

**CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE**  
Historic Architectural Review Board Regular Meeting  
February 18, 2010

The Historic Architectural Review Board met in formal session at 2:00 P.M., Thursday, February 18, 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  
Elizabeth Carter, Temporary Recording Secretary

---

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**  
**January 21, 2010 Regular Meeting**

The minutes of the January 21, 2010 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 the 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 the Opinion of Appropriateness application to construct a welcome center at

the proposed location if the project complied with the AGHP.

Ken Smith recused himself due to a conflict of interest.

David Luke, Applicant, presented the board with updated drawings and additional details as follows:

- Changed recessed niches to windows on the south elevation
- Second floor on east elevation included:
  - Siding
  - Shutters
  - Steeper roof, compliant with Albert Manucy's guidelines
- Front site wall would meet guideline standards
- Fire sprinkler closet replaced with a window on the south elevation

Mr. Weeks questioned why some windows on the south elevation had shutters but others did not. He asked if it was an intentional design, and Mr. Luke confirmed that it was.

---

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

Mr. Weaver questioned the aesthetics of the paired window and dormer placement, and he expressed concern that the proposal failed to meet the traditional Colonial architectural standards.

Mr. Luke referred to the precedents noted in Mr. Manucy's book and referenced several structures in the area that had been used as guidelines for the design of the proposed structure.

Mr. Weaver stated that subsequent information on Manucy's work showed that several structures were not really Colonial in nature but late 19<sup>th</sup> century additions. He affirmed that the Board's intention to develop in Spanish Colonial style. He further stated that he would support the application, but the question would probably resurface at a later date.

Mr. Weeks requested clarification to Mr. Weaver's concerns about the double windows and the dormer.

Mr. Weaver replied that both were a concern, and he clarified again the potential violation of the architectural standards and guidelines. He believed the items introduced a feature associated with a later period and incorporated other styles of architecture into a Colonial context.

Mr. Weeks defined his interpretation of the dormers as part of the rooms and to alter them would render the rooms unusable.

Mr. Luke confirmed Mr. Weeks' assumption.

Mr. Weaver wanted to ensure that the structure maintained its Colonial look while remaining functional.

Mr. Luke stated that the interior of the structure could not be ignored when considering light and useable space, and he agreed that he could not ignore the inside of a building when designing the outside.

Mr. Thomas stated that he was comfortable with the dormers, however, he commented that the height of the roof would not comply

with standard Colonial guidelines, and he pointed out that there was a combination of styles in the structure. He expressed concern about the metal roof on the back of the building, as he felt the structure went from a Colonial time period to a Victorian style. He said he understood the separation of style from the rear to the front was to make it look like an addition, but he was concerned about the metal roof.

Mr. Luke indicated that the appearance would be turned metal and not modern.

Mr. Thomas expressed concern with the shutters on the back of the building. He explained that, based on its size, the structure was in the category of the Treasurer's House or Governor's House, and he believed fancier shutters would be more appropriate. Otherwise, he believed the improvements and revisions were good.

Public Hearing opened; however, there was no response.

Mr. Halback expressed appreciation for the cooperative effort, and he encouraged the applicant to move forward with the design. He suggested that there would be plenty of opportunity to consider the design of the shutters, roof options, windows and other aesthetic features during the next phase.

Mr. Weaver also expressed concern with the metal roof, as there was a precedent for flat tile based on some governmental uses, as well as archeological and historical evidence, which fell under the guidelines. He also believed there had been a few cases when the board denied metal roofs on Colonial period buildings.

Mr. Weeks questioned the board's opinion on the shutters for the proposed structure, as the shutters on the south elevation were somewhat plain considering the visibility when approached from Cordova Street.

Mr. Weaver agreed with the appearance of the shutters, but he was concerned with the historical accuracy of the windows and shutters.

Following additional discussion on the windows and shutter styles, Mr. Luke indicated that he based the shutter style on the architectural guidelines, Manucy's book and some drawings from the Historical Society.

#### **MOTION**

**Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE Opinion of Appropriateness application F2009-0084 (keeping in mind the numerous comments by the board). Motion SECONDED by Mr. Weeks**

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

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

**NAYES: NONE**

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

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

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

**American Legion Post 37 – Applicant Charles F. Hamblen Club – Owner 1 Anderson Circle<sup>2</sup>**

#### **To construct a handicap ramp.**

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

#### **Exparte Communication:**

Mr. Weaver, Mr. Weeks and Mr. Thomas reported exparte communications with Mr. Richard White, spokesman for the applicant.

Mr. White provided drawings and recommended discussion regarding location and appearance.

Mr. Halback questioned whether Mr. White planned to submit development plans for the project, and the response was yes, but he had not done so yet.

Mr. Halback explained the process for presentation to the board and Mr. White volunteered to come back at a future meeting with the required documentation.

Mr. Thomas and Mr. Halback expressed interest in discussing some of the project details.

Mr. White indicated that the applicant wished to enhance the appearance of the building and make it accessible.

Mr. Weeks said the most important item for consideration was the handrails because of the visibility. He questioned whether wood or metal would be most appropriate for Mediterranean Revival.

Staff responded that either material could be correct in the right style, and Mr. White presented a photograph of the proposed style of railing.

Mr. Smith asked for clarification on the height from the sidewalk to the door as the drawing did not contain that information. He believed that if the height was reduced there might be no need for handrails, and the proposal might not require HARB's approval as it was a site improvement.

Mr. Halback indicated that the applicant would still need HARB approval, but it would make the process much easier.

Mr. Smith suggested that applicant meet with Nick Andrade, Building Official, as he believed a five-foot landing was needed in front of the door. He also believed that adjusting the height of the sidewalk eliminated the need for railings.

Mr. Thomas agreed with Mr. Smith and board discussion continued on the height and slope of the sidewalk and ramp, and it was determined that applicant could possibly install a sloped sidewalk and not a ramp, thus eliminating the need to meet ramp requirements.

Mr. Halback advised that the applicant still had to present a final design plan to the

<sup>2</sup> Staff report attached to original minutes

board for approval. He also suggested that the applicant consult with an architect or engineer who could help with the project.

Mr. Thomas reminded the applicant that he would need the level in front of the door and encouraged him to consider their suggestions to possibly eliminate the railing, but if railing was still used, he advised against pipe rails.

Mr. White said he would take the board's advice and consult an architect and return with a new proposal.

Following a brief discussion, it was determined that a public hearing was not necessary.

## **MOTION**

**Mr. Weaver MOVED to TABLE the Certificate of Appropriateness F2009-0095. Motion SECONDED by Mr. Weeks**

### **VOTE ON MOTION:**

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

**NAYES: NONE**

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

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

#### **City of St. Augustine – Owner/Applicant Historic Districts**

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

Mr. Birchim stated that the item had been WITHDRAWN.

## **5. Certificate of Demolition**

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

#### **George Arnold – Applicant** **74 Spanish Street LLC – Owner** **74 Spanish Street<sup>3</sup>**

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

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

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.

### **Exparte Communication:**

Mr. Weaver reported an exparte meeting with Gaere McDonald, Architect, on Thursday, February 11, 2010 to inspect the property and discuss the condition and integrity of the building.

Mr. Weeks reported that he visited the property and inspected the building.

Mr. Thomas indicated that he took a tour of the building with Mr. McDonald.

Mr. Halback also met with Mr. McDonald on February 18, 2010 and performed a brief inspection of the building.

Don Crichlow, Architect, presented a cost proposal for expenses associated with rehabilitation of the property at just over \$300 per square foot.

Mr. Halback confirmed that the cost proposal was the same information received by the board on December 23, 2009.

Mr. Crichlow continued that the owner was concerned that the cost of renovation was in excess of twice the value of property currently selling in the area. He also advised that it had been difficult to determine the value in tax abatement credits for restoration or the appraised value of the property after renovations. He explained that the cost to renovate a structure would not necessarily equate to its appraised value; therefore, he was unable to provide an estimate of tax abatement on the property.

Mr. Halback asked for clarification to Mr. Crichlow's testimony, and he questioned

whether the tax abatement issue was related to the cost proposal estimate.

Mr. Crichlow clarified that they were separate issues.

Mr. Weaver confirmed that the property would be eligible for tax abatement and other Code relief. He questioned the floor height requirement.

Mr. Birchim stated that the property might be eligible for a flood elevation variance based on its contributing status. He stated that the minimum elevation was nine feet, but he was unsure of the existing elevation.

Upon review of the survey, it was determined that the floor elevation was 9.05 feet and in compliance.

Mr. Weaver asked Staff for direction on the tax abatement and ad valorem exemptions.

Mr. Knight responded that about one-half to one dozen properties had received tax exemption, and he confirmed five year exemptions on the following:

- 24 Cathedral Place, old bank building received exemptions for renovations and restorations
- Casa Monica Hotel
- The old Ice Plant on Riberia Street
- House on Valencia Street

Mr. Knight clarified that all of the improved value that was put into the properties to restore them was exempt for five years, but currently properties were eligible for up to 10 years exemption at the County and City level.

Gaere McDonald addressed the cost proposal presented by Mr. Crichlow and clarified the proposal was an estimate of expenses that could be incurred should a project plan develop. He said the plan would include the following:

- The building would have to be moved to renovate

- The foundation would have to be redone
- The adjacent building would be tented
- The siding would have to be drilled for nails and reinstalled
- Proximity to adjacent building left little room to work

Mr. Halback questioned if the estimate provided by Mr. McDonald was based on a build-out condition or framed-out condition.

Mr. McDonald confirmed that the estimate was for a finished residence. He questioned the worth of the repair, as the cost should be taken into consideration.

Mr. Weaver then asked, in the event of the building being demolished, what type of building could be constructed in its place.

Mr. Birchim advised that it must be Colonial style, size limited to the lot, with set-backs and lot coverage taken into account, up to a maximum of 70% lot coverage and 2,500 square-footprint for a main structure.

Mr. Weaver questioned the lot size; what the minimum lot size was; and what the side set-back requirements were.

Mr. Knight advised that for the property the lot was 25 feet wide by 100 feet deep with 2,500 square feet. He believed the minimum lot size was 1,650.

Mr. Weaver asked if 25 feet was an acceptable width for a buildable lot.

Mr. Birchim confirmed the lot was a buildable, platted lot with side set-back requirements at three feet for Colonial structures; zero feet set-back in the front and three feet in the back, and not to cover more than 70% of the lot and no more than 50% could be covered with a main structure. He said that made 1,250 square feet for the main structure with the balance in an attached secondary structure.

Mr. Weaver stated that he was trying to ascertain an economic advantage for

construction of a smaller structure, and he observed that currently the building did not respect the existing side set-back requirements; indicating that it was overlapping with the adjacent property.

Mr. McDonald remarked that the existing footprint of the building was 850 square feet for the first floor. He further clarified that if the building was 1,250 square feet and two stories, at 2,500 square feet it would be more square footage than in the current building.

Mr. Weeks believed that, based on the lot size and coverage requirements, 1,900 square feet could be built on the first and second floors.

Mr. Halback wanted to understand how increasing the size of the structure worked toward a demolition permit or an economic hardship.

A discussion ensued and the applicant was asked for further detail related to the cost estimate and the economic hardship.

Mr. McDonald said he broke the estimate down by departments and compiled numbers but had not put the whole thing out to bid, because they did not have a set of prints to bid.

Mr. Halback attempted to clarify that Mr. McDonald had made no comparison to other current or past construction; therefore, while expensive, there was no testimony that the project was relatively expensive.

Mr. McDonald made a comparison to 46 Marine Street and indicated that while it was a bigger building it was similar in square foot price.

Mr. Halback concluded that in comparing the two projects there did not seem to be a big discrepancy in cost.

Mr. Smith asked for the difference in cost to renovate the structure versus constructing a new building of the same size and quality,

and Mr. McDonald indicated that the cost for a new building would be less.

Mr. Weaver questioned the structural soundness of the building and requested confirmation that it could be rehabilitated.

Mr. McDonald believed the lower floor was structurally sound, but the roof was questionable and the west, back end of both stories should be removed.

Mr. Halback indicated that he believed the back portion of the structure was an addition from a later period, and it was confirmed that it had been added possibly 20-30 years after the original construction.

Mr. Weaver confirmed that the building was a balloon frame building, and he asked if the handrail and windows were original to the structure, and concluded, if so, the building had much of its original detailing.

Mr. McDonald believed they were original to the building, especially the handrails, and he agreed there was some original detailing to the building.

Ben Butera, Architect, stated he had been retained to evaluate the condition of the building and testified that under normal conditions the cost to rehabilitate a structure was approximately 50% higher than the cost of new construction. However, he felt that considering the building would have to be moved, which was questionably risky and some structural parts replaced, all of which was time consuming, he determined an estimated cost of \$500,000.

Mr. Weaver questioned how much deterioration had occurred over the past seven years and if the roof was a contributing factor to the deterioration. He also clarified that approximately \$9,000 had been spent on maintaining the structure from 2003 to present none of which appeared to have been allocated to the roof.

Mr. Halback questioned whether \$9,000 spent over seven years would be considered appropriate stewardship. He

clarified that the entire \$9,000 was spent in the first year of purchase.

Mr. Butera cited vandalism and roof exposure as contributing factors to the deterioration of the structure but could not testify when it began or how long it had been going on, nor could he make a determination regarding the stewardship of the applicant, as he was unfamiliar with various details of the structure's purchase and condition history.

George Arnold, applicant/owner, provided a history on the roof issue:

- Roof peeled off during the three storms in 2004
- Two roofers' inspections revealed structure and termite damage to wooden supports
- Structure was not sound enough to work on
- No solid surface had been put on the roof
- Shingles had slats of wood on the crawl supports with gaps between and no tar paper
- Metal roof was put over the shingled surface
- Termites had caused extensive damage
- There was nothing in the walls that was to Code to support a rebuild of the roof

Mr. Arnold indicated that much of the \$9,000 spent on the building was to rebuild front and back collapsing porches. He believed over 90% of the structural damage existed prior to purchase, but had been unable to ascertain the extent of the damage, because it had been concealed behind plaster. He stated that had he known the extent of the damage, he would not have purchased the property. He pointed out that he had been unable to generate any income on the property since purchase, as it was unrentable, which was an additional reason for the lack of repairs. He believed he had done all the maintenance he could to keep the structure in a holding pattern as follows:

- Porch rebuilds
- Termite treatment
- Window replacement
- Vandalism repair

Mr. Arnold said his original intention was not to demolish the building, but neither was it his intention to perform extensive maintenance. He reported that at the end of 2008, he had an investment of \$318,789 in the property, but it was currently listed at approximately \$187,500-\$188,000, and no one was interested in purchasing it; therefore, he did not believe it made economic sense to repair.

Mr. Arnold emphasized that a 100% exemption for 10 years on all property taxes provided no significant financial incentive to repair the property. He had attempted to research income and rental amounts on comparable properties but was unable to obtain precise information. He determined that if he rented the structure at \$22 per foot, and factored in his investment, the return would be approximately \$1,500 per year.

He stated that he understood the board was concerned with the future of the structure, but expressed concern over his liability for the property. He indicated that he had no plans to build anything, and he suggested that as a vacant lot, someone else might be interested in developing it.

Mr. Weaver asked if Mr. Arnold had any quotes or estimates from roofers and asked if any inquiry had been made into stabilizing the roof, repairing the sheathing or restoring the structure's weather tight integrity.

Mr. Arnold replied he had received no written estimates from roofers but indicated that he had looked into replacing the metal sheathing; however, the roofers were unwilling to make repairs due to the risk involved.

Mr. Weaver asked about the previous resident and whether the building was inhabitable or rentable.

Mr. Arnold acknowledged the previous owner had lived in the dwelling, however there were many issues as follows:

- Holes in the walls and floors
- Rats
- Ceilings were falling down
- Leaks
- Falling plaster, where you could see through the walls to the building to the North
- Rotted windows covered with boards, foam, and pieces of sheet metal
- Extreme termite damage

Mr. Weaver believed that the applicant was aware of the condition of the structure before he purchased it, and he asked if alternative treatments had been considered for the termites.

Mr. Arnold explained that he thought a lot of the repair work would be cosmetic. He had not had the building inspected prior to purchase, and he was not aware of the extensive roof or termite problems. Additionally, he had not realized he could not tent the building; however, he had tried multiple termite treatments to no avail.

Public Hearing opened.

Robert Hall, resident, stated that he knew the previous owner of the residence and had been in the home numerous times prior to applicant's purchase. He attested to the poor conditions of the structure and was aware that water intrusion and termites had been an ongoing problem. He believed it was a common vernacular house not worth restoration.

Mr. Weaver asked if the condition of the structure was obvious to him at the time of purchase and whether he had been inside the building and noticed the framing of the house.

Mr. Hall replied that he had toured the applicant's buildings, and the poor condition was obvious to him considering his involvement with restorations. He noted

that it was a typical balloon frame structure, but the damage was extensive making a restoration quite a task.

Mr. Weaver asked if Mr. Hall thought balloon framing was a fairly important method of building construction; whether he looked at the Florida Master Site File on the building; whether he was familiar with the Model Land Company ("MLC"); whether he was aware that MLC owned the land at one time; and whether he thought MLC was important.

Mr. Hall replied that balloon framing was an inexpensive method of construction; he had not looked at the Florida Master Site File; he was familiar with MLC; and indicated he would not question the fact that they owned the land at one time.

Mr. Weaver asked Mr. Hall if he thought the Model Land Company was important, and the response was, it was no more important than areas of cities in the country that were developed about the same time.

Public Hearing closed.

Mr. Weaver asked Mr. Arnold to summarize his plans for the property. He cited the staff report that stated the applicant wanted to demolish the building for marketability purposes.

Mr. Arnold said he was not sure what his plan was, but if he could take the building down he would possibly develop the property at a later date. He indicated that he would be presenting plans for 76 Spanish Street (the renovation) at the next board meeting and had intended to use materials from the structure in question for the renovation.

Mr. Weaver referred to page four of the application, which indicated that the proposal was to demolish the building, because it had more marketability as a vacant lot.

Mr. Arnold explained that the “vacant lot” verbiage was due to his uncertainty on what to build there and when.

Mr. Weaver indicated that the applicant had received prior approval for the renovation with the original plan for both properties together.

Mr. Arnold explained that had not been his intention, and he indicated that the decision to combine the properties had evolved between the board and Mr. Crichlow who served as his agent. He detailed the circumstances around the two properties and explained that the original plan for the renovation was to have separate structures to the front and rear of the building, and the other building was to be a separate structure. He was advised that nothing could be in front or behind the renovation that blocked the view of it. He said Mr. Crichlow then developed the plan that joined the two properties; however, when it came to the final product, he had not approved.

Mr. Weaver reminded Mr. Arnold that he authorized and signed the application for HARB authorizing Mr. Crichlow to act as his agent, and confirmed that Mr. Crichlow represented him.

Mr. Arnold acknowledged that fact; however, he reiterated that the plan had not met his needs.

Mr. Weaver recalled that the plan had been revised to include the things Mr. Arnold wanted, and he was given an Opinion of Appropriateness for the structure.

Mr. Crichlow indicated that it was issued for using the two properties together, but that was not what the applicant wanted to do with the property.

Mr. Weaver confirmed the applicant’s desire to proceed with the renovation, and he questioned why the structure in question could not be renovated as well, considering the buildings were similar.

Mr. Arnold explained that the renovation was smaller and in better condition compared to the structure in question, which could be renovated, but it would be an economic hardship.

Mr. Thomas believed the building could be restored, but the closeness of the other structure had to be addressed. He also pointed out that it was the applicant’s responsibility to prove hardship.

Mr. Arnold said he could not work with the property, and he insisted it was a liability and an economic hardship. He stated that he would be happy to consider other options, such as selling it to the city.

Discussions ensued over demolition costs, and it was determined that the estimate to demolish the entire building was approximately \$16,000.

Mr. McDonald was asked for his thoughts on an estimate for simply stabilizing the structure. He advised that the concern over stabilizing the building went back to the roof issue; the roof could not support a worker making repairs.

Mr. Weeks expressed concern with the lack of a plan to replace the building, and if the building was demolished, restoration would be out of the question. He supported a plan that stabilized the structure until someone bought it. He believed the outside of the building was attractive, provided an ambiance to the street, and it looked better than a parking lot. He recommended denying the application for demolition and confirmed that the delay maximum was one year.

Mr. Weaver stated that he was prepared to make a motion to deny the demolition for one year, at which time applicant could return with more facts to demonstrate an economic hardship.

## MOTION

Mr. Weaver **MOVED** to **DENY** the Certificate of Demolition F2009-0044 for one year. Motion **SECONDED** by Mr. Weeks with clarification that the applicant could come back within the year with a plan for the building, as long as it did not include demolition.

The Board continued discussion on the condition of the building and stabilization efforts. Mr. Arnold agreed to put a tarp on the roof.

Mr. Halback said for the record that he understood the expert testimony but did not agree that it demonstrated a sufficient cause for economic hardship, and the other board members concurred.

### **VOTE ON MOTION:**

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

**NAYES:** NONE

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

### **Item 5 (b) F2009-0004**

**Yvan G. Sams – Owner/Applicant**  
**66 Smith Street<sup>5</sup>**

### **To demolish a structure (circa 1945)**

Mr. Birchim delivered the staff report and said based on the lack of significance and poor condition of the structure, and without the support of evidence to the contrary, the staff found that the Board could **APPROVE** the Certificate of Demolition application for the building located at 66 Smith Street.

Yvan Sams, Owner/Applicant, affirmed that she had been the owner of the property for 12 years and made the application for demolition. She advised that the property needed extensive repairs but financial constraints had prevented her from performing them. Her desire was to demolish the building and construct a Habitat for Humanity dwelling.

<sup>4</sup> Break 4:12p.m. – 4:24p.m.

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

Public Hearing opened; however, there was no response.

## MOTION

Mr. Weeks **MOVED** to **APPROVE** the Certificate of Demolition F2009-0004. Motion **SECONDED** by Mr. Thomas .

### **VOTE ON MOTION:**

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

**NAYES:** NONE

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

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

### **Recent Permitting:**

Mr. Knight reported on recent permitted activity and offered to answer questions.

### **SIGN PERMIT**

- 18 St. George Street (Local Hero's Café)
- 46 St. George Street (San Augustin Imports/Exports)
- 35 Hypolita Street (Sangria's Wine & Piano Bar)
- 48 Charlotte Street (The Accent Shop)

### **REPAIR, MAINTENANCE AND NEW CONSTRUCTION**

- 5 & 7 Cordova Street (Renovations for a restaurant)
- 20 Avenida Menendez (Paint exterior with HARB approved colors)
- 178 Avenida Menendez (Relocate electrical meter to underground)
- 304 St. George Street (Construct a new shed. HARB Approved)
- 28 Cuna Street (Change out mechanical heat pump)
- 24 Avenida Menendez (Paint exterior of building white)
- 48 Charlotte Street (Install interior fired rated double door)

## DEMOLITION

- 12 Castillo Drive (Exploratory Demo)

### Important Notice Regarding Commercial Structures:

Mr. Knight described the requirements of a new State law concerning new signage rules on certain commercial structures. He said that decals were now required on certain light-frame truss-type buildings, which would affect the historic district. He explained that as renovations occurred, placement of the decals would be required at the entrances.

Board discussion ensued to better understand the dynamics of the new law.

### Fort Signs:

Mr. Knight presented two new sign design ideas to direct visitors to the fort with different illustrations depicting the fort. He said the signs were historic brown and white and contained simply "Castillo de San Marco Fort" with a directional arrow.

The board discussed the signs and determined:

- Color was good
- Verbiage was good
- Fort image was preferred over aerial picture
- Signs could be a little smaller, but should be visible from at least 20-30 feet

### Trolley Stop and Shelter:

Mr. Knight described the new design details for the proposed trolley stop and covered shelter. He advised that this was not up for formal approval yet, just for general concept.

### Exparte Communication:

Mr. Thomas and Mr. Halback indicated that they had previously discussed the proposed

new design of the stop and shelter with Mr. Knight.

Mr. Knight advised the new design included a wood shake roof with minimal clearance for head room to lower the scale. He said the design widened the posts to remove angled bracing and gave it a more Colonial appearance. He stated that additionally, the structure was moved into the right-of-way providing three feet of additional sidewalk and made room for benches on the back side as well as a path of travel.

The Board was pleased with the proposed design and believed that reducing the height of the roof, taking away the bracing and pulling the sidewalk out was an improvement.

### Directional Signs:

Mr. Knight reported that the two signs located between the Visitor Center and the garage would be eliminated leaving a total of six signs back-to-back in that area for the fort.

## 7. Other Business

Mr. Knight advised that he adjusted the HARB meeting deadline for the month, extending it one week, because the turnaround time was too tight.

Mr. Weeks informed the board that he would not be in attendance at the next HARB meeting.

Mr. Crichlow addressed the board about HP1 issues and removing HP1 from the Colonial only style of architecture. He solicited the board for ideas on how to handle the matter, and he asked them to call him individually.

Mr. Halback suggested that the board consider Mr. Crichlow's appeal and contact him to share their counsel, but he believed the board should defer the matter to the Commissioners for further direction.

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

(NONE)

**9. Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:55 P.M.<sup>6</sup>

---

**Fred Halback, Chairperson**

---

<sup>6</sup> Transcribed by Elizabeth Carter