



MINUTES OF THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

July 16, 2020

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairperson Quina

MEMBERS VIRTUAL: Vice Chairperson Crawford, Board Member Fogarty, Board Member Mead, Board Member Salter, Board Member Villegas

MEMBERS ABSENT: Board Member Campbell-Hatler

STAFF PRESENT: Historic Preservation Planner Harding, Board Advisor Pristera (virtual), Senior Planner Statler, Digital Media Coordinator Rose

OTHERS PRESENT VIRTUAL: Will Dunaway, Meredith Crawford, Danny Zimmern, Ed Carson, Ed Fabro, Morgan Spear, Ed Rankin, Carlos Godinez, Christy Cabassa, Bobby Switzer

CALL TO ORDER / QUORUM PRESENT

Chairperson Quina called the Architectural Review Board (ARB) meeting to order at 2:02 p.m. with a quorum present and explained the procedures of the virtual Board meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Board Member Salter made a motion to approve the revised May 21, 2020 minutes, seconded by Board Member Mead, and it carried unanimously. Board Member Salter made a motion to approve the June 18, 2020 minutes, seconded by Board Member Mead, and it carried unanimously.

OPEN FORUM - None

Historical Preservation Planner Harding indicated corrections to some of the staff memos noting where "recommendations" is used, it should read "background" and where "background" is used, it should read "recommended Code sections." He stressed staff does not make recommendations at this Board.

NEW BUSINESS

**Item 1
Contributing Structure
Action taken: Approved.**

1 – 4 W. De Soto Street

**NHPD
PR-1AAA**

Ms. Spear presented to the Board and confirmed the work would be on an existing non-contributing structure at the rear. The primary home was constructed in 1937 as a two-story duplex, and they wanted to move the entrance from the rear cottage house to the front facing DeSoto Street. Staff confirmed the usage of the structure was allowed. Board Member Salter asked about the siding materials and extent of the infill. Ms. Spear advised they intended to match the sides, and if there was damage, they would match with in-kind materials. She indicated that actually there was no garage, and they planned to resurface that structure with lap board. She explained they would match the siding wherever the doors and windows are not to match the rest of the siding.

Board Member Mead made a motion to approve, seconded by Board Member Crawford, and it carried unanimously.

Item 2 **410 E. Belmont Street** **OEHPD**
Contributing Structure **OEHC-1**

Action taken: Approved with abbreviated reviews.

Staff clarified the height of the porch from grade would be 33" and the complete height of the rails would be 33" and would be identical replacements.

Mr. Rankin presented to the Board. Chairperson Quina asked if Mr. Rankin had seen the comments from Old East Hill, and he had. The posts could be done in 4x4 if required, but he explained they would end up twisting. He also advised he could not put the porch roof back the way it was. Board Member Salter stated his comments addressed keeping as much of the trim work as possible and that the rails mimic the original design. Advisor Pristera explained it was hard to tell what was original, but 809 Belmont also had spindle work at the top which could be the closest thing original, and he would prefer that it be saved. Mr. Rankin agreed and presumed it had been a railroad kit house. Advisor Pristera advised the brackets were not original, and the spindle work would be more appropriate. Board Member Salter stated the structural details for the new foundation piers indicate 12" CMU piers, and in other parts of the package it refers to being wrapped in brick veneer. He pointed out based on the pier detail, the face of the block and perimeter align, and the brick would stick out beyond the edge of the porch. Mr. Rankin stated the brick would not terminate beyond the deck, and he would add trim. Board Member Crawford suggested if the brick was mortared to the outside, the beam could be relocated to the outside facing the brick. Board Member Salter asked if the ARB had authorized vinyl lattice, and staff advised they had.

Board Member Salter made a motion to approve with the following modifications: 1) the existing spindle trim at the top of the porch will be reused, 2) new porch railing will have detail similar to the existing with final design submitted for abbreviated review, 3) pier detail illustrating the brick veneer and its relationship to the porch submitted for abbreviated review. Board Member Crawford stated there was discussion that the owner was willing to frame the roof as a shed versus a hip to replicate the original. Mr. Rankin agreed. The amendment was accepted to include swallow-tail battens and a shed rather than a hip roof. Board Member Fogarty seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.

Item 3

121 E. Government St

**PHD / HC-2
Brick Structures**

Contributing Structure

Action taken: Approved.

Mr. Godinez presented to the Board and stated utility work on the street broke a window (bracket). They intended to replace with wood clad to increase longevity. Board Member Mead asked when the upper windows were installed, and Mr. Godinez stated possibly in 1945. Chairperson Quina asked about the condition of the windows in order to consider repairing or replacing them. Mr. Godinez pointed out they had developed dry rot. Mr. Pristera advised that repairs were preferred, or replace them with the exact same window, but it was not really an issue since they were from 1945. (Board Member Villegas entered the meeting.)

Board Member Crawford made a motion to approve, seconded by Board Members Fogarty and Mead, and it carried unanimously.

Item 4

226 E. Government St

**PHD / HC-1
Wood Cottages**

Contributing Structure

Action taken: Conceptual Approval with comments.

Ms. Cabassa and Mr. Switzer presented to the Board. Ms. Cabassa stated the original structure was relocated to the current address in 1978, with the original foundation, chimneys and roof removed along with other changes. She advised that according to Mr. Pristera's comments, the contributing status should play a minor role in reviewing the plans for this property. She advised they added the pediments over the windows, the mullions back in the windows, 9' French doors on the front, replaced the front door and transom with a 9' door since those doors did not appear original. Two doors were added on the porch to the left side, and six shutters added on the west side. After reviewing the Code Section 12-2-10(A)(6)(d)(1), they added back the porch for the contributing portion which would not be detrimental to the house. Board Member Crawford noted the original porch was smaller, and Advisor Pristera stated it was more of a covered stoop. Board Member Salter thought the new design did take in the characteristics which were great about this building. He did point out the Board preferred salvaging as much of the existing materials as possible, specifically regarding the windows and doors; he preferred using those materials on the front façade as much as possible. Advisor Pristera indicated the windows under the porch were in better condition since they had been protected, but others showed signs of wear or significant damage. He would like to see original materials saved, but was unsure if they could be salvaged. Ms. Cabassa stated that would be a major undertaking. Chairperson Quina pointed out this was a conceptual and aesthetic review of the design at this point. Advisor Pristera indicated he had been working with the applicant to attain the desired results.

Board Member Villegas wanted to echo the concerns of Board Member Salter. She appreciated the changes that were made and thought they had respected the intention of the original builder, but in bringing in new products because it was too much of an undertaking to restore what is there, she felt the original façade of the front should be maintained as much as possible. Ms. Cabassa stated it would be a major undertaking to have the windows repaired and functional. Board Member Villegas stated even if it was a new product, it should replicate what it was replacing. Board Member Crawford agreed

they needed to consider the front and what could be repaired or replicated.

Board Member Crawford made a motion to approve conceptually as submitted with notes that the front door, shutters and three major openings including the four small gable openings, be looked at closely for restoration or replication with like materials. Board Member Mead seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.

Item 5

200 BLK W. Garden

**C-2 & C-2A
PHBD / GCD**

New Construction

Action taken: Denied

200 West Garden, Inc. is requesting that the Board waive the requirement to submit final plans prior to receiving a demolition permit for the remaining building at 200 BLK W. Garden Street. Per Sec. 12-2-10(A)(9)(2)(c), paragraph 3, the Board may do so under extreme, unusual and/or compelling circumstances or public safety purposes. A timeline for this project is included. Although demolition of the school board building had been approved (December 2018), consideration to save and rehabilitate the building was presented at the June 2019 meeting. According to the applicants and based on current research, the building is not suitable for preservation and has structural issues creating a safety hazard. At this time, the applicants are only seeking approval to be issued a demolition permit. Conceptual plans and elevations are also included in this packet. Also, final plans for the development will be brought back to the Board for review and consideration.

Chairperson Quina advised that the Board had approved demolition in the past, but the applicants now want to perform demolition, but the final plans are not available which is required by Code. He asked the reason for this. Will Dunaway, Meredith Crawford, Danny Zimmern, Ed Carson and Ed Fabro presented to the Board. Mr. Dunaway stated during the timeline of December 2018, the Board had found circumstances to allow the demolition. The project then returned in June 2019 for review of concept which included preserving the building. He then presented a presentation of the timelines involving the project. He explained that environmental work per FDEP had been completed, and they had removed other buildings, preserving the accent wall. He then presented a video from Peter Bazeli of MRICS explaining the merits of the demolition at this time. Mr. Bazeli indicated the condition of the building did not warrant the amount of money to be spent to preserve it. There were no features to offset the expense, and there were incredibly deep floorplates. Also, the living space was too far from the window lines and not a great adaptive reuse. Saving the building would inhibit the density of the site, and it was not worthwhile to save a large footprint. The greater opportunity was for housing at various price points.

Mr. Dunaway stated they were working to put together a nationwide team to come up with the design. They were at the same point with taking down the other buildings, and they were trying to incorporate this building; they wanted to take the building down now to get a clean slate and obtain greater interest for any nationwide team to partner with.

Chairperson Quina explained the Board's concern was with the building being demolished and the site vacant for several years. Mr. Dunaway stated their concern was with a continually deteriorating building. Mr. Carson advised they had done extensive due diligence on this project and gone as far as possible in the last two years. They felt the building was not only a liability to them in its current condition but a liability to the community. Chairperson Quina asked if they did not plan to use the conceptual plan – why

did they need an exception. Mr. Carson stated they wanted to bring in a nationwide team who might want to tweak the conceptual plans. Board Member Salter brought up that permit-level plans were required for the demolition, and members of the development team acknowledged and accepted that criteria. Mr. Dunaway stated they brought back conceptual plans which the ARB granted. At that time they were trying to save the building. A year later, they determined they would not be able to incorporate that building into the design. He noted in Section 12-2-10(A)(9)(2)(c) the Board may waive the requirements for replacement plans under strange, unusual and compelling circumstances. The building will not be incorporated in the design and will be coming down. Board Member Salter advised that permit-level documents are required, and when it originally came before the Board, the group was seeking approval to demolish. It is the responsibility of the owner to make sure the building is not demolished due to neglect. Mr. Dunaway stated in June 2019, they asked for demolition permits for other structures, and the demolition was granted. They were now asking to tear down the school building. Board Member Salter stated he understood that the development would not be using that building, but the point of developing permit-level documents so construction can start is a very important aspect in saving these important structures which is why it is listed in the Code prior to a demolition permit being issued.

Board Member Mead agreed with Board Member Salter's comments and understood that circumstances change but thought it was premature for them to ask for demolition at this stage. He agreed it was the duty of the owner to keep the building in safe condition, and this building forms a significant component of the street façade.

Chairperson Quina reminded the Board that the previously approved demolition was approved without foundation-ready permit drawings for that site and based on the concept drawings presented. Board Member Mead explained when the approval was granted, he made it very clear that the Board would see plans for this building prior to demolition. Board Member Fogarty asked what was keeping them from getting plans together if the building remains. Mr. Carson stated the out-of-town folks were afraid of small-town politics, and it was much easier to get them on board with a clean slate. Board Member Fogarty stated it did not seem they would be met with the same pushback if they could produce permit-ready plans. Staff confirmed the demolition permit had not been issued. Board Member Crawford confirmed that if the demolition was allowed, the only thing required was the development of the drawings to the level which the Code requires which did not have to reflect keeping that building. Board Member Villegas pointed out the demolition approved was for a separate property owned by the same group. Chairperson Quina affirmed that demolition was granted for the old School Board building pending construction imminence.

Board Member Mead made a motion to deny on the grounds that the applicants have not shown strange and unusual circumstances or that there is a clear public safety issue that would warrant the Board's acceptance of the presentation or packet as an acceptable set of plans for the project (per Section 12-2-10(A)(9)(2)(c)), seconded by Board Member Villegas, and the motion to deny carried unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT – With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:44 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "G. A. Harding". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a prominent initial "G" and a long, sweeping tail.

Historic Preservation Planner Harding
Secretary to the Board