

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

Historic Architectural Review Board Regular Meeting March 18, 2021

The Historic Architectural Review Board met in formal session at 1:00 P.M., Thursday, March 18, 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
Gaere MacDonald

Absent:

Paul Weaver, excused

City Staff:

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

2. General Public Comments for Items not on the Agenda

(None)

3. Approval of Minutes

MOTION

Ms. Wingo **MOVED** to **APPROVE** the February 18, 2021 minutes as presented. The motion was **SECONDED** by Mr. Benoit.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Wingo, Benoit, MacDonald,
Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. Modification and approval of Agenda

Mr. Benoit advised that he would be recusing himself from the hearing for item 5(b) as a potential contractor for the project.

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald **MOVED** to **APPROVE** the Agenda. The motion was **SECONDED** by Mr. Benoit.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Benoit, Wingo,
Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. Continued Items from Previous Meetings

5. (a) Certificate of Appropriateness
PL2020-0141 – 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 **APPROVE** a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) at **20 Aviles Street** because it meets

the applicable Secretary of the Interior's Standards 2, 3, 9, and 10 with the following finding:

1. The proposed fence design is largely in keeping with the existing fence that likely was constructed forty years ago; the fence's proposed new location will be along the same set back where the existing fence extends behind the historical marker sign (approximately 18" from the street curb); and the existing fence has a 16' wide gate, which is much wider than the AGHP's recommended 50" width for Pre-1821 buildings.

Roger Smith and Les Thomas reviewed the application.

The Board provided their ex parte communications.

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

The Board discussed:

- Lack of historical reference for the indented gate
- Indentation of gate was to provide space for pedestrians and allow more room for vehicles to turn on the narrow street
- Catalyst to redesign fence and gate was due to the need to replace the fence and desire to meet maintenance needs and modern vehicles
- Concern that placement of the gate was not historically accurate
- AGHP intention for gate width requirements may harken more to masonry walls with gates through them
- Proposed design allowed for continuing rhythm of the scalloped fence

- Gate was changed from rolling gate to swinging gate
- Recommendation to place palm trees on either side of the gate
- Setback of the fence from the street curb was a positive change for pedestrian safety

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE application PL2020-0141 at 20 Aviles Street as described. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Benoit.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Benoit, Wingo, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. (b) Certificate of Appropriateness PL2021-0012 – Marquis Latimer + Halback, Inc – Applicant Tara Owen & Malcolm Frank – Owner 252 St. George Street

Mr. Benoit recused himself from the hearing as advised under Modifications to the Agenda.¹

To make changes to front porch, including decking and masonry materials and new stairs, and modifications to the site features including landscaping, paving, and front gate.

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 **252 St. George Street** because it meets the applicable Secretary of the Interior's Standards 2, 4, 9, 10, with the following potential finding by the HARB:

¹ Form attached to original minutes

1. That the proposed turf grass is an appropriate alternative

Tara Owen and Gavin Cain reviewed the application, highlighting changes that addressed concerns from the Board regarding landscape materials, the gate, and the front porch.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:

- Wood deck was appropriate design
- Recommendation to salvage the pavers which applicant said would be returned to the Sisters of St. Joseph
- Recommendation to use tide water cypress rather than pond cypress
- New gate design was compatible
- Proposed plants were compatible
- Clarification of porch foundation construction
- Decking would run perpendicular to the house, with planks running from the house towards the street

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to APPROVE application PL2021-0012 for 252 St. George Street with the clarification that the deck plants would run from the house towards St. George Street. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Wingo.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Wingo, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. Certificates of Appropriateness

6. (a) PL2021-0027 – 260 St. George St., LLC – Applicant and Owner 260 St. George Street

To replace the existing windows with new wood windows, existing stucco with new stucco, and existing siding with new wood siding.

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 at **260 St. George Street** because the wholesale replacement of all the plaster, wood siding, and historic wood windows does not meet the applicable Secretary of the Interior's Standards 2, 4, and 9 with the following findings:

The HARB is to determine

1. Where the threshold is of change that qualifies as a Certificate of Appropriateness and where the line is crossed
2. What is the result of the wholistic change is going to be and how much historic material will remain

Chris Middlebrooks reviewed the application, citing his intent to mimic the existing look of the building with fresh materials to protect the structure from water.

The Board provided their ex parte communications.

Public hearing was opened.

Tara Owen spoke in favor of the application.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- The scope of the project was wide and the structure needed a dry-in material to protect it
- Differentiating the three eras of the building utilizing the different types of siding
- Recommendation to learn the state of the interior of the walls to determine how much water damage has occurred
- The need for a comprehensive scope of work that detailed the restoration plan for the building and analysis of the structure's condition including windows and stucco/wood exterior
- The desire to see a compromise between trying to salvage historical materials and whole-sale replacement of all materials
- If wood siding could be determined as the original exterior wall material, the potential existed to return the exterior to wood siding to mitigate the problems caused by stucco on wood
- Applicant planned to remove window unit air conditioners
- Plan could be laid out with photographs rather than elevation drawings
- Recommendation to detail how the wood around the windows would be designed to keep water out
- The need to remove the siding and the potential to need to replace with wood siding in-kind
- Request from the Board that applicant put in the effort to examine windows, provide a window schedule, and attempt to rehab as many as possible

Mr. Middlebrooks said he intended to replace all stucco, re-install existing wood siding and replace any in-kind as necessary, and leave the novelty siding.

There was continued discussion regarding window lights throughout the structure, and the possibility of utilizing the number of lites in each section of the building, as well as the types of exterior finish/siding to differentiate the additions to the building that had occurred over time.

Mr. Middlebrooks confirmed that his intent was to replace the stucco entirely to better waterproof that portion of the building and that he would remove and re-install existing siding to waterproof the structure, and replace any siding to match existing if necessary.

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to CONTINUE application PL2021-0027 to the April 15, 2021 meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Wingo.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Wingo, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY²

6. (b) PL2021-0028 – Michael Skjernerig – Applicant
Michael & Kirsten L. Skjernerig – Owner
165 Cordova Street

To re-establish a door opening on the rear façade and modify the stoop at that location, construct a single carport and storage building, and elevate the rear yard area with a retaining wall, add fencing, pavers, and a pool.

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 **165 Cordova Street** because it meets the applicable Secretary of the Interior's

² Recess from 3:01p.m. to 3:08p.m.

Standards 3, 6, 8, 9, and 10 with the following condition(s):

1. Paver presented to HARB is a true clay paver that matches the traditional character of historic paving materials and patterns
2. Use alternate plant materials that are native or listed in the AGHP (see item 1e previous section)
3. Applicant acknowledges that there are archaeological requirements, zoning requirements, and potential changes to code requirements related to the use of fill on residential properties

Michael Skjerner reviewed the application, including changes in response to staff concerns.³

The Board provided their ex parte communications.

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

The Board discussed:

- Proposed changes effectively addressed staff concerns
- Six Foot fence would hide view of storage building
- Concern that the galvanized fence would rust
- Request that variegated plant meet the AGHP criteria

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE application PL2021-0028 with the following conditions:

- **The garage be reduced to the proposed storage building as submitted**

³ Attached to original packet

- **The retaining wall has been eliminated from the application**
- **The brick pattern be basket-weave as shown in the supplemental drawings**
- **The alterations to the rear steps and the re-opening of a pre-existing door opening be approved as submitted**
- **The wood fence be approved as submitted with the updated alternative layout**
- **The applicant work with staff to ensure all plant materials were either AGHP approved or a native Florida species.**

The motion was SECONDED by Mr. MacDonald.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, MacDonald, Wingo, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. Opinion of Appropriateness

7. (a) PL2021-0030 – Peter Hotz, Architect of Peter Hotz Inc – Applicant
Michelle D. Ruby – Owner
308 St. George Street

To construct a two-story addition to the rear of the residential building, renovate the existing residence, and modify the site and landscape features to include an in-ground pool, patio, driveway, and retaining wall.

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** an Opinion of Appropriateness at **308 St. George Street** because the overall mass and height of the proposed two-story addition in relation to the existing structure is not generally compatible with the requirements of the AGHP. She added

that the proposed addition was nearly double the size of the existing structure and was therefore not compatible as an addition as it would overwhelm the existing structure.

Peter Hotz reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

Ms. Courtney responded to the applicant's presentation citing the AGHP and the plans submitted that showed that the proposed addition would be visible from the street.

The Board discussed:

- Scale of the addition seemed overlarge
- View of the cottage from Cordova Street was heavily altered
- Possible alternative designs to lessen the impact to the existing cottage, such as a detached garage, or a one-story addition
- Proposed two-story addition would be visible from St. George Street
- Zoning setback requirements may hinder a detached garage or single-story addition unless a variance could be obtained

MOTION

Mr. MacDonald MOVED to CONTINUE application PL2021-0030 at 308 St. George Street to the April 15, 2021 meeting pending further research into changing the mass of the design. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Wingo.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: MacDonald, Wingo, Benoit, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. Certificate of Demolition and Partial Demolition

8. (a) PL2021-0026 – Black Box Design Inc – Applicant

John Street Realty LLC – Owner
46 John Street

To demolish historic original portion and later addition of a building constructed c. 1950 that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and not located in a 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 **46 John 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, including the wood doors, pine boards and interior knotty pine paneling, 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

Robert Balch reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

17 certified notices were sent, 1 was returned in favor.

Public hearing was opened.

B.J. Kalaidi approved of the replacement structure being single-story and asked that staff read the breakdown for notice responses.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed that the structure had been heavily altered and was not eligible as a local landmark or contributing structure.

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE application PL2021-0028, finding that the building is not individually eligible as a landmark and would not be considered a contributing structure to any future historic district. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Wingo.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Wingo, MacDonald, Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. (b) PL2021-0029 – George & Monika Selmont – Applicant and Owner 339 Charlotte Street

To partially demolish a building constructed c. 1910-1917 that is recorded in the Florida Master Site File and not located in a district, to include building elements related to a building elevation and rehabilitation such as doors, windows, additions, and chimney.

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 **339 Charlotte Street** to include the front and rear stoops, the north side porch, the south shed/garage, the alteration to the fenestration on the front façade and shed roof dormer on east elevation, and the coquina chimney 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

windows, coquina chimney, and pre-cast concrete block along the foundation 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

George Selmont reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

19 certified notices were sent, 1 was returned in favor.

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

The Board discussed:

- House needed to be lifted 5 feet to meet freeboard requirement
- House flooded extensively during hurricanes
- Structure was outside of the historic district and did not fall under HARB purview for replacement design
- Most architecturally significant piece of the structure was the chimney which the applicant intended to rebuild if it could not be lifted in its current condition or was damaged in the process

MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE partial demolition application PL2021-0029 finding that the removal of the proposed building elements including the shed, stairs, side screened porch would not significantly alter the character of the building and with the request that if there are materials that could be salvaged, that

the applicant make a good-faith effort to restore or reuse those materials. The motion was **SECONDED** by Ms. Wingo.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Benoit, Wingo, MacDonald,
Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

9. Planning and Building Staff Communications

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

(Not included in the packet)

10. Other Business

10. (a) Review and recommendation for the National Register nomination of the Public Burial Ground aka Huguenot Cemetery

Ms. Courtney reviewed the subject and asked for a consensus of the Board regarding the nomination. She clarified that the Cemetery was not already included in a National Historic District.

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

MOTION

Ms. Wingo **MOVED** that the HARB wholeheartedly supports the nomination of the St. Augustine Public Burial Ground also known-as the Huguenot Cemetery as part of the National Register of Historic Places. The motion was **SECONDED** by Mr. Benoit.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Wingo, Benoit, MacDonald,
Duncan

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Ms. Duncan observed that the Cemetery was a vulnerable property that, unlike other historic places, could not be raised above flood-levels.

Board Member Comments

Mr. Benoit requested that staff consider swearing-in the applicant after the staff report to streamline the meeting further.

Mr. MacDonald noted the need to review and possibly reconsider approved plant materials in the AGHP considering recent applications where unapproved plants had to be denied even though the proposed plant materials were similar and more sustainable. He surmised that perhaps the list was too restrictive.

There was a brief discussion regarding the AGHP approved plants list which touched upon the difficulty in finding some of the approved plants as well as staff's efforts to look into updating the entire AGHP which would include alternative plant and building materials as well as possible landscape design review for projects.

11. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:12 P.M.⁴



Catherine Duncan, Chairperson

⁴ Transcribed by Candice Seymour