

**CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE**  
Historic Architectural Review Board Regular Meeting  
January 21, 2010

The Historic Architectural Review Board met in formal session at 2:00 P.M., Thursday, January 21, 2010, in the Alcazar Room at City Hall, St. Augustine, Florida. Fred Halback, Chairman, called the meeting to order, and the following were present:

**1. ROLL CALL:** Fred Halback, Chairman  
Len Weeks, Vice-Chairperson  
Leslie Thomas  
Paul Weaver, III  
Ken Smith

City Staff: Mark Knight, Planning and Building, Director  
David Birchim, Planning Manager  
Carlos Mendoza, Assistant City Attorney  
Carly Mason, Recording Secretary

---

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**  
**December 17, 2009 Regular Meeting**

The minutes of the December 17, 2009 Regular HARB meeting were approved as presented.

**3. Opinion of Appropriateness**

**Item 3 (a) F2009-0084**

**Kenneth R. Smith and David J. Luke**  
**Kenneth Smith Architects, Inc. –**  
**Applicant**  
**Flagler College – Owner**  
**63 Cordova Street<sup>1</sup>**  
**(Previously Tabled)**

**To construct the new Flagler College Welcome Center.**

Mr. Birchim said based on a review of information submitted by the applicant, the Architectural Guidelines for Historic Preservation and without evidence to the contrary, staff found that the board could choose the following:

- APPROVE – the Opinion of Appropriateness application to construct a welcome center at the location if the board was satisfied that the project complied with the Architectural Guidelines Historic Preservation (AGHP)
- DENY - the Opinion of Appropriateness application to construct a welcome center at the location if the board found that the structure was not in compliance with the AGHP
- TABLE – the Opinion of Appropriateness application to construct a welcome center and provide feedback to the applicant for redesign of the project

Ken Smith recused himself due to a conflict of interest.

David Luke, Applicant, presented the board with updated drawings. He said the proposed project was a critical point for Flagler College. He said the proposed building would be 2 ½ stories tall with 2,500 square feet that would include the following:

- Five foot garden wall

---

<sup>1</sup> Staff report attached to original minutes

- Two entrance piers
- Elevator shaft height and width would be minimized to meet handicap requirements
- Handicap ramp would be completely concealed
- East and West balconies would have doors
- Roof would be a low-sloped metal material
- Fountain and lighting would be detailed at a later date
- Pre-approved colors and hardware would be used
- Paving material would be a standard shell mix

Mr. Weaver said the applicant had used features from the Casa Horruytiner, Segui Kirby Smith House, and the Pena Peck House for the proposed project. He said the buildings were post-colonial editions, and he noted that the typical pattern had a single placed dormer or window.

Mr. Halback said the drawings indicated several indentions to better simulate multiple buildings instead of one massive building.

Mr. Weaver asked if the lot coverage could be scaled down for the adjacent buildings. He said the drawings seemed larger than the original request, and he questioned whether the applicant had referred to the Rocque Maps for insight about the property, and the response was affirmative.

Mr. Luke replied that the lot coverage was 70%.

Mr. Knight said the current percentage for PUD lot coverage would be 70%. He said once the applicant applied for a PUD the property would no longer be part of the HP District.

Public hearing opened; however, there was no response.

Mr. Thomas approved of the existing features as follows:

- Streetscape view from the front
- Suggested the courtyard wall be five foot six inches
- Handicap ramp
- Double dormers
- Elevator

Mr. Thomas suggested additional details for the south façade and replacing the blank windows with working windows. He said the first floor siding could be dissimilar from the second floor to create a unique appearance. He noted that the east elevation did not provide a Colonial appearance.

Mr. Luke replied that he tried to add in features from other buildings to create the east elevation.

Mr. Weeks said he was not in favor of the east elevation. He suggested adding a different material to change the features.

Mr. Weaver expressed concern about the dormers, and he noted that the project did not offer a Colonial feel. He asked why the applicant chose double-dormers.

Mr. Luke replied that the structure would be used as a Welcome Center, and he noted that Albert Manucy's book stated that garden walls started at five feet tall.

Mr. Weaver questioned the guidelines for the garden wall height, and the response was five foot six inches.

Mr. Halback said he concurred with the board's comments, and he requested changes to the front wall to meet HARB guidelines. He suggested tabling the item to allow staff time to review the new documents.

Mr. Halback asked for clarification regarding the necessary changes the applicant should provide.

Mr. Birchim replied that the items were as follows:

- East elevation roof height should be taller
- Should consider using siding or different treatment for second floor east elevation exterior
- Shutters could be used on eastern elevation
- Metal door on the southside would be unacceptable
- Single dormer option should be considered
- Courtyard wall height should be five feet six inches

Mr. Weaver said the buildings mass and scale were still a concern. He said the building would be more appropriate if it was flipped.<sup>2</sup>

Mr. Halback said the applicant proposed to install a crosswalk from Valencia Street to the Welcome Center.

Mr. Weaver expressed concern that the information was presented at the last minute, and he suggested tabling the item to allow additional time for review.

Mr. Luke replied that he would prefer to move forward with the application.

Mr. Thomas asked when the applicant would be allowed to go before the Planning and Zoning Board.

Mr. Knight replied that the application would be on the April PZB agenda.

Mr. Luke expressed concern about the orientation of the loggia, and the mass of

the building going back to the drawing board.

Mr. Halback questioned whether Mr. Weaver was concerned that the mass and scale was oversized for the building, and the response was affirmative.

Mr. Halback asked if Flagler College would be willing to proceed with documents and drawings when they received an answer from the PZB board, and the response was affirmative.

Mr. Luke said the mass would be either from the south or north side. He said the roof had a 40 degree slope.

Mr. Thomas said he would like to have additional drawings for the back of the building, and noted that he had no concerns regarding the orientation of the courtyard.

Mr. Weeks asked if the applicant would be able to return to HARB and still move forward with a PZB application, and the response was affirmative.

#### **MOTION**

**Mr. Weeks MOVED to TABLE the Opinion of Appropriateness F2009-0084 until February 18, 2010. Motion SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.**

#### **VOTE ON MOTION:**

**AYES: Weeks, Weaver, Thomas, Halback**

**NAYES: NONE**

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

#### **Item 3 (b) F2009-0100**

**Don Crichlow, Architect – Applicant**  
**76 Spanish Street, LLC – Owner**  
**76 Spanish Street**<sup>3</sup>

**To construct new commercial and residential buildings.**

<sup>2</sup> Power Outage break from 2:38 p.m. to 2:45 p.m.

<sup>3</sup> Staff report attached to original minutes

Mr. Birchim said based on a review of information submitted by the applicant, the Architectural Guidelines for Historic Preservation and without evidence to the contrary, staff found that the board could APPROVE an Opinion of Appropriateness at 76 Spanish Street.

Don Crichlow, applicant, said the property had previously gone before the board, and the board determined that the applicant had twelve months to create an alternate design that would be acceptable. He proposed to build a one story structure in the front of the property, and create an independent structure west of the existing building that would serve as a residence. He said the main structure would be a restaurant, and the middle building would serve as the kitchen/restroom area. He displayed updated front elevations, side elevations, and details of the porch façade related to the proposal. He said several options were considered for the building's façade, and he concluded that the owners' intentions were to make the property marketable.

Mr. Weaver expressed concern about relocating the building, due to the existing coquina piers. He asked about the two doors located on the east elevation floor plan. He suggested installing the kitchen and restroom in another building, and use the existing structure as the dining room to preserve the buildings history.

Mr. Crichlow replied that the east elevation had two existing doors. He said the building could be relocated to the back of the property to serve as a dining room, and build a new structure to serve as a kitchen and restroom. He said using the area for something other than dining would reduce the properties marketability.

Mr. Halback pointed out that the proposed project would not allow the owner to apply for some of the available historic exemption tax opportunities.

Mr. Smith questioned the following:

- Would the fireplace be removed
- Would the chimney be retained
- Would the screen porch continue along the entire porch
- Whether the two full-glazed doors and dining area windows met staff requirements

Mr. Crichlow replied that the chimney would be retained, and he noted that the screened porch would be turned to the north, and a screen door would be added that led to the entrance door. He said it was not uncommon to see casement windows on framed vernacular structures, and noted that the windows would provide lighting for an open atmosphere for the guests.

Mr. Birchim replied that the north elevation dining area had three paired windows and French doors along the front of the structure. He said the styles would not be typical for a framed vernacular; however, they could be forgiven, because the applicant would need to differentiate the new construction from the historic property.

Mr. Thomas thanked the owner for attempting to salvage the structure. He said he would prefer a taller roof pitch and additional lighting. He asked if the proposal was speculative, and the response was affirmative.

Mr. Crichlow said a variety of materials would be used to differentiate the buildings.

Mr. Halback said he would like to see additional roof pitch details, driveway material, and choice of colors.

Mr. Weeks questioned whether the front of the building had to be on the property line.

Mr. Birchim replied that would apply to Colonial style structures.

Mr. Smith asked why the building was considered a territorial building.

Mr. Birchim replied that staff wanted the historical and new construction to blend.

Mr. Smith expressed concern about the casement windows, and said he would prefer double-hung windows. He asked if the board had previously approved the style of window.

Mr. Birchim replied that framed vernacular typically had double-hung windows.

Mr. Crichlow said he would not want to bank the windows if double-hung windows were used.

Mr. Weeks said that casement windows would not be appropriate for the structure.

Mr. Crichlow indicated that the owner would have individual casements that opened from the inside.

Public hearing opened; however, there was no response.

Mr. Smith said he preferred three series of two windows paired in the opening and using double-hung windows

Mr. Halback suggested that the window details could be discussed when the applicant returned for a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Mr. Crichlow replied that the roof slope, style of windows, and porch would help set the design apart from others in the area.

#### **MOTION**

**Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE the Opinion of Appropriateness F2009-0100 to include alternative window styles, roof elements, and site elements. Motion SECONDED by Mr. Weeks.**

#### **VOTE ON MOTION:**

**AYES: Weaver, Weeks, Thomas, Smith, Halback**

**NAYES: NONE**

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY<sup>4</sup>**

#### **4. Certificates of Appropriateness**

##### **Item 4 (a) F2009-0099**

**Elaine H. Darnold – Applicant**

**Charles Steadham – Owner**

**178 Avenida Menendez<sup>5</sup>**

**To add a new dormer, doors, railing, and balusters.**

Mr. Birchim delivered the staff report and stated that based on a review of the AGHP, staff found that the Board could APPROVE a Certificate of Appropriateness for 178 Avenida Menendez as submitted.

Elaine Darnold, applicant, was sworn in.

Public hearing opened; however, there was no response.

Mr. Weaver questioned whether the project would include handrails and stringer located at the bottom. He questioned the location of the balusters and said they appeared to be one inch squared and centered on the stringer and handrail.

Ms. Darnold replied that the balusters would be an inch and three quarters with a top and bottom that included a notch to allow water runoff. She said the design would be a traditional wood painted handrail.

Mr. Smith asked if the north end of roof would remain the same and whether the elevation of the balcony deck would be located at the bottom of the railing with openings that served as drainage. He asked if the roof and doorway would provide adequate head room, and the response was affirmative.

<sup>4</sup> Break from 4:06 p.m. to 4:16 p.m.

<sup>5</sup> Staff report attached to original minutes

Mr. Thomas said he preferred that the dormer lined-up with the existing dormer.

#### **MOTION**

**Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE the Certificate of Appropriateness F2009-0099 as submitted to include the verbal baluster details and submit a drawing to staff. Motion SECONDED by Mr. Weeks.**

#### **VOTE ON MOTION:**

**AYES: Weaver, Weeks, Thomas, Smith, Halback**

**NAYES: NONE**

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

#### **Item 4 (b) F2009-0095**

**American Legion Post 37 – Applicant**  
**Charles F. Hamblen Club – Owner**  
**1 Anderson Circle<sup>6</sup>**

**To construct a handicap ramp.**

Mr. Birchim delivered the staff report and said based on the absence of any design information, staff found that the board could TABLE the Certificate of Appropriateness for a handicap ramp at 1 Anderson Circle.

Charles McHone said he was a member of the American Legion; however, was not the spokesperson for the application.

Richard White, applicant, said the American Legion had submitted drawings to staff for review.

Mr. Halback said the board had not received drawings, and they would prefer tabling the item to allow time for the drawings to be submitted and reviewed.

Mr. White said he would prefer the item be heard, because the handicap ramp presented an accessibility issue.

Mr. Weeks recommended that the applicant should submit the drawings to staff and

<sup>6</sup> Staff report attached to original minutes

allow time for review. He suggested tabling the item until the subsequent meeting.

Public hearing opened; however, there was no response.

#### **MOTION**

**Mr. Weeks MOVED to Table the Certificate of Appropriateness F2009-0095 until February 18, 2010. Motion SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.**

#### **VOTE ON MOTION:**

**AYES: Weeks, Weaver, Smith, Thomas, Halback**

**NAYES: NONE**

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

#### **Item 4 (c) F2009-0083**

**City of St. Augustine – Owner/Applicant**  
**Historic Districts**  
**(Previously Tabled)**

**To install directional signage (pedestrian) in the historic districts.**

Mr. Knight displayed three designs, and noted that Dana Ste. Claire recommended that the signs be brown/white aluminum with the City crest and wood poles. He said the proposed location at the intersection of the northeast corner of Orange Street and Cordova Street had been removed. He said a trolley stop sketch was included in the packet, and he noted that the directional sign would be placed next to the trolley sign.

Mr. Birchim provided samples of brick pavers for the board to review.

Mr. Halback suggested tabling the item to allow staff additional time to gather information.

Mr. Knight asked if the board would like to see a building located in the back drop of the trolley stop.

Mr. Thomas suggested reducing signage and providing additional details.

Mr. Knight noted that the only money available was for construction cost.

Mr. Weeks questioned the size of the sign and the whether the brick samples were new or used.

Mr. Knight replied that the signs would be 24" x 36" and the bricks were found at an offsite location.

Mr. Knight said the old brick would be installed and monitored for a year to make sure they would be a good fit.

Mr. Weeks suggested that staff look at the cost for each brick and see which style would be more cost efficient.

Mr. Halback said the board would like to see clay bricks that looked old, and the samples provided would be acceptable.

Public hearing opened.

Dana Ste. Claire, Director of the Dept. of Heritage Tourism and Historic Preservation and the Director of the St. Augustine 450<sup>th</sup> Commemoration, addressed signage and visitor behavior. He said improving the heritage landscape would improve some of the visitor expectations. He said the covered waiting area for the trolleys would be important for visitors. He said the proposed signage would not work on many levels, and he addressed the fact that the signs should be designed to organize the visitor experience. He said the proposed signs would confuse the visitor, and he suggested using a consistent template for all signage. He stated that the signage along St. George Street should be cleaned up. He noted that adding the word Fort to the proposed signage, including the brown/white sign with the City logo would be more appropriate, and he suggested removing the map located on the bottom of the sign.

Mr. Thomas questioned whether the crosswalks could be completed without the signs.

Mr. Knight replied that DOT had approved signage; however, they had not specified a maximum number of signs. He said a feasibility study had been completed for a tunnel, but it was determined inappropriate; therefore, signage was another option that the money could be used for.

Mr. Halback suggested using a multiple message sign that included the Fort information.

## **MOTION**

**Mr. Weeks MOVED to TABLE the Certificate of Appropriateness F2009-0083 to February 18, 2010. Motion SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.**

### **VOTE ON MOTION:**

**AYES: Weeks, Weaver, Thomas, Smith, Halback**

**NAYES: NONE**

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

### **Item 4 (d) F2009-0090**

**City of St. Augustine – Owner/Applicant**  
**Plaza de la Constitucion – Constitucion**  
**Monument**  
**(Previously Tabled)**

**To remove a chain and install fencing around a monument.**

Mr. Birchim noted that the item had been withdrawn from the agenda.

## **5. Certificate of Demolition**

### **Item 5 (a) F2009-0044**

**George Arnold – Applicant**  
**74 Spanish Street LLC – Owner**  
**74 Spanish Street**<sup>7</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Staff report attached to original minutes

**To demolish a structure (circa 1865-1884).**

Mr. Birchim delivered the staff report and said based on lack of justification for the demolition of a contributing property to a National Register District and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff found that the board could DENY the Certificate of Demolition application for the building located at 74 Spanish Street.

Mr. Halback asked the applicant whether he would like to proceed with the other two items, and the response was affirmative.

George Arnold, applicant, suggested that the board meet and walk-through the building. He said the building had incredible cypress siding, and he would like to reuse the siding for 76 Spanish Street.

Mr. Weaver questioned the condition and the use of the building at the time of purchase.

Mr. Arnold replied that the previous owner only occupied the second floor because the first floor was infested with rats. He said the building had active termites, rotten wood and plaster issues. He said he purchased the property on January 31, 2003.

Mr. Weaver questioned why the interior finishes had been removed. He said the owner had received a Certificate of Appropriateness for both 74 and 76 Spanish Street. He questioned whether the approval for 76 Spanish Street was what the owner had asked for, and the response was affirmative. He asked why the owner wanted to demolish the building after he had received a previous approval.

Mr. Arnold replied that he was told to complete the interior demolition to see the extent of work required for repair. He said repairs would not be feasible, and he suggested tabling the item to allow the board time to visit the site. He said water intrusion from the adjacent building was an issue as well as termites. He noted that he

could not tent the building for termites due to the proximity of the adjacent building. He also noted that the roof was too unstable for repairs.

Mr. Halback suggested tabling the item to allow the board to view the property and consider reuse of the siding for 76 Spanish Street.

Carlos Mendoza, Assistant City Attorney, said each board member would need to view the property separately to follow the Sunshine guidelines.

Mr. Weaver asked the owner if the building would be secured until a decision was made, and the response was affirmative.

Mr. Thomas said the owner had gone through a lot of trouble restoring two other properties, and he questioned why he had not considered relocating the building at 74 Spanish Street to salvage the structure.

Mr. Halback questioned whether the owner had researched movers about relocating the structure, and the response was no.

Mr. Arnold replied that removing the structure would not be cost effective.

**MOTION**

**Mr. Weaver MOVED to TABLE the Certificate of Demolition F2009-0044 to February 18, 2010. Motion SECONDED by Mr. Weeks.**

**VOTE ON MOTION:**

**AYES: Weaver, Weeks, Thomas, Smith, Halback**

**NAYES: NONE**

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Item 5 (b) F2009-0051**

**George Arnold – Owner/Applicant**  
**22 Avenida Menendez<sup>8</sup>**

<sup>8</sup> Staff report attached to original minutes

**To demolish a structure (circa 1890  
SJCPA, circa 1910-1917 FMSF)**

Mr. Birchim delivered the staff report and said based on a review of the applicable codes, the lack of information submitted by the applicant and lack of justification to demolish a contributing property to a National Register District, and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff found that the board could DENY the Certificate of Demolition application for the building located at 22 Avenida Menendez.

George Arnold, applicant, said the structure needed roof repair, due to a leak. He said the building located to the north had used clay concrete tiles, and he was interested in using the same material. He also mentioned that the American Legion had used flat fiberglass shingles for a roof replacement. He said his request had previously been denied three times, and he noted that the additional cost for clay tiles would be \$60,000. He said the existing finials and caps could be salvaged and a percentage of the tiles; however, he would like the entire roof to match.

Mr. Weeks said 70% of the existing clay tiles could be salvaged including the finials and caps. He said the tiles were unique and, he suggested adding new underlayment and clay tiles toward the back of the building.

Mr. Arnold replied that he wanted the roof material to be consistent.

Mr. Weaver said the application had been reviewed and discussed. He said Gaere MacDonald, contractor, had indicated the owner would only go with a particular style of roof. He said a lot of questions regarding the roof were unanswered at the previous meetings; however, the application was for a demolition, and the applicant would have to prove an economic hardship for approval.

Mr. Arnold replied that the property suffered no economic hardship, but could not

understand why surrounding buildings had been approved to use similar material.

Mr. Halback asked for staff clarification regarding the building next to 22 Avenida Menendez.

Mr. Knight replied that Tavern on the Bay had received an over the counter permit to remove and replace existing tile. He said staff had no evidence otherwise and presumed the material was clay tiles. He concluded that the tiles were replaced around eight years ago.

Mr. Arnold questioned whether the board would approve a structure from a different era.

Mr. Halback replied that the options were whether to demolish the building, table the item to consider using different material for the roof, or table the item to allow the board time to visit the site.

Mr. Arnold suggested tabling the item to allow time for the other options.

Public hearing opened; however, there was no response.

**MOTION**

**Mr. Weeks MOVED to TABLE the Certificate of Appropriateness F2009-0051 to March 18, 2010. Motion SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.**

**VOTE ON MOTION:**

**AYES: Weeks, Weaver, Smith, Thomas, Halback**

**NAYES: NONE**

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**6. Planning and Building Director's Report**

(None)

**7. Other Business**

(None)

**8. Review of Conflict Statements from  
Previous Meetings**

(None)

**9. Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:49 P.M.

9

---

**Fred Halback, Chairperson**

---

<sup>9</sup> Transcribed by Carly Mason