

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE, FLORIDA

Regular Historic Architectural Review Board Meeting
December 19, 2002

The Historic Architectural Review Board met in formal session at 2:00 P.M., Thursday, December 19, 2002 in The Alcazar Room at City Hall. The meeting was called to order by Chairman Dana Ste. Claire, and the following were present:

1. ROLL CALL

Dana Ste. Claire, Chairman
Roy Barnes
Peter Rumpel

Absent: Sally Ann Freeman
Henry Whetstone

City Staff: James Wilson, City Attorney
Mark Knight, Director, Planning and Building Department
David Birchim, Senior Planner
Pam Halterman, Recording Secretary

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
(November 21, 2002 regular meeting)

Mr. Ste. Claire asked if there were any corrections to the minutes.

MOTION

Mr. Barnes moved to approve the minutes as submitted. Mr. Rumpel seconded.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE.

3. CERTIFICATE OF
APPROPRIATENESS

Item 3(a) 2002-1183
Bayfront Golf
111 Avenida Menendez
To install lighting.

Jim Wettach, 26 Colony Street was sworn and stated that he represented the sightseeing trains. He added that they had assumed the lease for Bayfront Golf. He explained that they planned to be open during the evening hours by February 1st and they were before the board to obtain approval of outside lighting. He noted that they had submitted to the board two types of lighting:

- ❖ Lantern style Lexington
- ❖ Marina style Woodbridge (currently installed at the City Marina)

He advised that the area needed to be well lit for safety due to the concrete curbing and that the wiring would be installed underground for safety reasons. He stated that they would need to install a minimum of ten lights, although it could require up to fifteen lights. He commented that they would prefer to install as few lights as

possible, but enough to adequately light the area.

Mr. Ste. Claire opened the public hearing but there was no response from the public.

Mr. Rumpel stated that he would prefer the lantern style and questioned whether the brightness would be equal between the two styles.

Mr. Wettach advised that they were equal in brightness. He stated that they would prefer the lantern style, which would be more in line with the appearance of the area.

Mr. Rumpel questioned whether the City planned to change the downtown lighting from the lantern style in the future.

Mr. Birchim advised that eventually the gas style lights would replace the lantern style, however, it was currently on tabled status.

MOTION

Mr. Rumpel moved to approve the application with the conditions that the Lexington LXF lantern style lighting fixtures be used as presented in the application. Mr. Barnes seconded.

Mr. Barnes asked if the board should stipulate the number of light poles that they would be allowed to install.

Mr. Birchim advised that the board could let the applicant make that determination because they had already stated that they would prefer the lesser amount of poles.

Mr. Rumpel suggested that they remain with the number of poles that had been indicated on the application.

Mr. Wettach stated that the electrician had indicated that there would be a maximum of fifteen poles, however, they preferred to remain with ten poles.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Item 3(b) 2002-1187

William J. Schmelz

241 St. George Street

To construct an aluminum pool enclosure.

William Schmelz, 917 Delcie Drive was sworn in and stated that he represented the St. Augustine Aluminum Company. He advised that the same plans had been submitted approximately one year earlier and at the time the situation was similar due to only three board members in attendance. He explained that during the hearing the Sisters of St. Joseph had decided to ask the board to table the application. He noted that they had hired an architect to redesign the pool enclosure. He said that although the architect had obtained an approval from the board, the design was more than necessary and would cost between \$80,000 and \$100,000 dollars to build. Therefore, he stated that he had submitted the original design with the hopes that it would generate more discussion between the board members than the last time it was presented resulting in approval. He described the pool enclosure as fully surrounded by a seven and one-half foot wall with the roof top being the only portion of the structure that would be noticeable. He added that they would apply the same steel roofing as that used on other buildings in the complex. He reiterated that the Sisters were attempting to keep the cost down.

Mr. Ste. Claire opened the public hearing but there was no response from the public.

Mr. Ste. Claire stated that he had sat on the board along with the other members when the original application came before the board. He clarified that the original application had been reviewed and discussed at depth and the general consensus of the board was that they were not comfortable with an aluminum pool enclosure in a Historic District. He added that the board had requested that the architect, Don Crichlow, return with a design that would be more architecturally and historically compatible with the surrounding architecture. He noted that Mr. Crichlow had returned with a more appropriate design, which had been approved by the board. He reiterated that the project had generated much discussion that centered on that issue.

Mr. Rumpel stated that he concurred with Mr. Ste. Claire's recollection.

Mr. Schmelz stated that he had attended the first meeting and the board had only discussed the issue of the enclosure material which was aluminum. He added that Mr. Crichlow had taken over the meeting and when he saw that it would not receive approval, he quickly requested that the application be tabled. He asked whether the approved design included an aluminum structure decorated with concrete. He added that the aluminum structure that had been approved was quite prominent.

Mr. Rumpel clarified that the approved design was fifteen feet high and Mr. Schmelz's design would be twelve feet high. He explained that if the board accepted the idea that anything behind a wall was not their concern, it would be unjust because the City was composed of walls and most of the architecture was located behind walls. He reiterated that it was not a good way to review applications. He stated that it would

set a precedence to allow a non-traditional and non-historic enclosure and would make it hard for the board to turn down other applications. He said other solutions were more costly, however, the previous design would reflect the historic integrity of the area more than the applicant's design. He expressed that he had the same reservation regarding the design.

Mr. Schmelz stated that he had not obtained Mr. Crichlow's drawing that the board had approved and questioned whether that design consisted of an aluminum structure with decorated concrete.

Mr. Rumpel explained that it consisted of stucco with block that surrounded the pool along with screening and topped with a gabled roof.

Mr. Schmelz stated that his design would better reflect the buildings in the complex. He reiterated that his design would not show the aluminum. He requested that the board offer guidance with a redesign that would aid in keeping the cost down for the Sisters of St Joseph.

Mr. Ste. Claire asked if the driving issue was the cost of the enclosure and not necessarily the historic or architectural appropriateness.

Mr. Schmelz stated that it was not only the cost but the use of the room itself. He added that with the massive concrete and block wall, it would appear as an enclosed swimming pool and not opened as desired by the Sisters.

Mr. Rumpel suggested that Mr. Schmelz's design would consist of a similar amount of sun blockage due to the sizable metal portion of the roof.

Mr. Schmelz stated that it would be quite different due to the air flow from the opened sides of the enclosure.

A discussion ensued between Mr. Rumpel and the applicant regarding the difference between the old and new designs.

Mr. Rumpel stated that he would not be opposed to reviewing another design. He added that the applicant could design a less expensive enclosure that would meet with his approval, however, the proposed design would not be appropriate. He suggested that the applicant incorporate lattice and other materials into his design.

Mr. Schmelz agreed that the enclosure would be less expensive by incorporating lattice into the design.

Mr. Barnes questioned whether precedence would be set by allowing the proposed enclosure. He commented that the decision should be at the discretion of the board because the enclosure would be surrounded by a wall along with other influencing factors.

Mr. Rumpel commented that nothing was written in stone and precedence was "another weakened link in the chain" which would make it easier to prove with the next application.

Mr. Wilson advised that precedence was something that the board was legally required to follow. He reiterated that if the board erred, it did not mean that they would be required to repeat the mistake over and over. He noted that the board was required to apply the AGHP and City Code in a manner that would be required for the district involved. He said that it was at the

board's discretion to apply the codes and attempt to reconcile the proposal with the code provisions. He added that only the codes would be binding for the board.

Mr. Barnes stated that it was obvious that the proposed enclosure did not fit the area. He questioned how one could dress up a less expensive enclosure and remain with an appropriate appearance for the area.

Mr. Ste. Claire concurred with Mr. Barnes.

Mr. Rumpel recalled his suggestion to design a much less expensive structure and meet the intent of the code along with maintaining an appropriate appearance.

Mr. Ste. Claire stated that he agreed with the members of the board. He said that their concern was to ensure that the enclosure be architecturally compatible. He added that an addition of any aluminum enclosure in the HP district would be obtrusive. He advised that the board had approved a design that was close to masking that obtrusiveness. He suggested that the Sisters of St. Joseph would be the first to agree that they would want the structure architecturally compatible with the area. He instructed the applicant to revisit the approved design and find a way to reduce the cost of that installation.

MOTION

Mr. Rumpel moved to deny the application as submitted. Mr. Barnes seconded.

Mr. Ste. Claire added that staff recognized the same concerns and had recommended denial of the application.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**4. CERTIFICATE OF DEMOLITION /
CERTIFICATE OF
APPROPRIATENESS**

Item 4(a) 2002-2189

Don Crichlow

103 ½ Marine Street

**To demolish an existing house and
construct a single family residence.**

Mr. Ste. Claire noted that the applicant had requested that the application be withdrawn with one minor caveat that the board needed to discuss prior to a formal action. He read for the record the letter submitted by Mr. Crichlow to Mr. Knight regarding the application:

The property located at 103 ½ Marine St., which was the subject of the above referenced application, has recently (12/16/02) sold. The new owner desires to renovate the existing structure in lieu of demolition. The new owner has therefore requested that the current request for demolition be withdrawn. We will re-apply for a Certificate of Appropriateness for next month's HARB meeting. This way staff will have an opportunity to review and make recommendations on the new proposal prior to the meeting,

If it is possible to withdraw the request for demolition only and table the current request for Certificate of Appropriateness in order to save a new application fee, we would prefer that option. In any event I will have drawings for your review by December 27th.

We appreciate your consideration in this matter. Please let me know if a new application needs to be filed.

Mr. Ste. Claire stated that it was good news that the owner and the architect had explored the preservation / restoration option. He advised that the board was not required to formally take action on the withdrawal, although the board should take action on the request from Mr. Crichlow to table the Certificate of Appropriateness portion of the application.

MOTION

Mr. Rumpel moved to table the Certificate of Appropriateness application until January 16th HARB meeting. Mr. Barnes seconded.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. CERTIFICATE OF DEMOLITION

Item 5(a) 2002-1182

Jon Cummins

136 Marine Street

To remove a front porch.

Mr. Ste. Claire clarified that the Certificate of Demolition request did not involve the structure, although it was a demolition of a feature considered not to be a character of the house.

Jon Cummins, 136 Marine Street was sworn in and stated that he had recently purchased the house from the City of St. Augustine. He noted that they had intended to renovate the house. He advised that they had not obtained architectural drawings because they wanted to see the outcome of the hearing prior to spending the funds for the drawings. He added that the plans involved turning a vernacular style house into a Mediterranean revival style. He noted that they would remove the decaying front wrap-around porch and place the outdoor living

area to the rear of the house. He advised that the property was not historic and was located south of the Historic District.

Mr. Ste. Claire opened the public hearing but there was no response from the public.

Mr. Barnes stated that the property was not located in the Historic District and the plans appeared to be appropriate. He said that it would be wrong for the board to apply their authority too far out of the Historic District even if the owner desired to renovate in a preservation minded manner. He suggested that it was a simple issue to decide.

Mr. Ste. Claire stated that the house had lost its character because of the stucco and that the historical integrity had been compromised. He said the selective demolition would remove those elements of the house that would allow the applicant to restore the structure to its full grandeur.

Mr. Cummins stated that the board would be pleased with the results of the renovation. He noted that Ms. Freeman was a neighbor of his.

Mr. Rumpel stated that he resided across the street from 136 Marine Street and was also a neighbor of the applicant.

Mr. Cummins advised that he had taken photographs of Mr. Rumpel's garage and planned to incorporate certain design elements from that structure into his property.

Mr. Ste. Claire stated that in the current state, the house was very ugly, however, a jewel would be discovered under the modifications.

MOTION

Mr. Barnes moved to approve the application as submitted. Mr. Rumpel seconded.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Item 5(b) 2002-1136

Lottie Mays

95 Evergreen Avenue

To demolish a house.

Mr. Ste. Claire advised that the applicant was not present that day, however, the board would move forward and review the application without representation.

Mr. Ste. Claire opened the public hearing but there was no response from the public.

Mr. Ste. Claire stated that he had been consistent with voting in opposition of demolitions, however, the structure had been severely damaged by fire and it had become a life safety issue.

Mr. Birchim advised that Mr. Ste. Claire was correct. He directed attention to the photographs in the packet and noted that the fire had penetrated the roof and wood siding. He reported that Code Enforcement was pursuing a case against the owner for an unsafe structure. He stated that staff was asking the board to grant a Certificate of Demolition.

Mr. Ste. Claire noted that the fire had burned through the rafters and the porch had extensive damage.

MOTION

Mr. Barnes moved to approve the application as submitted.

Mr. Rumpel stated that he would have liked to review photographs of the inside damage of the structure.

Mr. Knight reported that the fire had started in the interior of the building and burned from the inside out. He advised that the structure should be demolition.

Mr. Rumpel commented that it was hard to determine from the photographs, however, he would accept Mr. Knight's word on the matter that the structure was irretrievable damaged.

Mr. Rumpel seconded.

Mr. Ste. Claire expressed that while he always voted to deny demolitions, it was a life safety issue and that staff along with Code Enforcement recommended approval of the demolition.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**6. PLANNING AND BUILDING
DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

Mr. Knight advised that he was available if the board had questions regarding the report.

7. OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Knight advised that the board had before them a proposed ordinance that included suggestions that the minimum qualifications and criteria identified for HARB members were very detailed and appeared to reflect a job application. He noted that they had simplified that section of the Code to identify the different factions that the City preferred to see on the board. He described the experience and educational background needed for new members of the HARB and noted that he had reviewed

qualifications for both HARB and PZB. In summary, he stated that he had removed the required timeframes of schooling and/or experience from both board descriptions.

NON-AGENDA ITEM

Mr. Ste. Claire recognized Susan Parker as the new Regional Manager for the Division of Historical Resources and noted that she had taken office at the Government House. He asked Ms. Parker if she would like to make any comments to the board.

Ms. Parker stated that she had served eleven years as a historian with the St. Augustine Preservation Board until it was eliminated by the State Legislators. She informed the board that she had returned to St. Augustine as the Community Assistant Consultant with the State's Division of Historical Resources and her office was located in the Government House. She indicated that she would attempt to attend a number of the HARB meetings. She stated that she was glad to be back and offered her assistance to the board.

Mr. Ste. Claire welcomed Ms. Parker and stated that they were very fortunate to have her and her historical expertise, and he hoped she would be able to participate in many HARB meetings.

OTHER BUSINESS con't

Mr. Knight asked for feedback from the board on the proposed ordinance and noted that he had added a resolution that was also attached to the board's packet.

Mr. Ste. Claire asked who had requested the revisions to the ordinance.

Mr. Knight reported that Commissioner Crichlow had asked him to review the ordinance and present it to the City Commission at their January meeting.

Mr. Ste. Claire asked what Commissioner Crichlow specific concerns were on the qualifications.

Mr. Knight noted that the City had a difficult time finding people to meet those minimum qualifications.

Mr. Rumpel commented that the qualifications were being ignored because many board members did not meet the minimum qualifications.

Mr. Knight reported that the new resolution involved building Colonial style homes in HP-1 where a limited number of Colonial structures existed. As an example, he noted that a street would consist of mostly framed vernacular and the owner of new construction would be required to build a Colonial style which required it to be set close to the street and made the house appear out of character with the streetscape. He stated that he created a resolution that would identify the general make-up of HP-1 based on the style of architecture and the new resolution set forth a guideline in HP-1 that would allow the new construction to match the architectural style of the buildings on either side of it and not be required to meet the strict Colonial style guidelines. He noted that it was suggested that the same resolution should apply to HP-2 and HP-3 and said he was seeking feedback from the board regarding the new resolution.

Mr. Rumpel stated that he agreed with the resolution and had suggested it earlier.

Mr. Wilson stated that at one point, people desired to reconstruct the entire town as a Spanish – Colonial village. He said that when the resolution was adopted, many people did not have a full appreciation of some of the structures that were built at the turn of the century. He commented that currently, forty to fifty years later, people possessed a whole different appreciation for the structures.

Mr. Rumpel agreed with Mr. Wilson and noted a recent example included Mr. Pierre Thompson's house on Charlotte Street, which was the only Spanish-Colonial house in the entire area.

Mr. Ste. Claire stated that it was a timely resolution.

Mr. Barnes asked if desired, one would be able to build a Colonial style house.

Mr. Knight stated that one would be allowed to build a Colonial style home.

Mr. Barnes clarified that even if the streetscape was not Colonial, one could build Colonial.

Mr. Ste. Claire summarized that the resolution recognized the diversity of architectural styles in the City which was the intent and purpose of the resolution.

Mr. Knight questioned if the board desired to include HP-2 and HP-3 regarding the new resolution.

Mr. Rumpel stated that he agreed that the resolution should include HP-2 and 3 districts.

Ms. Parker suggested that the guidelines be reviewed. She indicated that Mr. Manucy's work was based largely on structures that

were standing at the time. She commented that they had learned much about Colonial architecture since that period and it had not been incorporated into the guidelines. She said that if those guidelines were to be reviewed, there should be an expanded description of Colonial architecture, and if they obtained good research, those findings could be incorporated into their structures.

Mr. Ste. Claire stated that the language would eventually be placed into the Code which would reflect those changes set forth by the resolution.

Mr. Knight advised that he did not intend on having more specific language than that which was in the resolution before the board that day.

MOTION

Mr. Rumpel moved to recommend approval of the resolution to the City Commission and to recommend that HP-2 and HP-3 districts be included in the resolution. Mr. Barnes seconded.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Mr. Knight asked if the board would like to recommend approval of the ordinance to simplify the qualifications for HARB members.

MOTION

Mr. Rumpel moved to recommend approval of the proposed ordinance to the City Commission. Mr. Barnes seconded.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

NON-AGENDA ITEM

Mr. Ste. Claire noted that there existed a number of reports regarding Heritage

Tourism and the economic impact to the City of St. Augustine. He recalled the two and one-half year study from the University of Florida, Center for Tourism, that indicated the strength of the Heritage Tourism market and the economic impact it had on the local community. He said that the Flagler College, Department of Marketing, through Dr. Livingston, had produced a small report involving a study with one-hundred and fifty people that showed interesting visitor preferences. He added that the National Trust for Historic Preservation had been in the process of developing an on-going study involving Heritage Tourism and its balance with Historic Preservation. He noted that two of those documents were available through the City of St. Augustine or one could download the reports through the VCB website and Chamber of Commerce. He advised that those reports provided important and timely information about the Heritage Tourism industry. He stated that the report explained how Heritage Tourism played an important role in Historic Preservation with the protection of the City's historic fabric which attracted a particular segment of tourism audiences. He said that while tourism took on a negative connotation, Heritage Tourism was very important for Historic Preservation and seeking a balance between the two aspects would aid in understanding the relationship. He noted that those documents were available and suggested that HARB include that topic in a future discussion.

8. REVIEW OF CONFLICT STATEMENTS FROM PREVIOUS MEETING

None

9. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting
adjourned at 3:13 PM.

Dana Ste.Claire, Chairman

Pam Halterman, Recording Secretary