

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE
Historic Architectural Review Board Meeting
June 19, 2008

The Historic Architectural Review Board met in formal session at 2:00 P.M., Thursday, June 19, 2008, in the Alcazar Room at City Hall, St. Augustine, Florida. Paul Weaver, III, Chairperson called the meeting to order, and the following were present:

1. ROLL CALL: Paul Weaver, III, Chairperson
Fred Halback, Vice-Chairperson
James McCune
Leslie Thomas
Len Weeks

City Staff: Mark Knight, Director, Planning & Building Department
Tom Scofield, Historic Preservation Planner
Robin Upchurch, Assistant City Attorney
Carly Mason, Recording Secretary

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES ¹
April 17, 2008 and May 15, 2008 Regular Meeting

The minutes of the April 17, 2008 and May 15, 2008 Regular HARB Meeting were approved as presented.

3. Opinion of Appropriateness

Item 3 (a) F2008-0074

Elaine Fraser – Agent
John R. Fraser Revocable Trust – Applicant/Owner
14 St George Street

To review existing unpermitted structures.

Mr. Thomas recused himself from this item. Mr. Scofield delivered the staff report and stated that staff found the board could table the meeting until next month to provide the applicant with more time to prepare a site plan and conceptual elevations for the proposed improvements.²

Mr. Weaver questioned whether figure three and four of the handout would be discussed.

Mr. Scofield replied that figure three was a reproduction building and in keeping with the Spanish Quarter. He said that he did not have a lot of information about figure four; however, from looking at the Sanborn Map it showed a shed that was located where the oldest school was built. He suggested that Ms. Fraser could possibly provide more information about figure four.

Mr. Weaver said that the building was a main feature and a historical part of the City.

Mr. Weeks asked if the applicant had a time limitation due to Code Enforcement or pending citations, and the response was no.

Mr. Halback clarified that the issue in question was building nine, and the response was affirmative.

Mr. Halback questioned what the area was used for before the unpermitted pergola was built.

Staff responded that nothing was in place, and Mr. Scofield replied that the Grove of

¹ Mr. McCune arrived at 2:20 p.m.

² Staff report attached to original minutes.

Educators was there but relocated behind the Oldest School House.

Elaine Fraser explained that she had been away for ten and a half years, but she had operated Ripley's Believe It or Not from 2002-2006. She said she was unable to handle the Oldest School House project while she was operating Ripley's. She said that her father had asked Les Thomas to submit a drawing of a trellis, but she had no record that the trellis had gone before HARB. She concluded that she thought the proper steps were taken, but she would like to move forward and make the necessary corrections.

Mr. Weaver recommended using some colonial maps and doing some research. He said that one reason the application went before HARB was to reach an agreement to help with other areas, such as Code Enforcement and the land use.

Mr. Weeks suggested tabling the application until the next meeting for Mr. Thomas to gather more material.

Mr. Weaver said that the materials on the structure did not meet guidelines, and they were looking for something that would be appropriate for the colonial architecture.

Public hearing opened.

Richard Pinto said he operated his business out of building four and had been in that building since 1979. He said no renovations had been made, except for repairing a window sill.

Mr. Weeks replied that the building Mr. Pinto spoke about was not related to the application.

Mr. Halback asked if Ms. Fraser's intent was to retain the same look, and the response was affirmative.

Mr. Birchim said the Zoning Code stated that all business that occurred in the historic district must be done inside a completely

enclosed area, which was defined as the heated/cooled part of the building.

Ms. Upchurch said that meant business could not be conducted under a pergola, arbor, or trellis. She explained that items sold inside the building could be displayed under a pergola in a 3 x 3 display.

Mr. Birchim said a variance from the Planning and Zoning Board could not be obtained in HP District.

Mr. Halback said the Manuncy sketches provided to the board would be a possibility for a business operation instead of a pergola.

Mr. Weaver said his main concern was the building type could not have been constructed in the colonial era or with the type of material.

Exparte Communications:

Mr. Weaver and Mr. Weeks reported that they spoke to Ms. Fraser and Mr. Weeks went by the site.

MOTION

Mr. Weeks MOVED to table Opinion of Appropriateness case F2008-0074 at 14 St George Street until the August 21, 2008 regular meeting. Motion SECONDED by Mr. Halback.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weeks, Halback, McCune, Weaver

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. Certificates of Appropriateness

Item 4 (a) F2008-0070

Ian G.L. MacDonald, General Contractor - Applicant

Anna Marie Dunn - Owner
247 Charlotte Street (46 Marine Street)

To construct a pergola.

Mr. Scofield delivered the staff report and said that staff found the board could approve the application. He said the only recommendations from staff were that hurricane straps, tie downs, or large fasteners be concealed.³

Mr. Weaver asked if Mr. McDonald had anything to add to the staff report.

Gaere McDonald replied that the owner might build a garage in the future, which was the reason for installing the pergola.

Mr. Halback asked what the width of the pergola was from post to post and the reply was approximately four feet.

Mr. Thomas questioned the type of concealed fasteners that would be used.

Mr. McDonald replied that he had not gone before permitting; however, he could use the concealed straps and also had the option of adding the straps.

Mr. Halback questioned the style of lattice panels. He said that it looked like the lattice was diagonal, but it was hard to find a historical value in that style of lattice.

Mr. McDonald replied that the lattice would be installed on both side of the paths, and he could change the style.

Mr. Halback suggested installing a vertical lattice to keep with the historic district, and the applicant agreed.

Mr. McDonald replied that he had no problem using the vertical lattice.

Public hearing opened, no response given.

MOTION

³ Staff report attached to original minutes.

Mr. Weeks MOVED to APPROVE Certificate of Appropriateness F2008-0070 to include staff conditions for hidden hurricane tie downs, use of vertical lattice and to include 48 inch width on the inside dimensions of the four by four's. Motion SECONDED by Mr. Halback.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weeks, Halback, Thomas, McCune, Weaver

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Item 4 (b) F2008-0072

Don Crichlow, Architect - Applicant
Jesus and Marlene Piriz – Owners
264 St George Street

To remove a chimney on an outbuilding.

Mr. Scofield delivered the staff report and stated that staff found the board could approve the application; however, one condition was to salvage the brick and reuse in another application if possible.⁴

Don Crichlow said the new owners were in the process of having the property re-roofed, but would like to remove the chimney first. He noted that the chimney had not been used in years.

Public hearing opened, but no response given.

MOTION

Mr. Halback MOVED to APPROVE application F2008-0072 Certificate of Appropriateness to include staff comments as submitted. Motion SECONDED by Mr. Weeks.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Halback, Weeks, Thomas, McCune, Weaver

NAYES: NONE

⁴ Staff report attached to original minutes.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY
Item 4 (c) F2008-0073
Don Crichlow, Architect – Applicant
Virtu Cathedral Associates-Owner
24 Cathedral Place

To install a planter.

Mr. Scofield delivered the staff report and stated that staff found the board could approve the Certificate of Appropriateness application to install a planter at 24 Cathedral Place with the conditions outlined in the staff report.⁵

Don Crichlow said that the project was straight forward, as the owners wanted to install planters to add greenery to the front of the building. He said he agreed with staff recommendations, and he had no problem adhering to the requests.

Mr. Halback said that the drawing showed a drain line running out of the planter and into the drain installed under the sidewalk. He suggested taking out the entire panel of concrete instead of cutting a notch for drainage.

Mr. Crichlow responded that the panels would not match the sidewalk. He said it was possible that he might find a joint and work from that panel to achieve a cleaner look.

Mr. Halback questioned the type of watering device to be used, and the response was the planter would be hand watered.

Mr. Thomas asked if the owner owned the building, and the response was affirmative.

Mr. Weaver said that the building had been completely restored. He said that Howard Davis had contracted with Mr. Weaver to reconstruct the project. He commented that it was a contributing building to the district; however, it was not listed on the National Registry.

⁵ Staff report attached to original minutes.

Mr. Halback asked about the depth of the inset, and Mr. Crichlow's responded 20 feet.

Public hearing opened, but no one responded.

MOTION

Mr. Weeks MOVED to APPROVE Certificate of Appropriateness F2008-0073 at 24 Cathedral Place with the stipulation that the applicant install two planters and follow the suggestions as submitted. Motion SECONDED by Mr. Thomas.

Mr. Weeks questioned whether the board wanted to address removing the entire sidewalk.

Mr. Halback responded that the panel size should be taken in account. He said he would make the expansion joint the same size as the planter width.

Mr. Weeks AMENDED the MOTION to make the expansion joint the same size as the planter width. Motion SECONDED by Mr. Thomas.

VOTE ON MOTION:

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

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Item 4 (d) F2008-0075
Joe Teisan – Applicant
Barbara Teisan – Owner
78 Spanish Street

To modify previously approved plans for a rear addition.

Mr. Scofield delivered the staff report and stated that staff found the board could deny the Certificate of Appropriateness application to revise previously approved plans for a rear addition at 78 Spanish

Street with the findings as outlined in the staff report.⁶

Joe Teisan said the owner wanted to make the building economically viable. He intended to have a stand alone third unit consisting of a first floor addition, a second floor porch and a backyard for an economic enterprise. He explained that he needed access to the second floor to go forward with the project.

Mr. Thomas questioned whether the photos presented to the board showed the current state of the building, and he asked if all work completed met the requirements of the City, and Mr. Scofield's response was affirmative.

Mr. Weaver explained that the board gave the applicant different options for completing the east elevation as follows:

- Keep the current elevation level
- Go back and change construction for each level

Mr. Teisan informed the board that he had sent a letter regarding the railing.

Mr. Weaver asked staff if the letter had been presented to the board, and the response was no as the amendment was based on the Building Code regarding railing.

Mr. Weeks questioned the issuance date of the letter, and Mr. Teisan's responded June 4, 2008.

Mr. Weaver questioned whether staff thought the applicant was facing lot coverage issues, and the response was no.

Mr. Weaver said that the purpose of the application was to gain access to the second floor. He said the applicant would have to amend his ad-valorem tax exemptions and the board would need to approve of the amendments.

⁶ Staff report attached to original minutes.

Mr. Teisan replied that he would have no problem amending the tax abatement.

Mr. Halback commented that he thought the applicant would have chosen a different design if he had known the outcome.

Mr. Weaver concurred and said that the addition should be more integrated, as it looked like two separate additions.

Mr. Weeks questioned whether the current drawings had been approved, and the answer was affirmative.

Mr. Thomas questioned why the applicant wanted to install an additional stairway.

Mr. Teisan responded to make the structure commercial useful.

Mr. Weeks suggested expanding the back of the addition, but he would like to see the bathrooms and stairs constructed inside the building.

Public hearing opened.

Bart inaudible said that he had no problem with the board denying the external bathroom; however, 30% of the building cost would be designated to a fire sprinkler system, and he questioned whether the board had any other suggestions.

Mr. Halback said the board was not saying that he could not install an exterior staircase.

Mr. Scofield said that Nick Andrade, Building Inspector, had approved the plans as presented.

Public hearing closed.

MOTION

Mr. Halback MOVED to TABLE application 2008-0075 to the July 17, 2008 meeting as submitted. Motion SECONDED by Mr. Weeks.

Mr. Teisan replied that considering the deadline to resubmit he would like to move the meeting to August 21, 2008.

Mr. Halback AMENDED the MOTION to the August 21, 2008. Motion SECONDED by Mr. Weeks.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Halback, Weeks, Thomas, McCune, Weaver

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Item 4 (e) F2008-0076

**Michael Pounds – Applicant/Owner
23 Orange Street**

To install a porch railing.

Mr. Scofield delivered the staff report F2008-0076 and said that staff found the board may deny the certificate of appropriateness application to install an aluminum railing at 23 Orange Street based on the findings outlined in the staff report. He said the existing railing was not appropriate for the architectural style, materials, or appearance.⁷

Michael Pounds said he purchased the property in 1984 with two porches. He stated that he sold the building, and the new tenants had installed the railing. He said safety was an issue as people had fallen down the stairs. He said he would be willing to replace the railing.

Mr. Weaver said the applicant had replaced the stairway with a simple picket style railing, but the material was inappropriate for the structure.

Mr. Halback questioned whether the board wanted the sides on the handrails to be filled in or a simple detail added.

Mr. Weaver responded that filling it in would be a good option.

⁷ Staff report attached to original minutes.

Mr. Weeks questioned whether the applicant could use the railing from the balcony on the 1st level porch, and install railing with an aesthetic look, and Mr. Knight's response was affirmative.

Public hearing opened, no one responded.

MOTION

Mr. Weeks MOVED to APPROVE Certificate of Appropriateness F2008-0076 to remove the current inappropriate aluminum railing on the porch and stairs and replace it with a wood railing to match the 2nd floor balcony. Motion SECONDED by Halback.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weeks, Halback, Thomas, McCune, Weaver

NAYES: NONE

Item 4 (f) F2008-0077

**Tom Heinrich – Applicant/Owner
15 Bridge Street**

To install an emergency generator and HVAC units.

Mr. Scofield presented the staff report F2008-0077 and said that staff found the board could approve the application with one condition, addressing the fence on the other side of the mechanical units.⁸

Tom Heinrich said he had some concern about the fence on two sides, because it would be an eye soar. He said the height of the wall would not allow anyone to see in, unless they were looking from a second story.

Mr. Weaver questioned whether the units were visible to the public way, and the response was affirmative.

Public hearing opened, but there was no response.

⁸ Staff report attached to original minutes.

MOTION

Mr. Weeks **MOVED** to **APPROVE** Certificate of Appropriateness F2008-0077 as submitted. Motion **SECONDED** by Mr. McCune.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Weeks, McCune, Thomas,
Halback, Weaver

NAYES: NONE

5. Certificate of Demolition

Item 5 (a) F2008-0071
Wanda Brinson – Applicant
Josephine Coley – Owner
173A Riberia Street

To demolish a single-family residence built 1925.

Staff recommended that the board table the item until the July 17, 2008 meeting.

MOTION

Mr. McCune **MOVED** to **TABLE** Certificate of Demolition F2008-0071 until the July 17, 2008 meeting. Motion **SECONDED** by Weeks.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: McCune, Weeks, Thomas,
Halback, Weaver

NAYES: NONE

6. Planning and Building Director's Report

(None)

7. Other Business

Reschedule the 1:00 p.m. workshop until August 21, 2008

8. Review of Conflict Statements

(a) Les Thomas – 14 St George Street, case F2008-0074, Architect for project.

9. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:47 P.M.

9

Paul Weaver, III, Chairperson

⁹ Transcribed by Carly Mason