

# Historic Architectural Review Commission

## Meeting Agenda

March 9, 2010 – 3:00 p.m.  
City Commission Chamber  
Old City Hall, 510 Greene Street



The Key West Historic Architectural Review Commission will hold a public hearing on **Tuesday, March 9, 2010 at 3:00 p.m.**, in the City Commission Chambers of Old City Hall located at 510 Greene Street.

1. **Roll Call** Board members present included George Galvan, newly appointed Rudy Molinet, Nils Muench, and Carlos Rojas, and Chairman Peter Batty. Staff present included Assistant City Attorney Ronald Ramsingh, Preservation Planner Enid Torregrosa, Recording Secretary Diane Nicklaus and IT Support from Ian Willis and Ryan Salazar.
2. **Pledge of the Allegiance**
3. **Approval of Agenda** Under Old Business, item T1 has been requested to table in order that the applicant be able to attend a Tree Commission meeting prior to HARC hearing. It was moved by George Galvan, seconded by Carlos Rojas, to approve the agenda with changes. Motion carried.
4. **Approval of Minutes**
  - a. HARC Meeting Minutes- **February 9, 2010** It was moved by George Galvan, seconded by Nils Muench to approve the minutes. Motion carried.
  - b. HARC Meeting Minutes- **February 23, 2010** It was moved by George Galvan, seconded by Nils Muench, to approve the minutes. Motion carried.
5. **Items for Public Hearing**
  - a. **Old Business- Tabled items**
    1. T1- Request to build addition- **#1010 Windsor Lane- Morse Builders Inc. (H10-02-09-127)** Twenty eight feet eight inches by twelve feet eight inches addition to storage building beside cafeteria.  
  
TABLED
  - b. **New Business**
    1. CL1- Request to build a second story addition on back- **#416 White Street- Architect Michael Skoglund (H10-02-18-174)** Add second story rear of existing building with porch.

Michael Skoglund was not present, so property owner Suzanne Adykins represented the project. This is a frame vernacular contributing structure, circa 1890. Michael Skoglund was to be present to attest that this addition could not be seen from the street. Michael Skoglund arrived. The intention was to add a second floor to the rear portion.

There was no public comment.

Preservation Planner Enid Torregrosa reviewed her Staff Comments for the Board. The addition was going to be higher than the remainder of the house and would have an adverse affect on the property. You can see this requested addition from the right-of-way and her recommendation was to deny the project.

Nils Muench questioned if the sky light was going to be seen from the street. Michael Skoglund responded "just barely".

Chairman Peter Batty stated that one of the Guidelines did not allow for skylights to be visible from the street. Michael Skoglund stated that they could get rid of the skylight. They were not locked into that.

Chairman Peter Batty stated that Staff's concerns were with the skylight and the height. The response from the Preservation Planner was in the affirmative.

Michael Skoglund stated that they were only going up 5'4" higher than the front gable.

Carlos Rojas stated that although Staff makes a good point that it was higher than the existing building, he felt that it was far enough off the street so that it would not have an adverse effect on White Street. It was moved by Carlos Rojas to approve with the removal of the skylight. There being no second, motion failed.

Nils Muench stated that the Preservation Planner had made comments about the mass and scale not being in conformity with the neighboring buildings. Preservation Planner Enid Torregrosa stated that this was one of the oldest houses in the neighborhood. The addition would be higher than the original house. She felt that having the second floor on the back of the property was going to change the mass and scale of the original house. Her recommendation to deny was because of that.

Michael Skoglund stated that the surrounding buildings were all two full stories.

Carlos Rojas stated that this project previously had been considerably taller and they had approved a project around the corner where they had added a two story addition to the back of a one story structure.

Rudy Molinet questioned if the roof could be brought down a little bit. The response was in the affirmative. Preservation Planner Enid Torregrosa stated that she would have to see plans.

Chairman Peter Batty stated that they would have to make sure the pitch of the roof was acceptable. He stated that if the applicant was agreeable, possibly they could table this to allow for revision.

It was moved by George Galvan, seconded by Nils Muench, to table. Motion carried.

TABLED

2. CL2- Request to build two additions- **#711 Elizabeth Street- Kevin Melloncamp, Toolbox GC (H10-02-23-186)** Revision to previous approval H09-10-05-1141. Renovation of one story shotgun house with two new additions, 2 new stone terraces, new pool, and new wood deck as shown.

This is a contributing frame vernacular structure, circa 1933. Kevin Melloncamp represented the project. This project originally was presented last fall. They had revised the original project and this application includes new locations for the two additions, and a small shed with skylights. He wanted to amend the skylights by adding three windows. Other minor changes included size of the pool, stone terraces and the wood deck.

There was no public input.

Preservation Planner Enid Torregrosa reviewed her Staff Comments for the Board. Her only concern was regarding the skylights. Even though it was not a corner house, the way the property was designed, the skylights were visible. With the revision, she had no concern.

Nils Muench wanted to confirm that the skylights had been removed. The response was in the affirmative.

It was moved by Nils Muench, seconded by George Galvan, to approve. Motion carried.

APPROVED

3. CL3- Request to build a carport, after the fact - # **810 Eisenhower Drive- Adele V. Stones (H10-02-26-204)** Owner desires to construct an 11' by 15' (165 square feet) carport in the rear yard with attached arbor to support additional landscaping. The carport will be located behind existing six foot picket fence. The carport will be wood frame with galvanized v-crimp roof.

This is a contributing, Queen Anne revival structure, circa 1906.

Preservation Planner stated that what had been built had been removed March 2<sup>nd</sup>.

Ginny Stones represented the project. Although this was called after-the-fact, the structure was erected with 2x4's to represent the visual of what was to be constructed. In no way was the applicant intending to construct something without permit for demonstrative purposes only. The property at 810 Eisenhower historically has had a garage back to 1928, and as recently as 1974. The Property Appraiser's card shows an 18'x10' structure along the Olivia Street right-of-way. The style was hipped or gable, not flat or not shed. The property is a contributing structure with a high pitched roof. The carport was 60' from the structure. Ms. Stones stated that neighborhood contained a little bit of everything. The characteristic that defines the neighborhood is the eclectic nature of the structures. There are large estate homes as well as smaller cigar maker cottages and arts and crafts structures. The mass and scale of the surrounding structures is inconsistent. Ms. Stones provided photographs of structure in the immediate neighborhood all of which had garages that were adjacent to the rights-of-way.

There was no public comment.

Preservation Planner Enid Torregrosa reviewed her Staff Comments for the Board. She did research that there was evidence of a structure for a car in that particular location. She did not have any information about elevations. Based on the height of the structure Staff's recommendation would be to deny.

Carlos Rojas referred the Guidelines, page 40, "Outbuildings: Carports, Gazebos, Garages, Sheds, Shelters and Accessory Structures. Construction of excessive outbuildings detracts from the quality of an historic neighborhood and lessens its intended appearance and historical design by taking away areas devoted to landscaping and open space." There were already three outbuildings on the site. Items 4, 5, and 8, particularly 5 and 8. "Pre-existing historically appropriate outbuildings may be repaired or restored." Number 5 is most restrictive "The construction of new accessory buildings such as garages or carports which are highly visible from the public right-of-way are not appropriate in the historic district".

Nils Muench stated that one of the arguments was that it couldn't be seen because of the foliage. He stated that they had consistently held the view that they could not include foliage because in one day it could be removed. He also was concerned about how it appeared to the neighbor. He felt that there were no redeeming characteristics.

Rudy Molinet would feel a little bit better with documented evidence of what it looked like. It was clear about new structures and would concur with Commission Muench, but would feel differently if there was some evidence of prior existence.

George Galvan questioned the photographs. There appeared to have been something, was it taken down? He was somewhat confused, two drawings of a carport. One photograph was from Olivia, one from Eisenhower,

Ginny Stones stated that there were two outbuildings on the property. This lot was actually two oversized legal lots. In terms of the visibility from the right-of-way, you couldn't put a structure between the road and the carport or garage.

It was moved by Nils Muench, seconded by Carlos Rojas, to disapprove based on the Guidelines, page 40.5. Carlos Rojas seconded the motion.

Under discussion Commissioner Rudy Molinet questioned if the carport could be moved more away from the right-of-way towards Eisenhower. Ms. Stones stated that there was a historic pathway that had been used from the right-of-way to the house that would be disrupted. It was also their intent to utilize the historic location.

Assistant City Attorney Ronald Ramsingh mentioned the earlier referral to Guidelines 4, 5, and 8 on page 40.

Nils Muench amended his motion to include page 40, 4, 5, and 8. Carlos Rojas agreed.

Carlos Rojas pointed out in the preamble on page 40, referring to "excessive out buildings." He also reminded them that this was an exceptionally historic building.

Chairman Peter Batty had to agree with Rudy Molinet.

Carlos Rojas stated that it was removed near 1930.

Ms. Stones stated that there was evidence of a carport in 1974.

Motion carried.

Rudy Molinet voted no.

4. **CL4- Request to install HVAC units, under construction project- # 830 Truman Avenue- Architect Jose Gonzalez (H10-03-01-213)** Modification to existing approval H08-04-14-443. See attached narrative.

Jose Gonzalez represented the project. A/C units were originally intended to be placed on the facades; however these units are complete flush and concealed. Mr. Gonzalez stated the units were not projecting in any way. The units are completely flush and are concealed by a decorative panel.

Chairman Peter Batty stated that on the original application they were not included at all. Mr. Gonzalez stated that they weren't sure what they were going to use at the time.

Nils Muench questioned if they were originally going to put in some type of A/C. The response was in the affirmative.

There was no public comment.

Preservation Planner Enid Torregrosa reviewed her Staff Comments for the Board. She stated that usually she did not respond to projects under construction; however, she did provide history of the project.

Rudy Molinet questioned if they had thought about ductless units? The response was that these were the same type. Jose Gonzalez responded that the reason they didn't use that model was that they needed 55 units. There was no way to completely conceal that number of units.

Chairman Peter Batty questioned if the windows had been planned. The units appeared to be the same width.

Nils Muench had received more comments about this particular building being so close to Truman Avenue. Jose Gonzalez stated that the City asked them to move the building forward. Mr. Muench referred to the Guidelines, Page 45.2 stating that the units should not be visible.

Jose Gonzalez offered to provide a mock-up for the Board's review.

Chairman Peter Batty stated that the variance was not an issue at this meeting.

Jose Gonzalez stated they would not see a unit.

Nils Muench

Chairman Peter Batty stated he couldn't justify it the way it was seen now. It was just too intrusive.

It was moved by George Galvan, seconded by Nils Muench to table. Motion carried.

**TABLED**

#### **6. Historic Preservation Planner's Report**

They needed to decide on a date for the Sustainability Workshop. After discussion it was decided that April 27 would be the date.

It was moved by Carlos Rojas, seconded by Rudy Molinet, to set the date of April 27 for the workshop. Motion carried.

#### **7. Comments from Commissioners**

#### **8. Adjournment**

There being no further business, it was moved by Rudy Molinet, seconded by George Galvan, to adjourn. Motion carried.

Interested parties may appear at the public hearing(s) and be heard with respect to the proposed items. Copies of the applications are available from the City of Key West Planning Department located at 604 Simonton Street, Key West, Florida, Monday through Friday between the hours of 8:00 am and 5:00 pm.

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

ADA Assistance: Anyone needing special assistance at the HARC Commission hearing due to disability should contact the City of Key West at (305) 809-3720 at least two days prior thereto.

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