

Historic Architectural Review Commission

Agenda Packet

August 31, 2010 – 3:00 p.m.

City Commission Chamber

Old City Hall, 510 Greene Street



Item 4

HARC Meeting Minutes – **July 13, 2010**

Historic Architectural Review Commission

Meeting Minutes

July 13, 2010 – 3:00 p.m.

City Commission Chamber
Old City Hall, 510 Greene Street



The Key West Historic Architectural Review Commission held a public hearing on **Tuesday, July 13, 2010** at **3:00 p.m.**, in the City Commission Chambers of Old City Hall located at 510 Greene Street.

1. **Roll Call** Board members present included George Galvan, Rudy Molinet Nils Muench, Carlos Rojas, and Chairman Peter Batty. Alternate member Daniel Metzler arrived at 3:04pm.
2. **Pledge of Allegiance**
3. **Approval of Agenda** Enid Torregrosa informed the commission that the minutes for June 8, 2010 were not available. She also stated that Item 5b6 is postponed until the next meeting.

Nils Muench made a motion to approve the agenda; it was seconded by George Galvan.

4. **Approval of Minutes**
 - a. HARC Meeting Minutes – **June 8, 2010**

5. **Items for Public Hearing**

- a. **Old Business**

- b. **New Business**

1. Request for demolition of back portion and new construction – **#313 Truman Avenue** – **Applicant: Carlos Rojas, Architect (H10-01-77)** – Demolish non contributing second addition and replace with two story addition.

Carlos Rojas recused himself from the dais.

Carlos Rojas represented the project. He stated that the second addition on the house is in poor condition, he planned to demolish this non-historic portion of the house and replace it with a two story addition. He added that the addition is not visible from the right-of-way in the front of the property, and is in keeping with the mass and scale of the rest of the house.

No public comment.

Enid Torregrosa reviewed her staff report. She explained that this is the first reading for demolition. She informed the commission that the second addition portion of the house is non-historic, and she recommends approval for demolition.

George Galvan made a motion to approve the demolition of the non-historic addition; Rudy Molinet seconded the motion.

APPROVED

2. Request to install wireless antennas at roof top and new shelter structure - **#1500 Reynolds Avenue Applicant: Alfredo Amoedo/ SBA Network Service (H10-01-89)** – Adding antennas for AT&T Mobility to an existing rooftop cell site.

Alfredo Amoedo represented the project. He assessed the need for the antennas in Key West both for AT&T and the citizens of Key West. He proposed these antennas in addition to the existing cell site at the building

Enid Torregrosa reviewed her staff report. She stated that this is the second time the applicant has come before HARC on this project, and the first time the commission deemed a denial for the application. Mrs. Torregrosa worked with the applicant to review their plans and application. The applicant agreed to use the same height as the existing antennas, and follow the State Historic Preservation Officer's recommendations to lower the antennas and move them further south. She recommended approval.

Nils Muench stated that the project did not comply with paragraph five on page 42.

Enid Torregrosa stated that the antennas have been moved farther south and are using the same height as existing antennas on the building.

Rudy Molinet stated that the guidelines Mr. Muench cited were stated as applicable whenever possible.

Peter Batty asked the applicant to clarify if the additional antennas were going to look like the existing ones.

Michael Yanis the engineer for AT&T mobility explained that they were trying to minimize visual impact and to comply with the State Historic Preservation Officer's request they were going to lower the antennas to the roof line. The antennas will be visible from the right-of-way only so that the proper service can be provided. There is no place on the roof where the antennas could provide coverage and not be visible.

Nils Muench stated that this location on this particular building may not be the only option for the applicant.

Enid Torregrosa reviewed the letter from the State Historic Preservation Office. She stated that their position was that the antennas will have no adverse effect on historic properties.

George Galvan asked the applicant how much of the antenna would be visible from the right-of-way, and how many antennas would be added total.

Michael Yanis estimated that 3ft would be visible, and an additional nine antennas would be placed at the location.

George Galvan clarified the location of the photos in accordance with the site plans.

Peter Batty stated that it was not made clear in the application that there was going to be 9 antennas.

Enid Torregrosa and Michael Yanis explained that there were three locations of mountings called sectors, each sector with three antennas mounted on them to make a total of nine antennas. Mrs. Torregrosa stated that the maximum height is 11ft 2in and the parapet wall is 3ft 5in.

Rudy Molinet asked Staff if these antennas were being placed on the historic portion of the Casa Marina Hotel.

Enid Torregrosa explained that this portion of the hotel is a non-historic addition. She explained that there are three groups of antennas and one equipment shelter.

Carlos Rojas made a motion to approve; it was seconded by Rudy Molinet for discussion. He asked staff for clarification on a comment in the letter from the State Historic Preservation Office, on whether the Casa Marina was going to be placed on the National Register of Historic Places. Mrs. Torregrosa explained that she is in support of placing the hotel on the National Register of Historic Places; however there have been no actions taken to do so.

George Galvan asked staff the size of the shelter.

Enid Torregrosa stated the equipment shelter is 11 ft 6in depth by 20ft wide by 11ft 2in tall; the same size as the other shelter at the location.

Motion carried.

APPROVED

- 3. Request to restore existing cbs building– #803 Emma Street- Applicant: Michael Miller, Architect (H10-01-93) – Restoration of existing VFW and American Legion Hall.**

Michael Miller reviewed the history of the building. He stated that they planned a full restoration of the building; he presented the floor plans which included the current building with a large hall, mezzanine, and bar/food area. They would be adding a room near the second entrance for meetings. Restoration would include the concrete block walls, exterior painting, and new windows which would be impact louver windows.

No public comment.

Enid Torregrosa reviewed her staff report. She stated the concrete walls are in disrepair, and a letter has been received from Chief Building Official John Woodson that deems the building unsafe. She added that the plans comply with the guidelines and staff recommends approval.

Nils Muench made a motion to approve; Rudy Molinet seconded the motion. Motion carried

APPROVED

- 4. Request for demolition of non historic structures, new construction and restoration of historic house- # 911 Watson Lane- Applicant: Matthew Stratton, Architect (H10-01-94) – Demolish non-historic additions and accessory structures, including: enclosed L-shaped shed roof addition at NW corner of historic structure, covered side porch with shed roof along entire length of south elevation, gable roof addition on the north side of the building, a “pop-up” rooftop structure, a free standing pool house on north corner of property, a free standing 16’ by 24’ gable roof accessory structure at the rear of the property, and the in-ground concrete swimming pool. Restore front elevation include: replacement of french doors with pair of wood 6 over 6 double hung windows, replace front door with solid 4 panel wood door, and restore the gable louvered vent. Restore historic roofline over front 24’ (+/-) of structure, utilizing salvaged historic rafters from rear 12’ of structure. Install new Galvalume v-crimp roof at historic structure and porch. Patch and paint existing wood novelty siding, trim and rafter tails. Replace three existing doors at historic window opening locations on side elevations with new wood windows. Add 650 sq. ft. addition to south**

side of historic structure, 232 sq. ft. addition at rear of historic structure, and 1,000 sq. ft. addition at north side of historic structure. Add wood awning and porch at south elevation at existing door location. Tile existing concrete porch floor. Site improvements include a new lap pool, splash pool, pool decking, 10' by 10' cabana and observation tower, a 4' tall curved concrete garden wall, 8' tall louvered garden walls, louvered panels and gates at existing carport, tiered 6'-12" concrete planters behind pool, wood picket fencing at side and rear yards, and brick paving for sidewalk and driveway.

Matthew Stratton represented the project. He stated they planned to demolish 2,069 sq ft of non historic structure and construct 2,840 sq ft of new additions. He asked the commission why only the demolition and not the design were being heard at this meeting.

Peter Batty and Ron Ramsingh clarified this issue for Mr. Stratton.

No public comment.

Enid Torregrosa reviewed her staff report. She stated that many of the structures were build illegally. She recommends approval for the first reading for demolition.

Nils Muench made a motion to approve the first hearing of demolition; it was seconded by George Galvan. Motion carried.

APPROVED

5. Request to enclose existing back porch and built gable roof- # **1403 Catherine Street- Applicant: Matthew Stratton, Architect (H10-01-96)** – Enclose existing covered porch at rear with gable roof structure and extend existing flat roof porch 7'-6" toward rear. Add 5' by 8' wood deck landing opposite porch extension.

Matthew Stratton represented the project. He stated that this project was the enclosure of a non-historic rear porch. They planned to close the porch and expand it by a few square feet and expansion of a flat roof another 8 square feet.

No public comment.

Enid Torregrosa reviewed her staff report. She stated that the design and scale of the project was in keeping with the historic district and recommended approval.

Nils Muench made a motion to approve the project; it was seconded by George Galvan. Motion carried.

APPROVED

6. Request to demolish non historic addition and exterior staircase and construction of new frame building, new exterior staircase, restoration of existing structures, new swimming pool and site improvements- #**802-804-806 and 808 Whitehead Street, #324 Petronia Street, #809-811 Terry Lane Applicant: Michael B. Ingram- MBI-K2M Architecture (H10-01-101)- #802-804 Whitehead-** removal of single story addition and replace with 35'-0" by 30'-2" by 25'-7" high addition plus single story 30'-0" by 7'-7" addition on south elevation. Repairs of existing structure and painting. Existing sales pavilion to remain with addition of bathrooms on west end. Paint white. Existing cistern/bar to remain and reuse as walk in cooler, infill to be wood white lattice,

Compressor equipment housed in louvered boxed area to eliminate visual clutter. #324 Petronia Street-Existing building to remain. Remove awning section on north elevation, replace with section to match side profile. Signage as shown, building to be painted. Remove stair at east side. Market place pavilion to remain, Petronia Street end to be enclosed. Remove deteriorated wood/ glass doors and leave open. Paint white. #808 Whitehead Street Repair and replace wood siding to match. Replace wood windows with Marvin wood true divided light units with smallest muntins. Replace one window with four panel wood door. Porch railings to be in filled with 2 by 2 balusters. Paint. This building will contain three units for living. New control pavilion painted white. Existing sales booth for HTA trolleys relocated from corner of Petronia Street to Whitehead Street. Site improvements including refuse area, fences, new swimming pool with water feature, parking area and landscape.

POSTPONED UNTIL NEXT MEETING

7. Request to replace porch columns-# **936 United Street, Applicant: Wayne Garcia (H10-01-92)**- Repair porch and balconies. Replace wood columns as per plans submitted.

Peter Riesman represented the project. He stated that the columns on the original porch are now unsafe; they were turned wood columns, and they want to replace them with six by six posts. He added there is a conflict between the life safety code and the HARC guidelines. He then reviewed litigation issues regarding the conflict between HARC and life safety issues.

No public comment

Enid Torregrosa reviewed her staff report. She stated that the applicant had come to HARC for permission to paint the porch, replace the decking, and replace missing railings. She stated that the applicant had planned to reuse the columns but the engineer determined that they would not meet wind codes. She offered an alternative to the proposed plan, in which they would use the same columns with a metal channel as a structural post. She added that there would be a problem on the first floor because they wanted to put turn railings on the first floor. Staff recommended denial on the basis that six by six posts were inappropriate on a historic contributing structure.

Nils Muench stated that he did not approve of the proposed plans and he felt they went against existing guidelines.

Rudy Molinet stated that this was an important structure and all attempts to maintain its historic appearance should be made when considering renovation. He then reviewed the letter from the applicants engineer and pointed out that he did not deem it necessary to have six by six column set up.

Peter Riesman stated that the engineer recommended verbally that the columns be six by six for life safety concerns. He stated that he did not feel that the visual impact would be different.

Peter Batty stated that he disagreed not on a the visual aspect of the columns, but on the practicality that some engineers would agree that new wood would be easier instead of attempting to find a solution.

Daniel Metzler stated that it is important to know the live load and dead load as well as the grade of the wood that the engineer used to determine his calculations.

George Galvan stated that he agreed with the applicants plans and saw it as a compromise to take care of the existing life safety issue.

Wayne Garcia stated that there was a partial collapse on the east end of the porch that required emergency bracing. He added that the railings on the first floor were non historic.

Enid Torregrosa stated that the model created is not on a large scale to determine if it is acceptable to HARC.

Peter Riesman stated that the current situation is unsafe and the original column structure was six by six except areas where it was turned down.

Peter Batty asked the applicant if they were willing to create a larger scale model and bring it before HARC again.

Peter Riesman stated they would agree to create a larger scale model.

Rudy Molinet asked the applicant if the existing columns were braced and structurally sound for the time being.

Peter Riesman stated that the current structure was properly braced.

Wayne Garcia stated that they had saved the original gingerbread and porch spindles in storage and 70% of them are reusable.

Enid Torregrosa explained that the painting and deck restoration was staff approved, however when the columns were brought up it created an issue that needed to be reviewed by the commission.

George Galvan made a motion to table and for the applicant to bring back a larger scale sample; it was seconded by Rudy Molinet.

George Galvan made a motion for reconsideration on the issue.

Carlos Rojas stated that he would like to have an opinion form the chief building official on the safety of the structure.

George Galvan made a motion to table with the applicant bringing back a sample of the new column and existing column as well have a determination on the life safety issue made by the chief building official; Rudy Molinet seconded the motion.

Rudy Molinet withdrew his second for discussion.

Nils Muench stated that the type and quality of wood can still be chosen to meet the building issues. He stated that there are other options in replacing these columns that need to be explored.

Daniel Metzler stated the importance of the columns.

Rudy Molinet stated that there are other outlets to acquire old growth pine that need to be considered. He seconded the motion to table. Motion carried.

TABLED

Enid Torregrosa reviewed the upcoming projects and second readings to determine when and where the next HARC meeting would be held.

Enid Torregrosa stated that the new HARC numbers are going to be smaller and a notice will be displayed at the building site for any property under construction in the Historic District.

Enid Torregrosa introduced Quincy Perkins who presented his project of mapping all contributing houses in the historic district by using Google Maps.

7. Comments from Commissioners

The commissioners thanked Mr. Perkins for his project and volunteered time.

8. Adjournment

George Galvan made a motion to adjourn; it was seconded by Nils Muench. Motion carried.

Interested parties may appear at the public hearing(s) and be heard with respect to the proposed items. Copies of the applications are available from the City of Key West Planning Department located at 3140 Flagler Avenue, Key West, Florida, Monday through Friday between the hours of 8:00 am and 5:00 pm.

Anyone who may wish to appeal any decision made by the HARC Commission at this meeting will need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceeding is made which includes the testimony and evidence which the appeal will be based. Florida Statute 286.0105.

ADA ASSISTANCE: If you are a person with a disability who needs special accommodations in order to participate in this proceeding, please contact the ADA Coordinator at 305-809-3951 between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., or information on access available to individuals with disabilities. To request materials in accessible format, a sign language interpreter or other assistance (5 days advance notice required), please call 305-809-1000 for assistance.

Please note that one or more City Commission and or Planning Board members may be present at this meeting.