

## CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

### Historic Architectural Review Board Regular Meeting May 24, 2018

The Historic Architectural Review Board met in formal session at 1:00 P.M., Thursday, May 24, 2018, in the Alcazar Room at City Hall, St. Augustine, Florida. Antoinette (Toni) Wallace, Chairperson, called the regular meeting to order, and the following were present:

#### 1. ROLL CALL:

Toni Wallace, Chairperson  
Catherine Duncan, Vice-Chairperson  
Barbara Wingo  
Jon Benoit  
Paul Weaver, alternate

#### City Staff:

Jenny Wolfe, Historic Preservation Officer  
Kelli Mitchell, Historic Preservation Planner  
Isabelle Lopez, City Attorney  
Candice Seymour, Recording Secretary

#### 2. General Public Comments for Items not on the Agenda

The following members of the public gave comments:

- Ed Slavin
- Robert Hall

#### 3. Approval of Minutes

Ms. Wingo corrected a scrivener's error on page nine.

#### MOTION

Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE the April 19, 2018 minutes as corrected. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Wingo and APPROVED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

#### 4. Modification and approval of Agenda

(None)

#### MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE the Agenda as presented. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Wingo and

APPROVED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

#### 5. Public Comments related to Expedited Hearing items:

(None)

#### 6. Continued Items from Previous Meetings

#### 6. (a) Opinion of Appropriateness F2017-0153 – Don Crichtlow & Assoc. – Applicant

18 St. George Street LLC.– Owner  
18 St. George Street

To construct new buildings between Spanish and St. George set in the character of the Spanish Colonial Architecture. (Two versions of the proposed building were provided.)

Mr. Weaver recused himself because he was hired by the applicant to assist with an ad valorem tax exemption.<sup>1</sup>

The Board provided their ex parte communications.

<sup>1</sup> Form attached to original minutes

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** option "B" with modifications as an Opinion of Appropriateness for the construction of new buildings at **18 St. George Street**.

Don Crichlow and Ellen Avery-Smith reviewed the application with a presentation and additional documents.<sup>2</sup>

Public hearing was opened.

Robert Hall said that the project should look like a home to match the surrounding street. He said larger front entrances were more common on garden entrances and not front doors and he did not feel the wide doorway was appropriate.

Dan Holiday said that in the past, smaller structures were preferred on St. George Street.

Martha Mickler gave a brief history of the property and surrounding area and noted the architectural style she and her husband adhered to when they built their home in HP-3. She said, while she was concerned with the larger structures being constructed, she was pleased with the landscaping of those projects.

Nancy Pellicer had questions related to the plans. She was concerned about a large arcade in the area and asked that the builder designate a larger courtyard area.

Ron Mickler was concerned with the fact that the proposed structure was one large building which mirrors more closely structures in HP-2 rather than HP-3. He recommended an open-air market rather than an enclosed arcade.

Ed Slavin felt the large mass and scale of the project was inappropriate and the

application needed to be denied. He felt that examples of precedence should not alter the Board's decision on this application.

B.J. Kalaidi felt that the project was too dense and needed to be toned down prior to approval.

Public hearing was closed.

Ms. Avery-Smith responded to public comment noting that there would be an open space in the rear that could be landscaped and that one structure in the rear was removed to increase that space. She said the street-to-street wall was required according to the design guidelines for Second Spanish Period Architecture.

Mr. Crichlow clarified a connector in response to public comment. He felt that Option "A," which utilized the connector was more appropriate in scale and mass because it broke up the mass more than the single large primary structure in Option "B."

The Board discussed:

- Distance requirements for structures on the property
- Doorway and courtyard area
- Large mass of the project
- Existing and proposed covered areas
- Residential precedence of the site
- Mass and Scale of southern exposure
- Possibility of lessening the inset for the connector on the northern exposure to increase the inset on the south side allowing for more landscaping
- Staff recommendation to approve option "B"
- Option "C" presented by the applicant moved the larger primary structure to the front
- Regarding architectural compatibility, more separation

<sup>2</sup> Attached to original minutes

between buildings may be necessary

- Potential for connecting every building on the property though that was not the applicant's intent
- Concern for tight walkway between wall and the building on the south side
- Door should not be arched

#### **MOTION**

**Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE Opinion of Appropriateness application F2017-0153 with the suggestion to move forward with option "C" as proposed with the suggestion to improve on the differentiation in the southern loggia or hallway by adding further recess to the connectors as ways to differentiate the main structures. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Duncan.**

#### **VOTE ON MOTION:**

**AYES: Benoit, Duncan, Wingo, Wallace  
NAYES: NONE  
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY<sup>3</sup>**

**6. (b) Variance to the Design Standards for Entry Corridors 2018-0047 – Joanna Stark – Applicant**  
**Diocese of St. Augustine – Owner**  
**101 San Marco Avenue**

To request a variance to the sign standards for a free standing sign that exceeds the maximum size allowed in the Design Standards.

Ms. Wolfe read the staff report and said based on a review of the Design Standards and applicable city ordinances, Staff finds that the Board can APPROVE a Variance that makes the following findings for signage at 101 San Marco Avenue:

1. That the stand-alone sign at the central entry does not interfere with the property's setting and sightline to

the bridge and the Great Cross because it is set back on the property

2. That the northwest sign is an integral component of a proposed fence system and the sign area can be calculated as the smallest geometric shape surrounding the letters
3. That granting the variance will not be contrary to the public interest, will not affect other property or structures and will be in harmony with the spirit intent and purpose of this provision.

Brad Beach reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

The Board discussed:

- Dimensions for both proposed signs had been reduced from the previous meeting as requested by the Board
- Sign copy area as measured in the plans

#### **MOTION**

**Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE application 2018-0047. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Wingo.**

#### **VOTE ON MOTION:**

**AYES: Benoit, Wingo, Weaver, Duncan, Wallace  
NAYES: NONE  
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

#### **7. Opinions of Appropriateness**

**7. (a) F2018-0066 – 56 St. George LLC – Applicant**  
**The Monk's Vineyard – Owner**  
**56 St. George Street**

<sup>3</sup> Brief recess from 2:57p.m. to 3:07p.m.

**To replace the rear canopy, the front balcony, the second story windows and doors (main façade), and the existing stucco (main façade); cover the low wall in the front with stucco; install a handrail on the rear stairs and balcony; remove the existing A/C unit and hood exhaust and replace with new equipment; remove existing windows on the southern façade and install new windows on the same elevation; and paint a portion of the front façade.**

Ms. Mitchell 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** an Opinion of Appropriateness for **56 St. George Street** with the condition that the future Certificate of Appropriateness application addresses design issues to include the windows and balcony width.

Whitney Hobbes and Robert Crabtree reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

Public hearing was opened.

Dan Holiday spoke in favor of the application citing that the building had not been drastically changed or maintained since he rented the building in 1959.

Martha Mickler spoke in favor of the application.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- One-over-one sash window more appropriate than proposed colonial style
- Suggestion of an alternative to proposed wood roof shingle

Nate Goldberger, architect on the project, noted that the steel windows on the side elevation were to maintain fire-rating but that the style could be changed if desired.

There was further discussion regarding maintaining historical integrity of the structure by choosing a window style and pattern more closely related to the existing historic windows.

The Board also discussed concerns for extending the balcony since, historically; the balcony would have remained at the shorter width.

#### **MOTION**

**Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE Opinion of Appropriateness application F2018-0066 with the conditions that the applicant consider a roofing material other than the proposed wood shingles and that the new window design be based on the historic windows that are in place by replacing the forward windows in kind, and designing the side windows to replicate the largest window opening with a one-over-one metal-type window. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Benoit.**

#### **VOTE ON MOTION:**

**AYES: Weaver, Benoit, Wingo, Duncan, Wallace**

**NAYES: NONE**

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

#### **8. Certificates of Appropriateness**

**8. (a) F2018-0064 – Crown Castle NG East LLC – Applicant**  
**City of St. Augustine – Owner**  
**NE corner of Cathedral Place and Cordova Street**

**To construct a 40 foot tall concrete utility pole with an antenna and telecommunications equipment on the current sidewalk area.**

The Board provided their ex parte communications.

Ms. Mitchell 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 for **Cordova Street** to give the applicant time to consider relocating the utility pole to an area that will allow for vertical screening.

Chris Milnes reviewed the application.

Public hearing was opened.

Ed Slavin asked that the application be continued.

Les Thomas spoke against the application and was concerned that with the installation of one tower, more would follow.

B.J. Kalaidi spoke against the application.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Reasons that necessitate installation of the tower including providing cellular signal
- Florida legislation providing a legal right to install utility poles/towers in the right-of-way
- Possibility of finding other right-of-way locations

## MOTION

**Mr. Weaver MOVED to CONTINUE application F2018-0064 to the June 21, 2018 meeting to allow the applicant time to consider other right-of-way locations and appropriate finishes. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Duncan.**

### **VOTE ON MOTION:**

**AYES: Weaver, Duncan, Benoit, Wingo, Wallace**

**NAYES: NONE**

## **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

### **9. Certificates of Demolition**

#### **9. (a) F2018-0060 – Century 21 Property Group and Les Thomas Architect Inc. – Applicant**

**Robert F. and Barbara Carberry – Owner**  
**10 Beacon Street**

**To demolish a building constructed in 1956 that is recorded on the Florida Master Site File and is not located in a historic district.**

Ms. Mitchell 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 for **10 Beacon Street**.

Irene Arriola and Les Thomas reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

20 certified notices were sent, 4 were returned in favor, 4 were returned opposed and 5 had comments.

Public hearing was opened.

B.J. Kalaidi asked that the comments submitted against the application be read into the record.

Public hearing was closed.

Ms. Wallace and Mr. Weaver briefly read the certified notice comments.

The Board discussed the fact that there was no legal basis to deny the demolition.

## MOTION

**Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE demolition application F2018-0060 for 10**

Beacon Street on the basis that the structure was not an existing or potential historic building eligible for the National Register or individual landmark, or potentially contributing to a local or national register historic district. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Wingo.

**VOTE ON MOTION:**

**AYES:** Weaver, Wingo, Benoit, Duncan, Wallace

**NAYES:** NONE

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**9. (b) F2018-0061 – Century 21 Property Group and Les Thomas Architect Inc. – Applicant**

**Mary Ann Cramer & Ana Filomena Macedo – Owner**

**155 Washington Street**

To demolish a building constructed in 1930 that is recorded on the Florida Master Site File and is a contributing building to the Lincolnville Historic District. (Deemed substantially damaged by the city building official).

Ms. Mitchell 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 for **155 Washington Street** with the following condition:

- Recording of the structure for archival purposes prior to demolition to include photographs and measured drawings that will be submitted by the applicant to the Florida Master Site File with a courtesy copy provided to staff.

Irene Arriola and Les Thomas reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

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

Public hearing was opened.

B.J. Kalaidi appreciated that the Board read written comments submitted prior to the meeting.

Candace Carroll, owner of a neighboring property, mentioned the flooding in the area. She said her house was terra cotta and could not be lifted, but she had success with a tide wall until the recent hurricanes. She said the subject house was built by a notable architect. She invited the owner of the house to join a tide wall with hers to help protect the property. She also noted that eaves of the subject house encroached on her property. She felt that demolition by neglect was not a reason to demolish the home.

Dan Holiday felt that the house was not well-maintained and should be preserved.

Ed Slavin spoke against the application saying the tide wall and possibly a local landmark designation should be considered. He wanted more details on the effort to preserve the property.

Ms. Arriola addressed public comment by describing the efforts to preserve the house and noted poor workmanship and advice to protect the house as well as a low elevation that made selling the house as-is difficult.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Variance from FEMA elevation requirements possible, but would make flood insurance costs exorbitant
- Building Official's letter deeming the structure substantially damaged which meant that the structure was required to be brought into

- compliance with building code and flood regulations
- Concern for losing a contributing building
- Meeting FEMA flood requirements through mitigation without raising the structure
- Effects of low-lying houses on community flood insurance ratings
- Desire for further research regarding the history of the structure, particularly whether it was designed by F.A. Hollingsworth

**MOTION**

Mr. Weaver MOVED to CONTINUE application F2018-0061 to the June 21, 2018 meeting to allow for further time to research the history of the structure and to consider mitigation possibilities. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Wingo.

**VOTE ON MOTION:**

AYES: Weaver, Wingo, Duncan  
NAYES: Benoit, Wallace  
MOTION CARRIED 3/2

Ms. Arriola asked for clarification regarding the Board's request for more information.

**9. (c) F2018-0062 – Tracy Vandusen – Applicant**  
**Roger and Tracy Vandusen – Owner**  
**9 Milton Street**

To demolish a garage built in 1930 that is not listed on the Florida Master Site File but that is a contributing building in the Nelmar Terrace Historic District.

Ms. Duncan recused herself as an architect on the project.

The Board provided their ex parte communications.

Ms. Mitchell 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 for **9 Milton Street**.

Tracy Vandusen reviewed the application.

19 certified notices were sent, 2 were returned in favor.

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

The Board discussed information indicating that the garage was a more recent construction than originally believed and there appeared to be no historic reason to deny the application.

**MOTION**

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE application F2018-0062 based on the evidence provided that the building was not historic, there were structural issues, and the building was flood-prone. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Wingo.

**VOTE ON MOTION:**

AYES: Weaver, Wingo, Benoit, Wallace  
NAYES: NONE  
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**9. (d) F2018-0065 – St. Johns Law Group – Applicant**  
**Sale Vita LLC – Owner**  
**841 Anastasia Boulevard**

To demolish a building constructed in 1930 that is recorded on the Florida Master Site File and is not located in a National Register Historic District. (Deemed Substantially Damaged by the Building Official).

Ms. Mitchell 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 for **841 Anastasia Boulevard**.

James Whitehouse reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication:

(None)

15 certified notices were sent, 3 were returned in favor, 1 was returned opposed and 3 had comments.

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

The Board discussed a brief history of the building's ownership.

#### **MOTION**

**Mr. Benoit MOVED to APPROVE Demolition application F2018-0065. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Duncan.**

#### **VOTE ON MOTION:**

**AYES: Benoit, Duncan, Weaver, Wingo, Wallace**

**NAYES: NONE**

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

#### **10. Other Business**

##### **10. (a) Discussion regarding grant applications for three proposals being submitted to the Florida Division of Historical Resources by the City of St. Augustine**

Ms. Wolfe asked that the Board allow Ms. Wallace to sign letters of support for three grant applications to be submitted to the Division of Historic Resources for continued work on the waterworks building, a publication of resilient heritage in the Nation's Oldest City which included a case study on the aftermath of Hurricane's Matthew and Irma and flooding vulnerability of historic resources, and St. Augustine Survey phase four to update West Augustine west of the San Sebastian River.

Ms. Wallace asked for details regarding consultants for hurricane response analysis.

The Board reached consensus to the support letters for each grant.

##### **10. (b) Staff update regarding the status of the Historic Preservation Master Plan**

Ms. Wolfe provided a brief update, noting that she had worked on glossary language, graphics, and historical information. She noted that they requested input from practicing professional architects, contractors, realtors, and design professionals in the area and expect comments from the St. Augustine Historical Society as well. She expected to provide a clean draft version of the plan in August.

There was brief discussion regarding Hazard Mitigation, particularly regarding flood-prone historic structures and there was board consensus to include a discussion at the next meeting regarding the topic.

##### **10. (c) Reminder of National Historic Preservation Month open house at the historic Waterworks in Davenport Park**

(Not discussed)

##### **10. Review of Conflict Statements from Previous Meetings**

#### **11. Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:41 P.M.<sup>4</sup>



Antoinette Wallace, Chairperson

<sup>4</sup> Transcribed by Candice Seymour