation #9 as a compatible contemporary design; OR,

2 CONTINUE to allow the applicant time to submit more appropriate colors and/or designs elements.

Len Weeks and Dave Borders reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication: none

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi was concerned that there would be future changes based on the fact that there were many people involved in the project.

Public hearing was closed.

- Wood doors and wood trim for the windows was a good idea
- Painting the trim was acceptable
- The profile of the store would stay the same
- The design was simple, and the awnings would provide shade
- Confirmed that the glass façade would remain the same, only the framing would be changed
- This was a traditional recessed storefront design
- The floor tile had been installed in 2005
- Supported the revised plan
- Agreed the awnings looked good
- The paint selections were acceptable
- This building had a 1950's department store look currently
- Advised that there was no historical evidence to suggest what had existed for the window framing, it could have been cast iron, but was certainly metal

- There was no break in the different storefront and should read as the same
- There was wood on the existing windows
- The new design should look consistent whether it is wood or metal
- The end corners appeared to be three inches thick
- There were no comparison photos to study

Ms. Courtney asked the Board to comment on the color selections.

Mr. Weeks said that they had chosen colors from the available pallet and that they were selected based on what they thought the colors should be.

Mr. Border wanted to allow the tenants flexibility for the color selection while maintaining uniformity.

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE application HP2025-0055 with the awnings as shown, the lighting as shown, the center unit with a wood/terra cotta door and wood trim for the shop windows, a blue wood door on the northern unit, nothing would change on the southern unit with a conditional approval to change that door to a wood door; permission to paint the aluminum, with approved colors, if desired; the color selection as shown on the drawing would be the approved colors. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Weaver, Duncan, Potter, Beach

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. Opinion of Appropriateness

**6. (a) HP2025-0052 – Matthews | DCCM – Applicant
Sisters of St. Joseph, Inc. – Owner**

241 St. George Street
CONTINUED FROM JULY 15, 225

To construct a new institutional building on the northern portion of the property with associated alterations and repairs to existing masonry perimeter walls and new hardscape and landscape designs.

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 an Opinion of Appropriateness at 241 St. George Street:

1. APPROVE if the Board finds that the general concept as proposed or modified by the HARB meets the architectural requirements of the AGHP with understanding from the applicant that a Certificate of Appropriateness application with full architectural and construction details must be approved by the HARB prior to issuance of a building permit; AND, recommending that PZB approve required variances for the building height, yard requirements, and lot coverage/impervious surfaces as proposed or modified by the HARB; OR

2 CONTINUE to allow the applicant time to submit additional details as required by the Board for approval.

Christina Evans and Shane Larsen reviewed the application highlighting the changes that had been made as a result of the last HARB discussion.

The Board presented their Ex Parte Communication.

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

The Board discussed:

- The changes made in the plan were remarkable
- The addition of the balconies helped to break up the facade

- Verified that the balconies on the Aviles side were within the required setback
- The pergola was out of character of the design and interrupted the flow of the building
- The sisters wanted to have an outside connection within the building and the pergola allowed for that
- The design of the pergola was pulled back to lessen the prominence and could probably be adjusted
- The retention pond was there to assist with storm water retention, and it would be a feature of the landscape
- There would also be some underground features to the drainage plan
- This was an important site within the city
- Could the entire site plan be flipped
- There was access from St. George Street into this property
- The concern was that this would increase traffic on St. George Street; was there another alternative
- There was a system in place for deliveries that entered through the St. George Street gate
- Thought the roof height over the proposed balconies was too high and could be lowered
- Confirmed the setback along Cadiz to be compliant
- While an opinion of appropriateness did not require a landscape plan; wanted to know where the garden would be placed
- Wanted to see more detailing for the design as well as the materials that would be used
- The pergola on the roof should complement the design of the building
- Agreed the roof height should come down
- The massing was headed in the right direction
- Be sure to look at the existing motherhouse for the inspiration for the new building
- Differentiate the base of the new building as compared to the motherhouse

- A subtle differentiation was all that was needed
- Wanted to consider moving deliveries to the rear of the property to keep traffic off St. George Street

Ms. Lopez confirmed that the applicant was agreeable to a continuance.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to CONTINUE application HP2025-0052 at 241 St. George Street to the September 18, 2025 meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Potter.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Potter, MacDonald, Duncan, Beach

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY¹

7. Certificate of Demolition and Partial Demolition

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

CONTINUED FROM JUNE 18, 2025

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.

This item was administratively continued to the September 18, 2025 meeting. See item four.

7. (b) HP2025-0025-AVS Builders, Inc.- Applicant Elliot C. Pacetti & Wanda Wicker – Owner **24 Macaris Street**

CONTINUED FROM APRIL 17, 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

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 24 Macaris Street:

1 APPROVE as a partial demolition if the Board finds that the proposed alterations, as proposed and/or modified by the HARB and including what was previously approved under HP2025-0008, maintain the historic character and integrity of the structure and are compatible with the historic structure's building envelope; and removal of the chimney will not compromise the overall historic character and integrity of the structure; OR

2 CONTINUE the application if the HARB finds that the proposed work constitutes a full demolition that requires additional information related to structural integrity of the building or evidence of undue economic hardship.

James Whitehouse and Victor Saris reviewed the application.

The Board presented their Ex Parte Communication to include Mr. Weaver and Mr. MacDonald advising that they had had a phone call with James Whitehouse regarding 24 Macaris Street prior to the August 21, 2025 meeting advising that the application would change from a full demolition request to a partial demolition with changes to reflect the concerns of the Board.

Public hearing was opened.

¹ Break 3:16 – 3:27 pm

BJ Kalaidi wanted to know if the proposed changes would take away the contributing status of the building.

Charles Pappas felt that the partial demolition was really a full demolition as there was merely a shell left of the house. He said that in this case, there were people who were trying to do something and were willing to rebuild to preserve the character of the neighborhood.

Thomas Bird asked if anyone had visited the building. He said the house was "junk" and he felt that the board was giving the owner a difficult time.

Public Hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

Mr. Weaver said that the building was intact upon purchase. He asked if the applicants had done the due diligence when they purchased the house. He asked what the difference was between what had been approved previously and what was proposed today.

Mr. Whitehouse advised that a structural engineer had advised that the original approval could not go forward because the foundation had to be replaced. He felt that since the house had to be lifted it should be okay to center the house on the lot to allow for driveway access to the garage. He said that the chimney from the previous approval was allowed to be removed if it would not survive the lifting.

- This was now a partial demolition
- Having the porch across the entire front was acceptable
- Confirmed that the dormer window would remain
- Verified the house was going to be moved about seven to eight feet
- Saving and reconstructing the chimney was encouraging
- The garage addition was acceptable

- Verified that the windows would be staying in the same location and would be replaced
- The siding should not go to the ground, piers and lattice would be an acceptable finish for the house
- Confirmed that the façade of the building would remain and the chimney would be rebuilt in a different location
- Keeping the chimney was a good faith effort and was acceptable
- There was no way to clearly identify how the chimney was attached to the house until it was removed
- Had the applicant considered raising the house since it would be lifted
- Any skirting should cover any foundation piers
- Lifting the building to ten feet was acceptable
- Salvage the material from the chimney and try to put it in the same location on the opposite side of the house
- The windows that were located by the chimney should be moved as well

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE application HP2025-0025 at 24 Macaris Street to raise the structure and move it seven to eight feet to the west; to rebuild the foundation to create a finished floor elevation of ten feet, nine feet plus one; to rebuild the chimney with as much original material as possible on the west side of the house; to follow the window patterns as suggested by the board on elevations submitted to record. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Weaver, Duncan, Potter, Beach

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. Certificate of Appropriateness – Large Scale Projects

8. (a) HP2025-0054 – National Park Service – Applicant & Owner
1 S. Castillo Drive

To make improvements to the existing sea wall, including height increases to match the tallest portion of the wall and general repairs; to construct a new ADA boardwalk and steps to the north; and, to construct a new fee station along with associated landscape and hardscape changes throughout the property.

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 1 S. Castillo Drive if the Board finds that the proposed seawall improvements, new fee booth, and hardscape modifications are consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation #9 as a compatible contemporary design.

Jackie Brower and Gordie Wilson reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication: none

Public hearing was opened.

Leslee Keyes thanked Mr. Wilson for his contributions over the last many years of his service.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- The overall design was very good
- The ticket sale building should have wood shingles as there were no apparent fire hazards in the area
- Comfortable with the project
- The wood shingle would be nice but what was approved was fine

Mr. Weaver asked if the application was an advisory opinion or could the board make changes to the plan.

Ms. Lopez said she perceived this as a cooperative effort.

- Pleased to see that the plan was to raise the wall
- The security gate and fence were to disallow people from getting into the fort without paying
- Light fixtures would not change substantially.
- Agreed that authentic cedar shake shingle would be a better alternative
- Would any materials be reused
- The coquina was not a very good construction material
- SHPO advised that the center wall was the most important and using granite on the adjacent walls was a better idea
- Booth light fixtures should be a higher quality fixture that would last longer in the salt air environment

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE application HP2025-0054 at 1 Castillo Drive; based on the presentation and because it had been thoroughly reviewed by the Florida SHPO and found to be in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, MacDonald, Duncan, Potter, Beach

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY²

8. (b) HP2025-0053 – Rogers Towers, PA – Applicant
Kasam Hospitality, Inc. – Owner
24 Cathedral Place and Charlotte Street
(PID 197200000)

² Break 4:42 – 4:52 pm

To construct a commercial building on the west side of Charlotte Street and south side of Treasury Street to flank a new parking garage on the existing parking lot, related to an adaptive use project of the existing buildings.

Ms. Courtney read the staff report and said based on a review of the AGHP, reviews and discussions by the HARB during the previous Opinion of Appropriateness hearings, and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds that the HARB can take the following actions related to the new buildings, landscape, site plan, and other related features and design elements proposed in a Certificate of Appropriateness at 24 Cathedral Place and Charlotte Street:

CONTINUE to allow the applicant to incorporate any revisions recommended by the HARB and to include the planned review of the architectural plans for the existing historic buildings and proposed new buildings fronting Charlotte and Treasury Streets.

Freemont Latimer, Mike Koppenhauser, Les Thomas, and Ellen Avery-Smith reviewed the application focusing on the landscape plan.

Ex Parte Communication: none

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi asked why the landscape was being discussed prior to the building being approved

Ms. Avery-Smith advised that the staff had requested that the project be broken into separate parts as it was so large. She said that the landscape would be installed as the building was constructed

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Would the doors to the courtyards be open for the public to experience the design
- The larger courtyards should have a tree larger than an olive tree
- The olive tree would grow to a large tree and provide shade on the sidewalk
- A well would not be appropriate historically, a fountain would be a better idea
- There were a lot of hardscapes that needed some softening of that feature
- It appeared that there would still be a wall along the street rather than an in and out flow
- Suggested a sour orange tree as an alternative to the olive tree
- The selection of the palm tree was due to the limited soil volume along the sidewalk
- Spineless Yucca, which looked like the Spanish Bayonet and Podocarpus, were not AGHP approved plants
- The bougainvillea plant had thorns and could be dangerous as well, but was easily pruned
- The hanging plants would be placed on the streetlights, which were very sturdy
- Reminded the applicant of the archeology factor in the area
- Thought lowering the walls to the courtyards would allow for better visibility for pedestrians
- Vagrancy could be a problem in the courtyards, and any changes would have to factor that in
- Making the walls less opaque could be a solution to the problem

Ms. Lopez advised that since this was private property the owner had the ability to handle certain problems on their own.

- Wanted the courtyards to be more functional
- Thought that the gates or walls to the courtyard could be iron work fences
- Interaction with the public was important
- Felt that changing the gates to metal work would be the best option

Ms. Lopez advised that having trees that dropped fruit on the sidewalk was not a good idea.

- Courtyard C had been left shallow as there would have to be a place for the utilities
- The drop off into the hotel garage was valet only

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to CONTINUE application HP2025-0053 at 24 Cathedral Place and Charlotte Street to the September 18, 2025 meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Potter.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Potter, MacDonald, Duncan, Beach

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

9. Certificate of Appropriateness – City owned property

9. (a) HP2025-0011 – CBVR Telecom Design Group and Cellco Partnership Successor in Interest to Verizon Wireless – Applicant

City of St. Augustine - Owner

Various areas within/adjacent to existing City rights-of-way within Historic Preservation Zoning Districts 1 through 5.

CONTINUED FROM MARCH 20, 2025

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

This item was administratively continued to the September 18, 2025 meeting. See item four.

9. (b) HP2025-0056 – Marquis Latimer + Halback, Inc – Applicant

City of St. Sugustine – Owner

Various City Properties and Rights-of-Way within Historic Preservation Zoning

Districts 1 through 5 (PIDs 196050000, 1961500001, 1960400001, 1995700000)

To install new landscape plantings.³

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

Jeremy Marquis reviewed the application advising that this was the first stage of the project to relandscape the city with the directive from the CRA.

Ex Parte Communication: none

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi was concerned about CRA tax dollars being used for maintenance for the proposed plantings.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- There would be various plantings, some would be in irrigated areas and others would be more drought tolerant depending on the location
- Confirmed that this project was designed to be ready for the nights of lights season
- The selected plantings looked good
- Would like to see the garden by the VIC expanded
- Concerned that the roots of the proposed live oaks would destroy the streets
- There was some concern; however, the DOT had a system that allowed the roots to turn away from any underground pipes and the area proposed for planting had ample room for the roots to grow
- Any ground disturbance over 3 inches deep would need to have an archeological review.

MOTION

³ 6:17 pm Mr. MacDonald left the meeting

Ms. Potter MOVED to APPROVE application HP2025-0056 replanting various city properties and rights-of-way within the historic preservation zoning districts one through five. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Potter, Weaver, Duncan, Beach

NAYES: NONE

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

12. Next Scheduled Meeting Date(s)

12. (a) September 18, 2025 – Regular Meeting

13. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:59 P.M.⁴



Brad Beach, Chairperson

⁴ Transcribed by Michele Fudo