

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

Historic Architectural Review Board Communications Media Technology Meeting July 16, 2020

The Historic Architectural Review Board met in formal session at 1:00 P.M., Thursday, July 16, 2020, via Communications Media Technology (CMT) and with limited capacity in the Alcazar Room at City Hall, St. Augustine, Florida. Catherine Duncan, Chairperson, called the regular meeting to order, and the following were present:

1. ROLL CALL:

Catherine Duncan, Chairperson
Barbara Wingo, Vice-Chairperson
Paul Weaver, III
Gaere MacDonald

Absent:

Jon Benoit

City Staff:

Jenny Wolfe, Historic Preservation Officer
Julie Courtney, Historic Preservation Planner
Isabelle Lopez, City Attorney
Reuben Franklin, Director, Public Works
Laura Morse, Recording Secretary
Maria Lopes, Office Assistant
Candice Seymour, Recording Secretary

Ms. Wolfe reviewed public participation instructions for virtual meetings.

2. General Public Comments for Items not on the Agenda

(None)

3. Approval of Minutes

Heard after item 4.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE the June 18, 2020 as presented. The motion SECONDED by Ms. Wingo.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Wingo, MacDonald,
Duncan
NAYES: NONE
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOTION

Ms. Wingo MOVED to APPROVE the June 25, 2020 minutes as presented. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Wingo, Weaver, MacDonald,
Duncan
NAYES: NONE
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. Modification and approval of Agenda

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE the modifications to the Agenda. Motion SECONDED by Ms. Wingo.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Wingo, Weaver,
Duncan
NAYES: NONE
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. Public Comments related to Expedited Hearing items:

(None)

6. Continued Items from Previous Meetings

6. (a) Certificate of Appropriateness F2020-0052 – Paul J. Thompson – Applicant Paul Thompson and Maxie Thompson – Owners 67 Marine Street

To elevate the building following the concept design approved in the 2017 Opinion of Appropriateness including a new first floor finished with stucco, new doors and garage door, window, balcony, driveway, and removal of non-historic property walls.

Ms. Wolfe read the staff report and said Based on a review of the previously approved Opinion of Appropriateness (F2017-0137) and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds the board **APPROVE** a Certificate of Appropriateness at **67 Marine Street** with the following conditions:

1. Alter the exterior garage door to have wood exterior overlay instead of fiberglass
2. Provide brick paving details to staff for administrative review indicating a true clay brick material will be used
3. The applicant shall re-use coquina material from the historic chimney in the reconstruction of the chimney

She noted that conditions 1 and 2 had been satisfied by the applicant and only condition 3 still needed response.

Ms. Wolfe 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 (partial) at **67 Marine Street** limited to the chimney with the following finding and condition:

1. A finding by the HARB that the removal of a chimney requires a compromise to mitigate against future flooding.
2. The condition that in accordance with Section 28-89(2)d6 at the applicant's expense, salvage and preservation of chimney materials for reuse in a restoration of other historic properties. The board may also require at the applicant's expense the recording of the structure (chimney) for archival purposes prior to demolition. The recording may include, but shall not be limited to, photographs and measured drawings

Paul Thompson and Steve Schuyler reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:¹

- Concern that raising the structure to accommodate a new garage was not a flood mitigation strategy consistent with what has previously been approved²
- Previous meeting wherein HARB had heard the Opinion of Appropriateness for the property
- Ms. Wingo's clarification of conditions attached to the Opinion approval including maintaining the chimney

¹ Mr. Weaver lost connection from 10:30 a.m. to 10:36 a.m.

² Referenced letter from Mr. Birchim and addendum to staff report were included in the Board packet

- Concern that the proposed garage doors would change the architectural integrity of the structure
- Lifting of the structure alone would destroy its architectural integrity
- Additions should be architecturally different to define it as a newer portion of the structure
- Streetscape provided showed that raising of the structure would not negatively impact adjacent structures
- Applicant's intent to rebuild the chimney after the structure was lifted
- Current flood mitigation strategies leaned toward lifting houses to the minimum height needed to avoid flood damage
- Garage addition was proposed by applicant to mitigate parking deficiency
- Applying law consistently in spite of application differences
- Potential limitations to the Opinion approval made over two years ago
- The chimney as a character-defining feature
- Future codification of flood mitigation design standards
- Similarly lifted homes in the neighborhood
- Drawings submitted during the Opinion hearing were the same as those being proposed
- Finished floor elevation proposed to be 14 feet rather than the 12 feet preferred by the Board
- Utilizing other flood mitigation measures to allow for a lower elevation of the structure

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE application F2020-0052 for 67 Marine Street to elevate the building to 12 feet (5 feet above the existing floor elevation) to incorporate flood mitigation measures without the proposed garage addition because it is inappropriate and would lead to loss of architectural character.

Ms. Wolfe voiced concern for the motion, noting that the building design he described had not been reviewed by the Board or staff. She noted that the concept designs approved during the opinion showed the proposed garage.

Mr. Weaver CHANGED his motion and MOVED to CONTINUE application F2020-0052 to allow the applicant time to alter the design of the building.

Mr. Thompson expressed a desire to receive an approval or denial at the hearing.

Mr. Weaver CHANGED his motion and MOVED to DENY Certificate of Appropriateness application F2020-0052, for 67 Marine Street based on the fact that the request was not flood mitigation management but rather a substantial new addition to the building which was not appropriate and would result in a loss of character to the building, particularly the loss of the chimney which was described as a character defining feature in the staff report. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

Mr. Schuyler noted that the motion overturned the original opinion of appropriateness approval.

Ms. Wolfe advised that nowhere in the guidelines was the Board required to approve only elevations if related to flood mitigation, regardless of whether that intent was included in the application.

Mr. Weaver clarified that the major driving force of his motion was that he felt the requested elevation was inappropriate.

Mr. Thompson asked whether he would be able to start demolition of the non-historic walls and patio which did not require a certificate of demolition.

Mr. Weaver AMENDED his motion to include allowing the applicant to remove the non-historic property walls. Mr. MacDonald SECONDED the amended motion.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Mac Donald, Duncan

NAYES: Wingo

MOTION CARRIED 3/1

**6. (b) Certificate of Partial Demolition
F2020-0053 – Paul J. Thompson –
Applicant
Paul Thompson and Maxie Thompson –
Owner
67 Marine Street**

To partially demolish a structure built ca. 1840 and contributing to the St. Augustine Historic District limited to the chimney.

Item heard in conjunction with previous item.

Mr. Thompson noted that the house mover was concerned with lifting the structure with the chimney attached and that he intended to re-build the chimney once work was complete.

18 certified notices were sent, 3 were returned in favor, and 1 had comments.

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

There was discussion regarding:

- The possibility of continuing the application until concerns with the lifting of the structure had been resolved
- The necessity of removing the chimney to enable to lifting of the structure

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE Certificate of Partial Demolition application F2020-0053 to partially demolish a structure limited to the chimney with the condition that the applicant make every effort to preserve the stone a re-purpose it in the reconstructed chimney. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

Ms. Duncan felt the demolition should be contingent upon the approval to raise the house and voiced concern that the chimney would be removed well before the raising of the structure may occur.

There was a discussion regarding the logistics of removing the chimney, as well as other non-historic features, prior to the house being lifted.

The applicant expressed a desire to receive an approval or denial at the hearing.

Mr. Weaver CHANGED his motion and MOVED to DENY Certificate of Partial Demolition Application F2020-0053. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Duncan

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Duncan, MacDonald

NAYES: Wingo

MOTION CARRIED 3/1³

7. Certificates of Appropriateness

**7. (a) F2020-0069 – Geraldine and Peter
Vaccaro – Applicant
Peter Vaccaro and Geraldine Nowak
– Owner
15 Bridge Street**

Application was heard after item 7(b) to allow the applicants time to join the meeting.

After the fact approval to replace gate and framing using design approved in 2006,

³ Brief Recess from 11:56a.m. to 12:10p.m.

with colors and hardware finish that are not preapproved.

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 HARB can **DENY** a Certificate of Appropriateness for the after the fact painting of the gate and hardware at **15 Bridge Street** because it does not comply with AGHP treatment for gate colors and hardware. She said staff suggests that the applicant discuss with the HARB how the gate can be restored to a previous condition that is administratively approvable.

Geraldine and Peter Vaccaro reviewed the application, expressing a willingness to utilize pre-approved colors per staff recommendations.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:

- Support for steps the owners are willing to take to bring the gate back into compliance
- Recommendations to alter the hardware design and color to bring the design of the gate back into compliance

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to DENY application F2020-0069, 15 Bridge Street, After the fact approval to replace gate and framing using design approved in 2006, with colors and hardware finish that are not preapproved. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Wingo.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Wingo, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

There was discussion regarding the expectations of the Board for the get design that would be approved administratively including:

- Painting the hardware black
- Removing the hinge from dummy-strap
- Preference to revert back to the 2006 concept and replace the door with a similar color

7. (b) F2020-0073 – TTV Architects, Inc.

– Applicant

University of Florida Historic St. Augustine, Inc. – Owner

46 Cuna Street

To modify the existing coquina warehouse with a new opening, exterior wood staircase, four wall exhaust vents, lighting, ADA compliant ramps and site features.

Ms. Wolfe read the staff report and said Based on a review of the AGHP and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds the board can **APPROVE** the Certificate of Appropriateness at **46 Cuna Street** with the following conditions:

1. Provide a detail of the profile, material, finish, and section of the proposed staircase that is compatible with Spanish Colonial architecture. Consider a stair design that is L-shaped in plan to make the stair more compact similar to a 'loggia stairway' as per Manucy's Houses of St. Augustine but use simple square balusters with chamfered posts.
2. Provide details on parking lot improvements related to any painting and consideration for alternative

surface treatments that are less visually impactful

3. Provide details on the lighting source to indicate it is a soft white light.

Donnell Pinder, Billy Triay, and Christopher Noel reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:

- Staff recommendation for compacted stairs seemed more in keeping with the building's Spanish Colonial architecture and applicant was amenable to utilizing the design
- Second-story was intended for storage only
- Paint colors for handicap parking spots and the possibility of finding other ways, through state approval, to denote ADA parking

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE application F2020-0073 at 46 Cuna Street as shown in the plans and with the second option for the stairs as recommended by staff. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Wingo.

There was a brief discussion regarding other conditions provided by staff which the staff felt the applicants had addressed during their presentation.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Wingo, Weaver, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. (c) F2020-0065 – Don Crichlow & Associates – Applicant **Scott and Nikki Gordon – Owner** **287 St. George Street**

To build 46" high masonry wall along front and partial north property line to create a flood barrier and to construct a 48" high wood picket fence in front of masonry wall.

Item heard in conjunction with items 7(d) and 7(e).

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 the board can **APPROVE** a Certificate of Appropriateness at **287 St. George Street** because it meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation 3 and 9, with the following condition:

1. That the finish of the wood fence and the masonry wall's outer stucco coat complies with the AGHP.

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 the board can **APPROVE** a Certificate of Appropriateness at **289 St. George Street** because it meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation 3 and 9, with the following condition:

1. That the finish of the wood fence and the masonry wall's outer stucco coat complies with the AGHP.

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 the board can **APPROVE** a Certificate of Appropriateness at **295 St. George Street** because it meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation 3 and 9, with the following conditions:

1. That the finish of the masonry wall's outer stucco coat complies with the AGHP.
2. For any salvageable materials of the existing wall, to be reused or be salvaged if possible, 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.

Don Crichlow reviewed all three applications.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

Public hearing was opened for all three items; however, there was no response.

The Board discussed:

- Fence colors and consideration of utilizing a stain rather than paint to either paint the fences white or match the existing trim color of the house
- Consideration for hydrostatic pressure ratings of the proposed flood barrier
- Re-use of blocks being removed
- No walls would be built between the properties
- Stone would be a natural stucco or painted light color to differentiate fence, and the waterproofing would be under the stucco
- The proposed method as a future flood mitigation strategy at other properties

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE application F2020-0065, 287 St. George Street, to construct a masonry wall with a stucco finish either painted white or left

natural with a fence in front that is either white or matching the trim color of the associated house. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Wingo.

VOTE ON MOTION:

**AYES: MacDonald, Wingo, Weaver,
Duncan**

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**7. (d) F2020-0066 – Don Crichlow & Associates – Applicant
Patrick Crocetta – Owner
289 St. George Street**

Item heard in conjunction with items 7(c) and 7(e).

To build 46" high masonry wall along front property line to create a flood barrier and to construct a 48" high wood picket fence in front of masonry wall.

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE application F2020-0066 with the picket fence painted white to match the trim color of the building. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Wingo.

VOTE ON MOTION:

**AYES: MacDonald, Wingo, Weaver,
Duncan**

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**7. (e) F2020-0067 – Don Crichlow & Associates – Applicant
Maria Celia Pellecer – Owner
295 St. George Street**

To build 46" high masonry wall along front and partial south property line to create a flood barrier.

Item heard in conjunction with items 7(c) and 7(d).

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE application F2020-0067 for 295 St. George Street for a masonry wall left natural to match the building and with no picket fence. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Wingo.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Wingo, Weaver,
Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. (f) F2020-0071 – Les Thomas Architect – Applicant David and Elizabeth Powell – Owner 43 Cordova Street

To construct a detached carport in the rear courtyard.

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 the board can **APPROVE** a Certificate of Appropriateness at **43 Cordova Street** because it meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation 9 and 10, with the following conditions:

1. That the applicant provides evidence that the zoning height is less than 15' and if the building is 15' or greater for zoning purposes the applicant shall alter plans to meet the zoning requirements or request a variance through the Planning and Zoning Board.
2. Alter the roof to a hip or a gable roof structure
3. Consider altering the size of the structure to minimize the visual impact of the structure upon the visually open courtyard space

Les Thomas and David Powell reviewed the application.

⁴ Brief recess from 2:09p.m. to 2:16p.m.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:

- Roof pitch and style
- Height concerns
- Setback concerns which staff determined were not an issue as long as the applicant lowered the height of the roof to 15 feet or less

There was Board consensus to lower roof to a 5/12 pitch with vented gable roof

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVED application F2020-0071, 43 Cordova Street with the condition that the roof be at a 5/12 pitch with the Boston-hip roof with gable vent. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, MacDonald, Wingo,
Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY⁴

7. (g) F2020-0074 – Marquis Latimer + Halback, Inc. – Applicant 46 Avenida Menendez, Inc. – Owner 46 Charlotte Street

To make changes that include ADA accessibility to front and rear porches of building and site features including landscape features, displays, lighting, trellises, an outbuilding, and modifications to property wall.

Mr. Weaver recused himself. ⁵

⁵ Form attached to original minutes

Ms. Wolfe read the staff report and said Based on a review of the AGHP, the previous Opinion of Appropriateness approval for the design concept and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds that the board can **APPROVE** a Certificate of Appropriateness for changes to include ADA accessibility to front and rear porches of building and site features including landscape features, displays, lighting, and property wall with the following conditions:

1. A finding by the HARB that the tanks, pergolas, and seating features are appropriate and meet the SOIS #9 for compatible design and #10 for reversibility and are compatible with architectural style of the building such that the alteration or addition will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the structure.
2. Applicant shall provide details regarding the elevation view of the ADA lift, light source details showing soft white light with output limited to the subject property, details for the extended wood fence, and material and finish for the pergola elements at the HARB meeting for their review and approval.
3. The second floor façade must be restored to its previous appearance with the balcony railing and columns unless a future Certificate of Appropriateness is submitted to cover any discrepancies.

Jeremy Marquis and Dustin Felix reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:

- Resolution of staff report concerns

- Trellis in the rear would match the wood
- Hand rail on both sides may be required on front steps
- Possibility of venting the walls to allow for breezes to move through the property

MOTION

Ms. Wingo MOVED to APPROVE Certificate of Appropriateness application F2020-0074, at 46 Charlotte Street, which includes changes to the ADA accessibility to the front and rear porches and site features. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Wingo, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. Certificate of Demolition and Partial Demolition with Related Certificate of Appropriateness

8. (a) F2020-0076 – Les Thomas Architect – Applicant

James and Cole Wilson – Owner
272 St. George Street

To partially demolish a building limited to the detached structure built ca. 1960-1970.

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 **APPROVE** a Certificate of Partial Demolition for the one story detached structure at **272 St. George Street** because it is not a local landmark or otherwise designated as a historic building, with the following condition:

1. For any salvageable historic materials such as the wood door and windows, to be salvaged if possible, 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.

James and Cole Wilson and Les Thomas reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

29 certified notices were sent and 3 were returned in favor.

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

The Board discussed:

- Other than the door, the structure seemed to lack historic architectural significance
- Preference of the Board to salvage material, particularly the door

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE Partial Demolition application F2020-0076, 272 St. George Street, due to the fact that it is a non-historic building, fall outside the period of significance in the St. Augustine Historic District with the condition that the applicant make a good-faith effort to salvage materials. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Wingo.

There was a brief discussion regarding the demolition of accessory buildings.

VOTE ON MOTION:

**AYES: Weaver, Wingo, MacDonald,
Duncan**

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. (b) F2020-0070 – Les Thomas Architect – Applicant

James and Cole Wilson – Owner
272 St. George Street

To construct a new garage to replace existing detached structure built ca. 1960-1970.

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 the board can **CONTINUE** a Certificate of Appropriateness at **272 St. George Street** to allow the applicant to provide evidence that the design is compatible with the architecture and scale of a garage or detached outbuilding for that time period

Les Thomas reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:

- Possibility of a carriage house style rather than a garage
- Applicant's desire to have two garage doors
- Concern for the scale of the structure
- Pitch of roof was chosen to match roof pitch of the house
- Possible zoning issues due to the height of the structure which may require a variance application to the Planning and Zoning Board
- The need to see clear evidence that a garage/carriage house structure would be compatible with the style of the primary building
- Structure appeared to be a one and a half story house

MOTION

Mr. Weaver **MOVED** to **CONTINUE** application F2020-0070, 272 St. George Street, to the August 20, 2020 meeting. The motion was **SECONDED** by Ms. Duncan.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Duncan, MacDonald, Wingo

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

9. Certificate of Demolition and Partial Demolition

9. (a) F2020-0072 – Les Thomas Architect – Applicant

Modesto Gómez and Heidi Sykes-Gómez – Owner

35 Magnolia Avenue

To partially demolish a building, constructed ca. 1925 that is not located in a district but is recorded on the Florida Master Site File, limited to the garage addition (ca. 1950s).

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 **APPROVE** a Certificate of Partial Demolition limited to the ca. 1950s garage addition at **35 Magnolia Avenue** because it is not a local landmark or otherwise designated as a historic building, with the following condition:

1. For any salvageable historic materials, including the wood windows, to be salvaged if possible, 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.

Les Thomas and Heidi Sikes-Gomez reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

19 certified notices were sent, 4 were returned in favor, and 2 had comments.

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

The Board discussed that the garage did not qualify for a denial as it was not a historic building or local landmark.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver **MOVED** to **APPROVE** Certificate of Demolition application F2020-0072, 35 Magnolia Avenue, based on the fact that the structure to be demolished from circa 1950s was listed on the Florida Master Site File, but did not meet the criteria as a historic structure or local landmark with the condition that the applicant make every effort to repurpose and salvage materials. The motion was **SECONDED** by Mr. MacDonald.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, MacDonald, Wingo, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

9. (b) F2020-0068 – John and Sheryl Foti – Applicant and Owner **25 Miruela Avenue**

To demolish a building constructed ca. 1950 and not located in a district but is recorded on the Florida Master Site File.

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 **APPROVE** a Certificate of Demolition at **25 Miruela Drive**

because it is not a local landmark or otherwise designated as a historic building.

Kyle Foti reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

17 certified notices were sent, 1 were returned in favor, and 1 had comments.

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

The Board discussed that the structure did not meet any criteria for denial.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE Certificate of Demolition application F2020-0068, 25 Miruela Avenue, based on the staff report which indicated that the structure did not meet any criteria as a historic structure. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, MacDonald, Wingo, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY⁶

10. Certificate of Appropriateness – City Owned Property

10. (a) F2020-0075 – Marquis Latimer + Halback, Inc. – Applicant
City of St. Augustine/Public Works Department – Owner
Spanish, Cuna, Tolomato Rights-of-way

To continue the Downtown Improvements District Phase 1, completed in 2015, with addition of new streetscape, landscape features, and street lights.

Ms. Wolfe read stated that staff does not provide recommendations on city projects and is available to answer any questions related to the previous Opinion of Appropriateness and attached application materials.

Jeremy Marquis, Elijah George, Reuben Franklin, and Jason Hall reviewed the application.⁷

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:

- Resilient garden was a positive addition that would soften the streetscape and help prevent heat retention
- Recommendation that all the light fixtures have hanging baskets and that greenscaping be maximized throughout the design
- Clarification of cross-walk noted between Cuna and Spanish Streets
- Staff concerns which had been addressed by applicant
- Applicant's intent to use pre-approved plant materials
- Awareness of archeology zone impacts which had been discussed in the previously approved Tolomato Lot application

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE application F2020-0075, addressing the Spanish Street, Cuna Street, and Tolomato Lane rights-of-way for the City Plan. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Duncan.

⁶ Brief recess from 4:10p.m. to 4:14p.m.

⁷ Mr. Weaver excused himself from the meeting at 4:30p.m.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Duncan, Wingo

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**11. Planning and Building Staff
Communications**

**11. (a) Planning and Building Staff
Approved Permits Report**

(Provided for informational purposes only)

12. Other Business

**12. (a) Discussion regarding a request
from the FDOT for CLG review of design
suggestions related to the SR 5A/King
Street bridge over San Sebastian River
(Bridge No 78003)**

Dr. Ian Pawn reviewed the subject.

Board discussion included:

- Closed concrete railing, at 38 inches high, would not block view from vehicles
- San Sebastian bridge was built in 1949
- Preference for the simple concrete design that would distinguish it from the replacement bridge on US-1

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

11. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:58 P.M.⁸



Catherine Duncan, Chairperson

⁸ Transcribed by Candice Seymour