Historic Architectural Review Commission

Meeting Minutes
May 25, 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, May 25, 2010** at 3**:00 p.m.**, in the City Commission Chambers of Old City Hall located at 510 Greene Street.

1. **Roll Call** Board members present included George Galvan, Rudy Molinet, Nils Muench, and Chairman Peter Batty

2. **Pledge of Allegiance**

3. **Approval of Agenda** A motion to approve the agenda was made by George Galvan and senconded by Nils Muench. Motion carried.

4. **Approval of Minutes**

   a. HARC Meeting Minutes - **April 27, 2010** A motion to approve the minutes was made by Geoge Galvan and seconded by Rudy Molinet. Motion carried.

5. **Items for Public Hearing**

   a. Old Business- Tabled items

   None

   b. New Business

   1. CL1- Awning application – **601 Fleming Street – Applicant: Paul Cox (H10-05-05-500).** Replace the existing awning with new material and colors as provided.

   Lee Mattingly represented the project. He stated that they were replacing the existing awning with a new fabric. A sample piece of awning and photos were presented to the commission.

   No public comment.

   Brendon Cunningham informed the members that staff recommended approval; he stated that the awning was in need of repair and he left the color and pattern to the deliberation of the commission.

   Nils Muench referenced page 31 of the guidelines, he stated that traditional striped awnings were used historically.

   Rudy Molinet stated that the sample picture in the guidelines was of this particular building and noted its prominence.

   Nils Muench made a motion to approve; George Galvan seconded the motion. Motion carried.

APPROVED

2. CL2- Request to demolish existing garage – **811 Truman Avenue – Applicant: Gary the Carpenter (H10-05-12-528).** Remove existing garage structure and replace with new two-bay garage, workshop and laundry at grade and second storey storage units.

Gary Burchfield represented the project. He stated that city staff in the building and planning departments agreed that the garage structure needed to be demolished. He stated that the second floor was to be used for storage and it was technically only a half story. The original drawings had a higher roofline, but after staff review the roof line was given less of a pitch. There are four units in the building and there is no storage, this necessitates storage in the roofline of the new garage structure. He then stated that he was going to try to blend the new building into the historic building with a stucco block façade with siding above the 8 or 9 foot mark.

No public comment.

Peter Batty questioned staff if this item would require two hearings being that it is a demolition.

Brendon Cunningham confirmed that the item would require two hearings. He then stated that staff recommended approval and that the mass and scale were fitting. He noted that the location may require a variance to setbacks depending on how Mr. Burchfield applies for his permits.

Nils Muench requested clarification of the building plans by Mr. Burchfield.

Gary Burchfield explained the plans to the commission.

Ron Ramsingh stated that there was a requirement under the code of ordinances that required that the property be posted for demolition, which was not done. The property itself must be noticed as well as the regular notice for purpose of a meeting; he referred to section 102:217 of the code of ordinances.

Gary Burchfield stated that he was under the impression that because the structure was deemed a hazard it would not require two meetings.

Ron Ramsingh stated that if the chief building official condemns the building then that would be a separate procedure, however if it is an application to demolish a structure in the historic district then it would fall under the guidelines in the code of ordinances section 102:217.

Peter Batty recommended that the item be tabled so that the applicant would not have to start this process over again and staff could proceed with the correct notice.

Gary Burchfield asked if the circumstances would change if he was able to get the chief building official to deem the structure hazardous.

Ron Ramsingh stated that the way the application is submitted it would require further noticing, however if the applicant wanted to obtain a letter from the chief building official deeming the structure hazardous that would be a separate issue outside of the HARC commission.

Nils Muench stated that he feels they should follow the guidelines and the legal department's interpretation of the code.

George Galvan made a motion to table; Nils Muench seconded the motion. Motion carried.

TABLED

3. CL3- Request for new signage **– 530 Truman Avenue – Applicant: Anchor Sign, Inc. (H10-05-12-529)** Replace existing sign package to accompany proposed façade renovation.

Joseph Funderburk represented the project. He stated that he understood staff was recommending denial on the proposed signage, so he referred to new options and presented a drawing board with these options. He informed the commission that the current free standing sign is misspelled. He referred to the drawing board to show the rest of the proposed signage and its relation to scale and façade.

No public comment.

Brendon Cunningham stated that staff recommends denial based on guidelines 2, 6, and 24. In this case the signage exceeds the area and depth as well as number of signs allowed.

Peter Batty asked Brendon Cunningham if staffs decision to deny was considering the applicants newly presented options.

Brendon Cunningham stated that he had not received any different options other than what was provided to him in the original package.

Nils Muench suggested that the applicant review the guidelines then come back with a single proposal that is consistent with the guidelines.

Joseph Funderburk asked if the commission would be willing to accept the proposal that the existing signage is removed for the potential façade replacement and re-installed as is, with the only exception being the misspelled wording on the sign at the intersection.

Rudy Molinet asked staff if the existing signs met current guidelines.

Brendon Cunningham stated that staff had not reviewed the materials because it was not addressed in the application.

Rudy Molinet asked Ron Ramsingh if the current signage could be considered grandfathered.

Ron Ramsingh stated that there was no such rule in this case.

Peter Batty stated that it would be beneficial for the applicant to review the guidelines and bring back a concise proposal, currently there are too many options and it is not clear what the applicant is proposing.

Ron Ramsingh referred to the guidelines for the definition of façade and related it to size.

The applicant stated again that the only difference in the package is the corner sign being changed, after the facade repair was finished if it was allowed.

Rudy Molinet stated that the applicant was requesting something different as far as the logo on the street corner sign.

The applicant informed the commissioners that it is just a new style font.

Rudy Molinet stated that the applicant should return with a new application.

Peter Batty stated that the application that is in the packet is the only information they can make a decision on. Any changes would have to be re-noticed and brought before the board again.

Joseph Funderburk asked if the commission had any way to approve this application with the discussed changes. He also stated that if the commission did not have these capabilities he would have to follow their recommendation.

The commissioners discussed the options that could be considered for the applicant.

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

TABLED

Jose Gordillo the architect for the project stated that the commission could possibly discuss the building itself and then consider the application. He stated that the option is only to replace the sign that is currently there and fit it into the style of the new building.

4. CL4- Request for façade renovation **- 530 Truman Avenue – Applicant: Jose Gordillo / RRW Architects (H10-05-14-544)**. Renovate entry façade to include enlarged pediment feature and enhanced color scheme. Paint walls - Benjamin Moore "Steep Cliff Grey", columns and trim - Benjamin Moore "Minced Onion", column top and base - Benjamin Moore "Dark Pewter".

Jose Gordillo represented the project. He showed photos of the proposed façade renovation. He then stated that the renovation was a change in the entrance feature, refurbishing the metal roof, stucco and re-painting, and adding pilasters to define the building.

No public comment.

Brendon Cunningham stated that staff is recommending approval

Nils Muench asked for an image of the proposed façade.

Rudy Molinet questioned the applicant how much the facade increased the width of the area.

Jose Gordillo stated that it would increase to about 8 ft.

Nils Muench stated that he was concerned that the store front enlargement comes close to impacting the historic character of old town Key West.

Jose Gordillo stated that on the existing façade the feature holding the CVS sign is a component of the roof and is basically an oversized dormer.

George Galvan asked the applicant if the design of the proposed façade and space was due to the sign.

Jose Gordillo stated that it is CVS's intent to maintain maximum exposure and that was the reason for the increased façade. He also stated that the existing columns are the same as the current.

George Galvan stated that the area of the sign is a much larger space than the existing one. He then asked the applicant if it was designed to be larger because of the signage package.

Jose Gordillo stated that the facade is larger in the proposed package to give more definition.

Nils Muench referred to page 37 of the guidelines. He stated that what has been presented is an intrusion in the historic district.

Ron Ramsingh referred to page 49 guideline number 2.

Rudy Molinet stated that the sign is part of the façade package, and he supports the package as is presented.

George Galvan asked the applicant if the CVS Pharmacy sign was actually lower.

Jose Gordillo stated that it was lower.

George Galvan asked what the roofing materials were.

Jose Gordillo stated that it was standing seem that is existing on the entire building including the other businesses as a continuation of the mansard roof.

Nils Muench stated that the peak of the proposed dormer is higher than existing.

Rudy Molinet asked the applicant if the other storefronts had a similar roof line.

Jose Gordillo stated that it was the only one on the building with a dormer. He also stated that he would repair parts of the roof with the existing materials.

Rudy Molinet clarified the proposed plans and questioned the consistency of the buildings appearance.

Peter Batty stated that the decision of approval is based on the entire building appearance.

Ron Ramsingh asked the applicant if he represented this particular tenant or the owner of the entire building as well.

Jose Gordillo stated that he only represented the tenant.

Ron Ramsingh stated that because he only represented the tenant he might not have permission to change the rest of the roof.

Rudy Molinet clarified Mr. Ramsingh's statement.

Nils Muench made a motion to table; it was seconded by Rudy Molinet. Motion carried.

TABLED

5. CL6- Request to construct first floor utility enclosure and second storey addition – **328 Whitehead Street- Applicant: Peter Pike (H10-05-14-546)** Expand existing second storey bedroom to include new window and reuse of existing door and demolish and replace existing shed on first floor porch and replace with new enclosure with materials to match the principal structure.

Peter Pike represented the project. He stated that the owner was intending to provide for a partial addition to the rear of the structure. The addition is a second floor addition proposed to ac00commodate a new bathing facility on an existing upper level deck. It is proposed to have a roof to provide an enclosed space.

No public comment.

Brendon Cunningham stated that staff recommended approval.

Nils Muench asked Peter Pike to show the proposed addition on the full size plans.

Peter Pike pointed out the proposed additions to commissioners.

George Galvan made a motion to approve; Rudy Molinet seconded the motion. Motion carried.

APPROVED

6. Historic Preservation Planner's Report

Ron Ramsingh stated that the commission had voted on minutes that were not included in their packets at the last meeting; however they were provided and voted for approval at this meeting rectifying that error.

Rudy Molinet asked staff what the status was on the fence at the Harbor House site.

Ron Ramsingh stated that he had discussed the project with Assistant City Manager Mark Finigan. He stated that Mr. Finigan talked to the owners and set in motion two phases for the fence. The first is to paint the fence which was done; the second is to bring it into compliance with HARC.

7. Comments from Commissioners

8. Adjournment

Rudy Molinet made a motion to adjourn; it was seconded by George Galvan. 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.