

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE, FLORIDA

Historic Architectural Review Board Meeting
December 21, 2006

The Historic Architectural Review Board met in formal session at 2:00 P.M., Thursday, December 21, 2006, in the Alcazar Room at City Hall, St. Augustine, Florida. The meeting was called to order by Dana Ste. Claire, Chairperson, and the following were present:

1. ROLL CALL:

Dana Ste. Claire, Chairperson
Karen Harvey
Peter Rumpel
Antoinette Wallace

Absent:

Paul Weaver, III, Vice Chairperson (Excused)

City Staff:

Mark Knight, Director, Planning and Building Department
Tom Scofield, Historic Preservation Planner
David Birchim, Planning Manager
Robin Upchurch, Assistant City Attorney
Grace M. Vante, Recording Secretary

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
November 16, 2006 – Regular Meeting

Mr. Rumpel moved to approve the minutes of the November 16, 2006 regular meeting with the addition of Ms. Robin Upchurch's name to the list of City staff that had been in attendance. Ms. Wallace seconded.

MOTION CARRIED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

Mr. Scofield advised Mr. Ste. Claire that the minutes of the November 30, 2006 special meeting were in preparation.

3. Certificates of Appropriateness

Item 3 (a) 2006-1173
Howard Davis, Architect – Applicant
John and Teri Sutton - Owners
4 Artillery Lane

To modify exterior entrance.

Mr. Howard Davis, 252 St. George St., was sworn in.

Mr. Scofield referred to the cover sheet of the plans submitted by Mr. Davis regarding the north façade/elevation, and he made the following comments:

- Based on the original approved drawings the third-floor had a small round portal or ocular-styled window.
- Construction proceeded with installation of a double-hung sash window; based on the historical photographs it appeared to be the original configuration.
- The original approval of the ocular-styled window would be rescinded.
- The third-story window will be approved; it was in accordance with the original administration.
- The façade appeared to always be offset.

Mr. Davis noted that there was a column in the center of the peak.

Mr. Scofield referred to the cover sheet and continued with his comments as follows:

- There were four bays on the bottom floor that were distinguished by cast iron pilasters.
- Mr. Davis had tried to maintain a sense of symmetry in the fenestration.
- Recommendation had been made to remove one of the entrance doors.
- Mr. Davis had added an entrance door, addressing staff concern regarding symmetry of fenestration on the north side.
- The transoms were appropriate.
- The side lights had no historic architectural style and should be addressed.

Mr. Scofield referred to the next page and made the following comments:

- On the south façade the fixed windows and doors had originally been approved and were similar to the north façade.
- The courtyard area would have parking, making it reasonable to maintain the openings.
- Downstairs would have one bay dedicated to an isle of ingress allowing vehicles to come through on the first-floor of the building.
- It would be reasonable to have the carriage doors as demonstrated by the applicant.
- The inside courtyard would not have another door.
- The applicant proposed removal of the originally approved carriage doors; the proposal was acceptable to staff.
- The need for opening three of the four bays on the first-floor was questionable and should be addressed by Mr. Davis.

- It was imperative to maintain the eight-foot masonry wall around the perimeter of the courtyards.
- Proposal was to retain the eight-foot masonry wall on the south side and around the courtyard, preventing public viewing.
- Lighting fixture and hardware details had not been submitted by the applicant.
- The board needed to specify whether hardware and lighting fixture details should be listed on a COA application or if staff should review and approve.

Mr. Davis made the following comments:

- The window issue was self-explanatory.
- Regarding the four doors, there were four functions in the front.
- There was a back (inaudible) runner for which the City required an entrance.
- A door had been added to comply with the building department's request for access to the back (inaudible), behind the door and to the right.
- The carriage doors with transoms on either side of the front entrance were as they had been.
- The side lights could be taken out if there had been lights on the doors.
- As the previous application for the south/rear elevation, the plaster fence would be maintained but it was not shown on the photo.
- The only exception was that the six and a half-foot high stone fence on the east wall that ran to the southeast corner of the property would not be modified.
- The two outside openings were approximately 2.5-feet wider because of the difficulty in getting a vehicle through to measure the radius.
- The center opening was for parking a vehicle ninety-degrees under the building.

- The privacy wall would be maintained around the outside of the south courtyard.

Mr. Ste. Claire noted that there were no citizens in attendance for the item. He commented that Mr. Davis had addressed all staff concerns, and he proceeded to summarize the issues. He asked Mr. Scofield if there were any issues that could be referred to staff for review, in addition to the light fixtures and hardware.

Mr. Scofield said that the trim boards had been addressed in the drawings.

Mr. Davis clarified that there was no column on the south elevation where an upper gable was shown and it had been framed with an opening.

Mr. Rumpel questioned why the north elevation could not be done like the south elevation.

(inaudible response)

Mr. Davis commented that there was no post in the center of the opening in the back, but there was in the front.

Ms. Wallace asked for clarification on the third opening in the south elevation.

Mr. Davis said that the middle opening was for parking a vehicle at a ninety-degree angle; the vehicle would be totally under the building. He said that there were approximately six parking spaces; not every unit had one, but they continued to work towards additional parking.

Mr. Rumpel moved to approve application 2006-1173 at 4 Artillery Lane to modify the exterior of the building as follows:

- **On the north façade, eliminate the side entrances on the three exterior doors and the side lights on the exterior doors.**
- **Approve the new window to replace the circular window that had previously been approved, on the south and north elevation.**
- **Eliminate the doors on the south elevation and have open areas with access to the bottom-floor with the condition that the eight-foot wall would be maintained all the way around the south elevation courtyard area, except the area of the six-foot stone wall on the east side.**
- **Defer to staff for the approval of hardware, lighting and various other requirements that had not been submitted.**

Ms. Wallace seconded.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Rumpel, Wallace, Harvey, Ste. Claire

NAYES: None

MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY

Mr. Davis acknowledged a member of the Church in attendance and he thanked the Church for working with him.

Mr. Ste. Claire thanked Mr. Davis and the Church for working together. He asked if the elevator inside the Church had been preserved.

(inaudible response)

Mr. Ste. Claire commented that he would like to see the final product.

Item 3 (b) 2006-1211
Thomas Dailey, Dailey Construction –
Applicant
Conrad and Melissa Weihnacht - Owner
313 St. George Street

To revise previously approved plans.

Thomas Dailey, 3290 U.S. 1 South, was sworn in.

Mr. Scofield reported the following information:

- Six issues had been identified by the applicant.
- The first issue was to place siding on the knee wall at the side yard deck and to install a built-in bench as indicated.
- Work had been completed on a deck at the south side of the house.
- Staff had not identified the addition of a built-in bench as a problem, however, the contemporary appearance of the structure without siding, as originally designed, did not conform to the architectural guidelines for historic preservation.
- The applicant argued that a water trap would be created at the area where the siding met the porch deck.
- Recommendation was made to have vertical members re-configured to avoid inward sloping and eliminate trapping water.
- Pressure treated siding might be an option.
- The original design was more authentic and appropriate in consideration of the architectural style of the house.
- The second issue was to cover the front porch columns, eliminating water entrapment problems.
- Prior to renovation, the wrap-around portion of the front porch had been enclosed by a knee wall and topped with several paired square columns, as indicated in photos.
- Screening had been installed between each pair of columns.

- The knee wall with paired columns appeared to be an original architectural feature.
- The applicant requested retroactive approval to cover the porch columns.
- The manner in which the windows were installed would create a water entrapment problem if the columns remained exposed.
- The work completed to date was indicated in photos #1 and #2.

Mr. Ste. Claire said he thought the application/project had been reviewed and approved during a previous meeting.

Mr. Scofield said that the current application was intended to modify the original application. He said the request was to move two windows; staff had no issue with the request if the windows resembled historical configuration. He noted that the fixed window that had been moved to the second-story needed to look more like a double-hung sash window.

Mr. Scofield said that the casement windows on the porch were originally a six-light casement window design; however, a twelve-light casement design had been installed, which staff did not have issue with, but the board's approval was required.

Mr. Scofield said that a horse-shoe styled driveway was proposed by the applicant. He said that the house had a traditional front yard with a pedestrian walk from the public road to the primary entrance of the building with a driveway located at the side of the property. He said that the applicant proposed an additional driveway that would use a large portion of the front yard and require an additional curb cut in the front yard placing vehicles in the area typically reserved for pedestrians. The proposed change was not consistent with the ADHP and staff recommended the disapproval of the item.

Mr. Dailey stated that he had two additional items to be addressed and made the

following comments regarding the first item which was to eliminate the siding knee wall at the side deck and build a bench:

- The bench was being built as shown on page two of his presentation.
- The homeowner had requested a bench in lieu of the siding.
- Mr. Scofield had visited the site.
- The wall could be constructed; however, the pressure-treated siding was not available.
- If the pressure-treated siding was available, the paint would not adhere to it for at least one year because of the new copper chromate material used to pressure-treat wood.
- The deck boards were appropriately Yellow Pine that could not be pressure-treated but could be painted.
- A wall would block water from running under and through the deck causing rot, a problem that existed with older homes and necessitated repairs.
- Elimination of the wall addressed water run-off issues and avoided repairs.
- The deck had a slight slope and was water tight; therefore, a wall would create a dam effect.

Mr. Dailey made the following comments regarding the screen porch columns:

- At the start of the renovation process, the knee wall had significant water damage necessitating re-building of the columns, and the majority of floor joints were rotted and had been replaced.
- Initially there had been a 2'x8' sill on which the screen sat; the sill would be flat with no run-off.
- Exposed columns would cause the water to breach the sill and get into the wall causing damage to the drywall, insulation and electrical system.

- Permission to cover the outside of the columns with siding had been requested.
- The siding could be caulked and painted, eliminating water access into the wall.
- If permission was granted, the front porch would have the appearance of the house.

Mr. Dailey made the following comments regarding moving the window on the south side of the house to the second-floor height:

- The architect's original drawing showed the window on the first-floor at the south side of the house.
- A bathroom was located there.
- The window could supply natural light to a staircase proposed for installation.
- The window was low, placing it in the middle of the first-floor landing; moving it up would have resolved the issue.
- Page one and photo B of the presentation showed that the second floor had three windows; one window had been partially cut off.
- Two bedrooms appeared to have double-hung windows; the window that had been moved was between them.
- Mr. Scofield had requested that the fixed window be made to look like a double-hung window and Mr. Scofield's request was acceptable.
- The height of the window was intended to conform to the height of the other windows.
- The architectural renderings indicated windows over toilets.
- A casement window was requested for a small bathroom, which would not be designed to look double-hung.
- Page four of the presentation showed the window on the second-floor.

Mr. Dailey made the following comments regarding using twelve-light glass on the front porch windows:

- On the building print, the architect had indicated a certain profile/series, and the applicant had complied.
- The series indicated by the architect was a twelve-light glass; however, a six-light glass had been drawn in.
- The twelve-light glass was in compliance with the Florida building code.
- All other windows that had been changed matched the original configuration for a double-hung window.

Mr. Dailey made the following comments regarding permission to create a horse-shoe style driveway at the front:

- Mr. Scofield had indicated the request was not appropriate.
- A parking hardship existed.
- There were two properties on the same street with similar driveways as requested by the applicant; one of the driveways was concrete with some bricks.
- The proposed driveway would be constructed with pavers that had already been approved.
- There would be some landscaping.
- Future home owners could park in front of the home, eliminating a two-block walk.

Mr. Dailey asked if a ceiling fan would be allowed for the front porches, as requested by the homeowner's association. He stated that in the original drawing, the architect indicated fifteen-light glass doors replacing the existing doors. He said that during a previous meeting, the board had requested that the doors be architecturally appropriate for the building. He said he had been asked to save a prairie or mission-styled door at the first-floor entrance, but the door had not been the original and it needed work. He said that he had renovated it to demonstrate his support of the board's

request. He said that he had been asked to duplicate the style for a balcony door on the same side of the house. He stated a cost of \$200.00 for a door with the following characteristics:

- Prairie-style
- Full-view glass/one mutton design
- Small glass panes on the top and bottom
- No raised panels on the bottom.
- It would have flat wood as a rail.

Mr. Dailey stated that he had been told that he would not have to duplicate the number of panes as the existing door had two sections of glass with the mutton design on each. He stated a cost of \$1,500.00 to duplicate the renovated door, which would be a hardship for the homeowner. He noted that the house was not a period house; it had been deemed as frame vernacular indicating available materials from the surrounding areas had been used in its construction. He mentioned that two bed and breakfast structures on Avenida Menendez had their original doors; one was deemed a frame vernacular structure and the exterior doors had been replaced with fifteen-light doors.

Mr. Ste. Claire noted that the board considered structures in surrounding areas when reviewing an application; however, the ruling would not necessarily be influenced. He commented that the board might not be aware of the circumstances that authorized the structures. He noted that the board would work to correct some structural concerns in the City. He noted that there were no citizens in attendance for the item.

Mr. Dailey stated that the majority of the modifications had been discussed during the renovation process; the architect had not proposed the changes. He acknowledged that he had concentrated on the window specifications, and had not considered the actual architectural drawing.

Mr. Rumpel commented that there were no prairie doors, but there were many *prairie-style* doors.

Mr. Dailey said that four exterior doors would be changed; three fifteen-light glass doors had been approved, and his request was for a fifteen-light glass door for the porch.

Mr. Scofield stated that the upstairs balcony entrance door was appropriate for the architectural style and period, but a French-style door on the second-story primary entrance was not appropriate. He noted that the porch was a semi-public space, and the door entered an enclosed area.

Mr. Rumpel commented that he preferred that all doors matched. He said that he understood that all doors were custom; one was used as the primary entrance door and the others had been purchased. He commented that the photo demonstrated a screened porch with flashed columns, which would work as it had in the past, but he could not find justification to cover the columns.

Mr. Dailey said that he could create a façade on the front of the building giving the appearance of columns, allowing him to leave the siding as it was, and if the water flowed beyond the façade it would not reach the wall.

Mr. Rumpel commented that he was not looking at the details and he could not comment on how the windows would be installed, but it should have been done originally. He noted that a continuous slot at the bottom siding could prevent water from gathering in the back seating area.

Mr. Ste. Claire said he would not have a problem deferring to staff for review of the ceiling fan issue.

Mr. Rumpel recommended that the small square window in the back by the toilet be left as it was.

Mr. Dailey noted that there was no parking in the garages, which were wide and equivalent to approximately four garages. He stated that six years ago when the Weihnachts had bought the house, there had been four apartments in the house, and meters had previously been installed.

Mr. Rumpel noted that the conditions stated by Mr. Dailey were not in accordance with zoning laws but had been grand-fathered in and should be eliminated. He recommended against granting the circular drive because it would encourage eliminating conditions that should not exist.

Mr. Ste. Claire summarized the issues and asked Mr. Rumpel to make the motion.

Mr. Rumpel moved that the application 2006-1211 be approved with the following conditions:

- **The columns should be modified to emulate what existed originally, and the applicant must submit detail for staff review.**
- **The applicant must submit the type and color of the ceiling fans for staff review.**
- **The slot near the bench in the back would be acceptable, putting the wall back as shown on the elevations.**
- **The one large window on the south elevation would have an applied mullion to emulate a double-hung window.**
- **The smaller window on the west would be a casement window, acceptable as it was.**
- **The circular driveway would not be approved.**

Ms. Harvey seconded.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Rumpel, Harvey, Wallace,
Ste. Claire

NAYES: None

MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY

4. Certificates of Demolition

Item 4 (a) 2006-1197

Robert C. Ferran – Applicant/Owner
4 Coquina Avenue

To demolish a single-family residence built in 1949.

Mr. Ste. Claire stated that the item had been withdrawn by written request from the applicant.

Item 4 (b) 2006-1201

Michael A. Davis, A. D. Construction – Applicant
Senior Care of St. Johns - Owner
1 Milton Street

To demolish a quad-plex residence built in 1940.

Mike Davis, 23 Park Terrace Drive, and Doug Hernandez, representing Senior Care, were sworn in.

Mr. Scofield reported the following information:

- The photographs indicated a modest/mid twentieth-century masonry multi-family dwelling.
- Demolition of the structure would have minimal impact on the architectural and historical integrity and character of the neighborhood.
- Additional information was not warranted for the application.
- Postponement of demolition was not necessary.
- Included in the agenda packet was the proposed construction elevation for the property after the existing structure was removed.
- There was an opportunity to replace the current building with an addition to the nursing home that would be in accordance with the residential character of the neighborhood.
- The board could consider the option.
- Staff recommended approval of the Certificate of Demolition.

Mr. Davis noted that the stairs were in rough shape. He said that the nursing home had bought the structure with the intention of demolishing it and constructing an addition. He said that the number of beds would not increase; however, the number of patients per room would be reduced as a result of the addition.

Mr. Ste. Claire opened the meeting for public hearing.

Mr. Luke Dunlap, 4 Milton Street, was sworn in.

Mr. Dunlap stated that he lived across the street from the structure. He distributed a packet of information and made the following comments:

- In regards to the existing structure, there was agreement with staff that the building would not add to the character of the neighborhood.
- There were significant concerns, however.
- The demolition process was a concern.
- Commercial traffic resulting from the existing design was a concern.
- The sign that greeted citizens turning on to Milton Street from San Marco was shown in the packet of information.
- Many citizens ignored the sign.¹
- The sign helped in diverting construction vehicles from the Deaf and Blind School.
- The sign helped in directing commercial deliveries to the veterinary office and to the Spanish restaurant.
- There was significant interest in preserving the sign and speed bump, as they were helpful to the neighborhood.

¹ End of tape 1.

- Construction vehicles were large.
- In the long-term, commercial traffic was not desired.
- Children lived on the block between San Marco and Douglas Avenue.
- The plans had not been seen.
- There was asbestos siding on the structure proposed for demolition.
- During the demolition process, the materials would have to be put in plastic and disposed of appropriately.
- The current nursing home structure was dilapidated and unremarkable as was the building proposed for demolition.
- On the Nelmar side of the street, the nursing home staff could be seen smoking and had been heard using inappropriate language.
- Large garbage dumpsters and equipment were visible.
- If the concerns were not addressed in the proposed plans, he would not be in favor of the item.

Ms. Mary Dunlap, 4 Milton Street, was sworn in and made the following comments:

- The neighborhood was applying for membership to the National Register for Historic Districts.
- Her home was across the street from Paul Weaver's home.
- She was a Mom who worked at home as a computer programmer and noise was a major concern.
- Vehicle entry was a concern.

Mr. Ste. Claire advised that 15 comment forms had been mailed and seven had been returned. He said that five were in favor, one was opposed, and one was undecided. He noted that one was from Luke and Mary Dunlap, citizens who had previously testified.

Mr. Ste. Claire said that the board shared the concerns regarding traffic and asbestos disposal, however the board was required to address the demolition of architectural and historical structures, as well as the appropriateness of modifications or new construction in Historic Preservation Districts. He said that some of Mr. Dunlap's concerns might be highlighted to the Planning and Zoning staff at another occasion. He said that he suspected that the sign would remain. He said that commercial vehicles that were currently prohibited would continue to be prohibited. He commented that based on his knowledge of Mr. Davis' construction company, he thought the asbestos would be disposed of appropriately.

Mr. Davis commented that he would be happy to have additional discussions with Mr. Dunlap. He said that there was no vehicular entrance on Milton Street. He said that the proposed addition was planned with removal of an existing room to become a hallway. He said there would be an emergency exit on the north side of Milton Street, and there would not be a new entrance. He said that removal of asbestos was regulated and that he would not do anything to conflict with the requirements of the EPA. He said that during construction there would be large vehicles on the property generating noise; however, it would be kept to a minimum, and he would try to notify Mr. Dunlap prior to the arrival of vehicles. He said that he had children and shared the safety concerns.

Mr. Dunlap said that his major concern was the long-term effects of the project.

Mr. Ste. Claire asked for more details of the proposed replacement structure and improvements to the existing facility. He asked Mr. Davis if he would consider other options that might enhance the neighborhood.

Mr. Davis said that the proposed building would have to be functional and compatible with the existing structure. He noted that Café Spain was to the west, and that the east side was adjacent to an alley. He said that he would try to make the north side of the new structure appropriate for the neighborhood.

Mr. Ste. Claire questioned whether the demolition could be conditional on submission of an appropriate design for staff review.

Mr. Scofield read from item number five of the ordinance for the review of Certificate of Demolition as follows: *As a condition of issuing a Certificate of Demolition, the board may require the replacement design be approved by the board and that no permit be issued for the demolition of said structure till drawing sufficient for a building permit has been submitted for the new construction.*

Ms. Wallace said that she concurred and that she had no objection to issuing a Certificate of Demolition for the property; however she would like the proposed rectangular structure to be improved and asked Mr. Davis for some recommendation. She acknowledged that there were handicap accessibility requirements.

Mr. Davis re-stated his earlier comments and added that a gable could be installed. He said the existing structure had a flat roof and was a concrete-block stucco building with a concrete slab roof and a modified roof on top. He said that the new structure would have to fit with the existing structure.

Mr. Scofield recommended a simple pointed parapet and inset panels that would imply window fenestration as noted in his staff report.

Mr. Rumpel suggested that Mr. Davis hire a qualified person to propose a design as discussion might not accomplish the goal. He said that the canopy was the one element with some character. He said that he had no issue with the demolition of the old building; however he would like a revised proposal for the replacement structure.

Mr. Ste. Claire proposed approval of the demolition with the condition that there would be a revised plan for the replacement structure presented at the January 18, 2007 meeting. He stated that Mr. Scofield, Mr. Birchim and Mr. Knight were good sources of information and could help with ideas to ensure the architectural value.

Ms. Harvey asked about parking and traffic that might result from having the door on Milton Street.

Mr. Davis stated that the door would be an emergency exit and it would be alarmed.

Ms. Wallace moved that item 2006-1201, be tabled until the January 18, 2007 meeting, with the understanding that the owner's architect would present modified plans to the board.

Mr. Ste. Claire added that to satisfy the requirements of demolition, it was understood that the board was comfortable with the demolition and Ms. Wallace approved the additional comment.

Ms. Harvey seconded.

VOTE ON MOTION:

**AYES: Wallace, Harvey, Rumpel,
Ste. Claire**

NAYES: None

MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY

Mr. Scofield asked to have the revised plans submitted to him two weeks prior to the January 18, 2007 meeting.

5. Planning and Building Director's Report

Mr. Knight wished everyone a Happy New Year.

Mr. Ste. Claire shared his wishes for a Happy New Year.

6. Other Business

Mr. Ste. Claire clarified that during the November, 2006 regular meeting, Paul Weaver, III was elected Chairperson, and Antoinette Wallace Vice Chairperson.

Mr. Rumpel moved to elect Paul Weaver, III as Chairperson and Antoinette Wallace as Vice Chairperson for the year 2007. Ms. Harvey seconded.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Rumpel, Harvey, Wallace, Ste. Claire

NAYES: None

MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY

7. Review of Conflict Statements from Previous Meetings

Mr. Ste. Claire said that there were no issues for discussion.

Mr. Ste. Claire stated it was his last as Chairperson and he thanked the board members and staff for their support.

Ms. Wallace thanked Mr. Ste. Claire for his exemplary practice as the Chairperson in 2006.

8. Adjournment

Having no additional business, Mr. Ste. Claire adjourned the meeting at 3:30 PM.²

Dana Ste. Claire, Chairperson

² Transcribed by Grace M. Vante

