CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

Historic Architectural Review Board Regular Meeting
January 21, 2021

The Historic Architectural Review Board met in formal session at 1:00 P.M., Thursday, January 21, 2021, 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

---

2. General Public Comments for Items not on the Agenda

Heard after item 3

The Board heard from the following member of the public:

- B.J. Kalaidi

3. Approval of Minutes

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE the December 17, 2020 minutes as presented. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

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

4. Modification and approval of Agenda

MOTION

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

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

5. Public Comments related to Expedited Hearing items:

5. (a) 2020-0135 – Jorge Gallego – Applicant and Owner
66 Marine Street

To modify the site by demolishing a shed, constructing an in-ground pool and adding pavers.

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 Appropriateness at **66 Marine Street** because it meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards 9.

Jorge Gallego waived his right to a presentation.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE application 2020-0135. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Wingo.

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

5. (b) 2020-0142 – Matanza Fence – Applicant
Lakeview of St. Augustine Condo Association – Owner
172 Cordova Street

To replace existing fence behind the building facing the HP-1 district with a new design.

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 Appropriateness at **172 Cordova Street** because it generally is compatible with the Secretary of the Interior's Standard 9 with the following condition(s):

1. For an appropriate finish to be applied after installation

Jane Altenhofen waived her right to a presentation.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

There was brief board discussion regarding appropriate stain colors which revealed that the proposed stain would be appropriate.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE application 2020-0142 with the condition as detailed in the staff report. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

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

6. Certificates of Appropriateness

6. (a) 2020-0137 – Brandon Construction LLC – Applicant
Red Moon Properties – Owner
9 Aviles Street

To modify the building and site to include the addition of three windows on south elevation, pavers, decorative tile, lighting, and treatment of porch ceiling.

Ms. Wolfe read the staff report and said based on the previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) application (2018-0109), 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 **9 Aviles Street** because it meets the applicable Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation 2, 3, and 9, with the following conditions:

1. Confirm that all project lighting is soft white and warm lighting at the 3000K rating as indicated in email correspondence
2. Provide an alternative hanging and mounted light fixture in keeping with the Mediterranean Influenced style of the building and the area
3. Remove the exterior mounted or hanging light fixtures located above window/door openings and relocate Artillery Lane light fixtures to be adjacent to the pedestrian door

4. Remove the proposed wall tile or consider alternate design elements referenced in the AGHP
5. Provide a clay brick paver and color pattern distinct from Artillery Lane or use coquina concrete for the patio floor
6. Clarify that the stucco band will be pre-cast concrete and that the building sill/foundation line uses true cut coquina stone versus coquina aggregate cast block

Brandon Ecklund reviewed the application and addressed staff concerns and conditions.[1]

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:

- Clarification from staff that the applicant's proposed lighting met staff conditions
- Columns along Aviles Street were pre-cast coquina concrete with cut coquina stone foundation line
- Decorative tile detail had been removed from the application
- Lighting arrangement was appropriate as fixtures on other structures along the streetscape were affixed above a vertical element
- Additional windows along Artillery Lane were an improvement
- Recommendation for a lighting fixture on the corner of Aviles Street and Artillery Lane, right of the entrance on Aviles Street and level with the height of fixtures on Artillery Lane

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE application 2020-0137 with the following conditions:

1. **The additional three windows along Artillery Lane were approved as proposed**
2. **Eliminate the northernmost light on the Aviles Street Elevation,**
3. **Lower the three lights over the window openings on the Aviles Street Elevation**
4. **Lower and shift the Lights on Artillery Lane to be more pedestrian scale**
5. **Maintain the light on the southwest corner facing Aviles Street as Proposed**
6. **Light fixture amended to a more Mediterranean design as proposed**
7. **Eliminate the proposed tile wall detail in the covered portico**
8. **Approve the light fixture in the portico as proposed as long as lighting temperature requirements were met**
9. **Paint color and stucco bands approved as proposed with the cut coquina columns and water-table around the building**

The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

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

6. (b) F2020-0140 – Marquis Latimer + Halback, Inc – Applicant
Lightner Museum of Hobbies Inc. – Owner
75 King Street

To modify the south garden by extending a previously approved wall and add

[1] Additional drawings attached to original packet

pavers in two parking spots adjacent to the sculpture peninsula and to add hanging lighting from tree.

Ms. Lopez advised that the City had not yet signed an agreement for the use of the two parking spots proposed. She also noted that designs as presented would be brought in to allow for turn radius of the adjacent remaining parking spaces.

Ms. Courtney read the staff report and said based on the previously approved with conditions Certificate of Appropriateness application (F2020-0084), 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 **75 King Street**, because it meets the applicable Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, and 10.

Elijah George and David Bagnall reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

Public hearing was opened.

B.J. Kalaidi spoke against the application, citing parking issues and said the applicants should reimburse the City for lost income.

Ms. Lopez advised that the City was currently in negotiations for the use of the two parking spaces proposed for the project.

Ms. Courtney read an e-mail from Tonya Creamer into the record regarding the application.[2]

The Board discussed:

- Ultimate approval of the project would rely on agreement with the City for the use of the parking spaces
- Intent of the change was to make the area around the statue more inviting
- Importance of garden spaces to benefit the community and properly present the statue
- Proposed lighting fixtures would be attached to the tree and low profile with no impact to the tree
- Garden was intended to be open to the public at the same hours as the museum; however, the applicant may consider extending those hours

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE application F2020-0140, 75 King Street, to modify the south garden by extending a previously approved wall and add pavers in two parking spots adjacent to the sculpture peninsula and to add hanging lighting from tree with the condition that final approval depended upon an executed agreement with the City for use of the parking spaces. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Benoit.

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

6. (c) 2020-0141 – Ximenez-Fatio House Museum – Applicant
National Society of Colonial Dames – Owner
20 Aviles Street

To construct a replacement fence and move fence inward off the street front.

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 **CONTINUE** a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) at **20 Aviles Street** to allow the HARB to discuss

[2] Available in the original packet

potential alternatives with the applicant including the following:

1. The potential for a finding by HARB that a recessed fence from the building plane could be appropriate along a portion of the street edge particularly with a ground cover that is an approved paving material (loose coquina shell)
2. The ability for HARB to take into consideration the existing conditions including a double gate that exceeds the recommended width and the wall openings for driveways on a nearby Spanish Colonial property
3. Alternate design considerations including a more appropriate and typical Spanish Colonial, straight-lined picket fence at a continuous 5.5' height in combination with a partial area recessed from the street edge to allow for a gathering/entrance area

Roger Smith, Museum Director of the Ximenez-Fatio House, reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:

- History of the preservation and restoration of the structure by the Colonial Dames
- Lack of historical basis for the proposed changes
- Concern for setting a precedent and changing a character-defining feature of colonial Spanish architecture
- Applicant examples that, historically, the property had no fence, and the existing fence was brought in at one portion to make space for a pre-existing historical marker
- Movement of the fence would not interfere with existing window and shutter
- History of the existing fence was unknown
- Recommendation to leave the fence in its existing location along the street, but have a 12 foot gate with two 6 foot sliding gates
- Maintaining an appropriate 55" gate with possible removable bollards for vehicular access for maintenance
- Possibility of recessing a portion of the replacement fence to allow for the existing historical marker and better pedestrian safety
- Option of no fence based on historical evidence
- Desire of the Board to see additional documentation regarding the existing fence and a final design for the replacement

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to CONTINUE application 2020-0141 to the February 18, 2021 meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

VOTE ON MOTION:
AYES: Weaver, MacDonald, Benoit, Wingo, Duncan
NAYES: NONE
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY[3]

7. Certificates of Demolition, Partial Demolition, Relocation

7. (a) 2020-0131 – Robert & Barbara Pape – Applicant and Owner
9 Inlet Place

To demolish a building constructed in 1938 that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and is not located in a district.

[3] Brief recess from 2:46 p.m.to 3:06 p.m.

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 **9 Inlet Place** 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 possibly the wood windows, to be salvaged, 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

Barbara Pape was available for questions.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

10 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 the staff recommendation for material salvage to ensure the applicant understood the condition.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE Certificate of Demolition application 2020-0131, 9 Inlet Place, based on the staff report indicating the building was not in any districts, was not a national register listing or a significant historic building and with the condition that a good faith effort be made to salvage any significant historic material. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Wingo.

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

7. (b) 2020-0133 – Donald Crichlow and Associates – Applicant
91 Oneida LLC – Owner
95 Oneida Street

To partially demolish a building, constructed c. 1871-1885 that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and is a contributing structure to the Lincolnville National Register Historic District, including the two-story front porch and rear one-story wing.

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 at **95 Oneida Street** with the following conditions:

1. To approve the removal of the one-story the rear wing. To approve portions of the two-story front porch not to include the turned posts and roof
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

Don Crichlow reviewed the application including the slight changes of an additional window on the elevation drawings.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

23 certified notices were sent, 2 were returned in favor, and 1 had comments. Ms. Courtney noted an additional e-mail received and attached to the meeting packet.

Public hearing was opened.

Eric Schaefer spoke in favor of the application citing the poor condition of the house.

B.J. Kalaidi asked for more information regarding the proposed replacement and asked that staff read any comments submitted by neighbors.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Staff's recommendation to maintain the existing roof and turned posts to protect a character-defining architectural feature
- Design concepts that maintain the existing gable end to retain the integrity of the original portion of the two-story porch
- Applicant's intent to salvage as much material as possible
- Possibility that the porch would have to be removed to raise the structure, and then re-constructed in the same configuration, but at a higher elevation as the house was being raised
- Recommendation that new columns match existing column design

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE application 2020-0133 with condition two as detailed in the staff report to repurpose the posts and any other salvageable material and the applicant provide a drawing of record showing the repurposed posts and gable. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

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

7. (c) Certificate of Relocation F2020-0138 – Donald Crichlow and Associates – Applicant
91 Oneida LLC – Owner
93 Oneida Street

To relocate a building constructed c. 1871-1885 that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and is contributing to the Lincolnville National Register Historic District, eastward on the lot.

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 Relocation at **93 Oneida Street** because it meets Secretary of the Interior's Standard 2 for Retention of Distinguishing Architectural Characteristics.

Don Crichlow reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

23 certified notices were sent, 2 were returned in favor, and 1 had comments. Ms. Courtney noted an additional e-mail received and attached to the meeting packet.

Public hearing was opened.

B.J. Kalaidi asked for clarification regarding the details of an e-mail received by the board from Christopher Nolan.

Elaine Brooks asked for clarification that the structure would remain one story to which the applicant responded in the affirmative. She spoke in favor of the application.

Eric Schaefer spoke in favor of the application, citing the conditions of the

building and improvements to the neighborhood made by the proposed changes.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Type of block piers under the structure may not have been coquina
- Request from the Board to salvage piers if possible
- Need to raise and move the structure driven by the threat of flooding

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE application F2020-0138 to relocate the existing structure on the current property and the condition that the applicant recycle or salvage any coquina or significant foundations. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

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

7. (d) F2020-0139 – Patrick Canan – Applicant
Canan Enterprises LLC – Owner
41 Cincinnati Avenue

To demolish a building constructed c. 1910-1917 that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and is a contributing structure to the North City Historic District.

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 **CONTINUE** a Certificate of Demolition at **41 Cincinnati Avenue** to allow the applicant to provide additional information.
Patrick Canan and Les Thomas reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

Public hearing was opened.

B.J. Kalaidi asked that the application be continued so the Board could gather more information. She said the building should not be demolished unless it was proven to be financially infeasible.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- History of the structure and surrounding historic district
- Possibility of partial demolition to save original portion of the structure and remove newer, unstable portions of the building
- If additions were removed, they could be replaced without HARB oversight
- Concern for changing the application from full to partial demolition which could be mitigated by clearly stating what would be maintained and what would be demolished

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE application PL2020-0139 with the modification of the scope of the demolition to reflect a partial demolition wherein the original structure as defined by the applicant's site plan highlighted in green as well as the Sandbourne Maps showing the basic structure as 32 feet by 35 feet and with the condition that the applicant make a good faith effort to salvage materials. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

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

8. Incomplete Applications

8. (a) Certificate of Demolition F2020-0134 – Carlton Holley – Applicant
Carlton Holley & David Thomas – Owner
88 De Haven Street

To demolish a building constructed c. 1879-1885 that is recorded in the Florida Master Site file and is a contributing structure to the Lincolnville National Register Historic District.

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 **88 De Haven Street** with the following finding:

1. The HARB makes a finding that the evidence submitted or provided during the hearing is a sufficient building condition assessment that the building is not a candidate for adaptive use or rehabilitation and 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

Les Thomas reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

25 certified notices were sent, 1 was returned in favor, 1 returned opposed, and 2 had comments.

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

The Board discussed:

- Demolition would be funded by the applicant
- Support for the demolition based on the condition of the structure
- Concern for the lack of a case for economic hardship
- The Building Official's letter illustrating concern for the portions of the structure that were collapsing
- Possibility of maintaining original portion of the house
- Missing portion of the house

- Challenges of archival documentation based upon the condition of the house which Mr. Thomas advised he could work around

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE application F2020-0134 for complete demolition of the residence at 88 DeHaven with the two conditions that the applicant provide scale drawings and photographs of the existing house and make best efforts to salvage existing materials. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:
AYES: Benoit, Weaver, MacDonald, Wingo, Duncan
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

(None)

11. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:14 P.M.[4]

Catherine Duncan, Chairperson

[4] Transcribed by Candice Seymour