

9 Revised plans as per Commission request. Two proposals, proposal 1 step back new chimney, proposal 2 no built back of chimney and installation of wood siding- Code Compliance Case - #730 Southard Street - Adele V. Stones (H11-01-655)

This staff report is for the review of two proposed options for obtaining a final approval of a Certificate of appropriateness. On January 11, 2012 the Commission motioned to approve the design of a reconstruction of a chimney with the condition that the applicant submitted plans showing a step back chimney and that historic bricks be used for the reconstruction. The applicant is submitting two proposals, the first one is a chimney that is attached to the house and its flue; once reached the eave of the house is set back. The second option is not building any chimney and the installation of wood siding in the area where the chimney used to be. The applicant also included in the packet samples of historic bricks, which include some yellow color ones.

The new proposed chimney will be wider than the historic and the conditionally approved one as depicted on the William Street elevation. A second proposal of no built back is also submitted in this packet. This option was suggested by one of the Commissioners during deliberations on the January 11, 2012 HARC meeting.

The historic chimney was a character defining element of the historic house, which is listed as a contributing resource. The house located at #730 Southard Street is a magnificent example of a two and a half story frame structure and, according to the survey, was built in 1919. An exposed brick chimney was located on the south façade and was in stable condition when the project was presented to this Commission in 2011.

The house restoration process is going its way. The plans submitted and approved by the Commission were for the <u>restoration</u> of a historic house.

Restoration: The act or process of actually recovering the form and details of a property <u>and its setting as it appeared at a particular period of time by means of the removal of later work or by the replacement of missing earlier work.</u>

Understanding the true meaning of the word restoration it is staff opinion that the new proposed chimney design does not complies neither with the purpose of restoration nor with the Commission's motion of the chimney to be setback from the building. A restoration process involves recovering and preserving character defining features that makes a historic building unique. The historic chimney had a slimmer and less bulky configuration towards William Street and only its base was attached to the historic fabric.

Staff understands that the following guidelines can be reviewed for this application:

Building Exteriors- Masonry (page 25);

(6) Physical evidence guiding the repair or replacement work may include the actual portions of surviving masonry fabric, historical photo documentation, verifiable historic descriptions or new designs based on the original which are compatible with the size, scale, material and color of the historic building.

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings clearly states under roofs:

Recommended:

Replacing in kind an entire feature of the roof that is too deteriorated to repair- if the overall form and detailing are still evidence-using the physical evidence to guide the new work. Examples can include large section of roofing, or a dormer or chimney. If using the same kind of material is not technically or economically feasible, then a compatible substitute material may be considered.

Not Recommended

Removing a feature of the roof that is unrepairable, such as a chimney or dormer, and not replacing it; or replacing it with a new feature that does not convey the same visual appearance.

Standard 6

Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

The LDR establishes under Sec. 102-154- Compliance with certain federal standards, that the historic architectural review commission shall not approve any proposed work which will be in conflict with the US The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (revised 1992)

It is staff's opinion that the proposed chimney is inconsistent with the guidelines as well as the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings. It is staff's understanding that the new replacement should be more in keeping with the form and configuration of the chimney that was

demolished. The new design does not convey the same visual appearance of the historic chimney and does not match the old in design and visual qualities.

Staff wants to analyze the second proposal of no built back. According to the applicant Building Code and Fire Code were not going to be met if the historic chimney was operable, the original intent that was presented to this Commission. The plans approved by this Commission for the restoration of the house included the existing historic chimney with the extended flue. This extension was proposed because the original chimney finished under the eave of the house, an operable chimney will not meet actual codes on such situation. After the January 11, 2012 meeting architect met with staff and explained that he needed the proposed configuration in order to comply with codes and manufacturer's specifications and that the historic chimney did not have the configuration required.

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings includes the following under roofs (Page 16):


Recommended:

Designing and constructing a new feature when the historic feature is completely missing, such as a chimney or cupola. It may be an accurate restoration using historical, pictorial and physical documentation; or be a new design that is compatible with the size, scale, material, and color of the historic building.

Not Recommended:

Introducing a new roof feature that is incompatible in size, scale, material, and color.

After reviewing both proposals it is staff opinion that building back the chimney using the submitted plans will not comply with any of the Guidelines or the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. Proposing a no built back presumes the owner's determination of not using the chimney; which can bring into the discussion if then the chimney should be reconstructed as it used to be, with historic dimensions, and with the understanding that the new feature will not be an operable one. By not building back the chimney will be an option of not creating a *false historic chimney*.





CITY OF KEY WEST **BUILDING DEPARTMENT**

IN CO. PURIOR	CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENENSS APPLICATION # 1120 000655			
OWNER'S NAME:	Vincent Barletta, Trustee	DATE:	4/12/12	
OWNER'S ADDRESS:	730 Southard Street	PHONE #:		
APPLICANT'S NAME:	Adele V. Stones, Stones & Carde	enasphone#:	294-0252	
	S: 221 Simonton Street, Key West	FL 3304	0	
ADDRESS OF CONSTRU	JCTION: 730 Southard Street		# OF UNITS	
THE	RE WILL BE A FINAL INSPECTION REQUIRED U	NDER THIS PER	MIT	
DETAILED DESCRIPTIO	N OF WORK: y required that the conditionally approved chimney consider the conditional of the conditional o			

approved chimney considered at the January 11, 2012 meeting come back to the Board for approval of the chimney design meeting the two conditions imposed by the Board.

Proposal 1 attached pursuant to H11-01-1757 approving construction of new chimney with two conditions: (i) use of approved historic brick, and (ii) chimney "stepped back" from building.

If the Board denies approval for Proposal 1 depicting the chimney incorporating the Board's conditions, Applicant presents Proposal 2 and requests that the Board rescind approval H11-01-1757 and approve placement of wood siding in the location of the former chimney opening, no replacement chimney to be constructed. The wood siding would be installed at the 5' x7' opening of the former chimney, to match original siding on the house.

This application for Certificate of Appropriateness must precede applications for building permits, right of way permits, variances, and development review approvals. Applications must meet or exceed the requirements outlined by the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Key West's Historic Architectural Guidelines

Once completed, the application shall be reviewed by staff for completeness and either approved or scheduled for presentation to the Historic Architectural Review Commission at the next available meeting. The applicant must be present at this meeting. The filing of this application does not ensure approval as submitted.

Applications that do not possess the required Submittals will be considered incomplete and will not be reviewed for approval 3 2012

Applicant's Signature: Aleen Stone

Hogun	cu	Jun	111	н	llais
	-			=	

~	TWO SETS OF SCALED DRAWINGS OF FLOOR PLAN, SITE PLAN AND EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS (for new buildings and additions)
	TREE REMOVAL PERMIT (if applicable)
V	PHOTOGRAPHS OF EXISTING BUILDING (repairs, rehabs, or expansions)
/	PHOTOGRAPHS OF ADJACENT BUILDINGS (new buildings and additions)
/	ILLUSTRATIONS OF MANUFACTURED PRODUCTS TO BE USED SUCH AS SHUTTERS, DOORS, WINDOWS, PAINT COLOR CHIPS, AND AWNING FABRIC SAMPLES

Staff	Lise	Only
0 :0011	000	OTHY


Date:


Staff Approval:

Fee Due:\$


HISTORIC ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMISSION USE ONLY

Approved	Denied	D	eferred
Reason for Deferr	ral or Denial:		
_			
S			
HARC Comments:			
Building is	listed in the s	survey. Frame o	unawar
	•		
& gotan	y of the Inter	ions standards ;	Guidline
Guidel	ines for build	line experience at	100000000000000000000000000000000000000
		- Company	asonry p.es
Limit of Work App	proved, Conditions of A	pproval and/or Suggested	
Changes:			
			PLANNIN
			ES .
			APR 1 3 2012
Date:	Signature:		
		Historic Architectural Review Commission	ONROE COUR







#730 Southard Street Sanborn map 1892 copy




#730 Southard Street Sanborn map 1926



#730 Southard Street Sanborn map 1948 copy



#730 Southard Street Sanborn map 1962 copy





The Heritage House Collection, donated by the Campbell, Poirier and Pound families. The house at 730 Southard Street in the 1930s. From a collection of photographs taken or collected during the 1930s by the WPA workers in Key West.

Monroe County Library



Photo taken by the Property Appraiser's office c1965; 730 Southard St.; built 1919; Monroe County Library




The front of the Albury house at 730 Southard taken 1971. U.S. Navy photo. Monroe County Library


Photos Previous to the Demolition of the chimney














本00分



*003





*004



4005



*000





#4



#3
















LOCATION MAP

Port of Tract 5, City of Key West

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

On the Island of Key West and known on William A. Whitehead's map delineated in February, A.D. 1829, as Part of Lot Two (2) of Square Fifty—nine (59). Commencing at the corner of the intersection of William Street and Southard Street and running thence along the Southwesterly side of William Street in a Southeasterly direction One Hundred (100) feet; thence at right angles in a Southwesterly direction Sixty—eight and fifty—three one—hundredths (68.53) feet; thence at right angles in a Northwesterly direction One hundred (100) feet to the Southeasterly side of Southard Street; thence at right angles along the Southeasterly side of Southard Street; in a Northeasterly direction Sixty—eight and fifty—three one—hundredths (68.53) feet to the Point of Begining.

SURVEYOR'S NOTES:

North arrow & bearings based on assumed median 3.4 denotes exisiting elevation Elevations based on N.G.V.D. 1929 Datum Bench Mark No.: Basic Elevation: 14.324

Monumentation:

9 = found 1/2" Iron Pipe

▲= found P.K. Nail

 Δ = set P.K. nail P.L.S. No. 2449

Abbreviations:

p. = Plat P.O.C.= Point of Commence m. = Measured P.O.B.= Point of Beginning

N.T.S.= Not to Scale

Q = Centerline
Elev. = Elevation

N.T.S.= Not to Scale
P.B. = Plat Book
pg. = page
C.L.F.= Chain Link Fence

B.M. = Bench Mark C.B. = Catch Basin

Field Work performed on: 12/2/10


CERTIFICATION:

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the attached Boundary Survey
is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and beleif; that it meets the minimum technical standards adopted by the Florida Board of Land Surveyors, Chapter 61G17-6, Florida Statute Section 472.027, and the American Land Title Association, and that there are no visible encroachments unless shown hereon.

FREDERICK H. HILDEBRANDT

Professional Land Surveyor & Mapper No. 2749


Professional Engineer No. 36810




730 Southard 3	rust and Street, Ke	Vincent F. Bar ey West, Florida	letta 33040
Boundary Surve	y		Dwn No.: 10-349
Scale: 1"= 20'	Ref. 202-27	Flood panel No. 1516 K	Dwn. By: F.H.H.
Date: 12/2/10	202 27	Flood Zone: X	Flood Elev
REVI	SIONS AND	OR ADDITIONS	

ISLAND SURVEYING INC.
ENGINEERS PLANNERS SURVEYOR

3152 Northside Drive Suite 201 Key West, Fl. 33040 (305) 293-0466 For (305) 203 2237







REPLACE RALING

William St Side Elevation



William St Elevation

Barletta Residence

THOMAS E. POPE, P.A. ARCHITECT 7009 Shrimp Road #4, Key West FL TEPopePA®ael.com



Proposal 1







NEPLACE RAILING

William St Side Elevation

TEACH SIT

REPLACE-CROWN HOLLDING, PARCIA I ROTHIT



William St Elevation


SEPLACE RAILING

Barletta Residence


THOMAS E. POPE, P.A. ARCHITECT 7009 Shrimp Road #4, Key West FL (305) 296 3611 TEPopePa@aol.com

Proposal 2

Plans Approved with Condition On January 11, 2012



William St Elevation



Minutes of the Key West Historical Architectural Review Commission January 11, 2012

Approved – February 21, 2012

Page 9 of 12

Actions/Motions:

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

Yes: 7 - Ms. Bosold, Mr. Glorie, Ms. Gutierrez, Mr. Metzler, Mr. Miller, Mr. Green, Chairman Molinet

Installation of wood louvers over existing 4' high front fence and on sides and back yard fences. Total height of fences is 70"- After the Fact- Code Compliance case- #1316 Eliza Street- Victor Olson (H11-01-1747)

Victor Olson presented the project. Mr. Olson stated he did not know that he was in the Historic District. Mr. Olson added that he was simply trying to install a fence to protect his property. Mr. Olson stated that he did try to finish the section he was working on after the Code Officer Red Tagged his work but this was simply his effort to try to insure everything was secure for safety reasons.

Public Comments:

There were no public comments.

Staff Report:

Enid Torregrosa presented her staff report. Ms. Torregrosa stated that this is a Code Case. Ms. Torregrosa stated that six (6) foot fences are not allowed in the front of properties in the Historic District.

Commission Discussion:

The Commissioners discussed the height of the fence and the fact that Mr. Olson should have checked the codes prior to starting work and should have stopped work when the Code Officer Red Tagged him.

Actions/Motions:

A motion was made by Mr. Bryan Green, seconded by Mr. Theo Glorie, that the item be **Denied.** The motion **Passed** by the following vote:

Yes: 7 - Ms. Bosold, Mr. Glorie, Ms. Gutierrez, Mr. Metzler, Mr. Miller, Mr. Green, Chairman Molinet

Reconstruction of chimney with additional height of 6' to 10' and installation of flue liner in order to restore fireplace and chimney to operational condition, in compliance with fire and building code- Code Compliance case-#730 Southard Street- Adele V. Stones (H11-01-1757)

Ginny Stones presented the project. Ms. Stones detailed what happened that resulted in the historic chimney being demolished. Ms. Stone stated they are embarrassed and apologized for this mistake.

Public Comments:

There were no public comments.

Staff Report:

Enid Torregrosa presented her staff report. Ms. Torregrosa stated that this is a Code Compliance Case. Ms. Torregrosa stated that this request for an after the fact demolition of a historic brick chimney. Ms. Torregrosa added that the existing house is listed as a contributing resource. Ms. Torregrosa stated that this house is a magnificent example of a two and a half story frame structure and, according to the survey it was built in 1919. Ms.

Page 10 of 12

Torregrosa stated that nevertheless staff found a similar footprint on the same location on the 1892 Sanborn map. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the house is on a corner lot and has a widows' walk that was depicted for the first time in the 1912 Sanborn map. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the house used to have an exposed brick chimney on the south. Ms. Torregrosa stated that according to the applicant the brick chimney was in poor condition. Ms. Torregrosa added that on a submitted letter the applicant also states that the architect of the project was always contemplating the reconstruction of the chimney but that he was not aware of the requirement of a demolition approval for the external chimney. Ms. Torregrosa stated that this historic chimney was a character defining element of the house. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the structure had some vegetation but was structurally stable when the project received approval from the Commission. Ms. Torregrosa stated that there are not many historic exterior brick chimneys still standing at present time. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the demolition of this character defining element is an irreparable lost; once a historic structure is demolished there is no replacement for it. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is staff understanding that the existing structure presents characteristics and gives information which is contrary to criteria 1, 3, 5, 6, 8 and 9. It is staff opinion that the after the fact request for demolition is in conflict with the Code of Ordinance Section 102-218- Demolitions in the historic district. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is staff recommendation to this Commission to deny the request. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is the responsibility of this Commission to make a determination if the historic chimney qualified for demolition in accordance with Chapter 102 of the LDR's. Ms. Torregrosa concluded by stating that the removal of the historic chimney is an irreparable lost.

Commission Discussion:

The Commissioners had a lengthy discussion of what went wrong with this project and expressed their dissatisfaction and sadness of what happened to the historic chimney. An extensive discussion took place concerning the functionality and structure of the historic chimney. The Commissioners discussed a true re-construction verse what is being planned which is a new chimney build. The bottom line is the historic chimney is gone and cannot be brought back.

Actions/Motions:

A motion was made by Mr. Bryan Green, seconded by Mr. Theo Glorie, that the item be **Approved** with the condition of historic brick are used and it be set apart and new plans will be presented. The motion **Passed** by the following vote:

Yes: 4 - Mr. Glorie, Mr. Metzler, Mr. Miller, Mr. Green No: 3 - Ms. Bosold, Ms. Gutierrez, Chairman Molinet

Demolition of historic chimney- After the fact- Code Compliance case-#730 Southard Street- Adele V. Stones (H11-01-1757)

Ginny Stones presented the project. Ms. Stones stated that did not have anything to $\operatorname{\mathsf{add}}$.

Public Comments:

There were no public comments.

Staff Report:

Enid Torregrosa presented her staff report. Ms. Torregrosa stated that this is a Code Compliance Case. Ms. Torregrosa stated that this request for an after the fact demolition of a historic brick chimney. Ms. Torregrosa added that the existing house is listed as a contributing resource. Ms. Torregrosa stated that this house is a magnificent example of a

Page 11 of 12

two and a half story frame structure and, according to the survey it was built in 1919. Ms. Torregrosa stated that nevertheless staff found a similar footprint on the same location on the 1892 Sanborn map. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the house is on a corner lot and has a widows' walk that was depicted for the first time in the 1912 Sanborn map. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the house used to have an exposed brick chimney on the south. Ms. Torregrosa stated that according to the applicant the brick chimney was in poor condition. Ms. Torregrosa added that on a submitted letter the applicant also states that the architect of the project was always contemplating the reconstruction of the chimney but that he was not aware of the requirement of a demolition approval for the external chimney. Ms. Torregrosa stated that this historic chimney was a character defining element of the house. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the structure had some vegetation but was structurally stable when the project received approval from the Commission. Ms. Torregrosa stated that there are not many historic exterior brick chimneys still standing at present time. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the demolition of this character defining element is an irreparable lost; once a historic structure is demolished there is no replacement for it. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is staff understanding that the existing structure presents characteristics and gives information which is contrary to criteria 1, 3, 5, 6, 8 and 9. It is staff opinion that the after the fact request for demolition is in conflict with the Code of Ordinance Section 102-218- Demolitions in the historic district. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is staff recommendation to this Commission to deny the request. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is the responsibility of this Commission to make a determination if the historic chimney qualified for demolition in accordance with Chapter 102 of the LDR's. Ms. Torregrosa concluded by stating that the removal of the historic chimney is an irreparable lost.

Commission Discussion:

The Commissioners had no additional comments or discussion.

Actions/Motions:

A motion was made by Mr. Bryan Green, seconded by Mr. Theo Glorie, that the item be **Denied** based on page 39-1. The motion **Passed** by the following vote:

Yes: 6 - Ms. Bosold, Mr. Glorie, Ms. Gutierrez, Mr. Miller, Mr. Green, Chairman Molinet

No: 1 - Mr. Metzler

Remove existing Victorian shingle roof and replace with same. Construct new shed dormer at rear side of existing gable roof- #608 Griffin Lane- Robert Delaune (H11-01-1765)

Robert Delaune along with owners Elliot and Audrey Baron presented the project. Mr. Delaune stated that this proposed project involves a re-roofing and also adding a new dormer to the back of the house. The dormer will give the owners better use of the upstairs area.

Public Comments:

There were no public comments.

Staff Report:


Enid Torregrosa presented her staff report. Ms. Torregrosa stated that this for a new back *dormer* with a shed roof and the replacement of metal shingles of the main house with same material. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the house located on #608 Griffin Lane is listed as a contributing resource in the surveys. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the one and a half story frame vernacular structure was built circa 1889. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the


Agenda Items Item 15a

#730 Southard Street- Code Case- Chimney reconstruction

Plans approved by HARC

New submitted plans







Agenda Items Item 15a

#730 Southard Street- Code Case- Chimney reconstruction

■Elevation plan approved by HARC

 Elevation plan submitted as part of the Planning board variance request





Previous Approved Plans

SOUTHARD STREET


THOMAS E. POPE, P.A. ARCHITECT 7019 Shrimp Road #4, Key West FL (305) 296 3611

Barletta Residence

date: 3/28/II revision:

Site/First Floor Plan


Attic Plan



Second Floor Plan

Barletta Residence


THOMAS E. POPE, P.A. ARCHITECT 7009 Shrimp Road #4, Key West FL (305) 296 3611




William St Elevation

Barletta Residence

THOMAS E. POPE, P.A. ARCHITECT 7009 Shrimp Road #6, Key West FL (305) 296 3611 date: 3/28/II revision:



William St Side Elevation



The Historic Architectural Review Commission will hold a public hearing <u>at 5:30 p.m., April 25, 2012 at Old City Hall, 510 Greene Street</u>, Key West, Florida. The purpose of the hearing will be to consider a request for:

REVISED PLANS AS PER COMMISSION REQUEST. TWO PROPOSALS, PROPOSAL 1 STEP BACK NEW CHIMNEY, PROPOSAL 2 NO BUILT BACK OF CHIMNEY AND INSTALLATION OF WOOD SIDING

#730 SOUTHARD STREET

Applicant- Adele V. Stones- Application Number H12-01-655

If you wish to see the application or have any questions, you may visit the Planning Department during regular office hours at 3140 Flagler Avenue call 809-3973 or visit our website at www.keywestcity.com.

THIS NOTICE CAN NOT BE REMOVED FROM THE SITE UNTIL HARC FINAL DETERMINATION

Property Appraiser Information

Karl D. Borglum **Property Appraiser** Monroe County, Florida

office (305) 292-3420 fax (305) 292-3501 Website tested on Internet Explorer

----- GIS Mapping requires Adobe Flash 10.3 or higher. -----

Property Record View

Alternate Key: 1012009 Parcel ID: 00011690-000000

Ownership Details

Mailing Address:

730 SOUTHARD TRUST 11/29/2010 C/O BARLETTA VINCENT F TRUSTEE 40 SHAWMUT RD CANTON, MA 02021-1409

Property Details

PC Code: 01 - SINGLE FAMILY

Millage Group: 10KW Affordable No Housing:

Section- 06-68-25 Township-Range:

Property 730 SOUTHARD ST KEY WEST Location:

Legal KW PT LOT 2 SQR 59 G61-29/32 G61-33/34 OR177-157 (PROB 44-07-CP-216-K) OR1128-1375/79 OR1241-Description: 2122/23 L/E OR1889-442/44 OR2213-353/54 OR2386-1203/04 OR2389-1412/13 OR2408-1682/85 OR2497-1926D/C OR2497-636/37 OR2538-411/13

Parcel Map (Click to open dynamic parcel map) 8520 11480 TOO SOUTHARD ST 11490 11690 11500 S6_T68S_R25E 11630

Land Details

Land Use Code	Frontage	Depth	Land Area
01SD - RES SMALL LOT DRY	0	0	11,413.27 SF

Building Summary

Number of Buildings: 2 Number of Commercial Buildings: 0 Total Living Area: 3527 Year Built: 1919

Building 1 Details

Building Type R1 Effective Age 71 Year Built 1919 Functional Obs 0

Condition A Perimeter 352 Special Arch 0 Economic Obs 0 Quality Grade 550 Depreciation % 63 Grnd Floor Area 2,774

Inclusions:

R1 includes 1 3-fixture bath and 1 kitchen.

Roof Type IRR/CUSTOM Heat 1 NONE


Roof Cover METAL Heat 2 NONE Heat Src 2 NONE Foundation WD CONC PADS

Bedrooms 4

Heat Src 1 NONE Extra Features:

2 Fix Bath 0
3 Fix Bath 1
4 Fix Bath 0
5 Fix Bath 0
6 Fix Bath 0
7 Fix Bath 0
Extra Fix 0

Vacuum 0
Garbage Disposal 0
Compactor 0
Security 0
Intercom 0
Fireplaces 1
Dishwasher 0



Sections:

Nbr	Туре	Ext Wall	# Stories	Year Built	Attic	A/C	Basement %	Finished Basement %	Area
1	FLA	12:ABOVE AVERAGE WOOD	1	1993	N	Ν	0.00	0.00	1,620
2	OPX	12:ABOVE AVERAGE WOOD	1	1993	N	Ν	0.00	0.00	1,008
3	FLA	12:ABOVE AVERAGE WOOD	1	1993	N	Ν	0.00	0.00	1,154

4	<u>OPX</u>	12:ABOVE AVERAGE WOOD	1	1993	Ν	Ν	0.00	0.00	798
5	FAT	12:ABOVE AVERAGE WOOD	1	1993	N	N	0.00	0.00	64
6	ouu	12:ABOVE AVERAGE WOOD	1	1993	Ν	N	0.00	0.00	64

Building 2 Details

Building Type R1 Effective Age 20 Year Built 1938 Functional Obs 0 Condition G Perimeter 118 Special Arch 0 Economic Obs 0 Quality Grade 450 Depreciation % 27 Grnd Floor Area 753

Inclusions:


R1 includes 1 3-fixture bath and 1 kitchen.

Roof Type IRR/CUSTOM Heat 1 NONE Heat Src 1 NONE Roof Cover METAL Heat 2 Heat Src 2 Foundation WD CONC PADS

Bedrooms 2

Extra Features:

2 Fix Bath 0 3 Fix Bath 0 4 Fix Bath 0 5 Fix Bath 0 6 Fix Bath 0 7 Fix Bath 0 Extra Fix 0 Vacuum 0
Garbage Disposal 0
Compactor 0
Security 0
Intercom 0
Fireplaces 0
Dishwasher 0



Sections:

Nbr Type	Ext Wall	# Stories	Year Built	Attic A/C	Basement %	Finished Basement %	Area
----------	----------	--------------	---------------	-----------	------------	---------------------	------

0	FLA	12:ABOVE AVERAGE WOOD	1	1938	N	753
0	OPX		1	1938		115
0	SPF		1	1938		352

Misc Improvement Details

Nbr	Type	# Units	Length	Width	Year Built	Roll Year	Grade	Life
1	PT2:BRICK PATIO	189 SF	21	9	1984	1985	2	50
2	FN2:FENCES	165 SF	0	0	1984	1985	2	30
3	AC2:WALL AIR COND	1 UT	0	0	1988	1989	2	20
4	AC2:WALL AIR COND	1 UT	0	0	1988	1989	1	20
5	PT2:BRICK PATIO	124 SF	31	4	1984	1985	2	50
6	GR2:GARAGE	200 SF	0	0	1939	1940	2	60

Appraiser Notes

AK 1012025 (RE 00011710-000000) IS NOW COMBINED WITH THIS PARCEL PER THE OWNER'S REQUEST, DONE FOR THE 2012 TAX ROLL (2/15/2012 SCJ).

UNITY OF TITLE RECORDED (OR2540-2262) RESULTING IN COMBINATION OF AK 1012025 WITH AK 1012009.

Building Permits

Bldg	Number	Date Issued	Date Completed	Amount	Description	Notes
	9701696	05/01/1997	08/01/1997	1,100		UPGRADE TO 150 AMP

Parcel Value History

Certified Roll Values.

View Taxes for this Parcel.

Roll Year	Total Bldg Value	Total Misc Improvement Value	Total Land Value	Total Just (Market) Value	Total Assessed Value	School Exempt Value	School Taxable Value
2011	188,200	3,634	348,383	540,217	540,217	0	540,217
2010	287,055	3,998	437,427	728,480	728,480	0	728,480
2009	315,445	3,998	664,889	984,332	984,332	0	984,332
2008	310,020	3,998	952,567	1,266,585	1,266,585	0	1,266,585
2007	504,032	3,958	1,199,275	1,707,265	324,537	25,000	299,537
2006	638,258	3,958	651,035	1,293,251	316,621	25,000	291,621
2005	565,314	3,958	582,505	1,151,777	307,399	25,000	282,399
2004	410,307	3,958	479,710	893,975	298,446	25,000	273,446
2003	395,110	3,958	239,855	638,923	292,882	25,000	267,882
2002	379,640	3,958	239,855	623,453	286,018	25,000	261,018
2001	300,771	3,958	239,855	544,584	281,514	25,000	256,514
2000	261,337	4,395	130,207	395,940	273,315	25,000	248.315

1999	248,839	4,185	123,697	376,721	266,130	25,000	241,130
1998	210,206	3,535	123,697	337,439	261,939	25,000	236,939
1997	193,163	3,249	110,676	307,087	257,561	25,000	232,561
1996	153,394	2,580	110,676	266,650	250,060	25,000	225,060
1995	147,713	2,227	110,676	260,615	243,961	25,000	218,961
1994	124,987	1,884	110,676	237,548	237,548	25,000	212,548
1993	110,879	161	110,676	221,716	221,716	25,000	196,716
1992	110,879	161	110,676	221,716	221,716	25,000	196,716
1991	110,879	161	110,676	221,716	221,716	25,000	196,716
1990	73,829	161	86,262	160,251	160,251	25,000	135,251
1989	67,117	146	84,635	151,898	151,898	25,000	126,898
1988	56,881	146	71,614	128,641	128,641	25,000	103,641
1987	56,259	146	51,055	107,460	107,460	25,000	82,460
1986	56,559	146	49,342	106,047	106,047	25,000	81,047
1985	54,995	146	28,920	84,061	84,061	25,000	59,061
1984	51,368	146	28,920	80,434	80,434	25,000	55,434
1983	51,368	146	28,920	80,434	80,434	25,000	55,434
1982	52,340	146	28,920	81,406	81,406	25,000	56,406

Parcel Sales History

NOTE: Sales do not generally show up in our computer system until about two to three months after the date of sale. If a recent sale does not show up in this list, please allow more time for the sale record to be processed. Thank you for your patience and understanding.

Sale Date	Official Records Book/Page	Price	Instrument	Qualification
12/15/2010	2497 / 636	800,000	WD	02

This page has been visited 35,515 times.

Monroe County Property Appraiser Karl D. Borglum P.O. Box 1176 Key West, FL 33041-1176