

Minutes of the Key West Historic Architectural Review Commission

July 24, 2012

DRAFT

Page 1 of 8

Call Meeting To Order	
Chairman Rudy Molinet called the Key West Historic Architectural Review Commission (HARC) Meeting of July 24, 2012 to order at 5:32 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, Michael Miller, Vice Chairman Bryan Green, and Chairman Rudy Molinet. Commissioners absent: Daniel Metzler 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 Rudy Molinet inquired as to any changes to the agenda. Enid Torregrosa stated that item #1 (the minutes from June 26) was not ready and need to be postponed, item #10 was requested to be postponed by Staff prior to the meeting, and item #11 was withdrawn by the applicant prior to the meeting. Actions/Motions: A motion was made by Mr. Bryan Green, seconded by Ms. Maggie Gutierrez, that the Agenda with changes as noted by Ms. Torregrosa be Approved . The motion Passed by a unanimous voice vote.
Approval of Minutes	
1	June 26, 2012 Actions/Motions: Item was postponed during Agenda approval.
2	July 10, 2012 Bryan Green noted a typographical error in item #9 were Mr. Miller was quoted but it was Mr. Green who made the statement. Actions/Motions: A motion was made by Mr. Michael Miller seconded by Mr. Theo Glorie, that the Minutes be Approved with the correction as noted by Bryan Green. The motion Passed by a unanimous voice vote.
HARC Planner's Report	
	Ms. Torregrosa reported she did not have anything to say.
Assistant City Attorney's Report	
	Mr. Ramsingh stated that the appeal from 300 Front Street will be at the Code Hearing tomorrow. Mr. Ramsingh added that he just received a Notice of Appeal for the 730 Southard porch joist denial. Mr. Ramsingh stated that he thinks this is just a matter of procedure since they are working with Ms. Torregrosa on another alternative.

Minutes of the Key West Historic Architectural Review Commission

July 24, 2012

DRAFT

Page 2 of 8

	Chairman Molinet stated that he thinks this is a good time to review the year so far. Mr. Molinet stated that he has received good feedback as to how things are going so far this year. Mr. Molinet reminded the Commissioners to review the Guidelines Dos and Don'ts for the Commissioners and reviewed them with the Commissioners.
Old Business	
3	Demolition of carport with no built back- #1415 United Street- John Castro (H12-01-994) Second Reading The applicant was not present therefore; the item was tabled until later in the agenda.
4	Demolition of shed roof on back portion of house- #1211 Watson Street- Michael Skoglund(H12-01-1034) Second Reading Michael Skoglund presented the project. Mr. Skoglund stated he did not have anything to add from the last meeting. Public Comments: There were no public comments. Staff Report: Enid Torregrosa presented her Staff report. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is Staff's opinion that the Commission can consider the second reading of a 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 for a structure that is not historic and will not be considered contributing in a near future. Commission Discussion: The Commissioners had no additional comments or discussion. Actions/Motions: A motion was made by Mr. Theo Glorie, seconded by Ms. Maggie Gutierrez, that the item be Approved . The motion Passed by the following vote: Yes: 6 – Ms. Bosold, Mr. Glorie, Ms. Gutierrez, Mr. Miller, Mr. Green, Chairman Molinet
5	Demolition of portion of building exterior wall- #610 Greene Street- Anna Marie Wevers (H12-01-1091) Second reading. Anna Marie Wevers presented the project. Ms Wevers stated she did not have anything to add from the last meeting. Public Comments: There were no public comments. Staff Report: Enid Torregrosa presented her Staff report. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is Staff's opinion that the Commission can consider the second reading of a 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 for a structure that is not historic and will not be considered contributing in a near future.

Minutes of the Key West Historic Architectural Review Commission

July 24, 2012

DRAFT

Page 3 of 8

	<p>Commission Discussion: The Commissioners had no additional comments or discussion.</p> <p>Actions/Motions: A motion was made by Mr. Theo Glorie, seconded by Ms. Donna Bosold, that the item be Approved. The motion Passed by the following vote: Yes: 7 – Ms. Bosold, Mr. Glorie, Ms. Gutierrez, Mr. Miller, Mr. Green, Chairman Molinet</p>
New Business	
6	<p>Approving a Resolution of HARC recognizing the sharp increase in HARC applications, recognizing the need for additional HARC Staff and recommending the implementation of a HARC application fee to defray those costs, providing for an effective date.</p> <p>Ron Ramsingh and Enid Torregrosa presented the proposed resolution. Ms. Torregrosa reviewed the then and now statistics with the Commissioners</p> <p>Public Comments: Carl Reed from Southernmost Signs stated that he fees there should be a fee for HARC applications. Mr. Reed asked if the fees would be scaled. Mr. Molinet and Ms. Torregrosa responded that the fees would be scaled and explained the method of scaling would be by the amount of time and personnel that would be involved in with the processing of the application. The fee process would put the burden of paying for the Staff on the applicants not just the taxpayers, which is as it is now.</p> <p>Commission Discussion: Theo Glorie asked if there was going to be a qualification process for hiring another inspector. Ms. Torregrosa responded that there would be professional qualification requirements for both the inspector and any planner who is hired.</p> <p>Michael Miller suggested that Ms. Torregrosa ask for what is really needed. Mr. Miller also suggested that the resolution be more specific as to what additional new Staff is need as well as specifying "full time additional Staff". Mr. Miller also asked it be stated that the fee be paid at the time of the application. Mr. Miller concluded that he thinks the resolution as written is a bit soft.</p> <p>Actions/Motions: A motion was made by Mr. Michael Miller, seconded by Mr. Bryan Green, that the item be Approved with the addition of the verbiage "full time additional office staff" to section 1. The motion Passed by the following vote: Yes: 6 – Ms. Bosold, Mr. Glorie, Ms. Gutierrez, Mr. Miller, Mr. Green, Chairman Molinet</p>
7	<p>Increase the height of protective Atlantic Ocean boundary wall approximately 2.5' in order to prevent salt-water intrusion onto the property during storms. The increased height of wall will be made entirely of hurricane resistant glass- #400 South Street- Wayne LaRue Smith (H12-01-0993)</p> <p>Wayne LaRue Smith presented the project. Mr. Smith reviewed the project at the Johnston residence. Mr. Smith stated that he appreciates the Staff report and the fact that it presented the situation very well. Mr. Smith reviewed the history of the project. Mr. Smith stated that this application is an effort to address the situation at the property, which is impacted by storms. Mr. Smith stated that a variance has already been approved. Mr. Smith reviewed what is being done to protect the property. Mr. Smith stated that the proposed hurricane resistant glass is a result of the concerns from the neighbors during the Planning Board review. Mr. Smith remained to respond to any questions from the Commissioners.</p>

Minutes of the Key West Historic Architectural Review Commission

July 24, 2012

DRAFT

Page 4 of 8

Public Comments:

There were no public comments.

Staff Report:

Enid Torregrosa presented her Staff report. Ms. Torregrosa stated that this application is for increasing the height of an existing solid concrete fence with hurricane resisting glass. Ms. Torregrosa stated that on April 13, 2010 the Commission denied Certificate of Appropriateness H10-03-25-328 for a wall height increase of 2.9 feet to prevent salt-water intrusion; from 6 feet to 8.9 feet. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the applicant appealed that decision to the Special Magistrate. Ms. Torregrosa stated that on October 27, 2010 the Special Magistrate upheld HARC decision but requested the applicant to submit a height variance request to the Planning Board. Ms. Torregrosa stated that if the Planning Board approved the height variance request, the Magistrate will revisit his decision. Ms. Torregrosa stated that although denied applications cannot be resubmitted to this Commission this new application includes a revision of the proposed construction materials. Ms. Torregrosa stated that on January 19, 2012 the Planning Board approved the height increase with the condition that the addition should be constructed with hurricane resisting glass. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the main building is a non-contributing resource, however the Western Union Cable Hut located on the South corner next to the fence is a historic resource. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is Staff's opinion that although the proposed design does not comply with some of the guidelines, the proposed materials will make it transparent. Ms. Torregrosa stated that because of the proposed material Staff understands that there will be no effect on the Western Union Cable Hut or the surrounding urban context. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is Staff's opinion that if this application is approved it cannot be used as a precedent since there is a specific hardship as to the coastal zone location of this property.

Commission Discussion:

Michael Miller stated that he does not understand Staff's report. Mr. Miller stated that he does not see where glass is a good thing. Ms. Torregrosa responded that the Commission in denied the solid wall in the past and a change to the application was needed in order to be presented again in front of HARC. Mr. Molinet reminded Mr. Miller that the Planning Board has already approved the variance to be done in glass and that alternatives should not be discussed at this time.

Bryan Green stated that he too thought the Staff report was very clear and sets the fact well. Mr. Green stated that it was very helpful that the Planning Board has already reviewed the design and approved the variance.

Rudy Molinet thanked Mr. Johnston for all the things he does for the City. Mr. Molinet brought to the Commissioners attention that the Building Department measures things differently from HARC. Mr. Molinet stated that he also found it helpful that the Planning Board had already approved the variance.

Mr. Miller stated that he too likes the fact that the Planning Board had already approved the variance but he did not like the fact that they appeared to be designing the project. Mr. Ramsingh stated that the Planning Board has a "Good Neighbor Policy" which is why the glass wall was agreed to.

Actions/Motions:

A motion was made by Mr. Bryan Green, seconded by Ms. Maggie Gutierrez, that the item be **Approved**. The motion **Passed** by the following vote:

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

8 Change metal shingles with metal v-crimp- #1100 South Street- Tony's Roofing (H12-01-1083)
--

Minutes of the Key West Historic Architectural Review Commission

July 24, 2012

DRAFT

Page 5 of 8

Michael Wygan and Tony Gill of Tony's Roofing presented the project. Mr. Gill stated that the application is to replace metal shingles with 5 v-crimp roofing. Mr. Gill stated that it has come over several times over the past few years where Conch shingles verse v-crimp for the Historic esthetics. Mr. Gill reviewed the roofs of the property. Mr. Gill discussed the new Florida Building Code as it relates to roofs and compared the Conch singles and the v-crimp. Mr. Wygan stated that they want the house to look uniform. Mr. Wygan and Mr. Gill remained to respond to questions from the Commissioners.

Public Comments:

There were no public comments.

Staff Report:

Enid Torregrosa presented her Staff report. Ms. Torregrosa stated that this is for the request of replacing metal shingles with metal v-crimp panels. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the owner does not qualify for economic hardship, as he stated to Staff. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the house located on #1100 South Street is not listed in the surveys. Ms. Torregrosa stated that according to the Property Appraiser's records, the house was built in 1973, but the information of the records is conflictive with the Sanborn maps and the Property Appraiser's photo ca. 1965. Ms. Torregrosa stated that on the ca. 1965 photo the building has metal shingles. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is Staff's opinion that metal shingles have been the material for roofing for this house, which for sure was not built in 1973, as the Appraiser's records states. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the guidelines are clear as to in-kind basis replacement of roof material. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is Staff's opinion that the proposed metal v-crimp is less suitable material for replacement. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is Staff's opinion that this proposal is inconsistent with the guidelines.

Commission Discussion:

Chairman Molinet reminded the Commissioners and the applicants that the task at hand is to discuss the design.

Bryan Green asked Ms. Torregrosa to clarify the Guidelines. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the Guidelines are clear – "same for same". Mr. Green reviewed page 26 of the Guidelines, "like for like" or more suitable. Mr. Green stated that he does not have a problem replacing the v-crimp in order to make the structure more uniform.

Michael Miller stated that he wishes he had a site plan and would like to be able to review the changes over time. Mr. Miller reviewed the old photos of the structure. Mr. Miller stated that he finds the use of the metal shingles on a fifties ranch style house to be odd. Mr. Miller stated he could support the v-crimp.

Maggie Gutierrez stated that she agrees with Mr. Green and Mr. Miller. Ms. Gutierrez stated she could see both sides.

Donna Bosold agreed with the others.

Rudy Molinet stated he would like to see the bungalow in the rear covered with the conch shingles. Mr. Molinet added it would be nice if the house were restored to the Historic footprint. Mr. Wygan stated that they would loose more than half of the house if they were to revert to the Historic footprint. Mr. Molinet stated that if this applicant were allowed to convert to v-crimp it would be a precedence setting action. Mr. Molinet reviewed the Guidelines with the Commissioners.

Bryan Green stated that he thinks that with the modification to the fifties style house the v-crimp would be more appropriate.

Minutes of the Key West Historic Architectural Review Commission

July 24, 2012

DRAFT

Page 6 of 8

Ron Ramsingh stated decisions have implications and it is very important to not let the addition drive the decisions for the original structure.

Theo Glorie asked for clarification as to where the Conch shingles are. Mr. Wygan responded that the Conch shingles are only on the original structure. Mr. Molinet asked Ms. Torregrosa what is the Historic status of the structure. Ms. Torregrosa responded Historic but altered. Mr. Glorie stated that he does not think a ranch style house should have v-crimp. Mr. Molinet stated that he thinks it is a slippery slope to allow this change to take place. Ms. Gutierrez asked Ms. Torregrosa that with all the changes to the structure then is the house still Historic. Ms. Torregrosa responded that the house is still Historic but not contributing. Ms. Gutierrez stated that she finds Mr. Molinet's argument for the Conch shingles compelling.

Rudy Molinet suggested that the Florida Building Code be reviewed as well as finding NOAs for shingles that are appropriately wind rated.

The owner mentioned to the Commissioners that the roof is leaking. The Commission recommended the applicant to submit an emergency request to fix the roof.

Actions/Motions:

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

Yes: 3 – Ms. Bosold, Mr. Miller, Mr. Green

No: 3 – Mr. Glorie, Ms. Gutierrez, Chairman Molinet

A motion was made by Mr. Bryan Green, seconded by Mr. Michael Miller, that the item be **Postponed**. The motion **Passed** by unanimous voice vote.

9 Aluminum projecting sign with halo lit. Copy "Southern Cross Hotel"- 417 Eaton Street-Southernmost Signs (H12-01-1094)

Carl Reed presented the project. Mr. Reed reviewed the history of the project with the Commissioners and remained to respond to questions.

Public Comments:

There were no public comments.

Staff Report:

Enid Torregrosa presented her Staff report. Ms. Torregrosa stated that to install an aluminum projecting sign with halo effect on a contributing resource and was built circa 1920. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the contributing house is a one and a half story bungalow structure. Ms. Torregrosa stated that according to the Sanborn map of 1948 the building was used as a private hospital. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the proposed application is for the installation of a double face projecting sign that will be five square feet. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the sign would be installed perpendicular to the porch under the entrance canopy. Ms. Torregrosa added that the copy of the sign will be *Southern Cross Hotel*, and letters will not exceed 12" tall. Ms. Torregrosa stated that although the proposed new sign complies with the minimum area its design, proposed installation, materials, and location would detract from the historic fabric of the structure. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the entrance canopy has its own distinctive brackets that will be obscure with the sign, which will be parallel and adjacent to them. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is Staff's opinion that the proposed design is inconsistent with many of the guidelines, specifically those found on page 49 and 50.

Commission Discussion:

Bryan Green asked Ms. Torregrosa to point out the specific guidelines that she thinks the sign does

Minutes of the Key West Historic Architectural Review Commission

July 24, 2012

DRAFT

Page 7 of 8

	<p>not comply with. Ms. Torregrosa responded by pointing out Guideline 1, the specific paragraph on page 49 and the top of page 50.</p> <p>Michael Miller stated that he likes the design of the sign but not where it is being put. Mr. Miller asked if there is not a better place for the sign to be put. Mr. Miller stated that he likes the way this sign connects the old portion of the hotel with the new portion of the hotel.</p> <p>Donna Bosold stated that she does not have a problem with design but does not feel the sign and the brackets fits with the building.</p> <p>Bryan Green stated that the Commission may have led the applicant astray in asking for a replica of the old sign. Mr. Green reviewed the differences of the old sign and how it was hung. Mr. Green asked the applicant if it was possible to hang the sign on a post away from the entrance of the building.</p> <p>Rudy Molinet suggested that a reproduction of the old neon sign just a smaller mass and scale would be most preferable and it not be hung from the building. The Commissioners suggested the applicant move the sign to the location of an existing sign on the property but added that the new sign must be smaller in mass and scale.</p> <p>Actions/Motions: A motion was made by Mr. Bryan Green, seconded by Mr. Theo Glorie, that the item be Postponed. The motion Passed by a unanimous voice vote.</p>
10	<p>New structure on empty lot, new fence and food trailer 8' by 24' by 9'- #629 Duval Street- JDS of North America (H12-01-1130)</p> <p>This item was postponed by Staff prior to the meeting.</p>
11	<p>PVC detached hanging sign with aluminum post 4" by 4". Copy "Parking" and arrow- #400 Whitehead Street- Southernmost Signs (H12-01-1177)</p> <p>This item was withdrawn by the applicant prior to the meeting.</p>
3	<p>Demolition of carport with no built back- #1415 United Street- John Castro (H12-01-994) Second Reading</p> <p>The applicant was not present to present the item but the Commission decided to move forward with the item.</p> <p>Public Comments: There were no public comments.</p> <p>Staff Report: Enid Torregrosa presented her Staff report. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is Staff's opinion that the Commission can consider the second reading of a 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 for a structure that is not historic and will not be considered contributing in a near future.</p> <p>Commission Discussion:</p>

Minutes of the Key West Historic Architectural Review Commission

July 24, 2012

DRAFT

Page 8 of 8

	<p>The Commissioners had no additional comments or discussion.</p> <p>Actions/Motions: A motion was made by Mr. Theo Glorie, seconded by Ms. Donna Bosold, that the item be Approved. The motion Passed by the following vote: Yes: 6 – Ms. Bosold, Mr. Glorie, Ms. Gutierrez, Mr. Miller, Mr. Green, Chairman Molinet</p>
Comments from Commissioners	
	<p>Michael Miller stated that he wanted to continue the discussion concerning the roof in item #8. Mr. Miller stated that he did not understand why the applicant or the owner has not gone ahead and requested a permit to at least remove the roof and started the dry-in process to correct the leak while they are working with the Commission on the type of shingles. Mr. Miller added that that work would be necessary regardless to what type of roofing is re-applied. Mr. Miller also stated that he is troubled by the approval of item #7 - the glass wall. Mr. Miller stated that what troubles him is that the fact that the item had already been discussed and approved by the Planning Board with he thinks puts the Commission in an odd situation when it comes to their vote.</p> <p>Bryan Green began a discussion about what is currently happening with Citizens Insurance. Citizens is requiring changes that do not necessarily enhance the beauty of the Historic District or they will be raising rates. Mr. Green gave the example that he was told to remove the existing timber shutters that have been on his house for numbers of years and replace them with the type that are installed on the runners at the top and bottom of the openings or have his insurance increase from \$12,000 to \$20,000 a year. Mr. Green's comments prompted Rudy Molinet to mention that he does not like this time of year when many of the houses look like "sardine cans". Mr. Molinet asked if there was something that can be done like an ordinance which would prevent people from putting their shutters up and leaving them all summer long. Mr. Ramsingh stated he would have to do some research on the subject of limiting the time shutters can be closed/installed. Donna Bosold mentioned that it is very different between FEMA in Monroe County verse Old Town. Ms. Torregrosa suggested that she could draft a letter to the State Historic Office concerning the Citizens Insurance issue with both the shutters and roofs. Ms. Bosold suggested that if the Commission does choose to work with State or Feds then there needs to be distinctions between wind events verse the flood events since it is obvious that we have flood events more so than the wind events.</p> <p>Theo Glorie asked who sets the Historic District. Ms. Torregrosa explained that is a Federal regulation for all the fifty states and establishes a state level office (SHPO). Ms. Torregrosa and Mr. Ramsingh explained how the Historic Districts are established and managed.</p>
Adjournment	
	<p>Actions/Motions: A motion was made by Mr. Theo Glorie, seconded by Mr. Bryan Green, that the meeting be Adjourned. The motion Passed by a unanimous vote.</p> <p>Meeting adjourned at 7:40 pm.</p>

Submitted by,

Jo Bennett

Administrative Coordinator
Planning Department