

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

Historic Architectural Review Board Regular Meeting
January 15, 2026

The Historic Architectural Review Board met in formal session at 1:00 P.M., Thursday, January 15, 2026, 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
Elyse Wiemann, Senior Recording Secretary

2. General Public Comments for Items not on the Agenda

(None)

3. Approval of Minutes

Paul Weaver asked that there be a correction to his ex parte regarding item 7.b HP2025-0053.

MOTION

Linda Potter **MOVED** to **APPROVE** November 20, 2025, minutes with the requested modification. The motion was **SECONDED** by Paul Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

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

4. Modification and approval of Agenda

Item 6.a. HP2025-0074 requested a continuance to the February 19, 2026 meeting.

Item 6.b HP2025-0080 was administratively continued.

Item 8.a HP2025-0072 requested a continuance to the February 19, 2026 meeting.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE the agenda to include the following modifications: item 6.a HP2025-0074 and item 8.a HP2025-0072 would be continued to the February 19, 2026 meeting; item 6.b. HP2025-0080 was administratively continued. The motion was SECONDED by Catherine Duncan.

VOTE ON MOTION:

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

5. Public Comments related to Expedited Hearing items:

(None)

6. Continued Items from Previous Meetings

6. (a) HP2025-0074 Central Southern Construction Services, LLC - Applicant and Owner 264 St. George Street

Continued from November 20, 2025

To install a new metal gate across an existing driveway.

This item requested a continuance to the February 19, 2025 meeting. See item four.

6. (b) HP2025-0080 Studio Femke – Applicant 58 Charlotte St LLC – Owner 58 Charlotte St.

Continued from December 18, 2025

For design changes to outdoor spaces.

This item was administratively continued. See item four.

6.(c) HP2025-0083– Shawn Lumley- Applicant Ivan Topalov - Owner 27 Grove Ave

The applicant was not present. There was Board consensus to wait until the end of the meeting to see if the applicant arrived.

This item was heard after item 10.

For after-the-fact-replacement of original wood windows with new wood windows of a different 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 take the following actions for an after-the-fact Certificate of Appropriateness at 27 Grove Avenue:

1. CONTINUE to allow the applicant time to consider a muntin pattern more appropriate to the architectural style and time period of the structure; or,

2. APPROVE, if the HARB finds that the 4/4 windows meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation #9 as a compatible contemporary design that

maintains the historic character and integrity of the structure.

Anthony Shawn Lumley reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi said this was an after-the-fact application and the windows should be fixed to match what should have been installed.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Applicant had been in communication with staff
- Not understanding the rules of the historic district was not an excuse for installing a different design
- Should have had changes approved prior to installation
- Windows were two over two lite patterns
- Windows should be replaced in kind
- Replacement window used did not make sense for the configuration that was previously on the home
- The mullion configuration was incorrect; however, the Kolby window was a good choice
- Applicant should reapply with a corrected solution
- Felt muntins should be changed
- Work with staff to make the modifications

Ms. Duncan suggested continuing the application with the intent that the applicant would fix the windows.

Mr. Lumley replied that Mr. Topalov had contacted the manufacturer trying to get the issue resolved as quickly as possible.

Mr. MacDonald agreed; he said he did not feel this application should be referred to Code Enforcement.

Mr. Weaver said he appreciated Mr. Lumley making a good faith effort by working towards a solution. He said if the applicant reached a solution, staff could approve this administratively. He added that if for some reason there was an issue, the applicant could come back before the Board.

Ms. Seymour replied if it was fixed to what was approved in the building permit, the applicant would not need to return to the Board.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to CONTINUE application HP2025-0083 27 Grove Avenue for after-the-fact replacement of original wood windows with new wood windows of a different design to the February 19, 2026 meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, MacDonald, Duncan, Potter, Beach

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. Certificates of Demolition and Partial Demolition

**7. (a) HP2025-0084 – Gulfstream Design Group, LLC - Applicant
City of St. Augustine - Owner
500 Anastasia Boulevard**

To demolish a commercial building, constructed c. 1971, that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and not located in a district.

Staff does not generally provide recommendations for city projects. The HARB must make a determination based upon the information provided.

Christina Evans, Gulfstream Designs, reviewed the application.

Ms. Potter asked if the City Archologist would be asked to come and review the area to ensure there was no impact.

Ms. Evans replied it was not in an archology zone.

Ms. Courtney commented that there were archeological zones; however, this location was not located in one of them. She said they could investigate if they chose to, but it was not a requirement.

Mr. Beach confirmed the proposed design was reviewed by the Corridor Review Committee (CRC) and approved.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

Public hearing was opened.

Roger White, the president of the North Davis Shores neighborhood association, said he was in support of the fire station coming to the area and excited for the project to start.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Design had a nice look in the sense of the scale making the building not look massive
- Liked the breeze block element as it tied into Davis Shore and the other buildings in the area
- From Anastasia Boulevard there was more of an angled view breaking the building up with different heights; very well designed
- Good location for the fire station
- Building had been altered many times, based on the evidence presented

- There was nothing significant, historically or architecturally
- In support of the demolition since it was not a historic building
- Liked the design as it was mid-century architecture
- Like the location, multiple entry points to the new building, and the design as it fit in with the area
- Supported the demolition of the existing building
- Proposed structure was a better service to the community

Mr. Weaver said the CRC had reviewed the application, did HARB have any review authority over the design.

Ms. Courtney replied that HARB did not. She said the CRC had design purview over the entry corridors.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE application HP2025-0084 a Certificate of Demolition at 500 Anastasia Boulevard with no conditions. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Potter.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Potter, MacDonald, Duncan, Beach

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. (b) HP2025-0087 – A & O Builders LLC – Applicant True Real Estate Investments, LLC – Owner 7 Saragossa Street

For partial demolition of a residential building, constructed c. 1917- 1924, that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and contributing to the Model Land Company National Register Historic District, to include after-the-fact wholesale replacement of windows with a different material and design 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 CONTINUE an After-the-Fact Certificate of Demolition for Partial Demolition at 7 Saragossa Street to allow the applicant time to consider windows and fenestration patterns of a more appropriate design for visible elevations.

Ermal Alija and Sairo Kola reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

Mr. MacDonald noted he visited the site.

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

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi spoke in support of continuing the application and stated that after-the-facts applications were coming before the Board too often. She said it did not matter how long the applicant had been in business as the City had rules that should be followed. She asked who would watch and follow up with the applicant to ensure that the partial demolition was being executed correctly.

Elizabeth Miller said she had come before the Board previously when they were new to the area and they followed the guidelines as required. She said her fear was that investors, house flippers, and others in the area were doing the same and nothing was being done. She felt that the architectural beauty of the neighborhood was being compromised.

Pete Miller said as a retired builder and contractor, he was not in support of this type of work. He said homes deserved to be renovated and not changed. He said the front of the home was gorgeous with the windows and small flanking windows and he was upset it had changed and if it had to be, it should have been changed to something that

was suitable. He said there were no repercussions for the after-the-fact demolitions. He said they worked hard to make sure the changes they made to their home were done correctly, and there seemed to be no consequences if it was not done right.

Guy Courter said the contractors were very pleasant to be around; however, the problem was the home was not as it was. He said the fourteen windows on the front had been replaced with four and they were new construction vinyl windows and the sizes of the windows were changed. He said this was a classic home and it should have been taken care of as such, but it was being destroyed.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Windows were not even close to a replacement window
 - Nothing was documented other than pictures
 - The fenestration of the home had been completely changed
 - Had a permit but the work was negligent and beyond the scope of the permit, which was unacceptable
 - Applicants should reapply with a solution to bring the home back to how it was before, replacing the fourteen windows on the porch, and repairing it correctly
 - Agreed that the work done was unacceptable and should be sent to Code Enforcement
 - The entire character of the building was changed
 - Should have to start over and comply with the requirements
 - Felt the design was beautiful with the sleeping porch on the front but the character had been completely removed
 - Windows used were very cheap vinyl and not accurate for the replacement
 - What had been done was egregious
- Previous design was unique and a compatible design needed to be used for replacement
 - Should create a window schedule
 - Exterior elevations with connection to each window showing size and configuration for each
 - Proper windows needed to be selected
 - Trim details were essential as the details of the porch wrapped around with windows and mullions; all should be reviewed by the Board
 - Evidence was destroyed and now it would be more of a custom replacement
 - Windows were very important to the home as a contributing feature
 - Needed architectural drawings with window fenestration to move forward

Mr. Beach asked how the Board wanted to proceed with the application.

Mr. MacDonald suggested sending the application to Code Enforcement and having the applicant reapply with a suitable plan. He said there had to be consequences or this would continue to happen. He said this was destroying the history of the City.

Mr. Weaver said the problem with continuing was there was nothing to continue or remediation for what was there now. He said if continued, the applicant would have to return with new documents and a new design.

Ms. Lopez asked if the Board was suggesting a motion to deny without prejudice, which would allow the applicant to apply without having to wait a year.

The Board agreed

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to DENY application HP2025-0087 7 Saragossa Street without prejudice to return with a solution. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Duncan.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Duncan, Weaver,
Potter, Beach

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. Certificate of Appropriateness - Large Projects

8. (a) HP2025-0072– Matthews | DCCM – Applicant Sisters of St. Joseph, Inc. – Owner 241 St. George Street

Continued from November 20, 2025

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.

This item requested continuance to the February 19, 2025 meeting.

9. Planning and Building Staff Communications

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

(Provided for informational purposes)

10. Other Business

Isabelle Lopez, City Attorney, provided a legislative update regarding items that could potentially affect historic preservation.


The Board had a brief discussion regarding the update and asked Ms. Lopez to send them information on the bills that were being reviewed.

11. Next Scheduled Meeting Date(s):

a). February 19, 2026- Regular Meeting

12. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:32 P.M.¹



Brad Beach, Chairperson

¹ Transcribed by Elyse Wiemann