

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE, FLORIDA

Regular Historic Architectural Review Board Meeting  
March 16, 2006

The Historic Architectural Review Board met in formal session at 2:00 P.M., Thursday, March 16, 2006 in The Alcazar Room, City Hall. The meeting was called to order by Chairman Dana Ste. Claire, and the following were present:

**1. ROLL CALL**

Dana Ste. Claire  
Karen Harvey  
Peter Rumpel  
Antoinette Wallace

Excused:

Paul Weaver

City Staff:

Mark Knight, Director, Planning and Building Department  
David Birchim, Planning Manager  
Tom Scofield, Historic Preservation Planner  
Pam Halterman, Recording Secretary

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**  
**(February 16, 2006 regular meeting).**

Minutes from the February 16, 2006 regular meeting were approved as presented.

Ms. Wallace disclosed ex-parte communications by visiting each site listed on the agenda.

Mr. Ste. Claire noted that as a new procedure staff would make a report following the introduction of each case on the agenda.

**3. OPINION OF**  
**APPROPRIATENESS**

**Item 3(a) 2005-1345**

**Kanti Patel & St. Augustine**  
**Entertainment Concepts**

**6 Castillo Drive & 28 San Marco Avenue**

**To comment on a proposed hotel design.**

Mr. Ste. Claire noted that Mr. Patel had asked for his application to be tabled until the April meeting.

**MOTION**

**Ms. Wallace moved to table the application until the April 20, 2006 meeting. Mr. Rumpel seconded.**

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**4. CERTIFICATE OF**  
**APPROPRIATENESS**

**Item 4(a) 2006-0165**

**Martin F. Gould**

**Jack Hunter**

**22 Hypolita Street**

**To construct a new rear balcony, trellis and gate.**

Martin Gould, 50 Charlotte Street, was sworn in.

Mr. Scofield reported that the applicant had requested a Certificate of Appropriateness for a rear addition containing an elevator, exterior stairway, trellis and gate at 22 Hypolita Street. He noted that, based on review, staff found that the board could approve the application. He asked that the board include a condition that the paint color, exterior hardware and paving materials that might be used be consistent with the AGHP Guidelines.

Mr. Gould affirmed that the hardware, lighting and paint color would match the existing material. He said they would use coquina gravel if a sidewalk was created by the new gate.

Mr. Ste. Claire opened the public hearing but there was no response from the public.

Following discussion with the applicant and among the board members the following action was taken:

**MOTION**

**Mr. Rumpel moved to approve the application as submitted. Ms. Harvey seconded.**

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Item 4(b) 2006-0192**

**Don Crichlow**

**Virtu Cathedral Associates LLC**

**22 Cathedral Place**

**To reconsider muntins on storefront windows.**

Don Crichlow, 24 Cathedral Place, was sworn in.

Mr. Scofield reported that mullions had been previously approved by the board on the two

first floor storefront windows. He noted that the current tenant did not want the mullions on the windows because it blocked the view of the displayed artwork; however, placing the mullions on the windows would be consistent with the building. He stated that, based on the mentioned reason, staff found that the board could deny the request as submitted.

Mr. Crichlow noted that the client had requested the reconsideration for two reasons:

- 1) harder to maintain and clean between each pane
- 2) more visibility of his product

Mr. Ste. Claire opened the public hearing but there was no response from the public.

Mr. Rumpel suggested that hinges could be added to the frame of the mullions for easier cleaning.

Following discussion with the applicant and among the board members the following action was taken:

**MOTION**

**Mr. Rumpel moved to deny the application as submitted. Ms. Wallace seconded.**

**Vote on the motion.**

**Ayes: Rumpel, Wallace, Ste. Claire**

**Nays: Harvey**

**MOTION CARRIED 3/1 WITH MS. HARVEY DISSENTING**

**Item 4(c) 2006-0193**

**Don Crichlow**

**Virtu Cathedral Associates LLC**

**120 Charlotte Street**

**To review installed service entrance doors.**

Mr. Scofield reported that the application involved a non-historic addition to the rear of the structure. He said the applicant was seeking approval of entrance doors which had already been installed. He explained that the entrance would be used for service reasons only. He stated that the lenthil remained exposed. He said staff recommended approval of the doors with the condition that the lenthil was either painted or stucco placed on it, doors painted the same color as the building to blend in and should install appropriate style door handles.

Mr. Crichlow<sup>1</sup> agreed with staff's recommendations regarding the paint, hardware and the lenthil. He noted that the body of the building was a beige color.

Mr. Ste. Claire opened the public hearing but there was no response from the public.

Following discussion with the applicant and among the board members the following action was taken:

**MOTION**

**Mr. Rumpel moved to approve the application with the condition that the applicant paint the door to match the body color of the building, stucco the lenthil and change hardware to an appropriate material similar to the existing hardware on the building. Ms. Wallace seconded.**

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Item 4(d) 2006-0198**

---

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Crichlow had previously been sworn in.

**Kanti Patel**

**Seawall Motor Lodge LLC**

**32 Avenida Menendez**

**To install a retractable awning.**

Rene Schiegg, General Manager, Seawall Motor Lodge, was sworn in.

Mr. Scofield reported that the application had been previously submitted in September 2005 which the board denied without prejudice due to the lack of information and length of time on the agenda. He explained that more information had been submitted by the applicant. He noted that the awning would be operated for arriving guests only during inclement weather. He added that the awning would be placed in the courtyard area and the awning was retractable. He said staff found that the board could approve the awning with the condition that the mechanism shall be the same color as the balcony fascia, color and edging should be appropriate for the architectural style of the building and should not obscure architectural details when in the closed position, and the awning was only opened during inclement weather.

Mr. Ste. Claire opened the public hearing but there was no response from the public.

Mr. Rumpel offered the following:

- proposed awning had a round, funny-looking shape
- scalloped edging should be removed
- awning would hurt the appearance of the building while it was opened or closed
- awning was visible from the street
- a more simple and smaller European awning was available which would be more appropriate and less visible

Mr. Schiegg affirmed that he would be willing to complete research and ask the awning company to find the style of awning mentioned by Mr. Rumpel.

Board members asked that the color of the awning be natural or made from plain sail cloth.

**MOTION**

**Ms. Wallace moved to table the application until the April 20, 2006 meeting with the understanding that the applicant shall return to the board with design specs that meet the requirements described by Mr. Rumpel. Mr. Rumpel seconded.**

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Item 4(e) 2006-0199**

**Cary D. Wilkinson**

**Kathleen Hurley**

**20 Cordova Street**

**To construct a new railing and deck.**

Cary Wilkinson, P.O. Box 279, Orange Park, Florida, was sworn in.

Mr. Scofield reported that the application involved the installation of new railing and deck. He explained that the applicant and staff had worked together to find a more appropriate solution. He stated that the building was adjacent to the Historic District, and the B & B Inn owner would like to create a deck for the second floor suites. He said two new entrances to access the deck would be created through an old loggia porch which had been enclosed. He noted that the AGHP specified that balconies must have metal railing and were constructed with some ornamentation in a Mediterranean style. He recommended that the two-leaf

French doors be retained which was typical of the desired style. He said staff found that the board could approve the application with the mentioned conditions.

Mr. Wilkinson said staff had recommended that they match the existing railing and they had already located castings that would match.

Mr. Ste. Claire opened the public hearing but there was no response from the public.

Mr. Rumpel voiced concern about furniture on the deck. He said items placed on the deck should be part of the application.

Mr. Ste. Claire said it was not part of the boards' purview but suggested that the applicant could return to the board in the future with a furniture proposal.

Mr. Birchim explained that if the application, at its face value, was incomplete that was one issue; however, if the board believed there would be anticipation of some future use that would cause the owner to place furniture on the deck, it could be addressed at that time.

Following discussion with the applicant and among the board members the following action was taken:

**MOTION**

**Ms. Wallace moved to approve the application with staff recommendations and the condition that the applicant shall return to the board if furniture would be placed on the deck. Mr. Ste. Claire seconded.**

Ms. Harvey suggested that the railing would detract from the columns and arches and

some of the most attractive features of the building would be hidden.

Mr. Wilkinson explained that the railings were on different plains and would not detract from the architecture.

**Vote on the motion.**

**Ayes: Wallace, Ste. Claire, Rumpel**

**Nays: Harvey**

**Motion carried 3/1 with Ms. Harvey dissenting.**

**5. CERTIFICATE OF DEMOLITION**

**Item 5(a) 2005-1490**

**Adam & Karla Klayman**

**25 Avista Circle**

**To demolish a single family residence.**

Adam Klayman, 25 Avista Circle, was sworn in.

Mr. Scofield reported that the application had been tabled several times from previous meetings. He noted that new information had been submitted that day. He explained that the submitted documents involved a draft of the Florida Master Site file which had been prepared by Nancy Sikes-Kline in a volunteer effort in an attempt to document a structure on Davis Shores. He noted that Mr. Klayman had included photographs; however, no elevations had been included with his submittal. He said it was unknown who the architect was on the structure; although research would continue on that matter. He stated that staff recommended approval of the demolition request but recommended that elevations be submitted prior to issuance of a building permit.

Mr. Ste. Claire opened the public hearing but there was no response from the public.

The board members offered the following points:

- application lacked detailed information about the mold and water leak problems
- structure could be renovated into a contemporary style building
- not a complete submittal due to lack of elevations

Mr. Rumpel pointed out the following:

- Davis Shores would be unrecognizable if the demolition rate remained at its present rate
- The subject house could be easily renovated into a contemporary building
- If allowed, it would be setting a precedence of no value for all the same era style buildings on Davis Shores

Mr. Ste. Claire disclosed ex-parte communications with Nancy Sikes-Kline.

Mr. Rumpel voiced that very few remaining houses on Davis Shores were representative of the original Mediterranean style and the houses built later, such as the subject building, had some value and could be renovated but people were replacing them with McMansions which was a shame.

Mr. Klayman explained that the floor joist system would not support the construction of a second story and the replacement structure was not considered a McMansion.

Mr. Ste. Claire voiced that he had used the eligibility standards to determine the historic value of the subject structure.

Following discussion with the property owner and among the board members the following action was taken:

## **MOTION**

**Mr. Rumpel moved to delay the demolition application for one year in order to offer time for the applicant to complete further research regarding the renovation of the building.**

Mr. Ste. Claire noted that ten written response forms had been sent to surrounding property owners with five returned in favor and none returned in opposition to the application.

In response to an inquiry, Mr. Rumpel said the applicant should hire another professional to review the possibility of renovating the existing house to meet the homeowners' needs, and at the same time, the owner would be utilizing the essence of the building.

Mr. Klayman said it would be a difficult task.

Mr. Knight advised that if the building remained, the applicant would be able to create a geometric dome over the existing building. He said the board could only consider the demolition of the existing structure and not the replacement building because it was not part of the demolition.

Mr. Ste. Claire said things were being thrown out metamorphically because one board member thought the building had some architectural merit; however, the real problem was that it was an individual case without context. He asked that the board members offer the applicant direction in context with the existing demolition

ordinance. He noted that the subject building was not located in a historic district, was built in 1951 and it was clearly not recognized as eligible to be listed on the National Register of Historic Places. He voiced that he was at a loss as to what Mr. Rumpel was attempting to protect.

**Ms. Wallace seconded the motion.**

**Vote on the motion.**

**Ayes: Rumpel, Wallace, Harvey**

**Nays: Ste. Claire**

**Motion carried 3/1 with Mr. Ste. Claire dissenting.**

### **Item 5(b) 2005-1506**

#### **Robert Graubard**

#### **Conch House Builders LLC**

#### **48 Comares Avenue**

#### **To demolish a multi-family residence.**

Robert Graubard, 33 Water Street, was sworn in.

Mr. Scofield reported that the application had been tabled several times by the board. He noted the following information to the board:

- Tax roll information was included in the boards' packet
- A considerable increase in taxes had occurred in 1946 which indicated construction of a building on the lot
- The 1942 and 1943 Sanborn maps showed no building on the property
- Condition assessment had been provided to the board at the previous meeting
- New conceptual renderings were submitted

- A building must demonstrate exceptional significance and it was not an exceptional example of the Moderne style
- Staff recommended a delay of the demolition for one year in order to research issues mentioned by staff

Mr. Graubard offered the following points:

- Board members had individually visited the site
- Photographs had been submitted to board members and staff
- Original construction was in 1946 with an addition sometime later
- Building had been apartments for the past forty years
- Had offered the building free for relocation and the cost of demolition would be donated to whoever moved the structure

Mr. Ste. Claire opened the hearing to public comment.

Connie Cooper, 300 Arredondo Avenue, was sworn in and spoke in opposition to the application.

Mr. Ste. Claire closed the public hearing.

All members of the board disclosed ex-parte communications by visiting the site and speaking with Mr. Graubard and Nancy Sikes-Kline.

Ms. Harvey said she believed that the Coast Guard never used the building which should eliminate that concern.

Mr. Rumpel offered the following:

- Involved a prominent location
- Structure had been considerably compromised

- The building had an unusual style
- Would like to see it moved or incorporated into the plan for the area
- Would not want to see a parking lot on the property
- Agreed that the demolition should be delayed one year

Following discussion with the applicant and among the board members the following action was taken:

### **MOTION**

**Mr. Rumpel moved to approve the demolition application with the condition that the demolition shall be delayed for one year in order to research the possibility of renovation or relocation of the subject building and the demolition shall be carried out without the need to return to the board at the conclusion of the one year period. Ms. Harvey seconded.**

### **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY<sup>2</sup>**

#### **Item 5(c) 2006-0162**

#### **Robert Graubard**

#### **Conch House Builders LLC**

#### **57 Comares Avenue**

**To demolish two (2) commercial properties.**

Mr. Scofield reported that the buildings were located on the Conch House property and were over fifty years old. He explained that the buildings involved the masonry office which had been constructed between 1948 and 1951, and the other building was a framed stucco apartment building constructed in 1946. He said the buildings

---

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Ste. Claire called a break at 4:07 p.m. and reconvened at 4:12 p.m.

were not historically significant and in fair condition but had been compromised. He stated that staff found that the board could approve the demolition request for both buildings.

Mr. Ste. Claire opened the public hearing but there was no response from the public.

The following ex-parte communications were disclosed:

Ste. Claire – none  
Wallace – visited the site, Mr. Graubard  
Rumpel – visited the site, Mr. Graubard  
Harvey – visited the site, Mr. Graubard

Following discussion with the applicant and among the board members the following action was taken:

**MOTION**

**Ms. Wallace moved to approve the application as submitted. Mr. Rumpel seconded.**

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Item 5(d) 2006-0163**  
**Robert Graubard**  
**Conch House Builders LLC**  
**12 Inlet Place**  
**To demolish a single family residence.**

Mr. Scofield advised that the subject building had always been a single-family residence and in the style of a post war minimal traditional as noted by no overhang eaves with simple fenestrations which was typical of suburban tract houses built after World War II. He stated that staff found

that the board could approve the demolition request with the condition that a Florida Master Site file be completed on the building, to include photographs, site plan, etc.

Mr. Ste. Claire opened the public hearing but there was no response from the public.

Mr. Rumpel suggested that the house appeared movable.

Mr. Graubard agreed to display signage on the property to offer the house for free for a period of sixty days. He added that he would contribute the cost of demolition for the relocation of the structure.

Mr. Ste. Claire noted that nine written response forms had been sent to surrounding property owners with none returned in favor and two returned in opposition to the application.

Ms. Harvey pointed out that an apartment building existed at an adjacent lot; therefore, the area would not change by the proposed townhouses.

Following discussion with the applicant and among the board members the following action was taken:

**MOTION**

**Ms. Harvey moved to approve the application with the condition that the owner place signage on the property for sixty days to offer the structure free for relocation. Ms. Wallace seconded.**

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Item 5(e) 2006-0202**  
**Dan Torres**



**Kevin Torres**  
**113 Bravo Street**  
**To demolish a single family residence.**

Kevin Torres, 7025 County Road 46A, Suite #1071-319, Lake Mary, Florida, was sworn in.

Mr. Scofield reported that the subject building was a single-family structure and would be replaced with a single-family residence. He noted that the building had been constructed in 1884 and its historic integrity had been substantially compromised through improper renovations over the past twenty-five years. He said a comprehensive and complete report on the condition of the structure had been submitted by Mr. Torres. He stated that the stucco placed on the structure had accelerated the decay process of the building. He noted that staff recommended approval of the demolition request with the condition that a Florida Master Site file be revised prior to the issuance of a building permit.

Mr. Ste. Claire opened the public hearing but there was no response from the public. He noted that twenty-three written response forms had been sent to surrounding property owners with five returned in favor and none returned in opposition to the application.

Mr. Torres explained that he had owned the property for two months and had hopes of renovating the structure; however, once construction began it was found to be beyond repair due to the extensive termite damage.

Ms. Harvey disclosed ex-parte communications by visiting the site and speaking with Mr. Torres' sister, who

allowed her to view the interior which was in extremely bad condition.

**MOTION**

**Ms. Harvey moved to approve the application with the condition that the owner revised the Florida Master Site file. Mr. Rumpel seconded.**

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**6. PLANNING AND BUILDING DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

Mr. Knight offered to respond to questions.

**7. OTHER BUSINESS**

Mr. Ste. Claire thanked Nancy Sikes-Kline for her efforts in completing the Florida Master Site file on 25 Avista Circle.

Ms. Sikes-Kline suggested that Davis Shores properties needed to be listed on the Florida Master Site file. She noted that they had many volunteers who would like to help in that effort.

**8. REVIEW OF CONFLICT STATEMENTS FROM PREVIOUS MEETING**

None

**9. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:45 P.M.

Dana Ste.Claire, Chairman

---

Pam Halterman, Recording Secretary