

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE, FLORIDA

Historic Architectural Review Board Meeting
December 20, 2007

The Historic Architectural Review Board met in formal session at 2:00 P.M., Thursday, December 20, 2007, in the Alcazar Room at City Hall, St. Augustine, Florida. The meeting was called to order by Paul Weaver, III, Chairperson, and the following were present:

1. ROLL CALL: Paul Weaver, III, Chairperson
Dana Ste. Claire
Karen Harvey
Fred Halback

Absent: Antoinette Wallace (Resigned)

City Staff: Mark Knight, Director, Planning and Building Department
Tom Scofield, Historic Preservation Planner
David Birchim, Planning Manager
Robin Upchurch, City Attorney
Karen Rogers, City Clerk
Dianna Polland, Recording Secretary

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES –
NOVEMBER 15, 2007 REGULAR MEETING**

Mr. Weaver stated that the prior minutes were summarized with some detail left out. He voiced concern in the event of an appeal. He requested that Karen Rogers, City Clerk, and Robin Upchurch, Assistant City Attorney address the issue.

Ms. Upchurch stated that the City had a statutory obligation to keep minutes. She continued that the obligation could be satisfied simplistically by: noting what items were considered, who was present, who spoke, noting the substance of motions, who made the motions, who seconded and who voted on the motions. She stated that in the event of an appeal, she said the party appealing the decision would be required to present a verbatim transcript. She said that if details were not included, there might have been more detail than necessary. But, she said that if there were inaccurate details or motions, the board could ask for them to

be corrected or stricken. She concluded that the minutes were not meant to be a transcript.

Mr. Weaver acknowledged that in comparison to other local government minutes, "ours' were as good as any", if not better.

Ms. Rogers said that, the 95% or more of the meeting's content currently recorded was not required by law. She stated that in an attempt to fulfill deadlines, and with consideration to requirements by law, she was in the process of trimming the minutes. She expressed a desire to work with the board to maintain the office and meet legal requirements. She additionally spoke of a new digital system that would be helpful to create minutes in a more concise form.

Mr. Weaver cited corrections to the previous meeting notes as follows:

- 1) Page 4, right column, third paragraph from bottom, correction of

name, he had spoken with *Bob Bormea, not Greg Wormer.*

- 2) Page 12, left hand column, first paragraph, in re: to Mr. Weaver's comments on tax assessment, it should have read 1 million dollars in equity was taken out leaving \$1 million dollars in *equity*, not assessed value.

Ms. Harvey pointed out that on page 13, right column, the name of the 9th speaker against the demolition was, *Gayle Nick and not Gail Nook.*

Mr. Halback concluded, the list of errors by pointing out, page 16, left column, reasons pertaining to detrimental effects to the district were four, adding one to the three listed: *The loss of significant architectural examples such as the only remaining Sears Catalog house.*

Upon review of the audio tape, it was noted that Mr. Halback agreed with Ms. Wallace that *the demolition of six contributing structures and one potentially contributing structure would be detrimental.*

MOTION

Mr. Ste. Claire moved that the Minutes of November 15, 2007 Regular Meeting be approved as amended. Motion SECONDED by Mr. Halback MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

3.CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS

Item 3 (a) F2007-0336
Darrell Samples – Applicant
St. Augustine Foundation (Flagler College) – Owner
97 St George Street

To construct a roof over side entrance

Mr. Scofield reported staff recommendations as follows:

The building at 97 St George Street was a reconstruction of a colonial period house known as the Marin-Hassett House.

Constructed in 1969 by the St Augustine Restoration Foundation (today known as the St Augustine Foundation and the applicant for the project) the front masonry portion of the building was representative of 18th century architecture from the First Spanish Period and the rear was a replica of a British Period frame addition. The applicant/owner desired to construct a small shed roof over the secondary entrance on the south elevation of the building (see Photo #2 in the Support Document section). The roof was needed to prevent water from entering the building during inclement weather. The following design details were required for the project to be consistent with the Architectural Guidelines for Historic Preservation:

- Wood members should be square-cut, true dimension lumber without rounded corners
- Wood shakes or shingles should be used as the roofing material
- Sheet copper should be used for flashing
- Decking should be no thicker than 1" with no more than a 2 inch overhang at edges
- A fascia board should be installed over the rafter ends
- Support brackets should be 3"X 4"
- Paint color should match existing—a new color should not be introduced

Staff found that the Board should approve the Certificate of Appropriateness application to construct a roof over the side entrance at 97 St George Street provided that the following condition was met:

- Construction shall adhere to the guidelines outlined in the Staff Summary section above

Darrell Samples, 51 Spring Street was sworn in and said that he was in agreement with the staff's recommendations.

Mr. Weaver opened the public hearing, but there was no response.

MOTION

Mr. Ste. Claire moved to APPROVE F2007-0336 application to construct a roof over the side entrance at 97 St George Street . Motion SECONDED by Ms. Harvey.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Ste. Claire, Harvey, Halback, Weaver

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Item 3 (b) F2007-0337

**Leonard R. Tucker – Applicant
St George Street Properties - Own
21 Spanish Street**

To construct a wheelchair ramp

Mr. Scofield reported the following staff recommendations as follows:

The former residence at 21 Spanish Street had been converted to commercial use and was currently occupied. The building was a contributing property in the City of St Augustine National Register Historic District and was constructed sometime during the period 1865-85. The existing concrete ramp located at the rear entrance to the building (see photo #4 in the Support Document section) did not conform to ADA standards for access. The applicant proposed to replace it with a new concrete ramp that met the ADA standards (see attached drawing submitted by the applicant). A revised drawing had been provided by the applicant in an attempt to address the conditions outlined in the staff report.

Mr. Scofield stated that the following design details should be adhered to for consistency with the Architectural Guidelines for Historic Preservation:

- Level decks and landings should be constructed in a manner that was compatible with the architecture of the building
- Components should be made of wood painted white with a deck and railing that resembled the existing front porch of the building

- The wheelchair ramp should be as visually unobtrusive as possible installing a railing with a thin profile and no balusters would minimize vertical exposure
- Ends of the railings should be squared off, not rounded using a dark, but appropriate color would allow it to blend in somewhat with the surroundings
- Materials should be traditional in appearance with no tubular metal and anodized, polished or chromed finishes
- The rock salt finish as proposed by the applicant was an appropriate method to make the new concrete surface look seasoned/weathered

Mr. Scofield concluded by stating that staff found that the Board could approve the Certificate of Appropriateness application to construct a wheelchair ramp at the rear entrance of 21 Spanish Street if the following conditions were met:

- Only the ramp shall be constructed of concrete, a level decks or landings shall be constructed of wood
- Railings located on level decks and landings should be constructed of wood and should resemble the railings found on the front of the building
- Railings on the ramp and stairs should be constructed of solid or hollow, flat metal of an appropriate dark color, as in the configuration shown in the drawing submitted with the application
- Ends of the railing should be squared off, not rounded
- Tubular metal and anodized, polished or chromed finishes are prohibited
- A new drawing consistent with any conditions outlined by the HARB should be submitted for review by the Historic Preservation Planner prior to the issuance of a building permit and commencement of construction (PROVIDED)

Leonard Tucker, 21 Spanish Street was sworn in and said that he was in agreement with the staff's recommendations.

Mr. Weaver questioned whether staff had discussed a brick pier rather than concrete with the applicant, and the response was that Mr. Tucker had mentioned the possibility.

Mr. Weaver referred to photo number two with brick piers. He added that integrating wood would be an acceptable approach considering the building's history was from the pre-concrete era.

Mr. Tucker concurred and said he would work with Tom Scofield.

Ms. Harvey questioned the changes between the two drawings.

Mr. Scofield replied that Mr. Tucker had attempted to include all the conditions as listed on the staff report.

Ms. Harvey questioned whether the changes reflected staff's recommendations, and the response was yes.

Mr. Weaver added that another change was the substitution of brick piers as the foundation.

Mr. Halback questioned whether the steps would be done in wood also.

Mr. Scofield replied, that wood would be a nice material to use.

Mr. Weaver opened the public hearing, but there was no response.

MOTION

Mr. Halback moved to APPROVE Certificate of Appropriateness F2007-0337 to construct a wheelchair ramp, including the recommendations in the staff report, the December 19th revised drawing, and the recommendation to use brick piers, and wood steps. Motion SECONDED by Mr. Ste. Claire.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Halback, Ste. Claire, Harvey, Weaver

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Item 3 (c) F2007-0340

Sharon Fowler, Landscape Architect – Applicant Flagler College – Owner 125 Markland Place (102 King Street)

To make site improvements.

Mr. Scofield's report was as follows:

Lot 1 was contained within the (HP-4) historic preservation zoning district and lot 2 was not. Lot 2 was located at the rear of Markland, and for this reason, a certificate of application for this item had not been reviewed by the board.

Mr. Scofield said that for some unknown reason, there was a portion designated for the trash compactor that was located outside of the (HP-4) designation. He said the design was submitted and it looked like a good design, but HARB had no authority to review it. He added that staff reviewed all proposed improvements as a total package, with one property owner, but recognized that they had no authority over the portion of the property that involved the driveway and sidewalk. He said the trash compactor at the rear of Markland was a compatible design in appearance. He referenced the driveway that crossed the Billiard House and used to access the rear of the property and 48 Sevilla Street. He said that staff's recommendation was for alternatives for the casual access the college had been maintaining. He stated that the city discouraged any improved fixed infrastructures for the driveway that would change the appearance. He said staff advised that the sidewalk connecting the rear of Markland to the Billiard House be brick or shell. He recommended that the board approve the application with those conditions.

Mr. Weaver questioned whether the Billiard House was the Florida Public Archeology Building, and the response was affirmative.

Mr. Weaver said it was difficult to see the historic allee, and he questioned where it was located.

Mr. Scofield replied that the Palm Allee was at the rear of the Markland House and went to the archeological center.

Leslee Keys, Flager College, PO Box 1027 was sworn in and presented information related to the Billiard Cottage renovation. She said that to meet ADA requirements they had to provide a handicap ramp, which had been approved to the east of the cottage. She said that all the work would be crushed coquina with the exception of the handicap parking space, which would be an impervious surface to meet the ADA requirements. She said that the allee would be re-established for wheelchairs and it would be three feet wider to meet the ADA requirements.

Mr. Weaver questioned which recommendations Ms. Keys did not agree with.

Ms. Keys replied that the cottage needed to continue use of the path to the Billiard Cottage for handicap accessibility and the roadway for future use of the archeology center. She added that they had added landscape elements to soften the area.

Mr. Weaver questioned whether she was asking for a new driveway and parking spaces that staff had not approved.

Ms. Keys replied yes, because it had been necessary to obtain a building permit to renovate the cottage. She said the cottage had been re-done and used temporarily for handicap parking, yet it had not met the requirement for wheelchair ramp access. She continued that they had not placed the ramp on the west side to avoid damaging an Oak Tree.

Mr. Weaver questioned staff's recommendation for the existing parking lot to reduce the minimum drive aisle and parking space requirements.

Ms. Keys replied that the college had measured the proposal and, visually it looked like they had more space, but they would not meet parking lot standards. Therefore, the College preferred not to make the changes.

Mr. Weaver questioned whether Palm Allee would be paved with loose shell or dry-laid clay brick pavers and whether the existing border would remain.

Ms. Keys reiterated that if the Palm Allee remained as it was, it would not be wide enough for wheelchairs. She clarified that the path was 32", and they required 36".

Mr. Weaver questioned if she would use dry-laid clay brick pavers for the path.

She answered she could if that allowed for enough of an impervious surface, if not, she was also considering crushed stone.

Mr. Weaver said that sometimes width could be negotiated with the building official especially since 32" was close to 36", and he asked if that was possible. However, the building official was not present.

Ms. Keys questioned if there could be an approval based on the building official's minimum recommendation to meet the standard.

Mr. Weaver replied yes, if they made an attempt to negotiate a reduced width.

Ms. Keys replied that if they achieved approval to reduce the width from the building official, they would get it in writing to avoid any modifications later.

Following a brief discussion, it was determined that the ADA requirements would take precedent over historical preservation, however, the College should try to negotiate.

Mr. Weaver affirmed staff's last recommendation that any new plant materials introduced to the site should be verified through historical documentation.

Ms. Keys replied that the College would like to use plant materials that had been previously approved by HARB, stating that some of the proposed plants that have existed historically, and their ability to survive was questionable. She continued that staff's report indicated that Markland was built in 1839, but the construction of Markland began in 1839. She said that the current version was the 1901 version.

Mr. Weaver questioned whether staff had ever considered appropriateness and practicality for plant materials selected over historic value.

Mr. Scofield replied that the landscape architecture for the college, Sharon Fowler, had done an exemplary job in balancing those issues.

Mr. Weaver said it was the board's recommendation that the college use historic plant material, but allow flexibility.

Mr. Halback questioned whether the walkway would be made out of coquina shell given the fact that it needed to be wheelchair accessible.

Ms. Keys replied that an acrylic seal could be applied to coquina shell to compact it; however, she was unsure if drainage problems would occur.

Mr. Halback commented that coquina shell would not hold the matrix well, and it was probably not worth the effort. He added that there would not be a problem with brick. He suggested that coquina concrete might work well, as it would allow for the coquina look and provide a hard smooth surface.

Mr. Halback then referred to a photo that exhibited what he called, the wonderful Palm Allee. He commented that the tall fence in front of the chiller interrupted the rhythm of

the Palm trunks and should be moved to the other side.

Larry Weeks, Flagler College, PO Box 1027 was sworn in and replied that the college had been told by engineers that the equipment was needed for proper air flow, especially given the size of the building, but he could not answer the question from a mechanical standpoint. He added that the engineers informed them that they could not change the area; however, he agreed with Mr. Halback's suggestions.

Mr. Weaver questioned whether staff had discussed a brick pier rather than concrete with the applicant, and the response was that Mr. Tucker had mentioned the possibility.

Ms. Keys stated that the college had been using the unpaved driveway for at least 37 years.

Mr. Ste. Claire recognized the difficulty in meeting ADA requirements while maintaining the historic character. He also acknowledged Flagler's good record of accomplishment, and the remarkable restoration of the Billiard House. He agreed that the driveway was an unfortunate presence, but said he liked the idea of using brick for the pathway.

Mr. Halback asked staff if more parking was needed.

Mr. Scofield replied that they could put a handicap space in the existing parking lot, and provide wheelchair access to the ramp from there.

Mr. Halback questioned the college, if more parking spaces were needed for a code issue or for more parking ability.

Ms. Keys stated that spaces were required for the library and student's center, and she explained that they had already cut back from twenty to four parking spaces. She said the building official had told them that the space on the west side of the cottage would not be close enough to satisfy the ADA

requirements; therefore, they put the ramp and parking on the east side.

Mr. Halback questioned why a handicap space could not be added to the area where the last space of the parking lot was located, before it turned into the drive that led to the new spaces. He added that it appeared the space was closest to the front door and therefore no more of a distance. He also said that his question had not been answered as to whether or not it was the ADA code that had required the college to add three more parking spaces and a handicap space.

In response, Ms. Keys said that the code had not required them to add more spaces because it was an unpaved parking area and a loading zone for the library. She said the area's parking had been reduced due to the driveway size and turning radius that only allowed a minimum number of legal spaces, which was why 20 spaces had been reduced to 4.

Mr. Weaver questioned whether they had an as built drawing for the project.

Ms. Keys answered that it would have provided for parking to the north of the chillers and west of the library. She added that the dirt area serving as a loading zone for the library had been used for parking since the school first opened.

Mr. Halback asked if the two drives served as the entrance to the loading dock for the library, the response was affirmative.

Mr. Weaver opened the public hearing, but there was no response.

MOTION

Mr. Ste. Claire moved to APPROVE Certificate of Appropriateness F2007-0340 to make site improvements at 125 Markland Place, and to include 1) that the driveway and new parking spaces shown in the plans be allowed in keeping with the building official and ADA code for providing access, 2) that the existing

parking lot shall be reduced in size to minimum drive aisle and parking space requirements as determined by the building official, 3) that the walkway between the rear of Markland House and the Billiard Cottage shall be paved with either dry-laid brick or pavers or coquina concrete bordered in the brick and poured in sections to allow the pathway to expand the width of the path to 36 inches unless it was determined that an exception was allowable to leave it 32 inches as preferred by the board yet understanding that ADA requirements and public safety played into the matter, 4) to allow the new plant materials that had been pre-approved in the previous applications as part of the inventory for historical plants, 5) general suggestion if it was at all possible to move the fence on the other side of the row of palm trees and chiller to allow symmetry of the pathway, understanding the need for approval from a mechanical engineer in order to improve the vista and the overall character. Motion SECONDED by Mr. Halback.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Ste. Claire, Halback, Harvey, Weaver

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Item 3 (d) F2007-0341

Don Devino, Contractor – Applicant
Margaret A. Thorne - Owner San Salvador Street

To revise previously approved plans for the conversion of a carriage house to a single-family residence.

Mr. Scofield's report was as follows:

The Historic Architectural Review Board approved a Certificate of Appropriateness application submitted by Bryan McCloskey, project architect, in July. The construction phase of the project was almost completed when 10 issues had been identified that were not consistent with the HARB Order and Drawing of Record. There was a new Certificate of Appropriateness application

submitted by Don Devino, the General Contractor for the project in an attempt to remedy the inconsistencies. According to staff, the five items that required work were as follows:

- The Design of the entrance door on North Elevation
- Mullions on the new casement windows
- Mullions on the garage door windows
- Balusters on the balcony and second floor deck
- Rafter tails that had been covered by a fascia board, designed originally to be covered by fascia board

Mr. Scofield said that out of the list of 6 conditions recommended by staff, the fifth one, *brackets shall be installed under the balcony as originally designed and shall match the HARB drawing of record*, had been addressed to staff's satisfaction.

Don Devino, 6300 Old Dixie Drive said the home was on the city's fire maps in 1924, but that it had been built 15 years earlier. He said it was a garage with quarters for the help on the second floor. He added that the main house was behind the house in question.

Mr. Devino addressed the design of the entrance door, saying that it had been originally designed to be 36" wide, split down the middle with 18" sides, but it did not work well to prohibit wind and rain from getting in.

Mr. Devino said it been recommended by the city to build up three feet to avoid flooding, but it was agreed that they could build the house to be water proof up to the six foot level.

Mr. Weaver questioned whether the variance on floor height requirement was because it was a historic building, and the response was no. He added that it was a contributing building to the district, which that had something to do with the relief that was granted.

Mr. Devino replied that relief was granted because based on the plans provided to the building department, it was agreed that water

proofing could be done without lifting the building.

Mr. Devino said that the front door and the mullions and windows were made out of modern materials, yet built to withstand the wind and rain from the northeast corner of the house. He referenced the first issue by stating that the design of the entrance door was consistent with the look of the neighborhood, and he added that there were several houses built in the early 1900's with the same lead filled door made out of modern material.

Mr. Halback questioned Mr. Devino's description of modern material while asking if the door was wood.

Mr. Devino responded that it was a \$2700 door constructed with lead filled glass, but it looked like wood.

Mr. Halback remarked that he lived around the corner, and he disagreed that it looked like wood.

Mr. Weaver questioned why Mr. Devino had not gotten approval before installing the door, given that there had been a problem with the original design.

Mr. Devino answered that he should have; however, he had not considered it as he was focused on renovations having to do with water proofing and making his customer happy. He added that he had done projects in the historic district before; therefore, he had not thought it would be a problem.

Mr. Weaver asked him if he had been advised by staff that it was a problem, and the response was only after the fact.

A discussion determined that the original drawing appeared to be schematic and had not reflected the proposed door.

Mr. Weaver announced the next item of concern: the mullions on the new casement windows.

Mr. Devino replied that the windows had been approved by the city, and had Florida approval numbers. He informed them that the windows were structurally solid, double-locked, sealed tight, and high energy windows with mullions.

Mr. Halback questioned whether there had been a window on the detailed drawing that had been previously approved by HARB.

Mr. Devino, replied just a window with mullions.

Mr. Weaver questioned whether there had been an understanding at the time of approval that there would be mullions on the new casement windows.

Mr. Scofield's response was that there was a notation on the drawing provided by the architect that said "new windows would match existing casement windows".

Mr. Weaver cited the third issue: the lack of mullions on the windows on the garage door.

Mr. Devino replied that he had ordered new doors with mullions.

Mr. Weaver addressed the fourth issue: the balusters.

Mr. Devino replied that the balusters were selected to match the original manor house.

Mr. Weaver questioned when the house was constructed.

Mr. Devino answered, 1910, 1911, and added that originally it was a garage with a second floor for the servant's quarters.

Mr. Weaver questioned whether the house was from a different era with a different architectural style.

Mr. Devino replied no, but that it was from a different style. He added that there was no architectural style for the carriage house and it had been very fragile taking the crew 17 months to complete. He further stated that the client spent over \$250,000.00 on the project.

Mr. Weaver questioned if the recommended balusters were part of the drawing of record and a simple 1" square baluster would be used, and the response was affirmative.

Mr. Weaver questioned the attachment of the fascia.

Mr. Devino said that considering the water running off the roof and needing to hang gutters, he was unsure if he could take the fascia off.

Mr. Weaver asked if he was waiting to hang gutters until the issue was resolved, answer was affirmative.

Following questions from the board, it was determined that the original drawings had not shown gutters, but they were required by the Building Department and Mr. Devino had not sought further approval in his effort to keep everyone happy.

Margaret Thorne, 1 San Salvador Street, stated that she understood the door was a problem and asked what would be acceptable, and she asked about the mullions on the windows.

Mr. Weaver replied, a door similar to the original submittal. He said that the current mullion on the windows was not acceptable under Secretary of Interior Standards and had not been accepted in the city. He suggested that she look at the staff's recommendation, because the balusters were not appropriate for the building.

Mr. Scofield replied that Mr. McClousky had done a good job capturing staff's suggestions.

Mr. Devino replied they did not think there would be problems given the lack of criteria.

Mr. Weaver said that questions should be addressed to the designer or staff because some changes could be worked out administratively, but it was always best to get approval before changes were made to avoid extra expenses. He added that the problem with the door bracket had been solved and perhaps removing the fascia would solve the other problem.

Mr. Devino complained that it took six weeks to get a response.

Ms. Thorne asked the board what she could do about the gutters.

Mr. Weaver questioned whether it was part of the negotiation plan to put gutters on the building and if the problem could be solved.

Mr. Birchim replied that it could be solved and said half round was typical for a gutter.

Mr. Halback questioned if gutters were going to be placed all around the house and, the response was yes. He questioned the

type and appearance of gutter to be used, and the reply was a six inch aluminum square gutter painted white.

Mr. Halback remarked that gutters could be attached without using fascia for support, and offered these options:

- New rafter tails could be used for a better end condition
- Notched rafter tails (examples can be seen in the neighborhood)

Mr. Halback added that aluminum square gutters were not appropriate, and the color was important.

Ms. Thorne questioned the color, and Mr. Halback recommended working with staff.

Mr. Weaver opened the public hearing, and there was no response.

Mr. Weaver addressed the recommendations pertaining to the balusters, entrance door, new casement windows, brackets and gutters.

Mr. Devino remarked that the gutter system recommended by staff would cost \$12,000 as apposed to \$2,000. He agreed that the door should be replaced but not the balusters, as there had not been enough regard given to the owner's wishes.

Mr. Ste. Claire explained that the charge of the board was to preserve the historic and architectural integrity of the building, and deviation from the plans and staff's recommendations had created the problem. He concluded that Mr. Weaver's suggestions were a fair compromise.

MOTION

Mr. Halback moved to APPROVE Certificate of Appropriateness F2007-0341 to revise previously approved plans for the conversion of a carriage house to a single family residence to include the following recommendations that are listed in the staff report.

- 1. Replacement of the balusters to match the existing drawings**
- 2. Replacement of the entrance door to match the intent of the existing**

drawings by working with staff for agreed upon alternative

- 3. Windows in the garage corrected as listed that the casement windows would have the mullions placed on them with an external grid**
- 4. Brackets would be installed, if not already installed**
- 5. Gutters would be allowed if they were half round, allowing the fascia to remain with the color and appearance of the gutters and down spouts approved and reviewed by staff**

SECONDED by Mr. Ste. Claire.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Halback, Ste. Claire, Harvey, Weaver

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY¹

item 3 e) F2007-0342

Howard Davis, Architect – Applicant
Stephens Family Trust c/o Marilyn S. Peyton – Owner 8 Cathedral Place

To install new awnings and flag brackets.

Mr. Scofield reported as follows:

The building at 8 Cathedral Place was originally constructed in 1888 in the Moorish Revival architectural style. It was redesigned in the 1920s by local architect, Fred Hollingsworth to reflect the Mediterranean Revival architectural style. The applicant was seeking approval for the replacement of the existing flat, black canvas awnings with a rounded black fabric awning. The new awnings would conform to the rounded arch windows on the first floor of the building (see Photo #2 in the Support Document section). The following design details were required for the project to be consistent with the Architectural Guidelines for Historic Preservation:

¹ Brief recess

- Awnings should be made of canvas or other fabric traditional in appearance. Vinyl, fiberglass and metal awnings were prohibited - awning should not conceal important architectural features - design, color and hardware should reflect the period of the building - installation of hardware should not damage or mar exterior historic materials - masonry buildings penetrations should be made at mortar joints.

Staff found that the Board should approve the Certificate of Appropriateness application to install new awnings and a flag bracket at 8 Cathedral Place provided that the following condition is met:

- Construction shall adhere to the guidelines outlined in the Staff Summary section above

Howard Davis, 10 Cathedral Place, was sworn in and said that the canvass would be sewn to form two layers over the frames, and frames would be aluminum and match the canvass. He questioned if a terracotta color for the canvass could be approved.

Len Cutter, 8 Cathedral Place, was sworn in and said that he was pleased with staff's approval and added that Cutter and Cutter would accept either black or terracotta canvass. He said that he wanted to provide the best example of awning anyone had seen in America.

Mr. Weaver opened the public hearing opened, there was no response.

MOTION

Mr. Ste. Claire moved to APPROVE Certificate of Appropriateness F2007-0342 to construct a new storefront at 8 Cathedral Place, which included the Staff's condition and installation of a terracotta awning if approved by staff. Motion SECONDED by Mr. Halback.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Ste. Claire, Halback, Harvey, Weaver

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Item 3 f) F2007-0343

**Howard Davis, Architect – Applicant
Episcopal Diocese – Owner 25 King
Street (17 King Street)**

To construct a new storefront.

Mr. Scofield reported as follows:

The building at 25 King Street was originally constructed in 1954-55 and housed the F. W. Woolworth's department store for years. Although described in the Florida Master Site File as masonry vernacular architecture, the building displayed some definite Mission Revival style influences. The building, not considered a contributing building in the City of St Augustine National Register District, was compatible in architectural style and appearance. The applicant sought approval for replacement of the existing recessed storefront with a storefront that was flush with the façade of the building. The following issues were identified:

- The entrance doors should not swing out over the sidewalk (Recessing the doors by a few inches would remedy this)
- For a more traditional storefront appearance, doors and store windows should be designed with a larger kickplate
- Information on door material and hardware was not provided
- Preservation of the existing coquina pilasters was implied, stone should not be painted or stuccoed
- The proposed stained glass in the transoms should be simple geometric forms held together with lead beveled glass, opalescent colors, and elaborate shapes; forms or images were not appropriate.

- The colors selected were appropriate for the architectural style of the building
- The proposed clock in the niche on the parapet was not appropriate; clock would be better positioned just above the storefront entablature on either side of the façade - anything placed in the niche should be mounted flush to the wall with minimal projection

Mr. Scofield said that the Board should approve the Certificate of Appropriateness application to construct a new storefront provided that the aforementioned conditions were met:

Howard Davis stated that he agreed with staff's recommendations that the stained glass should be a simple geometric design, and the entrance door 16 or 18 inches wide, however, not with the recommended clock's placement. He explained that, because it is round, it should be centered.

Mr. Halback said he had no objections to the clock's location considering visibility. He provided complementary information about the building's designer Boris Lapidus and noted that although the building was not contributing, the design was a Revival gem.

Ms. Harvey questioned if there had been anything in the recessed area where the clock would be located, and the reply was yes, always.

Mr. Weaver said that the building had been created Mission style in the 50's. He opened the public hearing; however, no one responded.

MOTION

Mr. Ste Claire moved to APPROVE Certificate of Appropriateness F2007-0343 to construct a new storefront at 25 King Street to include all of staff's recommendations and conditions except the one referring to the clock; that it be allowed to be placed centered and in the parapet niche. Motion SECONDED by Ms. Harvey.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Ste. Claire, Harvey, Halback, Weaver

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Item 3 (g) F2007-0344

Kanti Patel, Jalaram Hotels, Inc. – Applicant Kanti M. and Kalavati K. Patel – Owners 6 Castillo Drive San Marco Hotel, Inc. – Owner 28 San Marco Ave.

To construct a new hotel.

Mr. Halback recused himself from the matter.

Mr. Scofield reported as follows:

The Historic Architectural Review Board approved An Opinion of Appropriateness application for the hotel project on April 20, 2006. The application was for a Certificate of Appropriateness and provided a final review for the exterior architectural details of the project. General comments based on the plans submitted to date had been supplied to the board and some of the concerns in which more data was needed pertained to the following items: materials, architectural styles, general architectural features, hardware, windows, shutters, mechanical and electrical equipment. He added that staff requested samples of paint colors because there were several little facades included in one big project. He explained that the colors would be provided per client's request at a later Certificate of Appropriateness meeting. He stated that foundations, considering the era in question, were traditionally built off the ground on piers. He added that engineer work would be done to fool the eye and promote the appearance that the building was off the ground. He concluded that staff reserved the right to comment on any additional information provided by the applicant including any revised architectural drawings.

Mr. Weaver clarified that staff's recommendations were based on the Opinion of Appropriateness, comments from the board, and the evidence presented by the public at the COA.

Mr. Scofield said the project was an evolution of design thoughts, and that the client was about midway in that process; therefore, staff recommended tabling the application until additional detailed information could be provided.

Gerry Dixon, 47 Cordova Street was sworn in, and he replied that the Opinion had not indicated that there were too many Second Empire roofs, or that they should be changed to a Queen Anne's style, or had indicated they should change a Classic Revival style, but the Opinion had approved the exterior elevations. He added that he wanted feedback from the board on those issues in order to carry the process forward and possibly save time at the next meeting.

Mr. Ste. Claire questioned the purpose of the presentation, saying that he had not seen the board's role as navigating architectural elements prematurely. He added that he favored tabling the item, because most of the items asked for at the opinion level had not been addressed.

Mr. Weaver said the applicant's presentation would give the board an idea of the project's course of action and progression, and Mr. Scofield concurred.

Mr. Dixon said that, based on staff's recommendations, they needed to modify a couple of elevations and possibly change some materials, per the client's request, if the board and staff agreed.

Mr. Weaver offered the option to present or table the matters until the next meeting.

Mr. Dixon replied that he wanted the board's opinion on the change of exterior appearances of two buildings that had been previously approved.

Mr. Ste. Claire questioned whether they had received the information in question, and the reply was no. He added that HARB would participate intelligently if they had materials for review prior to the meeting. He added that it was a great project, and he realized

that details needed to be ironed out, but he felt it was premature.

Mr. Weaver agreed.

Ms. Upchurch reminded staff that it was a properly noticed item and of the applicant's right to present with reference to due process. She elaborated that it could be an issue if the board considered tabling without the applicant's consent.

Mr. Dixon pointed out changes that had been made since the original Opinion of Appropriateness application. He said that from the Opinion the project went to the Planning and Zoning Board as a PUD and before the City Commission, resulting in several instruments to work within while crafting details. He referred to the site plan, specifically the location of the brick drive, and named surrounding streets. He said the drive went from one island to the other to avert traffic, which was one change not shown on the original opinion drawings. He said the landscape materials they had presented would be placed on Grove Street. He pointed out that the fencing defining each property had been changed. He added that another change was the framed building on the corner of San Marco Avenue and Castillo Drive (a Barcelona take off). He concluded that his client requested using coquina or poured concrete, and he was interested in the board's feedback.

Mr. Weaver replied that if masonry was used, veneer inside might be better. He questioned why they chose poured concrete.

Mr. Dixon replied that it was to assist in breaking up the buildings, but that they could go either way.

Mr. Weaver said that there were several ways of doing it when considering the neighborhood, there was a poured concrete

Moorish Revival style building, a Queen Anne Residence (converted to a boarding house) like the Barcelona with a tower and a prominent corridor that could be used as a prototype.

Mr. Dixon remarked that if they agreed to work off the Barcelona style it should be wood.

Mr. Weaver suggested a variety by placing the Moorish Revival style building in another place allowing the elevation to break up. He added that the recommendation of the Barcelona style was to maintain the authenticity of the style as a balloon framed structure with weather board on the exterior.

Mr. Dixon concurred. He pointed to a tower on the map and said that instead of it being round it would be a segmented tower.

Mr. Weaver confirmed that the tower was a Queen Anne tower with a Second Empire roof.

Mr. Dixon referred to the Queen Anne's tower with windows appearing steep by descending below the ridgeline.

Mr. Weaver said that the gable dormer was not captured totally within the Mansur.

Mr. Dixon said that he was encountering a room count and height issue.

Mr. Weaver said that another prototype that could be used virtually matches 26 San Marco Avenue.

Mr. Dixon stated that the windows would be easier to address with a steeper pitched Queen Anne style roof.

Mr. Weaver stated that he could possibly solve the problem with a Mansur.

Mr. Dixon noted that the aforementioned deviated from the originally approved plan, but with the board's approval they would make the changes. He moved onto the other issues pertaining to Grove Street and San Marco Avenue.

Mr. Weaver said that the San Marco Avenue building was important to achieve the original look, and the other buildings would provide a variety of design options. He added that the San Marco Avenue varied pattern and

elevation was most prominent, and on a larger scale they would need to transition into the pattern with Grove Street. He added that there was a two and a half story Gothic Revival building located on the other side of Barnacle Bills Restaurant that could be used as a prototype.

Mr. Dixon said that exterior modifications would be most drastic on the corner building, a deviation from what was in the original proposal, therefore, he encouraged staff suggestions.

Mr. Weaver said there were slate roofs on the Second Empire but roof shingles on the Queen Anne which could include a variety of roof shingles, shingle patterns and gables. He suggested that the Colonel Upham Cottage on St. George Street would be a good prototype to use, as it had weather boards, and two or three different shingle patterns.

Mr. Dixon replied that he would use metal roofing for one building, wood shingles on another, and asphalt with different patterns on another.

Mr. Weaver questioned if he would do a galvanized metal shingle or just straight crimped, and the answer was v'crimped. He added that the Carolyn Smith's house on Valencia Street had a stamped metal shingle indicating that there may have been pattern metal shingles in the 1880's but not a single v'crimped. He said he did not want to be too picky because the metal roofs became common when the city ordinance passed in 1915. He continued that there had been a consensus to use the Second Empire model for the Barcelona building and the Queen Anne model for San Marco would be appropriate because the prototype was close by. He added that considering styles of diminishing scale on Grove Street, the Gothic Revival would integrate the building well with other buildings on the street. He said that across the street was the Ripley's building, and on that elevation a Second Empire style might work.

Mr. Weaver opened the public hearing; there was no response

Messrs. Ste. Claire, Weaver and Ms. Harvey agreed that the plans looked good, and Ms. Harvey expressed concern about using concrete, but she was assured that they would not use concrete.

MOTION

Mr. Ste. Claire moved to TABLE Certificate of Appropriateness F2007-0344 to construct a new hotel at 28 San Marco Avenue until the January 17, 2008, meeting. Motion SECONDED by Ms. Harvey.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Ste. Claire, Harvey, Weaver

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. CERTIFICATES OF DEMOLITION

(None)

Item 5 (a) F2007-0272
Historic Preservation Property Tax Abatement
Joe Teisan – Applicant
Barbara Teisan – Owner
78 Spanish Street, TABLED

Mr. Scofield said that staff recommended tabling the item, because Mr. Teisan was successful in getting a waiver for the wheelchair ramp, and he would submit the application at the next meeting.

MOTION

Mr. Ste. Claire moved to TABLE Certificate of Appropriateness F2007-0272 concerning the properties at 78 Spanish Street until the regular meeting of HARB, January 17, 2008. Motion SECONDED by Ms. Harvey.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Ste. Claire, Harvey Halback, Weaver

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. Planning and Building Director's Report

7. Other Business

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to appoint Mr. Halback as both Vice Chair and representative to the Entry Corridor Review Committee. Motion carried by UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

Non Agenda Item

Ms. Robin Upchurch stated that over 15 years ago when she was a student at Flagler College, there was no parking at the Billiard House and student's feared their cars would be towed. She said that there had not been parking there for over 15 years. She concluded that she would want car access to the Chris Ellert driveway from Markland.

8. Review of Conflict Statements from Previous Meeting

(None)

9. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:35 PM.

Paul Weaver, III, Chairperson

² Transcribed by Dianna Polland