

# Minutes of the Key West Historic Architectural Review Commission

June 26 2012

**DRAFT**

Page 1 of 14

## Call Meeting To Order

Vice Chairman Bryan Green acting as Chairman called the Key West Historic Architectural Review Commission (HARC) Meeting of June 26, 2012 to order at **5:31 pm** at Old City Hall, in the antechamber at 510 Greene Street, Key West.

## Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag

## Roll Call

Commissioners present include: Donna Bosold, Theo Glorie, Maggie Gutierrez, Daniel Metzler, Michael Miller, and Vice Chairman Bryan Green acting as Chair.

Commissioners absent: Chairman Rudy Molinet

Also, present from City staff: Assistant City Attorney Ron Ramsingh, Historic Perseveration Planner Enid Torregrosa, IT Ian Willis, and Recording Secretary Jo Bennett.

## Approval of Agenda

Chairman Bryan Green inquired as to any changes to the agenda. Enid Torregrosa stated that item 12 was withdrawn by the applicant.

### Actions/Motions:

A motion was made that the Agenda with changes as stated by Ms. Torregrosa be **Approved**. The motion **Passed** by a unanimous voice vote.

## Approval of Minutes

### 1 May 09, 2012

### Actions/Motions:

A motion was made by Mr. Theo Glorie, seconded by Mr. Daniel Metzler, that the Minutes be **Approved**. The motion **Passed** by a unanimous voice vote.

### 2 June 12, 2012

### Actions/Motions:

A motion was made by Mr. Daniel Metzler, seconded by Mr. Theo Glorie, that the Minutes be **Approved**. The motion **Passed** by a unanimous voice vote.

## HARC Planner's Report

Ms. Torregrosa stated that for her HARC Planner's Report per the discussion at the last meeting concerning updating the minimal requirements for a submittal she would like to discuss the document included as item 3. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the expectation is that this document will be used to supplement page 56 of the Guidelines. Ms. Torregrosa outlined the process necessary to update the Guidelines for the Commissioners.

Michael Miller and Donna Bosold both had some several suggestions for improvements to the list.

Bryan Green asked that the suggested modifications be made to the document and then it be re-distributed to the Commissioners prior to the next meeting. Mr. Green added that the item will need to be on the next meeting for review and voting for approval.

## Assistant City Attorney's Report

# Minutes of the Key West Historic Architectural Review Commission

June 26 2012

**DRAFT**

Page 2 of 14

	<p>Mr. Ramsingh reported that the 221 Elizabeth Appeal has been dismissed. Mr. Ramsingh also reported that 2 Scheppens Lane had filed a Rit of Probation claiming that the City Chief Building Official had wrongly condemned the sundeck. The City was also successful in this action. Mr. Ramsingh also stated that the Victor Cushman white roof case has once again been postponed. Mr. Ramsingh concluded stating that the contractor for 300 Front Street (windows) has filed an appeal to the Special Magistrate.</p>
<b>Old Business</b>	
<b>3</b>	<p><b>Approval of HARC Minimum Requirements for Submittals as a replacement to Supporting Documents for HARC Review under page 56 of the Guidelines.</b></p> <p>This item was discussed during the HARC Planner's Report</p> <p><b>Actions/Motions:</b> A motion was made that the item be <b>Postponed</b> until the document is updated with the Commissioner's suggested updates. The motion <b>Passed</b> by a unanimous voice vote.</p>
<b>4a</b>	<p><b>New two story house and new fence-#914 James Street – Seatech of the Florida Keys (H12-01-345)</b></p> <p>Owen Trepannier presented the project. Mr. Trepannier explained the history of the project. Mr. Trepannier outlined the changes he made to the project to adjust the structure so it would better fit the neighborhood yet also suit the needs of the owner. Mr. Trepannier reviewed the two proposed options for the project. Mr. Trepannier discussed the mass and scale of the project in relation to the other buildings in the neighborhood. Mr. Trepannier remained to respond to questions from the Commission.</p> <p><b>Public Comments:</b> There were no public comments.</p> <p><b>Staff Report:</b> <b>Design:</b> Enid Torregrosa presented her Staff report. Ms. Torregrosa stated that this is a request for the construction of a new two-story house. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the plans propose the demolition of a one story non-contributing house. Ms. Torregrosa reminded the Commission that on February 8, 2012 the Commission approved plans for the "restoration" of the historic portion of the house and a new two-story addition. Ms. Torregrosa added that on March 28, a new application was postponed by the Commission for the demolition of the entire house and the new construction of a two-story structure. Ms. Torregrosa stated that on May 9 and May 22, revised plans were submitted and the project on both occasions was, again, postponed. On June 12 this item was postponed since the vote for motions were tied. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is Staff's opinion that both proposals are inconsistent with many of the guidelines for new construction. Ms. Torregrosa stated that Staff understands that although the building will be setback from the sidewalk approximately 13', due to the proposed side main gable roof it will be perceived taller than the non historic house on the east side. The main façade of the East side house is also setback from the sidewalk, but approximately 15'. Ms. Torregrosa added that the scale of the proposed house would not be in keeping to the scale and massing of the existing historic houses on that urban block. Ms. Torregrosa stated that Staff understands that most of the historic urban context on this part in town has been lost but what is still left as historic should be protected. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is Staff's opinion that, although the applicant had tried to lower the main façade's scale by incorporating hip roofs, the massing and scale of the entire house is not appropriate when reviewing what still standing as historic fabric.</p>

# Minutes of the Key West Historic Architectural Review Commission

June 26 2012

**DRAFT**

Page 3 of 14

## **Demolition:**

Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is Staff's opinion that what will be left of the historic part of the house once demolition takes place will be the West side of the house and the roof. Ms. Torregrosa stated although the historic part of the house is not irrevocably compromise by extreme deterioration it has been altered through time and there is not much left of the historic fabric.

## **Commission Discussion:**

Bryan Green inquired as to if what is in the current package is the same as the last meeting. Mr. Trepannier responded that yes it was and the design is what the owner wants to build. Mr. Green asked if the front view perspective that the Commission had requested was in the package and maybe he had just missed seeing it in the package. Ms. Torregrosa responded that she also asked for the perspective drawing but never received the requested drawing. Mr. Trepannier responded that they neglected to remember that request from the Commission.

Michael Miller asked Mr. Trepannier why with knowing that the Commission would once again be only six (6) members they would bring the same plan back. Mr. Trepannier responded that the owner is ready to get moving and is committed to the design. Mr. Miller told Mr. Trepannier that without the front view perspective the presentation may be what is causing the item to fail to receive the Commissioner's support.

Daniel Metzler stated that he agrees with Mr. Miller. Mr. Metzler stated that he would be voting in favor of the project option B.

Maggie Gutierrez stated that she continues to strongly agree with Staff and cannot support either of the options. Ms. Gutierrez stated that she is very familiar with the area and that she cannot support a two-story structure at this site.

Theo Glorie stated that when looking at the first set of approved plans and asked if the applicant had considered dropping back to that set of plans.

Donna Bosold stated that she cannot support the proposal.

Bryan Green stated that he cannot support the application due to the mass and scale of the structure in relation to the neighborhood. Mr. Green added that having the second floor set back might make the overall design

## **Actions/Motions:**

A motion was made by Mr. Daniel Metzler, seconded by Mr. Michael Miller, that the item be **Approved**. The motion **Failed** by the following vote:

Yes: 3 – Mr. Glorie, Mr. Metzler, Mr. Miller

No: 3 – Ms. Bosold, Ms. Gutierrez, Mr. Green

A motion was made by Mr. Daniel Metzler, seconded by Ms. Donna Bosold, that the item be **Postponed**. The motion **Passed** by the following vote:

Yes: 6 – Ms. Bosold, Mr. Glorie, Ms. Gutierrez, Mr. Metzler, Mr. Miller, Mr. Green

**4b**

Demolition of entire house- -#914 James Street - Seatech of the Florida Keys (H12-01-345)

In an effort to expedite the meetings all discussion took place during the discussion of item 4a.

## **Actions/Motions:**

A motion was made by Mr. Daniel Metzler, seconded by Ms. Maggie Guterrez, that the item be **Postponed**. The motion **Passed** by a unanimous voice vote.

# Minutes of the Key West Historic Architectural Review Commission

June 26 2012

**DRAFT**

Page 4 of 14

<b>5</b>	<p>Demolition of existing roof over one story structure on back of main house-<b>#513 Margaret Street – Michael Miller (H12-01-1014)- First reading</b></p> <p>Commissioner Miller recused himself from the discussion because he is the architect for the project.</p> <p>Michael Miller presented the project. Mr. Miller reminded the design was approved at the last meeting.</p> <p><b>Public Comments:</b> There were no public comments.</p> <p><b>Staff Report:</b> Enid Torregrosa presented her staff report. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is Staff’s opinion that the Commission can consider the request for demolition, as it is consistent with the criteria for demolitions in the historic district, Sec. 102-218 of the Land Development Regulations. The proposed demolition will be on an existing roof that is not historic. If the demolition is approved a second reading will be requested.</p> <p><b>Commission Discussion:</b> The Commissioners had no additional comments or discussion.</p> <p><b>Actions/Motions:</b> A motion was made by Mr. Theo Glorie, seconded by Ms. Donna Bosold, that the item be <b>Approved</b>. The motion <b>Passed</b> by the following vote: Yes: 5 – Ms. Bosold, Mr. Glorie, Ms. Gutierrez, Mr. Metzler, Mr. Green Recuse: 1 - Mr. Miller</p>
<b>New Business</b>	
<b>6a</b>	<p>Addition at front of the house- <b>#1114 Margaret Street- Richard Logan (H12-01-973)</b></p> <p>Richard Logan the owner and architect presented the project. Mr. Logan brought a scale model of the structure for the Commission’s viewing. Mr. Logan explained the history of the house. Mr. Logan stated that now that he has retired and spending more time at the house, he has determined he needs a little more room. Mr. Logan remained to respond to questions from the Commissioners.</p> <p><b>Public Comments:</b> There were no public comments.</p> <p><b>Staff Report:</b> <b>Design:</b> Enid Torregrosa presented her staff report. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the house exhibits a contemporary unique façade and the building is setback from the right-of-way approximately thirty feet. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the addition will be rectangular in footprint and one story with a shed roof. Ms. Torregrosa stated that both neighboring houses, 1112 and 1116 Margaret Street are listed as contributing resources and are one-story structures. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is Staff’s opinion that although the new design depicts a non-traditional new addition it will be appropriate to the existing house and to its surrounding historic urban context. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the new design will create a front volume much needed in the site since the existing structure is too set back from the street. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the new façade will also give to the existing house better scale and massing that will be more harmonious to its context; the existing house reads as an ancillary structure where compare with its surrounding structures. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is Staff’s opinion that the new design complies with the guidelines.</p>

# Minutes of the Key West Historic Architectural Review Commission

June 26 2012

**DRAFT**

Page 5 of 14

	<p><b>Demolition:</b> Enid Torregrosa presented her staff report. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is Staff's opinion that the Commission can consider the request for demolition as it is consistent with the criteria for demolitions in the historic district, Sec. 102-218 of the Land Development Regulations. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the proposed demolition will be for a non-historic front porch. Ms. Torregrosa stated that if the demolition is approved a second reading will be requested.</p> <p><b>Commission Discussion:</b> Theo Glorie asked if the front siding considered a wall. Mr. Logan responded that the front is part of the structure and that it will have glass above the area – he just did not put glass in the model.</p> <p>Michael Miller complemented the applicant on the presentation. Mr. Miller stated that he was a member of HARC when the first re-design of the house was presented. Mr. Miller stated he has a problem with the wall and the matter of scale. Mr. Miller stated that he finds it less inviting with the wall and the side entrance. Mr. Miller continued stating that he thinks the design turns a blind face to the road. Mr. Logan stated that the issue is that his lot is narrow yet long which complicates a design facing the road. Mr. Logan stated that the purpose of the wall is to give some privacy.</p> <p>Donna Bosold inquired if there are plans for landscaping in the front. Mr. Logan responded that his plans are landscape as much as possible.</p> <p>Bryan Green stated that he agreed with Mr. Miller about the blind face to the road but there isn't anything in the Guidelines that is against it.</p> <p>Daniel Metzler complemented the presentation. Mr. Metzler stated that he likes the contrast.</p> <p><b>Actions/Motions:</b> A motion was made by Mr. Daniel Metzler, seconded by Mr. Theo Glorie, that the item be <b>Approved</b>. The motion <b>Passed</b> by the following vote: Yes: 6 – Ms. Bosold, Mr. Glorie, Ms. Gutierrez, Mr. Metzler, Mr. Miller, Mr. Green</p>
<b>6b</b>	<p>Removal of front porch- <b>#1114 Margaret Street- Richard Logan (H12-01-973)</b></p> <p>In an effort to expedite the meetings all discussion took place during the discussion of item 6a.</p> <p><b>Actions/Motions:</b> A motion was made by Mr. Daniel Metzler, seconded by Ms. Maggie Guterrez, that the item be <b>Approved</b>. The motion <b>Passed</b> by a unanimous voice vote.</p>
<b>7a</b>	<p>Alteration of portion of front façade for new outdoor dining patio and glass entry wall- <b>#610 Greene Street- David Knoll (H12-01-975)</b></p> <p>David Knoll presented the project. Mr. Knoll explained the project, which involves creating an open air patio seating area for the restaurant. Mr. Knoll spent some time explaining the building as it exist and what is proposed to take place to accomplish opening up the front of the building to result in the open air seating area in the front of the building. Mr. Knoll stated that if the project is approved they plan to submit an additional application for an awning but that is not included in this portion of the project.</p> <p><b>Public Comments:</b> There were no public comments.</p> <p><b>Staff Report:</b></p>

# Minutes of the Key West Historic Architectural Review Commission

June 26 2012

**DRAFT**

Page 6 of 14

## **Design:**

Enid Torregrosa presented her staff report. Ms. Torregrosa stated that for an alteration to a front façade on a non-contributing commercial building. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the building is not listed in the surveys and according to the Property Appraiser's records it was built in 1973 (represented as building 2 in the PA records). Ms. Torregrosa stated that the existing building is not historic and has a symmetrical façade reinforced with a stepped parapet with its highest point on the center. Ms. Torregrosa stated that three wood awnings, similar to the one located on 612 Greene Street (contributing building built ca. 1928) reinforces the building's symmetrical façade. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the building's exterior walls are covered with wood siding. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the new design proposes the partial removal of the left and central portions of the façade in order to create one entrance. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the design proposes the removal of two existing awnings. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is Staff's opinion that the proposed design fails in meet Guidelines (1) and (3), (5) of page 38a, and (5) of page 46. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the proposed alteration of the façade, although designed for a non-historic building, will alter the balance and symmetry of it. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the building will lose integrity since there is an imposed partial façade that does not maintain any relationship with the whole frontal elevation and configuration of the structure. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the building in question is between two historic and contributing structures, which have symmetrical facades. Ms. Torregrosa stated that by creating the new design the building will no longer have a harmonious relation with its historic context. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the use of brick veneer on part of the elevation will make this new design stick out from the rest of the façade. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is Staff's opinion that this proposed design is not appropriate to the existing building or to its surrounding historic context.

## **Demolition:**

Enid Torregrosa presented her staff report. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the proposed demolition will be for a non-historic front commercial façade. If the demolition is approved a second reading will be requested.

## **Commission Discussion:**

Michael Miller stated that the package leave a lot to the imagination. Mr. Miller explained that the abstract drawings did not supply enough information but because he is an architect he thinks he understands what is going to take place with the structure. Mr. Miller asked Mr. Knoll responded to several questions in order to clarify the proposed design.

Donna Bosold asked just were the property line is as it relates to the building. Mr. Knoll responded that the building is approximately six inches from the property line.

Daniel Metzler stated that he agrees with Staff and that he would prefer to see the design changed in order to make the structure more symmetrical. Mr. Metzler suggested that the applicant postpone the item in order to come back with a new drawing that is more symmetrical.

Theo Glorie stated that he too thinks the design makes the building out of sync with the surrounding buildings.

Bryan Green stated that he is concerned about the project's design and the fact that they are cutting off part of the building to create the outdoor patio. Mr. Green suggested that instead of requesting of postponement that the applicant withdraw the application and return with a new improved drawing.

## **Actions/Motions:**

A motion was made by Mr. Daniel Metzler, seconded by Mr. Theo Glorie, that the item be **Postponed**.

# Minutes of the Key West Historic Architectural Review Commission

June 26 2012

**DRAFT**

Page 7 of 14

Prior to the vote the applicant **Withdrew** the application.

**7b** Partial demolition of façade- **#610 Greene Street- David Knoll (H12-01-975)**

In an effort to expedite the meetings all discussion took place during the discussion of item 7a.

The application was **Withdrawn** by the applicant.

**8** Restore art deco facade of 422 Appelrouth Lane and replace involuntarily destroyed structure at 420 Appelrouth Lane-**#420-422 Appelrouth Lane- Will Shepler (H12-01-996)**

Will Shepler presented the project. Mr. Shepler reviewed the history of the project and stated that they already have an approved project for rebuilding the roofs of the structures but once they farther along with the project they determined there was too much deterioration to make that project possible and they are seizing the opportunity to improve the buildings with a new proposed design. Mr. Shepler stated that they will be submitting a separate application for the sign.

**Public Comments:**

There were no public comments.

**Staff Report:**

Enid Torregrosa presented her staff report. Ms. Torregrosa stated that for the design proposal of 420 Appelrouth staff understands that the new façade is in keeping with the surrounding structures in the area. Ms. Torregrosa stated that although the new design evokes art deco elements it still reads as a contemporary interpretation. Ms. Torregrosa stated that Staff also understands that the proposed restoration for 422 Appelrouth Lane proofs to be consistent with the guidelines as it is based on existing evidence showing the character defining elements of the historic cbs structure. Ms. Torregrosa stated that Staff only concern regarding the application is the proposed color scheme, which is not traditional to the historic district and if approved can create a precedent. Ms. Torregrosa stated that otherwise it is staff's opinion that the proposed design will fit well in the historic urban fabric and that it is consistent with the guidelines for additions, alterations and new construction.

**Commission Discussion:**

Theo Glorie asked if they are affiliated with Better Than Sex since their colors are the same. Mr. Glorie stated that he likes the design but not the color.

Daniel Metzler asked if the awning is over the Public Right-Of-Way. Mr. Ramsingh responded that there are provisions in the LDRs. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the signage is not being reviewed at this time. Mr. Metzler stated that he likes the design but he would like the color to be different.

Bryan Green stated that he is pleased to see the regeneration of Appelrouth Lane. Mr. Green suggested that they change colors instead of pushing for the strong read.

Donna Bosold stated she was impressed with the design but not the colors.

Michael Miller discussed the deco design vs contempory design and the stucco. Mr. Miller stated that he likes the design but as with the other Commissioners he too would prefer to see a different color used.

**Actions/Motions:**

A motion was made by Mr. Michael Miller, seconded by Ms. Donna Bosold, that the design portion of item be **Approved** but not the colors nor the sign. The motion **Passed** by the



# Minutes of the Key West Historic Architectural Review Commission

June 26 2012

**DRAFT**

Page 8 of 14

	following vote: Yes: 6 – Ms. Bosold, Mr. Glorie, Ms. Gutierrez, Mr. Metzler, Mr. Miller, Mr. Green
<b>9a</b>	<p>Re-open front porch. New wood windows and doors. New rear addition and carport. New pool and rear deck. Repair and replace front wall and fence and new picket fence on side property lines- - <b>#517 Elizabeth Street- Thomas E. Pope (H12-01-997)</b></p> <p>Tom Pope presented the project. Mr. Pope explained that the site has a garage that they are requesting the demolition of it and its replacement with a more appropriate design. Mr. Pope stated that new wood windows and doors are also proposed as well as new wood lap siding to replace the existing where needed as well as over existing walls of attached CBS structure. Mr. Pope stated that the proposed swimming pool and deck will be located on the back of the site and not visible from the street. Mr. Pope remained to respond to Commissioner's questions.</p> <p><b>Public Comments:</b> There were no public comments.</p> <p><b>Staff Report:</b> <b>Design:</b> Enid Torregrosa presented her staff report. Ms. Torregrosa stated that this is for a restoration of a two story front porch that at one point in time was enclosed. The plans also include a new one story back addition and new pool and rear deck. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is Staff's opinion that the new design complies with the Guidelines. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the proposed mass, scale and design of the new addition and carport are appropriate to the historic fabric.</p> <p><b>Demolition:</b> Enid Torregrosa presented her staff report. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is Staff's opinion that the Commission can consider the request for demolition as it is consistent with the criteria for demolitions in the historic district, Sec. 102-218 of the Land Development Regulations. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the proposed demolitions will be for a non-historic attached additions and structures and for completely altered portions of the historic house. Ms. Torregrosa stated that if the demolition is approved a second reading will be requested.</p> <p><b>Commission Discussion:</b> Theo Glorie responded "Awesome".</p> <p>Michael Miller stated nicely done and asked how the windows were going to be protected. Mr. Pope responded that there would be using Plexi-glass with casement panels.</p> <p><b>Actions/Motions:</b> A motion was made by Mr. Theo Glorie, seconded by Ms. Maggie Gutierrez, that the item be <b>Approved</b>. The motion <b>Passed</b> by the following vote: Yes: 6 – Ms. Bosold, Mr. Glorie, Ms. Gutierrez, Mr. Metzler, Mr. Miller, Mr. Green</p>
<b>9b</b>	<p>Demolition of rear additions, carport, garage, side deck and portion of side one story addition-<b>#517 Elizabeth Street- Thomas E. Pope (H12-01-997)</b></p> <p>In an effort to expedite the meetings all discussion took place during the discussion of item 9a.</p> <p><b>Actions/Motions:</b> A motion was made by Ms. Maggie Gutierrez, seconded by Mr. Theo Glorie, that the item be <b>Approved</b>. The motion <b>Passed</b> by the following vote: Yes: 6 – Ms. Bosold, Mr. Glorie, Ms. Gutierrez, Mr. Metzler, Mr. Miller, Mr. Green</p>



# Minutes of the Key West Historic Architectural Review Commission

June 26 2012

**DRAFT**

Page 9 of 14

<b>10a</b>	<p>Elevate house +/- 4" to FEMA elevation of 7'. Relocate front doors. New rear addition to extend existing sawtooth and exterior renovations- <b>#411 Grinnell Street- Thomas E. Pope (H12-01-998)</b></p> <p>Tom Pope presented the project. Mr. Pope explained that the house is below FEMA flood zone regulations therefore they want to raise it up. Mr. Pope stated that the proposed one story addition will be on the south side of the back portion of the house and will have a gable roof. Mr. Pope The plans also include a pavilion attached to the back portion of the house. Mr. Pope stated that the existing front doors on the front façade will be relocated to the left side of the façade. Mr. Pope stated that the new gazebo will be attached. Mr. Pope remained to respond to Commissioner's questions.</p> <p><b>Public Comments:</b> There were no public comments.</p> <p><b>Design:</b> Enid Torregrosa presented her staff report. Ms. Torregrosa stated that plans include the request to raise the house +/-4" from its existing height in order to protect the house during floods. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the main house located on 411 Grinnell Street is listed as a contributing resource. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the two-story structure was built in 1899. Ms. Torregrosa stated that through time this structure has been altered and today part of the back structure has the same width of the main house. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the owners of this house recently bought the lot located on the south side. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is Staff's opinion that the proposed plans are consistent with the guidelines for additions and alterations. Ms. Torregrosa stated that Staff recommends to the Commission that the house should not be raised more than 4 inches since the house next door has almost the same finish floor elevation. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the location of the house in relation to the site must not be altered when raising the structure, as depicted in the plans. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is Staff's opinion that the scale, mass and proportions of the proposed addition and the pavilion are in keeping with the historic house and its surroundings. Ms. Torregrosa stated that if approved this project may require Planning Board review for side variances since this is a non-conforming structure.</p> <p><b>Demolition:</b> Enid Torregrosa presented her staff report. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is Staff's opinion that the Commission can consider the request for demolition as it is consistent with the criteria for demolitions in the historic district, Sec. 102-218 of the Land Development Regulations. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the proposed demolitions will be for non-historic attached additions and a shed that do not contribute to the integrity of the historic building. Ms. Torregrosa stated that if the demolition is approved a second reading will be requested.</p> <p><b>Commission Discussion:</b> Michael Miller asked if they plan to straighten the structure on the lot. Mr. Pope responded that they do not plan to change the location of the house.</p> <p><b>Actions/Motions:</b> A motion was made by Mr. Daniel Metzler, seconded by Mr. Michael Miller, that the item be <b>Approved</b>. The motion <b>Passed</b> by the following vote: Yes: 6 – Ms. Bosold, Mr. Glorie, Ms. Gutierrez, Mr. Metzler, Mr. Miller, Mr. Green</p>
<b>10b</b>	<p>Demolition of rear gazebo, shed and rear deck- <b>#411 Grinnell Street- Thomas E. Pope (H12-01-998)</b></p> <p>In an effort to expedite the meetings all discussion took place during the discussion of item 10a.</p>

# Minutes of the Key West Historic Architectural Review Commission

June 26 2012

**DRAFT**

Page 10 of 14

	<p><b>Actions/Motions:</b> A motion was made by Mr. Daniel Metzler, seconded by Ms. Maggie Gutierrez, that the item be <b>Approved</b>. The motion <b>Passed</b> by the following vote: Yes: 6 – Ms. Bosold, Mr. Glorie, Ms. Gutierrez, Mr. Metzler, Mr. Miller, Mr. Green</p>
<b>11</b>	<p>Brick entry walk and driveway. Concrete knee wall with wrought iron fence- <b>#730 Southard Street- Craig Reynolds (H12-01-1003)</b></p> <p>Craig Reynolds presented the project. Mr. Reynolds explained the construction of a four feet height concrete knee wall and wrought iron fence on the front and part of the side yards. The fence will be installed inside the property line. A wrought iron gate will be located in axis with the main entrance door. A sliding aluminum frame with wood picket gate will give access to the driveway facing Southard Street. The wrought iron pickets and frame will be black finished and the knee wall will be poured in place concrete with double line hand tooled pattern in stucco, and will not be painted. The plans also include the installation of Old Chicago brick pavers for the driveways facing Southard and William Streets.</p> <p><b>Public Comments:</b> There were no public comments.</p> <p><b>Staff Report:</b> Enid Torregrosa presented her staff report. Ms. Torregrosa stated that with the provided information it is Staff's opinion that the proposed plans are consistent with the guidelines. Ms. Torregrosa stated that although historically the site did not have a fence the proposed design is appropriate to the historic urban fabric. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the fence will be a light and transparent element that will give the owners their necessary privacy. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the proposed fence is a traditional design that can be found around the historic district.</p> <p><b>Commission Discussion:</b> Bryan Green asked why the client choose metal rather than traditional picket fence. Bryan Green stated that he thought it a odd choice for the metal. Mr. Reynolds responded that the expectation is that the fence will be more open thus giving the area a more open feel.</p> <p>Theo Glorie inquired as to how they were going to fit the fence on the side of the house that is so close to the sidewalk. Mr. Reynolds explained that the knee-wall fence would stop just short of that edge of the house and that there was not going to be a fence in that area.</p> <p>Michael Miller asked why the full working drawings. Mr. Reynolds stated the client wants the project to get moving as quickly as possible. Mr. Miller asked about the pool. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the pool had been approved earlier.</p> <p>Donna Bosold asked if the driveway area was ever paved before. Mr. Reynolds state that there were two strips of concrete in that area and it also already has a curb cut.</p> <p><b>Actions/Motions:</b> A motion was made by Mr. Michael Miller, seconded by Mr. Theo Glorie, that the item be <b>Approved</b>. The motion <b>Passed</b> by the following vote: Yes: 6 – Ms. Bosold, Mr. Glorie, Ms. Gutierrez, Mr. Metzler, Mr. Miller, Mr. Green</p>
<b>12</b>	<p>Request to rescind HARC approval H11-01-1757 to allow reconstruction of non functioning chimney to replicate original one- <b>#730 Southard Street- Adele V. Stones (H12-01-1004)</b></p>

# Minutes of the Key West Historic Architectural Review Commission

June 26 2012

**DRAFT**

Page 11 of 14

	Application was <b>Withdrawn</b> by the applicant prior to the meeting.
<b>13</b>	<p>After the fact approval to allow installation of three additional joists on second floor porch to meet current Florida Building Code floor loading requirement. Maintain historic porch joists with new joists milled to replace historic members- <b>#730 Southard Street- Adele V. Stones (H12-01-1005)</b></p> <p>Tom Pope presented the project. Mr. Pope apologized for the After-The-Fact application. Mr. Pope explained Code from the City or City departments verse Florida Building Code. Mr. Pope stated that this request for an after-the-fact installation of three joists under the second floor front and side porches. Mr. Pope introduced the project Structural Engineer Garland "Butch" Wilson. Mr. Wilson explained they needed to improve the porches since they were dangerous. Mr. Wilson stated that his opinion is that if the porch was loaded to actual code it would fail. Mr. Wilson stated that there may be other ways to improve the porch but this fix stays within code for all the spans. Mr. Pope explained that this fix allowed them to leave the historic fabric by added additional beams to improve the strength of the porch. Mr. Pope explained that the construction documents have the changes on them but the HARC approved plans did not.</p> <p><b>Public Comments:</b> There were no public comments.</p> <p><b>Staff Report:</b> Enid Torregrosa presented her staff report. Ms. Torregrosa stated that this is a request for an after the fact installation of three joists under the second floor front and side porches. Ms. Torregrosa stated that according to the construction plans that were submitted and approved by the Building Department a building section depicts the introduction of "three new 3 x 4 deck joists between existing". Ms. Torregrosa stated that the house originally had just three joists. Ms. Torregrosa stated that on the HARC approved plans, although there were no sections submitted, the architect included the phrase "restore wood porch" on the Southard and William Streets Elevations. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the architect also included in the elevation drawings a note stating "Contractor to remove and replace in kind rotted and/or deteriorated wood members as approved by architect and reviewed by HARC coordinator". Ms. Torregrosa stated that Staff was never advised by the contractor or the architect of the increasing of joist number under the second floor porch. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is Staff's opinion that if there was a need to make such a radical change to the front porches such change should have been presented in front of the Commission and prior to construction. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is Staff's opinion that the visual quality of the historic porch has been compromised by the introduction of additional structural elements. Ms. Torregrosa stated that Staff also understand that if there was a need in changing structural capacity in the second floor porch the architect or engineer should have considered the intent and purpose of the Florida Building Code for Existing Buildings regarding historic buildings. Ms. Torregrosa concluded stating that what has been done under the second floor front and side porches on this historic house has not been a restoration by any means. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the historic character and craftsmanship that the house used to exhibit under the second floor porches has been altered.</p> <p><b>Commission Discussion:</b> Bryan Green asked Enid it was her position that there was a need to strengthen the porch floor. Ms. Torregrosa stated that she is not a Structural Engineer but the expectation is that the project team would work with the Historic Planner to review the alternatives/options and determine the best overall solution.</p> <p>Daniel Metzler asked Mr. Wilson what was the design live load requirement for the porch. Mr. Wilson responded 40 pounds per square foot and that he used #1 Southern Pine based at two foot which is a little conservative.</p>

# Minutes of the Key West Historic Architectural Review Commission

June 26 2012

**DRAFT**

Page 12 of 14

Maggie Gutierrez stated that this situation is embarrassing. Ms. Gutierrez asked Mr. Pope if they placed a call to the HARC or Building Departments prior to moving forward with the changes. Mr. Pope responded that he did not think to do so at the time but did speak with John Woodson today. Maggie Gutierrez stated that she agrees with Staff and cannot support the design.

Donna Bosold asked Mr. Wilson how long he had been on the project. Mr. Wilson responded he has been with the project from the start.

Ron Ramsingh stated that this is a difficult situation. Mr. Ramsingh suggested the Commissioners use the Florida Building Code as it relates to Historic structures. In an effort to help the Commissioners with their decision, Mr. Ramsingh reviewed the Florida Building Chapter 11 for the Commissioners. Mr. Ramsingh added that it is his opinion that John Woodson, the City Chief Building Official needs to address the life safety issue and asked if the Commission would like for him to obtain Mr. Woodson's opinion.

Bryan Green asked if there was an alternative to what was done. Mr. Wilson stated that there were other alternatives to strengthen the porch and listed several. Mr. Green stated that he agrees with Mr. Ramsingh and suggested that this should be taken to the City Chief Building Official for his opinion to determine if there was a life safety issue.

Michael Miller stated that what we are talking about is restoration verse rehabilitation. Mr. Miller stated that if this is to be considered a restoration then he could not support the application. Mr. Miller added that surely the porch, as it currently stands after over a hundred years, would fall down if loaded, but it has been there for over a hundred and twenty years without failing as designed. Mr. Miller drew the Commissioners attention to the Florida Building Code for Historic structures adding that code gives them latitude if this is a restoration rather than a rehabilitation. Mr. Miller asked Mr. Wilson if he had made the three 3x4s paralims would they have met building code. Mr. Wilson responded "yes". Mr. Metzler asked Mr. Wilson if they would have been the same size as the historic joist. Mr. Wilson responded "more than likely" adding that paralims have twice the bending strength as a regular piece of wood. Mr. Pope stated the reason they went in the direction they did with the additional joist was that their desire was not to disturb the historic fabric. Mr. Pope stated that that their main concern is load of a large family activities on the porch.

Bryan Green stated that it is what it is and there isn't anything in the Guidelines that defines handling one contributing house from another. Mr. Green stated that due to this house being what it is, we are holding it to a higher standard than we might hold other houses. Mr. Green added that he thinks we are holding this building to a higher standard just because it is such a spectacular house. Mr. Green stated that the question to him is "Is this a defining feature" and stated that he did not find it to be a defining feature. Mr. Green stated that his concern is that other alternatives may not be acceptable. Mr. Miller reminded the Commissioners that Mr. Wilson had earlier stated that there were other alternatives to strengthen the porch and that the use of paralims would allow for the reconstruction to have the same appearance as the historic joist. Mr. Miller stated that he can support the construction as a rehabilitation but not as a restoration.

Donna Bosold stated that she agrees with Mr. Ramsingh that before the Commission makes a decision that they need the opinion of Mr. Woodson.

The Commissioners decided it was best to refer to the City Chief Building Official for his opinion prior to making a decision and asked Mr. Ramsingh to speak with Mr. Woodson.

## **Actions/Motions:**

A motion was made by Theo Glorie, seconded by Mr. Daniel Metzler, that the item be

# Minutes of the Key West Historic Architectural Review Commission

June 26 2012

**DRAFT**

Page 13 of 14

	<p><b>Approved.</b> The motion and the second were withdrawn following the Commissioner's discussion.</p> <p>A motion was made by Mr. Michael Miller, seconded by Ms. Donna Bosold, that the item be <b>Postponed.</b> The motion <b>Passed</b> by the following vote: Yes: 6 – Ms. Bosold, Mr. Glorie, Ms. Gutierrez, Mr. Metzler, Mr. Miller, Mr. Green</p>
<b>14</b>	<p>After the fact approval to revise existing porch fascia detail to eliminate water retention and pooling at joinder of piers and porch joists in order to preserve integrity of porch joists and columns by extending fascia to a minimum protrusion of existing piers- <b>#730 Southard Street- Adele V. Stones (H12-01-1006)</b></p> <p>Tom Pope presented the project. Mr. Pope explained that they revised existing porch fascia detail, which was to eliminate water retention and pooling at joinder of piers and porch joists in order to preserve integrity of porch joists and columns by extending fascia to a minimum protrusion of existing piers. Mr. Pope explained that the downstairs porches were in very bad shape. Mr. Pope explained what they changed and why they did so. Mr. Pope stated that he was attempting to do away with a water problem. Mr. Pope remained to respond to questions from the Commissioners.</p> <p><b>Public Comments:</b> There were no public comments.</p> <p><b>Staff Report:</b> Enid Torregrosa presented her staff report. Ms. Torregrosa stated that this after the fact consideration of new foundations that were not built flush with the front fascia board. Ms. Torregrosa stated that this construction detail creates a visual effect that the sides and front of the house are <i>floating</i> since the actual foundations are setback from the fascia. Ms. Torregrosa stated that before the restoration project started the house used to have the front face of the foundation flush with the fascia board and wooden pickets were installed between the piers. Ms. Torregrosa stated that according to the approved plans by HARC this detail was going to be restored. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is Staff's opinion that the way that the perimeter foundations were built during the restoration process is inconsistent with the guidelines and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Structures. Ms. Torregrosa concluded stating that this historic house has preserved its original integrity through times and, because of that, it is a unique example of a traditional crafted vernacular architecture that must be protected and preserved.</p> <p><b>Commission Discussion:</b> Brian Green asked Mr. Pope for some clarification of what they are looking at with the new construction. Mr. Green stated that if what is build there now is unacceptable then they need to deny the application and then it would be up to the applicant to return with new drawings or rebuild according to the original approved drawings.</p> <p>Michael Miller asked Mr. Pope to explain the differenced from his original drawings and what was built. Mr. Pope reviewed the changes that were made and explaining why the actions were taken. Mr. Miller stated that he would rather see the area built as the original drawing depicted.</p> <p><b>Actions/Motions:</b> A motion was made by Ms. Maggie Gutierrez, seconded by Mr. Michael Miller, that the item be <b>Denied</b> based on Article VI- Design Guidelines in Key West Historic District, page 34-8 and Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Structures (pages 16-17) Standard 2 and Standard 5. The motion <b>Passed</b> by the following vote: Yes: 5 – Ms. Bosold, Mr. Glorie, Ms. Gutierrez, Mr. Miller, Mr. Green</p>

# Minutes of the Key West Historic Architectural Review Commission

June 26 2012

**DRAFT**

Page 14 of 14

No: 1 – Mr. Metzler

## Commissioners Comments

Michael Miller opened a discussion concerning complaints about the Commissioners being hard on applicants based on personal preferences rather than the HARC Guidedlines. Mr. Green asked Mr. Miller to go back to the Mayor for more specific concerns. Mr. Ramsingh reminded that they need to stay away from the "I like" type of comments when ever discussion an application.

Daniel Metzler stated that he feels that he thinks the applicants may not like the discussion but when ever an application is denied they always state the reasons and the Guidelines.

Brian Green stated that the HARC Guidelines deficiencies need to be addressed, ie. Colors where and want about commercial buildings

Brian Green also inquired as to the status of the Signage Document. Ms. Torregrosa stated that who ever has it needs to get it moving. Ms. Torregrosa added that she would like to have the comments from each Commissioner submitted by the next meeting.

Theo Glorie stated that he had a discussion with Code Compliance Jim Young and that Mr. Young told him that he doesn't want to enforce signage issues such as banners until the Commission completes their work on the Signage guidelines.

## Adjournment

### Actions/Motions:

A motion was made by Ms. Donna Bosold, seconded by Mr. Daniel Metzler, that the meeting be **Adjourned**. The motion **Passed** by a unanimous vote.

Meeting adjourned at **8:58 pm**.

Submitted by,

*Jo Bennett*

Administrative Coordinator  
Planning Department