

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

Historic Architectural Review Board Communications Media Technology Meeting June 18, 2020

The Historic Architectural Review Board met in formal session at 10:00A.M., Thursday, June 18, 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
Jon Benoit
Paul Weaver, III
Gaere MacDonald

City Staff:

Jenny Wolfe, Historic Preservation Officer
Julie Courtney, Historic Preservation Planner
Isabelle Lopez, City Attorney
Candice Seymour, Recording Secretary

Ms. Wolfe reviewed public participation instructions for the virtual meeting.

2. General Public Comments for Items not on the Agenda

(None)

3. Approval of Minutes

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE the May 21, 2020 minutes as presented. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, MacDonald, Weaver,
Wingo, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. Modification and approval of Agenda

(None)

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE the existing Agenda. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Benoit.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Benoit, MacDonald,
Wingo, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. Certificates of Appropriateness

5. (a) F2020-0055 – Cronk Duch
Architecture – Applicant
12 Avenida Menendez, LLC – Owner
12 Avenida Menendez

To modify a recently approved Certificate of Appropriateness including revisions to the second floor stair, extending a roof structure over the roof level elevator, increasing the height of the north facing tower, and altering the ground level opening on the north facade.

Mr. Weaver recused himself.¹

¹ Form attached to original minutes

Ms. Wolfe read the staff report and said Based on a review of the AGHP, the previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness (F2019-0111) and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff finds that the board can take the following actions on the Certificate of Appropriateness at **12 Avenida Menendez**:

1. **APPROVE** the Certificate of Appropriateness to add the southwest stair (Meets SOIS 9 and 10)
2. **DENY** the revised north tower and entry because it creates a significant impact to the mass, scale, integrity, and design which obscures the character of the existing building and streetscape by changing the openness of the entry, adding openings above the primary roof ridge, increasing the overall height, and increasing the austerity of the south elevation. (Does not meet SOIS 3, 4, 9, 10)
3. **DENY** the revised central stair because it alters the rhythm and integrity of the existing roof feature and adds additional massing visible to the streetscape. (Does not meet SOIS 2, 4, 9, 10)
4. HARB may need to take action on any additional items that the applicant itemizes more specifically than what was identified in the staff review.

Joseph Cronk, Jeremy Marquis, and Elijah George reviewed the application.

Ms. Wolfe reviewed the additional lighting plans submitted by the applicant.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:

- The focus on how the project enhances existing modern Mediterranean Revival Style interpretation within the historic district
- Lack of historical significance of the subject structure
- Concern for impact of views from Charlotte Street
- Clarification of the wall to mask the mechanical equipment
- Desire to see views from Charlotte Street
- Tower design was improvement over previous design
- Desire to see pedestrian and street-view renderings of the design which were provided by the applicant
- Concern for the massing and scale of building
- Applicant clarified that they would be keeping the historic turned columns
- Concern for festoon lighting on the second story as incompatible lighting fixtures, particularly since festoon lighting had not yet been approved for Cuna Street improvements
- Proposed lighting fixtures would hang from the architecture in the courtyard area and the second-floor festoon lighting would hang from extended vertical elements of the proposed railing
- Proposed vegetation on the second story may help screen proposed lighting

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE Certificate of Appropriateness application F2020-0055 with the condition that the proposed festoon and courtyard lighting be brought back to the Board for discussion. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Benoit.

VOTE ON MOTION:

**AYES: MacDonald, Benoit, Wingo,
Duncan**

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**5. (b) F2020-0052 – Paul J. Thompson –
Applicant
Paul Thompson and Maxie Thompson
– Owner
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. Courtney 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 can take the following actions on the Certificate Of Appropriateness at **67 Marine Street** with the following condition:

1. The applicant provides all required documentation which conforms to the AGHP requirements subject to HARB approval.

Paul Thompson reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

Ms. Courtney read one e-mail comment from Hamid and Dilara Hafiz into the record.²

The Board discussed:

- Previous flooding in the subject property
- Proposed garage under the lifted house and stairway entry up to the front door
- Original Opinion of Appropriateness application which had been previously approved with conditions
- Concern for changing the scale of the streetscape
- Conditions of approval for the foundation and building elevation
- Concerns of adding garage to the bottom
- Board agreement that the house should be raised
- Desire to see streetscape view for comparison of proposed height with neighboring buildings
- Request to have more comprehensive record of HARB's previous Opinion approval
- Concern for last minute submittal of documents at the previous Opinion hearing
- Preference for solid masonry walls which would be compatible with neighboring structures
- Elevation study needed

Mr. Thompson responded to Board comments stating that the application was the same as previously approved and the Board responded that more details and clarification were necessary for approval.

Ms. Wolfe briefly reviewed the minutes from the previous Opinion of Appropriateness hearing.

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to CONTINUE application F2020-0052 to the July 16, 2020 meeting to allow the applicant to return with an elevation study illustrating how the subject house would compare in relation to adjacent buildings on the

² Attached to original minutes

street and reconsidering replacing the chimney after the lift. The motion was **SECONDED** by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Weaver, MacDonald, Wingo, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. Certificates of Demolition and Partial Demolition

6. (a) 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.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver **MOVED** to **CONTINUE** application F2020-0053 to the July 16, 2020 meeting. The motion was **SECONDED** by Mr. Benoit.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Benoit, MacDonald, Wingo, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY³

6. (b) F2020-0048 – Kenneth and Valerie Byrd – Applicant

Byrd Living Trust (Kenneth and Valerie Byrd) – Owner

61 Weeden Street

To partially demolish a structure constructed ca. 1920 and located in the Lincolnville National Register Historic District including the enclosed front porch.

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 Bard can **APPROVE** a Certificate of Demolition to partially demolish a structure constructed ca. 1920 and located in the Lincolnville National Register Historic District including the enclosed front porch at **61 Weeden Street** with the findings that:

1. The partial demolition of the enclosed front porch will not have a permanent impact on the historic integrity of the overall building.
2. The building's historical origination is ambiguous, as there is no record of it on the Florida Master Site File, a building is not shown in the location of 61 Weeden Street on the Sanborn Maps until the 1930 map was corrected in 1960, and there is no listing for 61 Weeden Street in the Polk City Directories until around 1957

With the following conditions:

1. Archival documentation as per Section 28-89(2)d6: In accordance with Sec. 28-89(2)d6 "...the board may also require at the applicant's expense the recording of the structure for archival purposes prior to demolition. The recording may include, but shall not be limited to, photographs and measured drawings."
2. 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."

³ The Board recessed from 12:30p.m. to 1:00p.m.

Kenneth and Valerie Byrd reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

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

The Board discussed:

- The raising and slight movement of the structure
- Pier foundation which would be rebuilt after home was raised
- Porch to be removed would be replaced with a deeper, wraparound porch
- Conditions recommended in the staff report, particularly the salvage of material

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE Certificate of Demolition application F2020-0048, 61 Weeden Street with the two conditions outlined in the staff report. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Benoit.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Benoit, MacDonald, Wingo, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. (c) F2020-0054 – Andrea Johansson – Applicant
Andrea and Lex Johansson – Owner
58 S. Whitney Street

Ms. Duncan recused herself from the hearing.⁴

To partially demolish a building constructed in 1954 that is not located in a district and is not recorded on the Florida Master Site File including the rear and side portion of the building.

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 **58 South Whitney Street** because it is not a local landmark or otherwise designated as a historic building

Andrea Johansson reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

15 certified notices were sent; however, none were returned.

Public hearing was opened; however, there was no response

The Board discussed the lack of staff conditions as it was deemed as having little historical significance.

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE Partial Demolition application F2020-0054 for 58 S. Whitney Street because the building does not qualify as a local landmark or is otherwise deemed as a historic building. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Weaver, MacDonald, Wingo

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

⁴ Form attached to original minutes

6. (d) F2020-0041 – Ancient City Construction, Inc. and Loise Trivette – Applicant
Federal National Mortgage Association (Fannie Mae) – Owner
274 South Matanzas Boulevard

To demolish a building constructed in 1955 that is not located in a district but is recorded on the Florida Master Site File.

Heard after item 6(e) to allow the applicant time to join the meeting.

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 274 South Matanzas Boulevard because it is not a local landmark or otherwise designated as a historic building

Johnny Antonio and Loise Trivette reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

Public hearing was opened; however there was no response.

The Board discussed:

- Home had been foreclosed upon
- Home was built on a slab and could not be raised
- Building had no architectural significance

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE Certificate of Demolition application F2020-0041, 274 South Matanzas Boulevard with no conditions because it

does not meet the criteria as a historic structure in the City Code and staff had not recommended any documentation or salvage requirements. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Benoit.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Benoit, MacDonald, Wingo, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. (e) F2020-0049 – Larry Antonatos – Applicant
Ann C. Antonatos – Owner
171 Inlet Drive

To demolish a building constructed in 1957 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 **171 Inlet Drive** because it is not a local landmark or otherwise designated as a historic building.

Larry Antonatos was available for questions.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

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

The Board discussed:

- Hurricane damage and neglect had contributed to existing poor condition which had been noted by Code Enforcement in late 2019
- No conditions due to lack of architectural significance and little material to salvage

MOTION

Mr. Benoit **MOVED** to **APPROVE** Certificate of Demolition application F2020-0049 at 171 Inlet Drive for the demolition of the existing building with no conditions. The motion was **SECONDED** by Mr. MacDonald.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, MacDonald, Weaver,
Wingo, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. (f) F2020-0050 – Todd and Brenda
Wilson – Applicant
97 Masters LLC – Owner
97 Masters Drive

To demolish a building constructed ca. 1928 that is not in a district but is in the process of being 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 **97 Masters Drive** because it is not a local landmark or otherwise designated as a historic building.

Todd and Brenda Wilson reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

13 certified notices were sent and 2 were returned in favor

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

The Board discussed:

- Support for the applicant keeping the cedar tree on the property
- Lack of grounds for Board denial

MOTION

Mr. Weaver **MOVED** to **APPROVE** Certificate of Demolition application F2020-0050, 97 Master Drive, based on lack of documentation that it is a building of any historical significance, and with no conditions. The motion was **SECONDED** by Ms. Wingo.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Wingo, MacDonald,
Benoit, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. (g) F2020-0051 – Todd and Brenda
Wilson – Applicant
T & B Prop. LLC – Owner
99 Masters Drive

To demolish a building that was constructed ca. 1923 and not located in a district but is in the process of being 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 99 Masters Drive because it is not a local landmark or otherwise designated as a historic building with the following conditions:

1. For any salvageable historic materials, including the wood interior shingles, paneling, moldings and flooring, 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

Todd and Brenda Wilson reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

12 certified notices were sent and 2 were returned in favor.

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

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE Certificate of Demolition application F2020-0051, 99 Masters Drive, To demolish a building that was constructed ca. 1923 and not located in a district with the condition that the applicant make a good faith effort to salvage materials. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Wingo

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Wingo, MacDonald, Benoit, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. Planning and Building Staff Communications

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

(Provided for informational purposes)

8. Other Business

Ms. Wolfe advised that there would be a special virtual meeting of HARB on June 25, 2020 starting at 1:00p.m.

Ms. Wolfe noted that the next regular HARB meeting on July 16, 2020 was tentatively expected to be an in-person meeting with protocols in place for proper social distancing.

Mr. Weaver asked staff to give brief updates in reference to e-mail complaints regarding

115 Bridge Street and 164 Avenida Menendez.

Ms. Wolfe responded, noting that she had not received any complaints regarding 115 Bridge Street, but had received complaints for the painting of a gate at 15 Bridge Street. She said that she had gone out to inspect 164 Avenida Menendez and it appeared to be in accordance to the HARB approved plans. She added that there had been inquiries 115 Bridge Street.

9. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:35 P.M.⁵



Catherine Duncan, Chairperson

⁵ Transcribed by Candice Seymour