

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

The Historic Architectural Review Board met in formal session at 2:00 P.M., Thursday, March 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  
Leslie Thomas  
Paul Weaver, III  
Ken Smith

Absent: Len Weeks, Vice-Chairperson

City Staff:

Mark Knight, Planning and Building, Director  
David Birchim, Planning Manager  
Carlos Mendoza, Assistant City Attorney  
Elizabeth Carter, Temporary Recording Secretary

---

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**  
**February 18, 2010 Regular Meeting**



The minutes of the February 18, 2010 Regular HARB meeting were approved as presented.

Mr. Halback announced that agenda item 5(d) F2010-0011 – Rhett’s St. Augustine, LLC, 66 Hypolita Street, would be tabled until the April 15, 2010 meeting due to a lack of a Quorum. He explained that Mr. Thomas and Mr. Smith had to recuse themselves from the matter; both having worked on the project in the past, and additionally, Mr. Weeks was absent.

**3. George Arnold Properties**

**Item 3 (a) Certificate of Demolition - F2009-0051**

**George K. Arnold – Owner/Applicant**  
**22 Avenida Menendez**  
**(Previously Tabled)**

**To demolish a structure circa 1910-1917**



Mr. Halback confirmed the item was WITHDRAWN and no further action would be needed.

---

**Item 3 (b) Opinion of Appropriateness - F2010-0019**

**Don Crichlow, Architect - Applicant**  
**George K. Arnold – Owner**  
**22 Avenida Menendez<sup>1</sup>**

**To make changes to the building and site.**



Mr. Birchim delivered the staff report and said the Board could APPROVE an Opinion of Appropriateness for a new building and site improvements at 22 Avenida Menendez with further clarification regarding the main entrance design, coat of arms appliqué and second floor balcony setback on the south side.

Don Crichlow, Architect, explained the owner’s plans to convert the existing structure from a Bed and Breakfast to a single family residence as well as enhance the Mediterranean style. He presented site plans detailing the planned improvements as follows:

- Window relocation and replacements

---

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

- Entrance modifications to the front and back of the structure including stone surrounds and columns
- Balcony additions to include iron railings, a patio and French doors
- Menendez Coat of Arms
- Roof modifications
- Iron grills installed over windows and porch
- New stairway

Mr. Crichlow presented a sample of the proposed roof tile and pointed out that it was not concrete as had been presented but a clay material, which kept it more in line with the Mediterranean architectural style.

Mr. Halback commented on the details of the roof and the Ludowici style and questioned how Mr. Crichlow was handling that aspect of the preservation.

Mr. Weaver also pointed out that the roof had been applied for and been denied at least twice by HARB, and was currently on active appeal before the City Commission. He questioned the legal aspect of the roof considering it had been dealt with and denied in the past.

Mr. Knight clarified that it was a separate application and since it was not the same, the applicant could re-apply with the different material.

Mr. Crichlow indicated that the concrete tile roof had been denied, but the new proposal was for clay. He also stated that the ridge and caps would be presented at a later date, but it would be similar to what currently existed.

Mr. Halback clarified that the proposal was to replace the entire roof, including all of the detail pieces, with clay tiles.

Mr. Crichlow presented additional photographs and summarized the general direction and asked for validation that the

approach they were taking would be appropriate.

Mr. Smith liked the overall presentation but questioned the height of the columns and expressed concern over the roof and the color of the tile. He also confirmed the drawings presented were the same as in the board's package and asked for a drawing of the north elevation prior to issuing a final certificate. Additionally, he questioned the color of the brackets and whether they would be painted the same color as the roof or if they would be terracotta.

Mr. Crichlow confirmed the columns were the proper height, explained the design aspects of the roof and agreed to provide a drawing of the north elevation. He further confirmed the drawings he presented were the same as those in the agenda packet. He said he was not certain whether or not the brackets were painted wood or terracotta.

Mr. Thomas was pleased to see the restoration plans and had no issues with the details, and he thought the Crest was interesting but was curious to see how it would be handled. He was also happy with the clay tile and thought the lighter color of the tile was standard to Mediterranean Revival, which would darken with age.

Mr. Weaver encouraged the applicant to read the minutes concerning previous roof matters related to the building and reminded him there was a procedure for removing an existing tile roof. He expressed concern with the removal, as he believed about 70% of the roof was salvageable. He further disclosed that he certified the building as a historic structure about 15 years ago and was fairly familiar with it. He did not believe the windows or the door were historic but he suggested considering what was historic on the building, particularly on the east and south elevation:

- windows

- brackets
- overall design

Additionally, Mr. Weaver confirmed the balconies would be functional and questioned the necessity of moving the window above the entrance for symmetry. He felt there was some asymmetry to the building and moving the window took away from the original design.

Mr. Crichlow was questioned on the design decision for the balconies, and he indicated that the design was one the owner liked, but it could be modified if needed. He further indicated that the owner wanted to make improvements to the house that were more appropriate to the style, and he asked the board for their feedback.

Mr. Weaver concluded that Mr. Crichlow had done a good job of retaining much of the historic value of the home, but he still had an issue with moving the window above the entrance.

Mr. Halback agreed with the board and expressed appreciation for the restoration efforts, as he felt the level of sophistication, detail and investment was impressive. He asked for clarification on the balcony to make sure it would not interfere or cross the property line requiring a variance.

Mr. Halback also requested that Mr. Crichlow present the following at the next meeting:

- Finalized design plans
- Site landscaping plan
- Lighting plans

Finally, Mr. Halback reminded the applicant that according to previous testimony over 70% of the roof was salvageable, and he recommended reuse of the tiles wherever possible.

Mr. Weaver also agreed that the roof was a strong historic element of the building.

Public hearing opened.

Steve Schuyler, Architect, stated that he had done some work on the building in the past and identified it as a moderately Mediterranean Revival building in HP-3, and he indicated that the architecture in that district was supposed to be first Spanish period. He felt that with the amount of changes being made to the structure the changes should reflect the Spanish period not the Flagler era.

Public Hearing closed.

Mr. Crichlow acknowledged the board's comments and concerns and confirmed that the roof was still an issue to be dealt with. He pointed out, however, that while it was the original roof on the structure, it was not Mediterranean Revival, and therefore he believed it could be replaced.

Discussion ensued on the various types of roof tiles available in the 1920s and their appropriateness to the structure. It was agreed that while there were several options that were acceptable, the tiles currently on the roof were the most appropriate for the renovation. Additionally it was recommended that should the roof be replaced entirely, the old tiles should be repaired and reused at another location whenever possible.

Mr. Knight clarified the City Code on renovations in an HP-3 district and stated that all new construction must be of colonial architecture but as far as restoration and renovation the law would not apply.

**MOTION**



**Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE the Opinion of Appropriateness F2010-0019 for 22 Avenida Menedez with the applicant keeping in mind the comments and concerns of HARB. Motion SECONDED by Mr. Smith.**

**VOTE ON MOTION:**

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

**NAYES: NONE**

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Item 3 (c) - Certificate of Appropriateness - F2010-0018**

**Don Crichlow, Architect – Applicant**  
**76 Spanish Street, LLC - Owner<sup>2</sup>**

**To construct new commercial and residential buildings**



Mr. Birchim delivered the staff report and 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 a Certificate of Appropriateness at 76 Spanish Street.

Mr. Crichlow presented the new proposal for renovations at the location and highlighted the following changes:

- Sliding windows (“Sliders”) to replace casement windows or double hung windows on north elevation
- Reduction of double door to single door at entrance
- new roof cover and increased pitch on the back building on the west elevation
- Railing and fence detailing

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

Mr. Weaver clarified that the chimney was going to be removed from the inside of the structure but retained on the outside with support from the attic. He expressed appreciation with the retention of the chimney, as he felt it was significant to the historical value of the structure.

Mr. Smith had concerns over the appropriateness of some of the new designs including the windows and framed vernacular architecture and asked if those design elements met with the Spanish Colonial guidelines. He also had some questions about the roof.

Mr. Knight said it had been approved as an Opinion of Appropriateness and it had been raised as a question internally; however, there was no desire to appeal and the timeframe had expired so what had been approved could be carried forward into a certificate.

Mr. Weaver and Mr. Halback believed the proposed renovations were governed by the compatibility of existing structures and believed that keeping with the framed vernacular architecture would be appropriate.

Mr. Crichlow confirmed that the roof was 5V galvalume metal with wood shingles.

Mr. Smith indicated that he still had concern with the sliding windows and the expanse of the windows on the north elevation. He felt there was too much window for the wall area.

Mr. Crichlow understood the concern but stated that the abundance of windows followed the concept and function of the space inside.

Mr. Weaver thought the windows gave the building the open feel of a pavilion, but he was not sure he liked the sash or the slider windows and asked why casements would not work.

Mr. Crichlow replied that they would not work, as they could not be opened out because they interfered with the ramp, and they could not open in because it would take up too much space. He advised, however, that he had achieved the look of casements using sliders.

Discussion continued on the style of the windows to more fully understand the relevance to the building. It was determined that type of window had been used in other structures in the area and gave the building a cracker style. It was also confirmed that no casement windows were planned for the building; however, Mr. Critchlow indicated that he had no problem using casement windows in the front if the board wanted.

Mr. Halback asked for construction details typically found in a certificate such as:

- Building sections
- Simulated coquina piers
- Window threshold detail
- Doorframe details
- Material colors
- Hardware
- Light Fixture cut sheets
- Detail on Tabby pavers
- Clarification of coquina – gravel or shell
- Finishes
- Handrails

Mr. Crichlow stated that the plans were typical and advised that the coquina piers were the same piers that had been approved by the board for a few of his projects, but he would compile the details and present them as requested. He also advised the tabby pavers were really tabby concrete with wood dividers at three feet, and he volunteered to come back to the next board meeting with all the details requested.

Public Hearing open

Robert Hall, Resident, approved of the project and was pleased to see something other than a house being built on Spanish Street, and he hoped similar structures would be encouraged whenever possible.



Public hearing closed.



## **MOTION**

**Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE the Certificate of Appropriateness F2010-0018 with the conditions previously noted to be presented at the April 15, 2010 HARB Meeting for final approval. Motion SECONDED by Mr. Thomas.**

### **VOTE ON MOTION:**

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

**NAYES: NONE**

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY<sup>3</sup>**

## **4. Certificate of Demolition**

### **Item 4 (a) F2010-0010**

**Mary O. Sanders – Applicant**

**Annie Owens – Owner**

**25C Pine Street<sup>4</sup>**

### **To demolish a structure (circa 1930).**



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, staff found that the Board could APPROVE the Certificate of Demolition application for the building located at 25 C Pine Street.



Mr. Edgar Tony Owens, brother of Mary Owens Sanders, Applicant, advised that he was assisting his sister with the matter, was there when the pictures were taken of the home, grew up there and believed renovation would not be cost effective;

<sup>3</sup> Break from 3:29 p.m. to 3:37 p.m.

<sup>4</sup> Staff report attached to original minutes

therefore, he thought the structure should be demolished.

Mr. Weaver advised that Certified Notices were mailed and seven responses were returned in favor of the demolition. Three responses had comments about the deterioration of the building and the fire hazard of the structure.

Public Hearing opened; however, there was no response.

#### **MOTION**

Mr. Smith **MOVED** to **APPROVE** the **Certificate of Demolition F2010-0010**. **Motion SECONDED** by Mr. Thomas.

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

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

**NAYES:** NONE

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

#### **Item 4 (b) F2010-0015**

**Shiloh Missionary Baptist Church –  
Owner/Applicant  
278 W. Kings Street<sup>5</sup>**

#### **To demolish a residential building (circa 1920)**



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, staff found that the Board could **APPROVE** the Certificate of Demolition application for the building located at 178 W. King Street.



Moses Floyd, Applicant, had no additional information to add to staff's presentation, and the board had no questions for him.

Public Hearing opened; however, there was no response.

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

#### **MOTION**



Mr. Weaver **MOVED** to **APPROVE** the **Certificate of Demolition F2010-0015**. **Motion SECONDED** by Mr. Thomas.

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

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

**NAYES:** NONE

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

#### **Item 4 (c) F2010-0016**

**Shiloh Missionary Baptist Church –  
Owner/Applicant  
278 W. Kings Street<sup>6</sup>**

#### **To demolish a commercial building (circa 1947)**



Mr. Birchim delivered the staff report and said based on the lack of significance of the structure, and without the support of evidence to the contrary, staff found that the Board could **APPROVE** the Certificate of Demolition application for the commercial building located at 278 W. King Street.



Mr. Floyd returned to the podium and again concurred with staff. There were no questions.

Public Hearing opened; however, there was no response.



#### **MOTION**

Mr. Weaver **MOVED** to **APPROVE** the **Certificate of Demolition F2010-0016**. **Motion SECONDED** by Mr. Thomas.

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

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

**NAYES:** NONE

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

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

## **5. Certificate of Appropriateness**

### **Item 5 (a) F2009-0095** **American Legion Post 37 – Applicant** **Charles F. Hamblen Club - Owner** **1 Anderson Circle** **(Previously Tabled)**

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



Mr. Birchim delivered the staff report and said based on a review of the information submitted, staff found that the Board could APPROVE a Certificate of Appropriateness for a handicap ramp at 1 Anderson Circle.



Don Critchlow, Architect, spoke on behalf of applicant indicating that he had been retained to address the issue of the handicap ramp.

The board postponed their questions until after the public hearing.

Public Hearing opened; however, there was no response.



Mr. Thomas said a previous recommendation had been to possibly use a sloped sidewalk as opposed to a handicap ramp, and he asked what happened with that plan.

Mr. Critchlow believed that a slope would require a significant addition of fill and considering the ramp was eight-feet the ramp was the way to handle it.

Mr. Halback expressed concern about the location of the proposed commemorative brick display. He did not believe there was much historic significance to the bricks, and he felt uncomfortable with them being placed along a public sidewalk. He also wanted more design details for the bricks.

Mr. Crichlow noted that he was told that the applicant wanted two or three rows of

---

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

commemorative bricks, but he had no details. He suggested that it was not a pressing component of the project and could possibly be removed from consideration, or the board could approve the ramp with the condition of receiving more details related to the bricks.



#### **MOTION**

**Mr. Thomas MOVED to APPROVE the Certificate of Appropriateness F2009-0095 with the condition that the commemorative bricks be removed from the application. Motion SECONDED by Mr. Smith.**

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

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

**NAYES: NONE**

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

### **Item 5 (b) F2010-0005** **Darrell Samples – Applicant** **St. Augustine Restoration Foundation -** **Owner** **91 St. George Street<sup>8</sup>**

#### **To install a wood picket fence and two gates**



Mr. Birchim delivered the staff report and said based on a review of the information submitted, staff found that the Board could APPROVE a Certificate of Appropriateness for a wood picket fence and gates in the rear of 91 St. George Street, with the condition that the fence was left natural or painted white.



Darryl Samples, Applicant, clarified that he wanted to install a fence; however, a second set of drawings had been submitted without his knowledge; and therefore, he had to clarify his plans as follows:

---

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

- 4X4 Posts in concrete
- 2X4 Rails
- 1X4 Pickets with 2½ inch gaps
- Everything to be pressure treated
- The gates arched down

Mr. Halback commented that more detail should have been submitted with the plans. He also indicated that Sharon Fowler had submitted the second set of drawings, and he confirmed that she was the landscape architect used by Flagler College. He recommended that communications and conflicts be addressed outside of the HARB.

Mr. Smith stated that he was unaware of a relationship between Flagler College and the St. Augustine Foundation but considering that he had been a Foundation Board member 30 years, he would recuse himself.

Mr. Knight clarified that the Foundation and the College were two separate entities, with separate boards; therefore, it was not necessary for Mr. Smith to recuse himself.

Mr. Halback confirmed the specifications being considered for approval were submitted by Mr. Samples and questioned why he was enclosing the property.

Mr. Samples cited the following reasons:

- High traffic area
- Immediately accessible from the parking lot
- Pets were walked on the grounds
- Children played in the yard
- Vagrants slept there at night

Mr. Weaver pointed out the area was zoned HP-3, and referred to the Florida Masters Site File, which indicated the historic reconstruction of 91 St. George Street had been a first Spanish period building; therefore, he questioned the appropriateness of a Victorian picket fence.

Mr. Samples said it was the style of fence he used on his Spanish Street property, but the homes around his property were Victorian.

Mr. Weaver suggested that a five foot, six-inch colonial period fence or masonry wall would be more appropriate.

Mr. Samples expressed concern about public safety with a masonry wall as pedestrians walked along the sidewalk to the parking lot.

The Board suggested that the applicant model the wall after the adjacent property, decide on masonry or wood, develop sketches and details and return for consideration.

Mr. Halback expressed concern over the necessity of erecting a wall around the property and encouraged the applicant to discuss alternatives for leaving the area open with the foundation.

Public Hearing opened; however, there was no response.

#### **MOTION**

**Mr. Weaver MOVED to TABLE the Certificate of Appropriateness F2010-0005. Motion SECONDED by Mr. Thomas.**

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

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

**NAYES: NONE**

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

#### **Item 5 (c) F2010-0009**

**Steven M. Schuyler, Architect – Applicant**  
**Patrick and Gail Crocetta - Owners**  
**289 St. George Street<sup>9</sup>**

<sup>9</sup> Staff report attached to original minutes

**To enclose a rear porch, construct a rear deck and construct a new detached garage**



Mr. Birchim delivered the staff report and said based on a review of the information submitted, staff found that the Board could APPROVE a Certificate of Appropriateness for a porch enclosure, a new garage and paving at 289 St. George Street with the following conditions:

- Garage with one siding material, either shingle or lap siding
- Paving material be acceptable to the Board

Exparte Communication:

Mr. Halback disclosed that the owners were his neighbors, and he had briefly discussed what their plans were for renovations. He added that they had retained Mr. Schuyler to perform the work.



Steven Schuyler, Architect/Applicant, provided detailed plans for the renovations and addressed staff's concern about the proposed garage siding materials. He indicated that the owners were comfortable with either material but preferred shingles for at least two sides of the structure, but based on cost constraints they requested approval for both options.

Mr. Halback indicated the need for further detail on the plans, such as dimensions and pavement pattern.

Mr. Schuyler described the pavers' design as herringbone, consisting of a shell mixed concrete to provide proper drainage. He believed a herringbone pattern was most appropriate for the project and produced a sample of the paver.

Public Hearing opened; however, there was no response.

Mr. Schuyler confirmed to Mr. Thomas that the siding would not be a mixture of tile and siding, and the owners were comfortable with either style but, in the end, they wanted the flexibility of choosing either option.



**MOTION**

**Mr. Halback MOVED to APPROVE the Certificate of Appropriateness F2010-0009 per the drawings and provided the siding would be shingled and the pavers would be gray tremron in a herringbone pattern. Motion SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.**

Mr. Weaver questioned the motion to approve with the stipulation that the siding be shingled only.

Mr. Halback clarified that the motion was based on the board's attempt to limit the allowance of options in the application approval process. He further pointed out that he believed the basis for the option request was financial, and he noted that it had been brought up by the board in the past that cost options were not the responsibility of the HARB.

Mr. Weaver still questioned the restriction in the motion to allow both options considering both materials were acceptable.

Mr. Birchim clarified that an approval on one type of siding would not mean that the applicant could not return with a new application for the other option, should the need arise.

**VOTE ON MOTION:**

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

**NAYES: NONE**

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Item 5 (d) F2010-0011**  
**Rhett's St. Augustine, LLC –**  
**Owner/Applicant**  
**66 Hypolita Street**

To remove the existing wood gate and replace with a masonry wall and metal gate and to remove existing doors and windows and replace with wood and glass panel sliding doors

Item tabled until the April 15, 2010 board meeting.

**Item 5 (e) F2010-0012**  
**Valerie Lee – Owner/Applicant**  
**23 Grove Avenue<sup>10</sup>**

To install a masonry wall and gate<sup>11</sup>



Mr. Birchim delivered the staff report and said based on a review of the information submitted, staff found that the Board could APPROVE a Certificate of Appropriateness for a new wall and gate at 23 Grove Avenue.

Discussion confirmed that while it was not necessary for the applicant to be in attendance, there were questions to the application that needed to be addressed.

Mr. Halback felt that without the applicant's attendance, it would be difficult to make any decisions and recommended tabling the issue.

Mr. Weaver further recommended a more thorough application and drawings be submitted for the next meeting.

Public Hearing opened; however, there was no response.

**MOTION**

<sup>10</sup> Staff report attached to original minutes

<sup>11</sup> Item heard after Item #F2010-0023.

Mr. Halback MOVED to TABLE the Certificate of Appropriateness F2010-0012 until April 15, 2010, with the request that the applicant appear before the board and the stipulation that appropriate drawings and details be submitted.



It was pointed out that the drawing of the proposed wall was unfinished on one side, and it was confirmed that the issue would be addressed at the subsequent meeting.

**Motion SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.**

Mr. Birchim agreed to relay the board's comments to the owner in preparation for the next meeting.

**VOTE ON MOTION:**

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

**NAYES: NONE**

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Item 5 (f) F2010-0013**  
**Elaine Darnold – Applicant**  
**Charles and Mary Steadham - Owners**  
**178 Avenida Menendez<sup>12</sup>**

To re-roof, re-shingle and enlarge the height of a garage for a car lift



Mr. Birchim delivered the staff report and said based on a review of the AGHP, staff finds that the Board could APPROVE a Certificate of Appropriateness for a new garage and driveway at 178 Avenida Menendez as submitted .

Elaine Darnold, Applicant, had no additional information to add to Mr. Birchim's report and was poised to answer questions.

Mr. Thomas stated that originally he worried about the height of garage but based on the height of the house it looked good.

<sup>12</sup> Staff report attached to original minutes

Mr. Weaver also thought the plan was acceptable.



Public Hearing opened; however, there was no response.

**MOTION**

**Mr. Smith MOVED to APPROVE the Certificate of Appropriateness F2010-0013. Motion SECONDED by Mr. Weaver.**

**VOTE ON MOTION:**

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

**NAYES: NONE**

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Item 5 (g) F2010-0020**

**Josh Parks**

**Local Hero's Cafe – Applicant**

**Donna Parks - Owner**

**11 Spanish Street<sup>13</sup>**

**To install a wood board fence and gate**

Mr. Thomas recused himself based on his working relationship with Mr. Kendall.



Mr. Birchim delivered the staff report and said based on a review of the information submitted, staff found that the Board could APPROVE a Certificate of Appropriateness for a wood board fence and gate at 11 Spanish Street with the condition that it was painted white or left natural.

Anthony Kendall agreed with the staff report but clarified the fence would be left natural.

Mr. Weaver confirmed that the height would be compliant with AGHP guidelines.



Public Hearing opened; however, there was no response.

<sup>13</sup> Staff report attached to original minutes

**MOTION**



**Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE the Certificate of Appropriateness F2010-0020. Motion SECONDED by Mr. Smith.**

Mr. Weaver clarified his motion to add a condition that the fence be painted white or left natural, and the owner confirmed that he would going to leave it natural.

Mr. Weaver asked that the stipulation for the fence to be left natural be added to the motion, and it was agreed to by Mr. Smith.

**VOTE ON MOTION:**

**AYES: Weaver, Smith, Halback**

**NAYES: NONE**

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Item 5 (h) F2010-0021**

**Thomas J. Burrier, General Contractor – Applicant**

**Columbia Restaurant of St. Augustine - Owner**

**98 St. George Street<sup>14</sup>**

**To install a ticket booth in the parking lot for the Columbia Restaurant parking attendant<sup>15</sup>**



Mr. Birchim delivered the staff report and said based on a review of the information submitted, staff found that the Board could APPROVE a Certificate of Appropriateness for a ticket booth in the rear (Spanish Street) parking lot at 98 St. George Street.

Mr. Smith confirmed the roof was hip style and clarified that the photographs and the drawing submitted represented the proposed final structure.

Mr. Thomas indicated that he had done similar projects in the past and suggested

<sup>14</sup> Staff report attached to original minutes

<sup>15</sup> Item heard after Item #F2010-0012

that a bigger opening would improve the design and accommodate a shutter.

Mr. Birchim clarified that the attendant would not be conducting business from the booth but would leave the building to greet the customer and conduct the transaction.

Public Hearing opened; however, there was no response.



### **MOTION**

**Mr. Thomas MOVED to APPROVE the Certificate of Appropriateness F2010-0021 with the stipulation that the applicant matched the drawings he submitted and shutters were put on the window. Motion SECONDED by Mr. Smith.**

### **VOTE ON MOTION:**

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

**NAYES: NONE**

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

### **Item 5 (I) F2010-0022**

**Les Thomas, Architect – Applicant**  
**Sunset Ventures LLC - Owner**  
**12 Castillo Drive<sup>16</sup>**

**To redevelop the property with a second floor addition, new exterior colonial building element and site work for a new museum**

Mr. Thomas recused himself considering he was the Architect/Applicant.



Mr. Birchim delivered the staff report and said based on a review of the information submitted, staff found that the Board could APPROVE a Certificate of Appropriateness for the redevelopment of the property at 12 Castillo Drive with the following conditions:

<sup>16</sup> Staff report attached to original minutes

- Underlined questions regarding the placement of doors explored by the applicant
- A landscape plan showing the placement of required plant materials submitted
- Minor details such as hardware, light fixtures, courtyard furniture and features, etc. were addressed in a new COA application



Anthony Kendall stated that the concept of the museum design was to have two Second Spanish Period Colonial buildings linked by a one story building and appear as a compound in the traditional Colonial style. He advised that some revisions had been made to their plans to reflect comments from the staff as follows:

- Windows on the second story modified to be spaced evenly
- Eliminated first floor wood panel doors and replaced with an alcove with separate entrances to the left and right
- Changed the handrails on the handicap ramp to wood and added a wooden gate

Mr. Kendall also indicated that they would come back to the board with the lighting and landscaping requirements.

Mr. Halback questioned a wall that appeared to be at the handicap ramp but was actually approximately 30 feet beyond it as confirmed by the site plan.

Following a brief discussion it was agreed that the applicant still had more detail to add concerning the brick in the courtyard, the coquina paving, landscaping, site furniture, light fixtures and hardware.



Public Hearing opened; however, there was no response.



## MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE the Certificate of Appropriateness F2010-0022 with the condition that the site work would be presented later. Motion SECONDED by Mr. Smith.

### VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Smith, Halback

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

### Item 5 (j) F2010-0023

City of St. Augustine – Owner/Applicant  
Historic Districts<sup>17</sup>

To install directional signage (pedestrian) and construct a trolley/train passenger shelter



Mr. Knight presented the department's plans for the improvements as follows:

- Brick crossing in front of the Fort 16-Foot wide with countdown signals
- Brick crossing at Hypolita Street would remain at existing width
- Coquina concrete mix for Fort Alley
- Signage plan with a total of six signs between the parking garage and Fort Alley
- Replace the lighting along A1A
- Install a planned eight foot sidewalk along the east side of A1A in front of the Fort (to be constructed at a later date upon approval)
- Trolley stop on Orange Street east of St. George Street

There had been an issue concerning the ownership of the property for the Trolley stop; however, Mr. Knight confirmed with Mr. Gordie Wilson, Superintendent for the Castillo de San Marco National Monument, that the Fort would transfer the property to the City in the event the City did not own it.

<sup>17</sup> Staff report attached to original minutes

Mr. Knight presented the final two options for the sign panels as follows:<sup>18</sup>

### Sign Panels (28x21 inches):

- Option One – Franklin Gothic Medium condensed two and one-quarter inch letter height, one-inch border
- Option Two – Sylfaen two inch letter height, one-inch border

### Mounting Option (freestanding metal posts, painted black):

- Option A - nine-foot six-inches no finial
- Option B - ten-foot with finial bracket

Mr. Halback, Mr. Weaver and Mr. Thomas preferred option two for the sign panel and option A for the mounting.

Mr. Smith also preferred option two for the sign but leaned toward option B for the mounting, but he was not opposed to option A.

Public Hearing opened; however, there was no response.



## MOTION

Mr. Weaver MOVED to APPROVE the Certificate of Appropriateness F2010-0023 to install directional signage and construct a Trolley Train passenger shelter with the signage to be Option 2 for lettering and Option A for mounting. Motion SECONDED by Mr. Smith.

### VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weaver, Smith, Thomas,  
Halback

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

<sup>18</sup> Drawings submitted with staff report and attached to original minutes

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

Report attached to original minutes

**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 5:21 P.M.<sup>19</sup>

---

**Fred Halback, Chairperson**

---

<sup>19</sup> Transcribed by Elizabeth Carter