

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE, FLORIDA

Historic Architectural Review Board Meeting
February 21, 2008

The Historic Architectural Review Board met in formal session at 2:00 P.M., Thursday, February 21, 2008, in the Alcazar Room at City Hall, St. Augustine, Florida. The meeting was called to order by Paul Weaver, III, Chairperson, and the following were present:

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

City Staff: Tom Scofield, Historic Preservation Planner
David Birchim, Planning Manager
Ron Brown, City Attorney
Dianna Polland, Recording Secretary

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – January 17, 2008 REGULAR MEETING

MOTION

Mr. St. Claire MOVED that the Minutes of January 17, 2008, Regular Meeting be approved. Motion SECONDED by Mr. Weeks. MOTION CARRIED by UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

3. CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS

Item 3 (a) F2007-0344

Kanti Patel, Jalaram Hotels, Inc. – Applicant
Kanti M. and Kalavati K. Patel – Owner
28 San Marco Ave.

To construct a new hotel

Mr. Halback recused himself.

Mr. Scofield reported the following:

The Historic Architectural Review Board approved an Opinion of Appropriateness application for the hotel on April 20, 2006, and the Certificate of Appropriateness

application was submitted for the December 20, 2007 HARB meeting, but it was tabled twice. According to the revised drawings, most of the landscaping site plans addressed staff's comments related to the architectural portion and 99% was complete, with exception of the muntins, sidelights and transoms; therefore, staff recommendation's include those minor details. The creation of 6 separate facades, especially along Grove Avenue would be to break-up the rhythm and mass of the building. The connector and recessed areas between the facades, materials have been simplified for the roof, siding and colors to allow the facades to stand out. The Queen Ann portion of the building, on the corner of San Marco and Grove Avenue, looked good as a result of extensive research. Staff found that the board could approve the Certificate of Appropriateness application to construct a new hotel at 6 Castillo Drive and 28 San Marco Avenue to include, staff's recommendations, and that any modified changes or drawings be submitted to the Historic Preservation Planner to serve as the hard drawing of record.

Jeremy Marquis, Halback Design Group, was sworn in, referred to the new drawings,

and reported the following detail additions and changes:

- Tree survey complete; Red Cedar to be saved, resulting in exceeded credits
- Hardscape Plan incorporated a sidewalk to extend Castillo Drive's streetscape
- Incorporated historical standard light fixtures along Castillo Drive, and reused some from existing hotels to maintain historic district
- Monument that was on the right-of-way moved back and incorporated into the low masonry walls
- Incorporated existing utilities
- Added handicap ramps
- Reused large fountain from 3D world in Auto Court and a small fountain for the garden path
- Lighting Plan regarding Second Empire Style, showy scroll work added a French feel to the lighting for the pathway and Auto Court, bollards added for safety
- Italianate fixtures incorporated on the Monument Signage
- Regarding the Queen Ann Victorian, torch lights added along crush brick pathway
- Regarding the Folk Victorian, simple king of lanterns, added for pathway
- Classical Revival, similar to the Folk Victorian, but simplified scroll work added
- Carpenter Gothic, gothic arch incorporated into lighting
- Red Cedar incorporated into the fencing of Victorian
- Details added to functionality of 3D fountain
- Detail added to hex pavers area
- Structural soils incorporated to allow urban trees to live and spread better
- Brick turned along wall of the pool and spa area
- Wrought iron brackets changed to match architecture

- Elm Trees proposed have been separated
- Shifted Oak Trees to south, opening view
- Cammellias added

Mr. Weaver said they needed to vote on the exterior light fixtures and he complimented the team on the project.

Public hearing opened, there was no response.

Gerald Dixon, Dixon & Associates, was sworn in, and said the proposed changes were as follows:

Castillo Drive South Elevation:

- Added porch on the second floor
- Wrapped porch for 3D look
- Lengthened a porch
- Changed doors
- Made some minor window changes

Queen Anne:

- Narrowed tower with wrapped roof

Grove Street Elevation:

- Implemented existing trees
- Hotel rooms on first floor because of activities and porch utilization

Mr. Weaver commented that the setback as related to the San Marco elevation between the Barcelona and Queen Anne structures appeared to be problematic, and questioned what material would be used to fill the space.

Mr. Dixon replied, heavy landscaping, and he added that it was 2 dimensional; therefore, looking straight at it would promote a different appearance.

Mr. Marquis elaborated that they would plant high shrubs and Oak Trees for the

residential scale so the three facades would stand out.

Mr. Dixon said the Mansard's colors and materials, minimizing the roof pitch, and the 7 foot hallways made the structure narrower, breaking up the heights.

Mr. Weaver said he was concerned about the San Marco elevation, as it looked like Grove Street was broken-up, but on Castillo Drive the main entrance showed a clear break.

Mr. Dixon replied that the hotel would have the same elements as the Hilton, and the setback would help.

Mr. Dixon said that they would come back for approval on color and hardware, and he spoke briefly about color schemes for the Queen Anne, and how they would be toned down on Grove Street, and that shingles would be used in places dependent upon the specific architecture.

MOTION

Mr. Ste. Claire MOVED to APPROVE Certificate of Appropriateness F2007-0344 application located at 28 San Marco and 6 Castillo to construct a new hotel to include all 7 listed staff recommendations, Motion SECONDED by Mr. Weeks.

VOTE ON MOTION:

**AYES: Mr. Ste. Claire, Mr. Weeks,
Mr. Weaver**

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Item 3 (b) F2008-0012

Don Crichlow, Architect – Applicant
St George Street Properties LLC – Owner
32 St George Street

To install a new gate, fence and pavers.

Mr. Scofield reported the following

Although not a reconstruction of an actual colonial era house, it was apparent that in 1963, the builders utilized the architectural standards and details for a First Spanish Period dwelling that was outlined in Albert Manucy's *The Houses of St Augustine, 1565-1821*. Manucy's book and the Pre-1821 standards outlined in the Architectural Guidelines for Historic Preservation booklet were used to review the application. Several items outlined in the staff report were addressed in revised drawings.

Mr. Scofield continued that changes included:

- Masonry wall would be a wood fence along St. George Street and in the back of courtyard area
- Size of the double leaf gate reduced for AGHP standards consistency
- Gate style selection appropriate

Mr. Scofield added that materials to be used for the courtyard pavers needed to be addressed, and that the south elevation courtyard entrance doors were closed off; however, the tenant would like them reopened for continued use. He added that the north elevation door was installed without a building permit or HARB approval, but the tenant agreed to replace it in accordance with AGHP guidelines. He concluded that the board could approve the Certificate of Appropriateness to install a new gate, fence and pavers at 32 St. George Street, but to include 8 conditions; 7 listed in the report and one that a letter from the property owner be received endorsing the improvements.

A discussion with staff questioning conditions based on the new drawings concluded that 1, 2, 3, and 5 were satisfied, 4 needed to be addressed, and 6, 7, with owner's letter should remain.

Mr. Crichlow was sworn in and said that he would request the property owner approve

the changes on the drawings, and added that the rear of the property development was short term, about one year and a half; therefore, materials used would not be the most durable. He said that based on staff's recommendations changes were made as followed:

- Modified entrance courtyard wall to allow public access
- Wooden fence on St. George Street
- Reduced gate width opening to maximum 6 feet
- Courtyard pavers would be tabby or coquina, and based on staff's approval and AGHP guidelines
- Doors never sealed, but displays placed in front of openings; owner would reuse doors by removing displays
- Original drawing not accurate; never intended to change St. George Street side doors
- North elevation entrance door vandalized; never replaced, but owner was willing to replace it with appropriate First Spanish style door

A conversation about the coquina pavers to be used led to the following:

- Finding someone local to cast might be difficult
- Might be cheaper to pour and score
- Wanted to use the same or similar pattern
- Liked the Marine Street coquina shell piers, not scored and nice pattern
- Would use 2x2 concrete shell
- No decision regarding scoring

Mr. Weaver addressed the damaged door, requesting it be replaced with original door and Mr. Crichlow agreed.

Mr. Weaver said conditions 1, 2, 4, and 5 were addressed.

Public hearing opened; however, there was no response.

MOTION

Mr. Halback MOVED to APPROVE Certificate of Appropriateness F2008-0012 to install a new gate, fence and pavers to include the new plans, and bullet conditions, 3-final selection of paving materials, 6-final selection of the north elevation entrance door, 7-confirmed owner's approval of the changes. Motion SECONDED by Mr. Ste. Claire

VOTE ON MOTION:

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

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Item 3 (c) F2008-0013

Don Crichlow, Architect – Applicant
Edrich Development Inc. - Owner
100 St George Street

To install improvements for a restaurant

Mr. Scofield reported the following

The proposed improvements would be associated with the opening of a 190 seat restaurant on the second floor of the four interconnected buildings located at 100 St. George Street [formerly known as Faraway Places]. Impacts that would affect the building's exterior would be the installation of a walk-in cooler/freezer, an elevator, and a platform lift. All of the improvements would be constructed on the building's south side in the small courtyard, currently inaccessible to the general public. Towers exceeding the height of the roof line were required for the elevator and platform lift. The applicant proposed raising the height of two roof lines to partially conceal the towers as shown in the elevation drawings, and the increase was substantial for the roof's section containing the elevator tower. The Architectural Guidelines for Historic

Preservation recommended that roof pitches for 18th century colonial buildings be within 45° to 53°. The applicant stated that the roof pitch would not change—the same slope would be extended higher to cover a majority of the equipment towers; therefore, the only condition recommended had been addressed, and staff found that the board should approve the Certificate of Appropriateness application to install improvements associated with a restaurant.

Mr. Crichlow summarized that the south side of the building, pointing to the first floor plan. He explained that access to the second floor restaurant would be on the outside of the building to provide room and to meet Code, and they would install a lift and refrigeration for the kitchen. He said Hypolita Street elevation would be moved higher and further back. He concluded that the changes in the roof were compatible with the design of the building with minimum impacts on the elevation.

In response to questioning, Mr. Crichlow replied that currently the lot coverage was 72%, 70% was allowed, but the improvements would further increase the footprint, and considering that there was no procedure for a variance, he was seeking a Planned Unit Development from the Planning and Zoning Board.

Mr. Halback questioned the restaurant's identity, and Mr. Crichlow replied the Bubble Room, and added that it was popular, family oriented and would be a landmark for downtown.

Mr. Weeks questioned trash.

Mr. Crichlow said that trash would be brought to the compactor located at Spanish and Treasury Streets; used and emptied as often as necessary, and he assured the board that the compactor trip would be part of daily business.

Mr. Weeks requested that the enclosed area for the compactor on Spanish Street

be taken into consideration when designing the restaurant, and Mr. Crichlow replied affirmatively.

Mr. Halback questioned if it was inappropriate for them to designate two areas as refuse areas.

Mr. Birchim replied that the City was reviewing the possibility of a third compactor placed on Spanish Street, and if approved staging would be on site.

Mr. Crichlow remarked that the owner did not mind taking the trash down to the Treasury Street compactor.

Public Hearing opened; however, there was no response.

MOTION

Mr. Weeks MOVED to APPROVE Certificate of Appropriateness F2008-0013 to install improvements for a restaurant Motion SECONDED by Mr. Ste. Claire.

VOTE ON MOTION:

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

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Item 3 (d) F2008-0014

Don Crichlow, Architect – Applicant
74 Spanish Street LLC & 76 Spanish Street
Owner (need to get not on agenda correctly)

To convert two single-family residences into a restaurant

Mr. Scofield reported the following:

On September 20, 2007, HARB approved, with conditions, an Opinion of Appropriateness application for the renovation and conversion to commercial use, the buildings at 74 and 76 Spanish

Street. In the current Certificate of Appropriateness application, the design concept evolved to accommodate a 150-seat restaurant.

74 Spanish Street:

- Relatively intact building was a fine example of a pre-Flagler era, Folk Victorian framed vernacular house
- House's setback from neighboring building and property line to the north was less than 2 feet

76 Spanish Street:

- Building was one of five Territorial Period buildings left in the City
- House's setback from the street was substantially greater than others on Spanish Street

Mr. Scofield said the following changes had been made based on the conditions outlined in the Opinion of Appropriateness and were consistent with the AGHP:

- Second entrance door and the porch access stair on façade of 74 Spanish Street was eliminated
- Inappropriate front addition on 76 Spanish Street was removed
- Wheelchair ramp was pushed back on the property as requested
- Deck pavilion was removed

Mr. Scofield added that details were needed regarding architectural materials, configuration, and construction methods, that were historically appropriate, and included chamfered posts, tongue and groove decking and traditionally designed railings. He recommended a condition to have the ramp and deck designed in a manner where they were structurally supported independent of the original buildings to minimize damage to historic exteriors. He pointed out that one condition outlined in the Opinion of Appropriateness had not been addressed regarding the two

story historic addition on 74 Spanish Street, as it was in worse shape than the main house and would be substantially rebuilt. He said the current drawings suggest that the addition's roof ridge line would be raised to match the roof ridge height of the original building, and the staggered wall plane on the south elevation between the two sections would be eliminated. He stated that raising the roof of the historic addition to match the ridge line of the main house would not be in compliance with the AGHP guidelines, as they specifically state additions should not appear to be part of the original historic building; therefore, the existing roof ridge line and staggered wall plane should be maintained, and it was included as a condition for the Certificate of Appropriateness.

The following new information was presented in the current Certificate of Appropriateness application:

- Renovated façade of 76 Spanish Street appeared consistent with AGHP guidelines
- Enlarged rear addition on 74 Spanish Street—almost twice the floor area as shown in the Opinion of Appropriateness, appeared to comply with AGHP guidelines; however an elevation drawing showing the proposed rear (west) elevation of the complex should be provided
- New flat-roofed addition on 76 Spanish Street (original design showed a gable roof)
- Although the gable roof design was more compatible with the existing historic building in form and mass, the proposed flat-roofed addition complied with AGHP
- Located at the rear of the property, and subordinate to the historic building's size and scale, protecting the historic integrity of the existing building while improving function and use

- New addition connecting the two historic buildings introduced to the design would impact the existing north elevation of 76 Spanish Street and conflicted with several AGHP guidelines
- The connector should be moved back a few feet to connect with the proposed, non-historic portion of 76 Spanish Street
- The AGHP encouraged retaining historic chimneys as a significant roof feature, and there were some questions about fireplace locations and what would happen with the brick chimneys
- The submitted drawings showed a brick paved yard area adjacent to Spanish Street, that appeared to be for two vehicles; parking of vehicles in the front yard of a historically significant property was inappropriate per AGHP, as the guidelines specifically state "Parking area should not be adjacent to or easily viewed from public rights-of-way"
- There was no parking requirements in the HP-2 zoning category and over 120 parking spaces were located within 200 feet of the property, the paved area should be eliminated as a parking area
- New fencing 4-foot and 6-foot in height was shown in several locations on the current plan however, only one fence was shown in elevation view; therefore, detailed information should be provided on fencing design, materials and colors

Mr. Scofield concluded that staff found the Board could approve the Certificate of Appropriateness application to convert two single-family residences into a restaurant at 74 & 76 Spanish Street provided 8 conditions, as listed in the report, were met.

Mr. Weaver questioned if there had been supplemental drawings, since the staff

report was devised, and whether there were conditions eliminated, and the reply was affirmative.

Mr. Crichlow was sworn in and said that they would come back for another hearing with more details pertaining to landscape, and other details, explaining that they were trying to find out if the concept would be approved.

A conversation about the project's unfinished details as related to COA application requirements versus COO application requirements led to staff's response that there was no mandate to require a project to obtain a COO before applying for a COA, and that the project could be approved as an Opinion or Appropriateness or tabled as a COA, without the applicant needing to reapply.

Mr. Crichlow replied that the only concern was that the owner receive a comfort level that the concept was accepted, the details would be worked out. He addressed staff's conditions as follows:

Bullet 1:

- Roof ridge, rear portion has dropped down and in bad shape; required rebuilding
- Wall not staggered, same plane but somehow roof dropped down

Mr. Weaver said the wall plane should be subordinate, and separated if it were a new construction.

Mr. Crichlow questioned, if he did not remove the walls, but rebuilt the roof, whether that would create the differential roof elevated height, and the response was affirmative.

Mr. Crichlow continued:

Bullet 2:

- Connection between the two existing buildings per interior standards was difficult to achieve
- Moving it back brought it to the kitchen area, interfering with access to the bar area
- Moving it forward would be difficult because of the stairs

A question about what Secretary of Interior Standards requirements applied to the buildings-connection resulted in the following replies:

- Strongly encouraged new additions put at the rear of the building; proposal was created on the side
- It should be built so that it could be removed
- It should demonstrate differentiation from original

A collaboration about how to connect the buildings as related to meeting the requirements offered the following ideas and comments :

Mr. Weaver:

- Place connection west of the stair, to avoid going from one elevation to another
- Put it behind and preserve window, making sure everything worked functionally
- Save window and put everything on the back side of it, eliminating impact on any major building elevations
- Historically on 74 Spanish Street, probably was a kitchen and bathroom as proposed concept
- North building effects were irrelevant, as it was new construction
- A compatible design satisfied the subordinate standards for new construction

- Consider less patio space

Mr. Halback:

- Could eliminate closet to push it back further
- Connection needed more study
- Connector between the two was better way to deal with issue, as maybe flat instead of peak roof
- Could eliminate 25 square feet from the kitchen
- Could obtain feel of separate buildings

Mr. Scofield:

- Turn the window opening into a door creating minimal impact, as it would maintain feel of it being potentially reversible

Mr. Weeks:

- Push north kitchen wall back to gain some extra space

Following the discussion, Mr. Crichlow replied that he could work with the ideas, and addressed the remaining conditions as follows:

- No problem with making ramp independent of any part of existing building
- Deck could stand alone
- Vehicle parking not allowed; no problem
- Any revised plans would be brought back to staff and board

A discussion about whether the item should be tabled or approved as an Opinion resulted in a decision to table the item, allowing the applicant to make changes and return with details.

Comments for the applicant for the next meeting were as follows:

Mr. Halback:

- Concept right on target
- Nice use for a series of buildings that need care
- Prefer connection in back or in line with newer construction
- Would like to see some areas as landscaping versus paving that could be parked on
- Would like details of new sections to understand methods used
- Would like details on site issues, and the western elevation, screened porch, the fences, ramp, light fixtures, hardware, and site furniture
- Should look at it as connector instead of marriage of two buildings

Mr. Weeks:

- Rescreened porch detail
- Patio furniture details, as they could have impact on buildings and seen from two sides
- Exterior landscape details
- Hardplan details

Mr. Weaver:

- Provide materials, colors, hardware, installation, methods for exterior architectural elements and features as stated in one of staff's condition

Public Hearing opened; however, no one responded.

MOTION

Mr. Halback MOVED to TABLE Certificate of Appropriateness for F2008-0014 to convert two single-family residences into a restaurant until March 20, 2008 regular HARB meeting Motion SECONDED by Mr. Ste. Claire

VOTE ON MOTION:

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

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Mr. Crichlow questioned details to be provided, and Mr. Birchim replied a typical wall section, but no need to provide details on outlets, plumbing, fixtures, or framing, etc.

Item 3 (e) F2008-0017

Kevin Brock, Brock Fence - Applicant
Memorial Presbyterian Church – Owner
San Marco Avenue & Orange Street
(Huguenot Cemetery)

To replace a fence

In recognizing that Mr. Brock was not present, the board questioned if the item should be tabled, and Mr. Scofield responded that he thought the applicant wanted them to act.

Mr. Scofield's report was as follows:

The western boundary fence was too short for the applicant's needs, and currently it was a non historic solid steel fence, painted black. He continued that in order to balance requirements with the applicant's wants and needs, an available aluminum product lengthened to a 4 to 5 foot height with implemented scroll work as an existing architectural element on the rear gate was agreed on. Recommendations left for application consideration pertained to the picket spacing and use of finial and scroll work.

Mr. Halback questioned which fence the applicant request approval of, referring to several choices, and reply was the Vanderbilt and the Californian with finials.

Mr. Halback commented that they needed to decide if any of the stock fences were appropriate, and reply was that based stock

patterns could come reasonably close to the AGHP guidelines.

Mr. Ste. Claire remarked that the fence line was highly visible and visited, made a statement and it was probably the most immediately accessible historic structure near the Visitor Information Center; therefore, he said, if the stock fencing was not appropriate, it was imperative that they direct the keepers of the cemetery to move in the right direction.

Public Hearing opened, no one responded.

MOTION

Mr. Ste Claire MOVED to TABLE Certificate of Appropriateness F2008-0017 to replace a fence Motion SECONDED by Mr. Weeks

VOTE ON MOTION:

**AYES: Mr. Ste. Claire, Mr. Weeks, Mr. Halback, Mr. Weaver
NAYES: NONE
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

CERTIFICATE OF DEMOLITION

**Item 4 (a) F2008-0015
Kenneth A. McClain Sr.-
Applicant/Owner
64 Oneida Street**

To demolish a single-family residence built in 1935.

Mr. Scofield reported that the application fee had not been paid, and the adjacent property owners were not notified as required by ordinance.

MOTION

Mr. Ste. Claire moved to TABLE Certificate of Appropriateness F2008-0015 to demolish a single-family residence built in 1935 Motion SECONDED by Mr. Weeks

VOTE ON MOTION:

**AYES: Mr. Ste. Claire, Mr. Weeks, Mr. Halback, Mr. Weaver
NAYES: NONE
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

5. HISTORIC PRESERVATION PROPERTY TAX ABATEMENT

**Item 5 (a) F2007-0272
Joe Teisan – Applicant
Barbara Teisan – Owner**

78 Spanish Street,

Mr. Scofield's report was as followed:

A Historic Preservation Tax Abatement application for 78 Spanish Street was originally submitted at the August 16, 2007 Historic Architectural Review Board meeting; however, several issues delayed the review, resulting in repeated tabling, but those issues had been resolved, and a completed application with associated plans and drawings was submitted on February 14, 2008. Comments and corrections were provided for review in the staff report. On the list of work items, an asterisk (*) indicated an item that potentially conflicted with the abovementioned guidelines, or required additional information from the applicant, and most listed had missing information, but not much conflict with the Secretary of Interior Standards and the criteria used for tax abatement. The review included interior and site work as required for Historic Preservation Property Tax Abatement items, and certain information, typically associated with major renovation projects. The following work items were not provided:

- Electrical and mechanical equipment including HVAC units, plumbing fixtures, backflow preventers, etc
- Lighting and hardware

¹ Heard Item 5 (a) after Item 3 (e)

- Kitchens including cabinetry, countertops, faucets and hardware
- Bathrooms including sinks, tubs/showers, medicine cabinets, faucets and wall and floor treatments
- Paint colors and placement
- Fences, walls and gates
- Landscaping and site features

Mr. Scofield added that the items missing were not necessarily going to be improved on.

Mr. Weaver questioned if the items listed as missing were interior or exterior, and reply was interior and site work issues.

Mr. Scofield concluded that staff found that the board could approve the request for a Historic Preservation Tax Abatement for 78 Spanish Street provided that the following conditions were met:

- Corrections shall be made to the application as identified in the staff report and a signed original shall be resubmitted to the Planning & Building Department
- Additional information requested in the staff report shall be provided by the applicant, specifying what the intent was with items listed as consistent with established historic preservation standards and criteria
- Front porch raises questions as to whether entire structure needed to be removed and replaced with a kind of prefabricated baluster and railing, especially since the application was for tax abatement relief
- Original ornamentation on the 2-story front porch shall be recreated and installed before the historic preservation tax abatement was granted

Mr. Weaver asked if there had been approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness

for the exterior of the building, and reply was for the rear addition.

Mr. Halback questioned if there was a Certificate of Appropriateness required to fix the things caused by the fire, and reply was yes; it was granted for the current porch design.

Mr. Weaver commented that the porch detailing was previously approved, and his interpretation of the program was that it was for a rehabilitation renovation project and not for restoration, so Mr. Teisan had two options, he could keep what was there, with no requirement to restore or maintain what was there.

Mr. Halback questioned the purpose of granting a tax abatement, asking if it was a reward for bringing the property back to it's original condition.

Mr. Scofield replied that it was an incentive designed for the property owner to do the right thing.

Mr. Birchim stated that, in lieu of demolition, and in order to stabilize the jeopardized building, the board correctly allowed the level of quality work.

Mr. Teisan was sworn in, gave thanks for the clarification and said that the building looked like it was done by two different people at two different times. He added that what existed currently was unacceptable, and he wanted a more integrated design that was appropriate to it's time.

Mr. Weaver suggested that he do something similar to what was there, using a simpler compatible design that fitted the building's handrails, sleepers, and balusters. He said the applicant should provide drawings if repair and replace work was done.

Mr. Teisan said that the design of the top porch, compared to the bottom was more

acceptable; therefore, he suggested duplicating it.

A conversation about procedural matters regarding approval for modifications and renovations as related to the Historic Preservation Property Tax Abatement application resulted in the following facts:

- The Historic Preservation Property Tax Abatement application approval provided basis for a building permit
- Work done would be certified by HARB
- The tax abatement application went to the City Commission for approval after HARB certified work
- Following the City's approval, it would be sent to the County for the Board of County Commissioners to activate the County's portion of the tax abatement
- Back of building approved for a tax exemption, applicant could leave front the way it was
- Procedural options were, to table application and wait for applicant to come back with changes, or approve the application and future modifications for approval would go through staff or a COA before the HARB
- Applicant's options were: maintain selectively repair or replace what was there, or based on photographic evidence of what was there historically, go back and restore detail

Mr. Ste. Clair said that considering all the work the applicant had done, and believing the restoration work would be done, and any modifications would be addressed through a separate COA, the application should be approved.

Public hearing opened; however, no one responded.

Mr. Teisan questioned if he could leave the brick exposed, and Mr. Weaver responded that if the structural brick was never intended to be exposed, it should be covered through dry wall or plaster or an equivalent.

MOTION

Mr. Ste. Claire moved to APPROVE Historic Preservation Property Tax Abatement F2007-0272 concerning the properties at 78 Spanish Street with the following conditions: that corrections shall be made to the application as identified in the staff report and signed originally and resubmitted to the Planning and Building Department, and additional information requested in the staff report shall be provided by the applicant to the satisfaction of the Historic Preservation Planner and shall be consistent with the established historic preservation standards and criteria and that applicant had options of either maintaining the existing porch as previously approved by HARB or restoring the porch and any work done subsequent to the application to it's pre-fire condition and providing HARB with a drawing to document restoration. **SECONDED by Mr. Halback**

VOTE ON MOTION:

**AYES: Mr. Ste. Clair, Mr. Halback,
Mr. Weeks, Mr. Weaver**

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. Planning and Building Director's Report

(None)

7. Other Business

Recognition of service – Antoinette Wallace

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

Mr. Halback reported a conflict at the last meeting with the San Marco Hotel at 6 Castillo Drive.

9. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:10 P.M.

_____²
Paul Weaver, III, Chairperson

² Transcribed by Dianna Polland