



MINUTES OF THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

February 17, 2022

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairperson Salter, Vice Chairperson Mead, Board Member Courtney, Board Member Fogarty, Board Member McCorvey, Board Member Ramos, Board Member Yee

MEMBERS ABSENT: None.

STAFF PRESENT: Historic Preservation Planner Harding, Senior Planner Statler, Advisor Pristera, Assistant City Attorney Lindsay, Help Desk Technician Russo

STAFF VIRTUAL: Urban Design Specialist Gray

OTHERS PRESENT: Brandy Strahan, Bill Winter, Christi Colabianchi, Michael Carrow, Jody Wells, Lalla T. Pierce, Walter Pierce, Michelle MacNeil, Dan Girardin, Tim Richardson (virtual)

CALL TO ORDER / QUORUM PRESENT

Chairperson Salter called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. with a quorum present.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chairperson Salter proposed a correction to the January 20, 2022 ARB minutes on 117 W. Wright Street to read "Chairperson Salter stated the proposed addition to the house was consistent with the style, but recommended when the project returned, to not "use" a wood clad window." Board Member Mead made a motion to adopt the proposed change, seconded by Board Member Ramos, and it carried 6 to 0. Board Member Mead made a motion to approve the January 20, 2022 minutes, seconded by Board Member Ramos, and it carried 6 to 0.

Historic Preservation Planner Harding advised staff requested the Board to review a possible scrivener's error in the recorded and approved December 16, 2021 minutes. The proposed correction was to change the word "quarter" to "corridor" on page 4 for 43 S. Palafox Place. Revised minutes were furnished to the Board. Board Member Mead advised this was an adequate description of what he had stated. Board Member Mead made a motion to adopt the change, seconded by Board Member Fogarty, and it carried to 6 to 0.

OPEN FORUM - None

(Board Member Yee arrived for the meeting.)

NEW BUSINESS

Item 3 **1390 N. Spring Street** **NHPD**
Contributing Structure **PR-1AAA**

Action taken: Approved.

Jason Strahan is requesting approval to install a new 14' x 30' in-ground pool which will be completely hidden from view behind a privacy fence. The new pool will be at ground level, and will be surrounded with new granite paver decking, granite coping, and with "Key West Marina" tile and white plaster with blue quartz.

North Hill had no opposition to the request, and there were no other speakers on this item.

Board Member Mead made a motion for approval, seconded by Board Member Fogarty, and it carried unanimously.

Item 4 **314 E. Intendencia Street** **PHD**
Contributing Structure **HR-2**

Action taken: Approved.

Donna Fite is seeking approval to add decorative shutters to a contributing structure. The proposed shutters will be mahogany, and the hardware will be powder coated stainless steel. All shutters will be stained to match the front entry door.

Mr. Wells presented to the Board. Board Member Courtney asked if the shutters were inset, and Mr. Wells advised the windows would not allow that. It was an old house and windows were almost flush. They would be very close to flush. There will be an "L" hinge on the shutter and an offset panel on the wall. In the open position, they will probably be about $\frac{3}{4}$ " off the wall with "S" hooks and clips on the backside. They will be 100% functional shutters, and everything will be mounted on the trim.

Board Member Ramos made a motion to approve, seconded by Board Member Courtney, and it carried unanimously.

Item 5 **428 Bayfront Parkway** **PHD**
Contributing Structure **HC-1**

Action taken: Approved with Comments.

Mr. and Mrs. Pierce are requesting approval to replace windows on the west and east side of a contributing structure. The existing windows are irreparable, inoperable, and not original to the home. The proposed unit is an Anderson 400 Series 6/6 double-hung white wood-clad window.

Board Member Courtney indicated it was exciting to see this building saved and renovated since it was a very unique property which told a story of our past. She explained it was always a good idea to save the windows when rebuilding. Ms. Pierce indicated Oakleigh Custom Woodworks, their restoration company, had not been able to evaluate the property, but regardless of the final outcome, the front door would be custom built to match the time period, and the front window would definitely be rebuilt. She pointed out work was at a standstill while they figured out the window situation with Oakleigh Custom Woodworks in their evaluation. Advisor Pristera stated he had not looked at the windows up close and suggested maybe their firm could determine if they were original or not; the wood windows were more in keeping with the original and probably old enough to match what was there before. He stated the front window was definitely original, and the side windows get replaced over time, but if they had been replaced, they were solid wood. He pointed out it was cost effective to rebuild the wood windows, but what really drives it is if someone has worked on them before because the pieces and parts of them can be rebuilt. He asked if the windows were fire rated, and staff advised the building official stated that was not a requirement.

Advisor Pristera encouraged them to ask their restoration professional for other ideas for hurricane protection. Ms. Pierce explained they wanted to make sure the front window was preserved and looked as it should.

Board Member Ramos asked if their intent was to replace the existing windows with new windows, and Ms. Pierce indicated when they originally put the packet together, that was the intent since they had not found anyone to feasibly restore the windows. After the packet was submitted, they became aware of Hastings Reed. They were asking for 1) approval of a project where Hastings Reed restores the windows within 6 weeks or less, or 2) that they install the Andersen windows they have since the rebuilding would take longer and they would have to switch them out, or 3) if they find out it would either be too costly or too timely and the final product would not be structurally good, the Andersen windows would be installed. Board Member Ramos asked if those windows were the 400 series, and Ms. Pierce advised they found 6 Andersen windows with divided lites, and they chose them since they were Andersen's answer to historical renovations. Staff confirmed the Andersen 400 series had been approved in this area. Ms. Pierce advised they were rebuilding and keeping the front window since there would be protection from the porch, and Mr. Pierce noted they had found a hurricane-rated window glass for that front window.

Board Member Ramos asked if the Board was allowed to approve the options or would an abbreviated review be required to approve the wood-clad windows, and staff advised that would not be necessary if the Board deemed the steps were acceptable, and a board-for-board repair did not require ARB approval but would be reviewed through staff; the Board's determination could be approved with an abbreviated review for updates. Chairperson Salter asked if they had determined that the exterior applied mullion was available and could be installed on the windows, and Ms. Pierce advised if Mr. Reed determined they could not rebuild the windows, they would need to order and test the applications, and she felt that was highly possible. For reference, standard replacement windows for their house in Cantonment took 10 months to received even when paid in full, which was their concern with this project.

Board Member Yee made a motion to approve the application with the steps outlined by the homeowner and notifying Advisor Pristera and Historic Preservation Planner Harding of the intended plan once they determined the feasibility of restoring the originals. Chairperson Salter proposed an amendment that should the project result in the permanent installation of the windows, it was only acceptable if an applied mullion on the exterior was available and installed; the amendment was accepted. Board Member Ramos clarified that this would not apply to the storm window on the front which would return for an abbreviated review, and it was determined the front window was not included in the packet and would be reviewed internally. Ms. Pierce explained the 6/6 application would be muntins and not mullions. **Board Member Ramos then seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.**

Item 6

624 E. Government Street

PHD

Noncontributing Structure

HC-1/Wood Cottages

Action taken: Approved with Comments.

Kelly Greene is requesting approval to replace all existing wood windows (21) with vinyl windows at a noncontributing structure. The replacement windows will be 1/1 single hung to match the existing style and will be PGT vinyl.

Staff explained since this structure was noncontributing, the standards were less restrictive. Historic Preservation Planner Harding stated he did not think this structure was designed to match the historic structure, and it was located in its own subdivision.

Ms. Colabianchi addressed the Board and advised the existing wood windows were beyond repair. They were dealing with termite damage, wood rot, and hurricane damage. Their intent for

renovation was to remove all siding and soffit fascia material and evaluate the building. She believed the home was constructed in 2001, and the majority of windows were rotted and caused damage to the framing of the window jams. Also 20% to 30% of the exterior framing would need repair or replacement; the Hardie lap siding would also be replaced. The quote was for a vinyl impact-rated window with no grids, but now they had a wood window with no grids. She stated the intent was not to change the look of the home. Staff advised if they were intending to go with like-to-like material, it would be a board-for-board which would be addressed during the permitting process. Board Member Ramos indicated they were replacing the wood windows with the PGT 5500 series and asked about the transom windows above the existing windows. Ms. Colabianchi advised they would be replaced with the PGT 5520 same brand window and same size. Staff explained if the Board wanted to approve the board-for-board work for the siding at this meeting, that would be acceptable.

Board Member Fogarty asked about the color of the frame, and Ms. Colabianchi explained the houses in that subdivision had black frames, but they intended to return to white PGT window. Board Member Ramos asked if the Board was approving the board-for-board siding replacement, would there be a color change on the siding. Ms. Colabianchi indicated they had not gone that far in the process but would bring that change back for approval; staff explained this would be considered in the abbreviated review process.

Board Member Fogarty made a motion to approve as submitted with the PGT white framed clear glass and the same style window and color for the transoms as well as approval for the board-for-board siding replacement; the motion was seconded by Board Member Courtney and carried unanimously.

**Item 7
Variance**

312 E. Intendencia Street

**PHD
HC-1/Wood Cottages**

Action taken: Approved.

Bill and Kathy Winter are requesting a variance to the side yard setback requirements in Sec. 12-3-10(1)h, Figure 12-3.1 and to the rear yard coverage requirements in Sec. 12-3-55(4). The variance requests are:

- 1) To increase the maximum allowable rear yard coverage from 25% (200 sf) to 37.5% (300 sf); and
- 2) To reduce the required west side yard setback from 5' to 3.1' (a reduction of 1' 11").

The variance request was to accommodate a future garage which will provide the property owners off-street parking in the historic commercial district.

A similar application under a separate project, but for this property, was granted in May 2018. That approved request was to increase the rear yard coverage from 25% (200 sf) to 36.25% (290 sf) for a detached garage. The 2018 approval also allowed the proposed accessory structure to be located 3' from the west property line although a minimum of 5' was required (a reduction of 2').

Staff explained conceptual review for what will be constructed would return to the Board. The Quasi-Judicial procedure was explained to the Board. Assistant City Attorney Lindsay advised what the Board was asked to decide was whether the application met the standards which set forth the variance criteria, and the decision would be based upon what was presented today and not on anything which had occurred outside of this setting.

Board Member Mead asked for the grounds on which the previous variance was granted in 2018. Historic Preservation Planner Harding explained that variance was not acted upon, and the minutes were sparse in indicating why it was approved. It was determined the lot was relatively narrow, and the buildable area in the rear yard was fairly small, and other accessory structures were in the relative location where the 2018 applicant wanted to place theirs. Board Member

Mead wanted to know how this application differed from the 2018 variance in regard to the minimum question in the prior grant. Staff advised the allowance by right would be no more than 25% of rear yard coverage; the 2018 variance was approved to occupy 36.25%, and this variance requested 37.5%. Also, the 2018 variance was approved to be located 3' away from the west property line; this variance was requesting 3.1' and if the any part of the accessory structure encroaches into the buildable area, the accessory structure must meet the building setbacks of the principal structure. Staff advised the 2018 request was for a different project and different applicant which required that it come before the Board. Board Member Mead explained in discussions with planning staff in other jurisdictions, the position was that a variance once granted, attached to the property. He wanted to know what was already decided and what the Board had to address in light of that. Staff explained the Board must address everything again since in our Code of Ordinances, variances were not attached to the land. Board Member Mead understood that if a development plan were approved and the property transferred, the variance attached to the development plan. It was determined this was a different development plan; Assistant City Attorney Lindsay agreed. Staff explained the 2018 development plan never progressed past this Board.

Board Member Mead asked for the necessity for the rear versus what was addressed before. Staff indicated the rear yard setback was larger, and based on discussions with the applicant, the variance was specifically for off-street parking. The property catty-corner to this had no parking so the patrons and construction workers parked on Intendencia Street, leaving no off-site parking spaces for this future development. Board Member Mead asked if there was a de minimis rule applicable in terms of differences between the variance once granted and a variance that comes to the Board on the same property. Staff was not aware of a de minimis rule but in his understanding of how the Board had treated past variances granted in the past, the Board had used that as justification to approve. It was the opinion of staff that there was not a major difference in what the last applicant was approved for.

Board Member Yee asked if the garage was 1' wider than the previous approved version, and Ms. Winder stated it was 1' wider and 2' shorter. Mr. Winter indicated there was commercial parking on the north and west sides and an approximately 7' privacy fence. Staff explained the plans indicated a 5" façade that would allow for brick when the project returned for conceptual review. Board Member Ramos clarified that the variance approval would be based on current information without prior decisions, and the variance previously approved did not apply to this applicant and wanted to know why the Board was considering the previous information. Assistant City Attorney Lindsay explained her information did not preclude the Board from looking at the prior variance since it was part of the package and part of the record; the record is of something relevant from the past, so the Board was allowed to consider that prior variance. She explained it was not desirable for the Board to make a decision based on something such as an ex parte conversation outside this room, and if that was relevant to the Board's decision, it would have to be disclosed in this meeting. Also, the adjacent properties and how that impacts how the Board looks at the variance criteria are relevant, but it would not be appropriate for the neighborhood to come and say what they wanted the Board to do and for the Board to decide based on popular opinion.

Board Member Mead moved that based upon the record of the prior decision and the facts submitted in that regard as regards the findings that justified a variance at that time, should be adopted for purposes of this decision because the project here is on the same property, it is sufficiently and substantially similar in scope and dimension, and the differences are de minimis and our findings should reflect that and therefore should be

granted on the same terms as the prior decision under those findings. The motion was seconded by Board Member Ramos and carried unanimously.

**Item 8
Contributing-Conceptual**

1015 N. Reus Street

**NHPD
PR-1AAA**

Action taken: Conceptual Approval with Comments.

Michelle MacNeil is requesting conceptual approval for renovations and additions at a contributing structure, and for a two-story accessory building with a garage on the ground floor and living space on the second. North Hill had no objections to this request for conceptual approval. They also wanted to commend the homeowners and architect for their attention to historic details, for their use of authentic clay roof tiles, and for working their addition to preserve the existing heritage oak tree.

Ms. MacNeil presented to the Board. Chairperson Salter indicated it looked like an addition, but it brought back some original elements which had been lost in previous renovations. He asked if the intent was to paint the existing brick house, and Ms. MacNeil advised the owners wanted to paint it or use a limewash, and it would be hard to match the brick. She pointed out the brick had also sustained water damage. They were planning to use stucco on the second story and the perimeter of the building if the Board was agreeable. They were likewise trying to make everything as narrow as possible to save the heritage tree. Chairperson Salter explained his only recommendation going forward was to try and find a brick similar to the existing since he was not in favor of painting brick on historic structures because he believed they were a part of the architectural character of the structure. It appeared that the existing two-story element was stucco and original to the house as well. He did believe there were bricks similar to the existing, and a slight variation would also be appropriate because of where they were adding the brick. He pointed out they would have to restore the brick before painting it anyway and recommended avoiding painting and all costs.

Advisor Pristera stated he had looked at the house, and the biggest hole was at the front gable. He wondered if in the back addition, how much of the original brick walls were being removed and could they salvage some of that brick to patch the gable end and perform other repairs without adding another brick to it. Ms. MacNeil stated in the rear façade, one half of it was brick, so that amount would be available to use for the top of the gables where they needed a match. She indicated they would do their best to see if something else was available. She also explained the windows and doors on the exterior where they proposed wood clad windows; they were adding windows and replacing some aluminum windows which were added later. They wondered if the outbuilding at the rear could have vinyl windows with simulated divided lites and if the exterior doors could be fiberglass with simulated divided lites on the outbuilding and existing building since the front door was not original and the side door was an aluminum sliding glass door – could they be fiberglass or something else. Chairperson Salter explained on the renovation of historic structures, a clad wood replacement window had been allowed in the past, and he believed fiberglass doors had also been allowed; as far as the freestanding structure in the rear, it would technically be considered new construction, and vinyl had been allowed in this district, and staff agreed.

Board Member Mead indicated he had toured the site, and he lives two houses away. He agreed this was a good job at trying to adapt what they've already got in the modifications to the original style. The parapets were ruined with the large gable, but they had rescued the stylistic elements effectively. He also preferred not affecting the brick, but the damage to the overall façade was pretty significant. If there was to be any coating to the brick, he preferred it be a limewash with a product that could leave as much as possible the surface of the brick as opposed to a paint which

would wipe out most of that detail.

Mr. Richardson, the owner, indicated Ms. MacNeil had done a great job in representing the owners and creating a vision for the house, and he appreciated the Board's consideration. Board Member Ramos agreed with the comment on the brick but thought for a Mediterranean Revival, the limewash would be appropriate as well, and he could go either way. Staff reminded the Board this was a conceptual approval, and the final product would return to the Board.

Advisor Pristera asked if they had consulted a mason regarding the bricks and how involved the repairs would be without using a coating, and Ms. MacNeil advised their contractor felt this was the easiest course with the amount of damage, but they would explore other possibilities. Mr. Pristera encouraged salvaging the brick and having someone look at the structure to see what could be done to perform the repairs correctly so they wouldn't look out of place. Board Member Mead explained having seen the structure and the interior structural issues, the old parapet walls had significant water intrusion problems probably because of deteriorated flashing or failed roof surfacing. As a result, the southeast corner on both walls was heavily infested with termites, saved only by the fact they had heart pine and had only gotten for the most part into the surface of the studs and not into the heart of them. There was some sagging of foundational girders or structures which contributed to a lot of cracking in the brick on those facades. There was also an area in the north façade interior where a lot of the water probably ponded and may have intruded into the structure; there was an area in the bathroom where there were penetrations in the roof which may have contributed to some partial collapse of those piers or underlying girding which also contributed to some cracking in the brick façade in that area as well. All of that was being repaired, but the damage to the façade from some of the structural portions was significant. Board Member Courtney agreed with reassessing once all of those areas were repaired and cleaned, and explained you honor the original judgement by saving it.

Board Member Mead made a motion for conceptual approval with requests that a report be provided in the final submission to address that both the quantity and extent of the brick damage and the availability of the material both in terms of salvage and reuse in the structure as well as any substitute material that may be used to make or not, or the unavailability of it if that's the case, before a determination is made to coat the existing brick, preferentially with limewash. For final review, the Board wants to see something to substantiate those concerns. The motion was seconded by Board Member Ramos and carried unanimously.

Item 9

180 N. Palafox Street

PHBD

Contributing

C2-A

Action taken: Approved with Comments.

Michael Carro is seeking approval for exterior modifications to the rear and sides of a contributing structure. The proposed changes being presented are in tandem to interior renovations which will convert the second floor into residential living quarters. Changes to the front, including the balcony extension, new windows and doors, and paint to match the adjacent building were approved in May and November 2018 and are not part of this review. This review includes all changes to the sides and rear of the building and to the second-floor exterior. These include (but are not limited to) the addition of metal-clad wood windows and doors, a new standing seam metal roof system, new guardrails and green wall screening, and a white stucco finish to match the existing.

Mr. Carro and Mr. Girardin presented to the Board. Board Member Fogarty disclosed that her employer had been involved with SMP Architects and the owner to consult on interior work, and she had worked on interior design. She did not feel there was a conflict of interest, and staff confirmed there was no conflict of interest.

Chairperson Salter explained the package stated the main west elevation along Palafox was not changing based on the previous approval, but he noticed a discrepancy and wanted to make sure or verify if part of this package was to include the change or if the change was not intentional. On the right side of the west elevation, the original proposed an approved elevation which indicated that the second-floor door and frame centered on the lower section of window – the only symmetrical portion of the building and was a much smaller window that was centered on the lower bank of windows. On the original approved elevation, that door opening was the same width as the window below; he wondered if the intent was to center the second-floor window and door on the ground-floor window or if the intent was to off-center it intentionally. Mr. Girardin explained the door could be moved slightly to be centered above that window opening. The previous plans were not to scale, but the current drawings were based on his measurements. Chairperson Salter explained if the door were centered on the opening, it would meet the intent of the original approval; if that was acceptable in the design, no more discussion would be needed, however, if they wanted to shift it, then it would be made a part of the discussion. He also indicated the east elevations on the rear noted the area between the first and second floor, the parapet guardrail, was noted as an existing EFIS (a metal panel). Mr. Girardin explained it would be a change in a metal panel to a new EFIS. It was also determined the new elevator would exist within the existing recess where the door openings were, and the canopy was the only element sticking out. Chairperson Salter stated this would be a nice addition to the building and had no concerns with it.

Board Member Ramos questioned the existing use, and Mr. Carrow indicated there would be offices on the first floor, but the second floor had been vacant for a long time. Board Member Ramos advised it was huge improvement to the front and rear facades. Staff advised this project would be going before the Planning Board in March for a License to Use for a balcony extension.

Board Member Yee made a motion to approve as submitted with the change to the fenestration to be realigned to the window below, and the applicant was agreeable. The motion was seconded by Board Member Courtney and carried unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT – With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:31 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Historic Preservation Planner Harding
Secretary to the Board