

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE, FLORIDA

Historic Architectural Review Board Meeting
January 17, 2008

The Historic Architectural Review Board met in formal session at 2:00 P.M., Thursday, January 17, 2008, 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, Vice-Chairperson

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

2. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

MOTION

Mr. Ste. Clair **MOVED** to nominate Mr. Paul Weaver for a second term as Chair, and Mr. Fred Halback as the Vice-Chair for 2008 until 2009. Motion was **SECONDED** by Ms. Harvey. **MOTION CARRIED** by **UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE**.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – December 20, 2007 REGULAR MEETING

MOTION

Mr. Ste. Clair **MOVED** that the Minutes of December 20, 2007, Regular Meeting be approved. Motion **SECONDED** by Mr. Halback **MOTION CARRIED** by **UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE**.

4. CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS

Mr. Halback recused himself.

Item 4 (a) F2007-0344

Kanti Patel, Jalaram Hotels, Inc. – Applicant
Kanti M. and Kalavati K. Patel – Owner
28 San Marco Ave.

To construct a new hotel

Mr. Halback recused himself.

Mr. Scofield's staff report was as follows:

Mr. Scofield said staff comments were based on the recent three detailed elevation revisions, as well as other recent changes and documents provided by the applicant. He commented that the elevations had evolved regarding design, and from a prior meeting's discussion, it was agreed that one of the facades would be converted to a Queen Anne Style. He referred to staff's recommendations as follows:

- The west facade incorporated Gothic Revival and Italianate Styles, but it might be best to go with the Gothic Revival Style.
- A substantial balcony stretched across all elevations; therefore, the

linear balcony could be broken up with integrated scattered porches

Mr. Scofield recommended tabling the item until the next meeting.

Mr. Weaver clarified that the documents the Board received entailed the South elevation along Castillo Drive, specifically the porch detail, the Queen Anne style building on the corner of Grove, and a list of requested items not received from the applicant. He clarified that they received sheets A, B, C, an updated review sheet, and a checklist with staff comments.

Gerald Dixon was sworn in and stated the current application was for a Certificate of Appropriateness, not for an Opinion; and at the Opinion level, the designs and exterior elevations were defined and approved. He said he had tweaked the project; however, Mr. Scofield was not satisfied, even though the applicant had not been obligated to make the changes at the Opinion level. He reiterated that the elevations were addressed and the discussions should concern construction documents, and door and balcony details. He expressed concern that he had received the comment list that day.

A brief discussion determined that an Opinion was based on architectural details, but details could be considered different from style, it was noted that staff had received documents the day that the staff report was scheduled to go to Mr. Dixon, and the importance of getting the project right was noted.

Mr. Dixon questioned the potential effect the HARB process would have on obtaining a Planned Unit Development.

Mr. Knight said the drawings that were approved on the Opinion of Appropriateness were attachments to the PUD and as a condition of the PUD, they were needed for a Certificate of Appropriateness. He said

that in the instance of substantial change the PUD would be amended.

Mr. Dixon pointed out that scale, spacing, building size or density had not been changed, only architectural details; therefore, negating substantial change. He expressed concern about waiting another month to get a certificate. He addressed the items mentioned by Mr. Weaver as follows:

- Roof samplings would be post slate-approved by Mr. Scofield
- Mansard roofs with a slight pitch would not meet the 35 foot code requirement

Mr. Knight clarified that if the definition of height was modified to incorporate a new roof, the project would require a PUD amendment.

In response to a question, Mr. Dixon said the current changes were the windows, doors, and roof, and the structure would be built with turned columns.

A discussion regarding the Queen Anne Style determined that a conical tower could be used, and that Mr. Dixon had experienced architectural constraints related to the PUD.

Mr. Dixon said the changes included:

- Some eaves would be radius
- Pitch roof
- Same number of units
- Attic spaces integrated for better architectural look

Mr. Weaver questioned why the structures were not varied from 1 1/5 to 2, and Mr. Dixon said he would look at it. He commented that the project was close to being worked out.

Mr. Dixon distributed the Queen Anne Style examples, and said there were a few

shutters in that era, but to meet hurricane impact requirements, shutters should be used.

Mr. Dixon, referring to his designs, said that the various colored elevations allowed for the roof patterns, and other features to distinguish the different building styles.

Ms. Harvey questioned the tallest tower's height, and the reply was 45 to 50 feet.

Mr. Weaver questioned the porch on the third story building, as recommended in the staff report, and Mr. Dixon replied he planned on constructing it as recommended.

Mr. Dixon said, once the architectural features and styles were complete, the light fixtures, color, awnings and canopies could be defined. He clarified that the mechanical equipment would be screened in, placed internally on the roof, and inside the courtyard area. He concluded that storm water drainage would be underground.

Jeremy Marquis, Halback Design Group, was sworn in, presented the Board drawings, and said the revisions as discussed with staff were as follows:

- Parking area defined for public (verses private areas) for loading and unloading
- Vehicular and loading areas, the welcome mat, and the front entry would be done using red clay brick pavers
- The pedestrian area would be done using cast concrete hexagonal pavers of gray and charcoal
- Decorative trench drain water feature as shown
- Decorative bollards would match the lighting along San Marco Avenue and Castillo Drive (no lighting along Grove Avenue due to the residents' concern)

- Terra cotta pots used to guide vehicles.
- Brick surrounding the lighting
- Hotel sign would rest on red brick appropriate for the Victorian period
- 6" flush concrete curb

A board's discussion about the usage of brick determined the following:

- Brick was appropriate as opposed to coquina
- A sample was requested
- Concern for usage of brick, considering the coquina walls and various coquina landscaping
- Brick examples used in the north city were noted
- Brick instead of coquina was an issue under the guidelines
- Turning the brick to exemplify the period would be worked out with staff

Mr. Marquis continued that:

- Low Masonry Wall with pickets ties near the lighting showed cohesion and addressed the separated entities by reflecting differences
- The pool area, and details reflected the Victorian period with brick walls
- A planter wall with brushed concrete finishing provided semi-privacy in the chase lounge area
- Cabbage Palm trees used for buffer
- A three foot wall blocked the Spa
- Landscaping reflected Victorian period

Public hearing opened, no one responded.

MOTION

Mr. Ste. Claire MOVED to TABLE F2007-0344 application located at 28 San Marco and 6 Castillo to construct a new hotel until the February 21st regular meeting. Motion SECONDED by Ms. Harvey.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Mr. Ste.Claire, Ms. Harvey,
Mr. Weaver

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Item 4 (b) F2007-0347

Coenraad Van Rensburg, General Contractor – Applicant
National Society of Colonial Dames - Owner
28 Cadiz Street

To construct a wheelchair ramp

Mr. Scofield's report was as follows:

Mr. Scofield said the building has been used casually for overnight stays. One of the members, confined to a wheelchair, required access to the building. The proposal was for a classic wheel chair ramp, but an option could be a portable wheelchair ramp or wheelchair lift. He added that either of those options would be less intrusive, therefore staff recommended denying the application.

Mr. Weaver acknowledging that the applicant was not present, opened the Public Hearing, but there was no response.

MOTION

Mr. Ste. Claire MOVED to DENY Certificate of Appropriateness F2007-0347 to construct a wheelchair ramp at 28 Cadiz Street. Motion SECONDED by Mr. Halback.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Mr. Ste. Claire, Mr. Halback,
Ms. Harvey, Mr. Weaver

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Item 4 (c) F2007-0348

Global Candle Gallery Inc. – Applicant
Robert E. Giebeig, et al – Owner
100 St. George Street

To construct a demonstration booth.

Mr. Scofield reported that the applicant had withdrawn the application, as the structure had been constructed without a building permit, and without HARB approval. Additionally, he said that the applicant had agreed to disassemble and reapply with a new proposal.

(Withdrawn)

Item 4 (d) F2007-0350

Don Crichlow, Architect – Applicant
Hewlett Enterprises - Owner
24 Avenida Menendez

To construct a wall and relocate a door

Mr. Scofield reported the following:

The project was an ongoing evolution of the Casa Blanca Inn. The applicant would be moving the kitchen internally and enclosing a rear wall and moving a doorway. Two conditions would need to be addressed as it pertained to the removal of a fence once the wall was constructed. The original wall, currently an exterior wall, would become an interior wall, and per Secretary of Interior Standards guidelines, the wall should not be destroyed or altered.

Mr. Crichlow passed out new drawings reflecting several changes with regard to the door, wall and fence. He said that the wall would not be removed, but recessed slightly and redone with a smooth stucco finish to match the building. He addressed the existing 6 panel door by saying that they would remove the glass, however the change to a solid raised panel would match, and bring out the details on the door.

Public Hearing opened, no one responded.

MOTION

Mr. Halback MOVED to APPROVE Certificate of Appropriateness F2007-0350 to construct a wall and relocate a

door and to include the revised drawings and the staff recommendations as listed in the report. Motion SECONDED by Mr. Ste. Claire.

VOTE ON MOTION:

**AYES: Mr. Halback, Mr. Ste.Claire,
Ms. Harvey, Mr. Weaver,**

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Item 4 e) F2007-0353

Martin Gould, Architect – Applicant

Despina Xynidis – Owner

17 Hypolita Street

To make renovations to building exterior.

Staff report was as follows:

Mr. Scofield said staff addressed 8 items. He added that the wheelchair ramp should only be removed if the building official approved the alternative. He added that the alternative was a portable wheelchair lift. He continued that a shed addition would be constructed as part of an outdoor barbeque location, and he informed the board that the health department had an issue using the facility in that manner. He concluded that the design would fit nicely in the courtyard area, and recommended approving the application with 8 conditions.

Martin Gould, 50 Charlotte Street, was sworn in, referred to the drawings, and said ivory would be used on the body of the building, the trim, wood, and trellis. He said the roof steps would done in soft beige and the two doors olive green. He added that the application predicated on removal of ramp approval for more outside seating, and improve the overall appearance. He said that currently there was no style.

Mr. Weaver question if the applicant agreed with staff's recommendations, and the reply was yes, but added that shutters were not required in his opinion; however, he would build them and make them workable.

Mr. Weaver questioned if the shutters needed to be operateable, and if staff had received the drawings prior to that day, and the reply was yes re: shutters and no regarding the drawings.

Mr. Gould said the shutters would be made from scratch but balance the front facade. He added that the light over the grill would copy existing lights over the garage doors, but the light over the entrance would be new. He agreed with staff's recommendations.

A lengthy discussion between the Board and applicant about the wheelchair ramp removal, how to deal with what was underneath it after removal, and the new portable lift revealed the following:

- Unusual for one to remove a ramp and replace it with a portable lift
- Lift would be utilized when someone needed it, but stored out of sight when not in use
- Majority of seating would be outside; however, one could request the lift upon arrival
- Ramp currently over entire concrete
- Paving left following the destruction would be affected - good time to install pavers or a new slab
- Following removal of ramp, fresh concrete for columns to support the trellis was recommended
- Consideration to keeping the rough crude look was important to the applicant
- Neutral concrete color paint matching the sidewalk could be placed over the concrete left to maintain appearance
- New paved area would add to the appearance
- It was not determined whether the concrete would be removed and replaced or painted
- What happened after removal of ramp still needed to be reviewed

- How the underneath after removal was dealt with should be a condition of approval
- There was discomfort from one board member about taking the ramp down when others were required to have one
- It was an eyesore; taking it down would improve the look of area, the street, and attract business

Mr. Ste. Claire questioned why portable lifts were not suitable options, and the reply was that ADA requirements were complex; most commercial structures needed to include permanent handicap ramps designed to meet specifications; however, it was the city's building official that determined if a portable ramp met the federal guidelines.

Mr. Ste. Claire questioned if the applicant wanted to table the item, given that it hinged upon the wheel chair ramp removal, and Mr. Gould replied that he preferred a decision, but if approved, with contingencies.

Mr. Birchim added that an approval with conditions would not influence the building official's decision.

Public Hearing opened, no one responded.

MOTION

Mr. Halback MOVED to APPROVE Certificate of Appropriateness F2007-0353 but to include staff's recommendations and two conditions: 1) Building official must approve the wheel chair ramp removal and usage of a portable lift, and 2) Applicant required to collaborate with staff to find a suitable surface replacement for the area currently underneath the ramp and for an appropriate color to be used on the surface. Motion SECONDED by Ms. Harvey.

VOTE ON MOTION:

**AYES: Mr. Halback, Ms. Harvey,
Mr. Ste. Claire, Mr. Weaver**

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Discussion followed emphasizing interest in the building official's decision, given the recent case studies for different procedures involving ADA ramps.

Item 4 f) F2008-0001

**Joe Teisan, Architect – Applicant
Barbara Teisan – Owner 78 Spanish
Street**

To revise previously approved plans for a rear addition.

Staff's report was as followed:

The proposal for a square footage expansion for a rear addition would allow a window to be added, and steps to include hand rails that mimic the porch deck upstairs. Conditions remained the same as previous approval for the rear addition, however the approval of the current application would supersede the previous approval. He concluded that the elevation not shown on the drawing would be consistent in appearance and materials with new changes.

Joe Teisan, 47 Grove Avenue, was sworn in and said that the changes proposed were as follows:

- Change on South elevation of the addition to add two windows instead of one
- Front porch encroachment due to ramp no longer resulting in change to being the original facade

Mr. Teisan was questioned about the process to get a waiver from the State regarding the wheel chair ramp, and the reply was as follows:

He presented information to the Handicap Advisory Board and the issue pertained to two federal laws, the ADA and Historic Preservation Act. He said he exhausted all efforts through the local HARB, but the lift and ramp had been rejected. He reiterated that one needed to exhaust local HARB possibilities, and the compliance by rulings from the State level before presenting the package to two successive organizations in the State. He concluded that he was the first applicant from the area to apply for the waiver and receive a clear submittal path by Mr. Androtti, but it took 6 weeks.

Public hearing, no one responded.

MOTION

Mr. Halback moved to APPROVE Certificate of Appropriateness F2008-0001 to revise previously approved plans for a rear addition including staff's recommendations. Motion SECONDED by Mr. Ste. Claire.

VOTE ON MOTION:

**AYES: Mr. Halback, Mr. Ste. Claire,
Ms. Harvey, Mr. Weaver**

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. HISTORIC PRESERVATION PROPERTY TAX ABATEMENT

Item 5 (a) F2007-0272

Joe Teisan – Applicant

Barbara Teisan – Owner

78 Spanish Street,

Mr. Scofield recommended tabling the item, until a complete set of drawings were received for review.

Mr. Teisan questioned if the interior would be reviewed by HARB, and the response was affirmative.

MOTION

Mr. Ste. Claire moved to TABLE Certificate of Appropriateness F2007-0272 concerning the properties at 78 Spanish Street until the February 21, 2008 regular meeting. SECONDED by Ms. Harvey.

VOTE ON MOTION:

**AYES: Mr. Ste. Claire, Ms. Harvey,
Mr. Halback, Mr. Weaver**

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. Planning and Building Director's Report

(None)

7. Other Business

Mr. Hall reported that he had gone before the board since 2003 regarding protection to HP-3 and especially at this time considering property values. He explained that after a study in HP-1, Ordinance 2003-01 was approved listing fifteen architectural designs that could be utilized in HP-1, 2 and 3, but the study had not included HP-2 and HP-3. He pointed out that Commissioner Crichlow agreed that the ordinance had not been intended for HP-2 and 3; however, it had been passed including all three zones. He urged the board to resolve the problem, and he provided some potential scenarios that could occur, especially considering surface parking lots, without their attention.

A brief discussion indicated that Mr. Hall's fears might possibly be unfounded, but Mr. Hall disagreed and stated that he was committed to at least one portion of the City remaining purely Spanish Colonial.

8. Review of Conflict Statements from Previous Meeting

Fred Halback declared he had a conflict with item, 6 Castillo Drive/San Marco Avenue.

9. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:05 PM.

_____¹
Paul Weaver, III, Chairperson

¹ Transcribed by Dianna Polland