

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE
Historic Architectural Review Board Regular Meeting
January 15, 2009

The Historic Architectural Review Board met in formal session at 2:00 P.M., Thursday, January 15, 2009, in the Alcazar Room at City Hall, St. Augustine, Florida. Dana Ste. Claire, Chairperson called the meeting to order, and the following were present:

1. ROLL CALL:
Dana Ste. Claire, Chairperson
Fred Halback, Vice-Chairperson
Leslie Thomas
Len Weeks
Paul Weaver, III

City Staff:
Ron Brown, City Attorney
Carlos Mendoza, Assistant City Attorney
David Birchim, Planning Manager
Tom Scofield, Historic Preservation Planner
Carly Mason, Recording Secretary

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
December 18, 2008 Regular Meeting

The minutes of the December 18, 2008 Regular HARB meeting were approved as presented.

3. Certificates of Appropriateness

Item 3 (a) F2008-0142

Thomas Addison, Cellar 6 LLC - Applicant
TEP, Inc. (John Jennison) - Owner
2-10 Aviles Street (AKA 17 King Street)¹
(Tabled from 11/20/08 meeting)

To install exterior lighting, sign brackets and exhibit panel.

Mr. Scofield delivered the staff report and stated that based on the review of information submitted by the applicant, the Architectural Guidelines for Historic Preservation, applicable city ordinances and without support of evidence to the contrary, staff found that the Board could TABLE the

¹ Staff report attached to original minutes

Certificate of Appropriateness. He explained that the application was to install exhibit panels and make right-of-way improvements at 2-10 Aviles Street, and tabling would provide the applicant with additional time to prepare support documentation and coordinate with the Public Works Department.

MOTION

Mr. Weeks MOVED to table Certificate of Appropriateness case F2008-0142 until February 19, 2009. Motion SECONDED by Mr. Halback.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weeks, Halback, Thomas, Weaver, Ste. Claire

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Item 3 (b) F2008-0143

Andrea Tedder, Barnacle Bill's Seafood House – Applicant
Chris & Eddy, Inc. (Christopher Way) – Owner

14 West Castillo Drive²
(Tabled from 11/20/08 meeting)

To install exterior lighting, canopy and landscape materials.

Mr. Scofield delivered the staff report and said that based on the review of information submitted by the applicant, the Architectural Guidelines for Historic Preservation, applicable city ordinances and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff found that the Board could APPROVE the Certificate of Appropriateness application to install exterior lighting, canopy, and landscape materials at 14 West Castillo Drive with the following recommended conditions:

- Appropriate paving materials shall be used which included poured coquina concrete, tabby, loose coquina, crushed shells, and brick or stone on sand
- New exterior light fixtures shall match in style and appearance those fixtures already used on the building, but may be larger in size.
- Light fixtures shall be metal with glass lenses/globes
- A traditional three rail, vertical wood plank fence six feet in height shall be allowed on the western boundary of the parking lot west of the restaurant building outside of the right-of-way.
- Pre-fabricated panels shall not be used
- The adjacent hedge shall be maintained if space allowed

The fixed canopy shall meet the following criteria:

- The canopy roof shall not extend further than the eastern wall of the building
- The rafter ends shall either be covered by a fascia or cut to match

² Staff report attached to original minutes

the rafter tails on the existing tiled pent roof

- New woodwork will use some of the same ornamental details found on the building's existing woodwork
- The proper flashing shall be installed at the edges of the standing seam metal roof
- All hurricane clips, straps, hangers, anchors, and roof fasteners used in the construction of the fixed canopy shall be installed in the city right-of-way and require the approval of the Public Works Department
- Plans and drawings shall be revised including a detail of the proposed tiled retaining wall to reflect work items approved by the HARB and resubmitted to the Planning & Building Department to serve as the drawing of record

Paul Weaver recused himself due to a conflict of interest.

Andrea Tedder, applicant, stated that she intended to make beautifications to the exterior of the building.

Mr. Ste. Claire asked if she was in agreement with staff conditions, and the response was affirmative.

Public hearing opened; however, there was no response.

Mr. Halback questioned the type of material that would be used for the driveway.

Ms. Tedder replied that she would use plain concrete.

Mr. Halback said that staff's recommendations indicated that a coquina shell concrete finish should be used instead of plain concrete.

Mr. Thomas clarified that she would use the coquina shell concrete finish for the driveway. He asked if she had submitted a

drawing for the concrete, and asked if the colored tiles would be used on the bench. He also questioned whether the wood benches would be replaced with concrete benches, and the answer was affirmative.

Ms. Tedder said the benches would have concrete block with 3 x 3 beige tiles and colored glass tiles spread throughout.

Mr. Thomas noted that the benches were positioned around the palm trees.

Mr. Halback asked if the cross ties would be finished with the concrete coquina finish, and the response was affirmative.

Mr. Thomas noted that the retaining wall was in the City right-of-way.

Mr. Weeks asked why she chose tile verses wood, as wood would be more appropriate for the location.

Mr. Halback expressed concern about the retaining wall and people entering the driveway. He said the proposed look would not match the building. He indicated that a more detailed drawing would have been more appropriate.

Mr. Weeks said the building was nice; however, the proposed look would not fit the theme.

Ms. Tedder explained that she chose tile, because over time the wood benches would not hold up. She suggested reducing the number of tiles.

Mr. Thomas said if the benches were tiled from the top of the bench verses the front, it would be a better fit.

Mr. Weeks suggested putting stucco on the front of the benches and using tiles on the top.

Mr. Thomas said the beige tiles could be used on the front to avoid snagging clothing,

and the top of the bench could have the colored tiles.

Mr. Halback said he would have preferred a construction or layout drawing to review. He asked if the applicant could provide that information, and the response was affirmative.

Ms. Tedder said the driveway landscaping was overgrown and would be cleaned up. She said that a concrete barrier could be installed; however, once the driveway was returned to its original width there would be ample space.

Mr. Weeks recommended that the dimensions of the project be added to the survey.

Mr. Halback said that if the applicant provided layout plans it would be more in the spirit of what the board required, plus it was part of the guidelines.

Mr. Ste. Claire asked if the applicant was comfortable with the proposal for the benches, and the response was affirmative.

Mr. Weeks questioned whether the benches would have backs, and the response was no.

Mr. Halback questioned whether staff was comfortable with the applicant bringing the recommended items back to them for review, or whether he would prefer tabling the item.

Mr. Scofield replied that he would work with the applicant.

Mr. Thomas said the entrance canopy would have cut rafters with a blue roof.

Mr. Weeks asked if the posts would be sealed or painted.

Ms. Tedder said she preferred to paint the post for consist usage.

Mr. Ste. Claire questioned whether the applicant agreed to use the preapproved sign and lighting fixtures for the building, and the response was affirmative.

Mr. Scofield replied that there was no pre-approved lighting; however, sign lighting could be used.

Mr. Thomas asked if there was an existing fence, and the response was affirmative.

Mr. Halback said the landscaping was overgrown and the applicant was proposing to build a twenty-eight foot tall planter. He requested additional information concerning the planter.

Ms. Tedder said she would be planting eight three foot high Coontie Palms in place of shrubs, and 15 three foot tall Indian Hawthorns in between the restaurant and the west parking lot. She said the shrubbery around the proposed retaining wall would remain the same; however, the overgrown plantings would be removed.

Mr. Weeks noted that 27 inches was too tall for a seat, as benches were normally between 18 to 20 inches tall. He questioned whether the wall would be the same level, and the response was affirmative.

Mr. Ste. Claire said that completed work would have to be approved by the Public Works Department.

Mr. Halback said he was not in favor of the application, because the applicant had not provided enough detail.

Mr. Thomas said he would like the front elevation apparent, considering that the property was located on Castillo Drive.

Mr. Ste. Claire questioned whether the applicant should bring the layout back to board or if staff could accept the material.

Mr. Thomas said the applicant could provide staff with the elevations.

Mr. Halback questioned the level of documentation the applicant would need to provide. He indicated that the board should be consistent with the application process.

Mr. Thomas said he felt that most of the documentation had been provided; however, more details should have been shown.

Ms. Tedder said her initial proposal was to go before the board to see what would be approved.

Mr. Ste. Claire pointed out that the applicant could have applied for an Opinion of Appropriateness application. He asked that the applicant submit the layout design to staff, and a copy be given to the board.

Mr. Weeks asked if the applicant would have to reapply and pay fees for the Certificate of Appropriateness application, and the response was affirmative.

MOTION

Mr. Weeks MOVED to APPROVE Certificate of Appropriateness F2008-0143 with the modifications suggested from the board and all documentation changes be submitted to staff, including details for the rafters.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weeks, Ste. Claire

NAYES: Thomas, Halback

MOTION FAILED TO CARRY WITH A 2/2 VOTE

MOTION

Mr. Weeks MOVED to APPORVE Opinion of Appropriateness F2008-0143 with the expectation that the applicant would return with the final drawings.

VOTE ON MOTION:

**AYES: Weeks, Halback, Thomas,
Ste. Claire**

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Item 3 (c) F2009-0001

Don Crichlow, Architect – Applicant

Warren Merrill – Owner

16 Castillo Drive³

To remodel façade, construct retaining wall and install patio.

Mr. Scofield delivered the staff report and said that based on a review of information submitted by the applicant, the Architectural Guidelines for Historic Preservation, applicable city ordinances and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff found that the Board could APPROVE the Certificate of Appropriateness application to remodel the façade, construct a retaining wall and install a patio at 16 Castillo Drive with the following recommended conditions:

- All new doors and windows shall be wood with divided light (no snap-on grids) leafs and sashes.
- Door leafs should have at least one solid panel on the bottom
- Site and building improvements shall be consistent with the St. Augustine style (Pre-1821) criteria outlined in the Architectural Guidelines for Historic Preservation
- All hurricane clips, straps, tie-downs, hangers, anchors and roof fasteners used in the galleries and pergola shall be hidden from view
- A zocalo of appropriate color shall be painted on masonry walls
- Plans and drawings shall be revised to reflect changes approved by HARB and resubmitted to the Planning & Building Department to serve as the drawing of record

³ Staff report attached to original minutes

Mr. Weaver said one problem with sticking with the Spanish Colonial Revival style was the structure had a modern setback.

Don Crichlow, applicant said the proposal represented the first phase of the project. He said the owner wanted to rehabilitate the building to start receiving a return from his investment. He said the building would have to be elevated to nine feet, and he indicated that he was proposing to bring the entire site up to nine feet, which would include ramp accessibility. He said the concept plans would include the addition of a second story at a later date. He indicated that a new slab would be poured inside the building, the walls would be extended up, and a new truss system would be installed during phase one. He said access to a stair would be proposed for accessibility to the second floor. He said a raised patio would be constructed using a coquina or tabby paver. He expressed appreciation to be working on the project.

Mr. Weaver asked if the applicant could clarify the pattern for the east side of the building.

Mr. Crichlow provided a new copy of the drawings showing the east side of the building. He indicated that he would be changing two windows, installing double hung windows, and three French doors.

Mr. Halback questioned whether the three foot wall in the front would consist of a solid coquina finish. He asked if the building backed up to an existing coquina wall.

Mr. Crichlow said he had priced the coquina veneer and felt that using a coquina sheldash with raked joints would be more cost efficient. He said an existing coquina wall was located at the left of the building and a coquina tabby wall was located to the back. He provided a sample of the coquina concrete finish, and indicated that it would cost about seven dollars a square foot. He stated that he would use either Queen or Date palms and remove the existing palms.

He said an existing light pole located at the front of the property would have to be relocated.

Mr. Halback suggested using Date or Sable Palms.

Mr. Weaver questioned the window fenestrations and why the north elevation could not be similar for both sides.

Mr. Crichlow said a counter was set up on the leftside of the building and above the counter was a garage door opening, which would be closed in. He said a lot of phase one improvements would be in preparation for phase two. He added that raising the elevation would make it possible to view the Fort.

Mr. Ste. Claire said the building needed attention, and the improvements would be an asset.

Public hearing opened; however, there was no response.

Mr. Weaver referred to bullet two, List of Conditions, and suggested that it read *St. Augustine shall be consistent with the Architectural Guidelines for Historic Preservation.*

Mr. Weeks said the Spanish Quarter was located behind the building. He asked if the applicant had thought about running the parapet across the back with scuppers to hide the equipment on top of the roof, which would also help with the installation of the second floor.

Mr. Crichlow said the floor trusses would be installed during the renovations for phase one. He said the back of the building currently had a small grease hood and exhaust fan. He indicated that he could install the parapet around the backside. He concluded that decorative lighting would be used in the back of the building.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE Certificate of Appropriateness F2009-0001 to include staff recommendations, to include on bullet two that the guidelines shall be consistent with the Architectural Guidelines for Historic Preservation, add another bullet stating that the parapet be built according to the original drawings and maintained for all elevations. Motion SECONDED by Mr. Weeks.

VOTE ON MOTION:

**AYES: Weaver, Weeks, Thomas,
Halback, Ste. Claire**

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Mr. Halback clarified that the board used the current drawings. He said that the board allowed the applicant to use a replicated coquina wall in the front of the building as an option, and the applicant would use either a Date or Sable Palms.

4. Certificates of Demolition

Item 4 (a) F2008-0155

**St. Paul AME Church – Applicant/Owner
91 Martin Luther King Avenue⁴**

To demolish a dwelling built circa 1910.

Mr. Scofield delivered the staff report and said that based on the review of information submitted by the applicant and City Building Official, the Architectural Guidelines for Historic Preservation, applicable city ordinances, and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff found that the Board may APPROVE the Certificate of Demolition application for the building located at 91 Martin Luther King Avenue with the following recommended condition:

- Any significant building materials, architectural details, ornaments, and

⁴ Staff report attached to original minutes

fixtures, shall be salvaged from the house prior to demolition.

- If it was determined that there were no salvageable materials, a letter from an architectural salvage company stating that such an evaluation had been conducted shall be submitted to the Planning & Building Department

Nick Andrade, Building Official, said that on November 20, 2008 he had the opportunity to inspect the building and found that it was in poor condition. He said there was water intrusion, the interior walls had termite damage, the mortar for the chimney stack would fail with a strong wind, and the roof was sagging. He said the building was starting to rotate laterally, which was causing the foundation to kickout on the southside of the building. He said the lateral bracing made of plaster was cracked in various places and the floor joists were sagging. He indicated that the electrical system and wiring was old and failing. He said the building was dangerous and not cost efficient to repair. He concluded that the owner had been provided with a posting in regards to the damage and had until February 2, 2009 to rehab or demolish the structure.

Mr. Ste. Claire said there was a conditions assessment submitted as part of the record.

Mr. Weaver questioned the integrity of the structure.

Ron Rolls, Pastor of St. Paul AME Church, applicant, said he agreed with the direction of the application.

Public hearing opened.

Mike Crocker said he was the next door neighbor, and he was in favor of the application.

Mr. Ste. Claire reported that 15 certified notices were mailed and two had been returned in favor.

Public hearing closed.

Mr. Scofield said it did not appear that anything would be salvageable, and he withdrew the staff conditions.

MOTION

Mr. Halback MOVED to APPROVE Certificate of Demolition F2008-0155 based on staff comments. Motion SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Halback, Weaver, Thomas, Weeks, Ste. Claire

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. Planning and Building Director's Report

(NONE)

6. Other Business

6. (a) Review of proposed amendment to the City of St. Augustine, Historic Preservation Tax Abatement Ordinance

Mr. Knight said Commissioner Sikes-Kline would like the board to review the proposed amendment to the Preservation Tax Abatement ordinance. He indicated that the ordinance had gone before the PZB, and they recommended approval. He said the amendment would extend the timeline for the Property Tax Exemption to ten years.

Mr. Ste. Claire asked if the board would be making a recommendation to the City Commission, and the response was affirmative.

Mr. Weaver questioned whether the City would make a recommendation to the

County to extend their ordinance to ten years.

MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE recommendation of the ad valorem exemption extension from five to ten years, and to include a recommendation that the City Commission recommend to St. Johns County that they also extend the term of there exemption from five to ten years. Motion SECONDED by Mr. Weeks.

VOTE ON MOTION:

**AYES: Weaver, Weeks, Thomas,
Halback, Ste. Claire**

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

NON AGENDA ITEM:

Mr. Ste. Claire said a PZB workshop would be held on February 21, 2009 at 1:00 p.m.

7. Review of Conflict Statements from Previous Meetings
December 18, 2008 Regular Meeting

**Les Thomas, 108-110 St George Street
(December 18, 2008 Regular meeting)**

Mr. Thomas said he was the architect for the property.

**Len Weeks, 108-110 St George Street
(December 18, 2008 Regular meeting)**

Mr. Weeks said he was the general contractor for the property.

8. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:54 P.M.

5

Dana Ste. Claire, Chairperson

⁵ Transcribed by Carly Mason