Call Meeting To Order
Chairman Rudy Molinet called the Key West Historical Architectural Review Commission (HARC) Meeting of March 14, 2012 to order at **5:34 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, Vice Chairman Bryan Green, and Chairman Rudy Molinet.

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

Approval of Agenda
Chairman Rudy Molinet inquired as to any changes to the agenda. Enid Torregrosa stated that item #8 has been withdrawn by the applicant.

Actions/Motions:
A motion was made by Ms. Donna Bosold, seconded by Mr. Daniel Metzler, that the Agenda be **Approved**. The motion **Passed** by a unanimous voice vote.

Approval of Minutes

1 February 08, 2012

Actions/Motions:
A motion was made by Mr. Michael Miller, seconded by Mr. Theo Glorie, that the item be **Approved**. The motion **Passed** by a unanimous voice vote.

2 February 21, 2012

Actions/Motions:
A motion was made by Ms. Donna Bosold, seconded by Mr. Theo Glorie, that the item be **Approved**. The motion **Passed** by a unanimous voice vote.

HARC Planner's Report
Ms. Torregrosa presented the HARC Applications Monthly Reports, which were included in the meeting package. Ms. Torregrosa highlighted that so far this year 447 HARC applications have been processed – 173 processed in January, 202 processed in February, 72 processed so far in March. Ms. Torregrosa added that of the 202 applications processed in February that 176 were Staff approved. Ms. Torregrosa also noted that 25.36% of the applications submitted were completed the same day, 35.04% were completed in 1 day, and 5.41% were completed in 2 days. Ms. Torregrosa concluded stating that this means that a total of 65.81% of the applications submitted were processed complete by the HARC Staff in 2 days or less which is a great turn-around. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the higher number of days in the turn-around are due to fact that additional necessary information was missing from the application and therefore the application could not be processed until that information is submitted.

Assistant City Attorney's Report
Mr. Ramsingh reported that the Proposed Revision to the HARC Demolition Ordinance is

scheduled for the March 27th Special Planning Board Meeting.

Old Business

3 Demolition of existing stairs, shed and roof- **#812-814 Baptist Lane- #812-814 Patone Street- Ty Symroski/ Cynthia Domenech (H12-01-189) Second reading**

Ty Symroski and Chris Liddle were present. Mr. Symroski stated that he did not have anything additional.

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 proposed demolitions can be considered by the Commission since they comply with the criteria for demolitions in the historic district as stated in Chapter 102 of the Land Development Regulations. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the applicant needs to coordinate with the landscape division in order to avoid any damages to the existing historic trees.

Commission Discussion:
The Commissioners had no additional comments or discussion.

Actions/Motions:
A motion was made by Mr. Theo Glorie, seconded by Mr. Daniel Metzler, 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

4 Demolition of back attached addition- **#610 Olivia Street- Thomas A. Kelly (H12-01-254) Second reading**

Tom Kelly was presented to answer any questions about the project. Mr. Kelly stated that he did not have anything to add.

Public Comments:
There were no public comments.

Staff Report:
Enid Torregrosa presented her staff report. Ms. Torregrosa stated that this is it is Staff's opinion that the proposed demolition can be considered by the Commission since it complies with the criteria for demolitions in the historic district as stated in Chapter 102 of the Land Development Regulations.

Commission Discussion:
The Commissioners had no additional comments or discussion.

Actions/Motions:
A motion was made by Mr. Daniel Metzler, seconded by Mr. Theo Glorie, 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

5a Renovations and reconfiguration of one story rear addition. Reconstruction of two story rear addition- **#306 Elizabeth Street- Robert Delaune (H12-01-256)**

Rob Delaune presented the project. Mr. Delaune stated that the purpose of this project is to improve the back portion of the house by removing some existing additions that were added to the historic structure and constructing a new addition. Mr. Delaune stated this new design would improve the existing condition of the historic house.

Public Comments:
There were no public comments.

Staff Report:
Design:
Enid Torregrosa presented her staff report. Ms. Torregrosa stated that this is a request for renovations of a historic building and the construction of attached additions on the back. The main house is a two story structure and is listed as a contributing resource. The frame vernacular structure was built circa 1850. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the proposed additions and new configuration of the back portion of the house will not have an effect on the historic house. Ms. Torregrosa added that although the two story addition will be visible from Eaton and part of Elizabeth Street, its proportion, mass and scale are appropriate for the historic fabric in the surrounding urban context. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is Staff's opinion that the proposed design will improve the existing condition of the historic house and it is consistent with the guidelines for additions and alterations. Ms. Torregrosa concluded that if approved this project may require Planning Board review since the building is non-conforming and the proposed improvements will exceed 66% of the value of the structure.

Demolition:
Ms. Torregrosa stated it is Staff's opinion that the proposed demolitions can be considered by the Commission since they comply with the criteria for demolitions in the historic district as stated in Chapter 102 of the Land Development Regulations. Ms. Torregrosa added that Staff understands the actual structures attached to the back of the building cannot be deemed contributing to the historic fabric. Ms. Torregrosa added that if the first reading for demolition if approved a second reading is required.

Commission Discussion:
Mr. Miller inquired about the doors at the rear of the house. Mr. Delaune responded to Mr. Miller's inquiries concerning the doors, their functionality and setup.

Mr. Molinet inquired if windows on the main house are being replaced. Mr. Delaune stated they are not planning to replace any windows at this time.

Mr. Glorie stated he liked the design.

Actions/Motions:
A motion was made by Mr. Theo Glorie, 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

5b Demolition of rear additions- **#306 Elizabeth Street- Robert Delaune (H12-01-256)**

In an effort to expedite the meetings all discussion took place during the discussion of

item 5a.

Actions/Motions:

A motion was made by Mr. Daniel Metzler, seconded by Ms. Theo Glorie, 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

New Business

6 New elevated office building and renovation of existing concrete structure- **#202 William Street- Bender and Associates (H12-01-258)**

Haven Burkee presented the project. Mr. Burkee stated that this project contains two components: This first involves the renovations to an existing concrete structure facing the waterfront. The second component will be the construction of new two story office space building facing Lazy Way. Mr. Burkee stated that due to the new building being located in a FEMA V flood zone the first floor of the building cannot be used for habitable space therefore it be used for storage. Mr. Burkee reviewed the plans for construction and renovation and 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 a request for renovations of a concrete structure and the construction of a detached addition on its back. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the existing structure is a one story concrete building that is not listed in the surveys as a contributing resource. The new design proposes a two story concrete building. The south east corner of the building will be open and a sales desk is proposed on that space for tickets sales for the Western Union Schooner. The plans also propose renovations to the existing concrete building. The new design incorporates a rooftop. New wood barn door type will be installed on the existing fenestrations. The proposed new addition will create a new urban façade much needed in that important corner block. The proposed mass and scale of the building is in keeping with the existing building and its surrounding non-contributing structures. The new building will conceal a back portion of a building and its site that for decades has been an urban eyesore in such a significant waterfront corridor site.

Commission Discussion:

Mr. Glorie asked if the purpose of the structure is to provide office space for Schooner Wharf Bar? Mr. Burkee responded that it is to provide office space for the client – Key West Bight. Mr. Burkee added that it is why there is no interior walls in the building. The floor plan would be to completed to suit the lessee which may be Schooner Wharf. Mr. Glorie inquired as to if that area could be used for public restrooms. Mr. Burkee reminded Mr. Glorie that there is an issue with using that space due to the FEMA requirements.

Mr. Miller asked if the flat roof would support mounting the HVAC equipment. Mr. Burkee stated that they had not designed that yet but it was a possibility for the HVAC equipment to be located on the roof or mounted above flood level between the buildings. Mr. Miller inquired as to how the equipment would be concealed, if placed on the roof. Mr. Miller asked staff if the Commission should be reviewing the plans since the plans are not complete and that the MEP may change the appearance of the building. Mr. Miller

also inquired why there is only one set of stairs for the structure. Mr. Burkee explained the plans do not show the existing buildings and mentioned that maybe looking at the photos would help understand the site. Mr. Miller concluded that he finds the elevations lacking and that he could support the direction but he could not support the application without the completed plans showing all buildings. Mr. Miller also stated that he would prefer to see the completed MEP prior to making any decision concerning the proposed project.

Mr. Green stated that he is very disappointed with the design. Mr. Green stated that he did not think this design would stand up over time. Mr. Green stated that he could understand inexpensive design but not design that lacks quality. Mr. Green stated that the building lacks a lot and he worries about how the first floor would stand up to conditions in the area. Mr. Green concluded that the design just doesn't work for him.

Ms. Bosold asked if there will be any limitations of the use of the deck. Mr. Burkee stated that they did not have an limitations for the deck and that would be left up to the Key West Bight to determine.

Mr. Metzler asked if signage was being reviewed as part of this application. Mr. Molinet responded that the signs in the pictures were existing. Mr. Metzler stated that he did not like the elevation along Lazy Way Lane and that it was out of scale with the environment. Mr. Metzler suggested maybe landscaping or color changes on the buildings may help.

Actions/Motions:

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

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

7a Construct new gable roof on back portion of house and increase height of exterior walls- **#319 Grinnell Street- Michael Skoglund (H12-01-298)**

Michael Skoglund presented the project. Mr. Skoglund stated that the proposed project is to extend the exterior side walls of the house 3'6" in order to build a gable roof over the back portion which involve the removal of an existing sawtooth roof. Mr. Skoglund remained to respond to the Commissioner's questions.

Public Comments:

There were no public comments.

Staff Report:

Design:

Enid Torregrosa presented her staff report. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the house is listed as a contributing resource in the surveys. The one and a half story frame vernacular structure was built in 1924 and is located on a corner lot. Ms. Torregrosa stated that according to the 1948 Sanborn map the house had a one story "L" shape back attached addition. Ms. Torregrosa stated that in the 1962 Sanborn map this back portion of the house is depicted as a one story rectangular footprint, as it stands today. Moreover the actual pool is located where the cistern used to be. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the proposed plans include the removal of a sawtooth roof and its replacement with a gable roof in order to convert the entire house as a one and a half story one. It is staff's opinion that the proposed design does not comply with the guidelines. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the design proposes the enlargement of a contributing resource,

which is contrary to the guidelines. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the 1962 Sanborn map evidences that the existing back portion of the house was a one story sawtooth with a small back porch. Ms. Torregrosa stated that today the small back porch has been enclosed. Ms. Torregrosa added that changing the sawtooth roof and covering the back portion of the house with a gable roof will completely change the historic roof form and configuration as well as the proportions and scale of the building. The proposed change will have an adverse effect in the historic structure.

Demolition:
Ms. Torregrosa stated that her report is for the demolition request for a sawtooth roof and a small shed roof located on the back portion of a contributing house. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is staff's opinion that the roof actual configuration of a sawtooth and a small shed are illustrated in the 1962 Sanborn map therefore the existing roof configuration has been there, at least since 1962. Ms. Torregrosa stated that Staff cannot give a specific date as to when the sawtooth and small shed roof configuration were built. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is Staffs understand that the roofs are structurally sound, therefore are not compromised by extreme deterioration. Ms. Torregrosa concluded that it is staff's opinion that demolishing the existing roofs in order to allow the proposed gable roof will be contrary to the guidelines and to the LDR's.

Commission Discussion:
Mr. Miller asked why there were no elevation drawings included in the package. Mr. Miller asked Ms. Torregrosa if she would have objected as strongly if an additional sawtooth were used instead of loosing the sawtooth. Ms. Torregrosa stated that she objected to the form and that she cannot make an opinion on something that has not been presented with a drawing.

Mr. Green stated that he is in complete agreement with the Staff Report and could not support the application.

Actions/Motions:
A motion was made by Mr. Bryan Green, seconded by Ms. Donna Bosold, that the item be **Denied** based on Guidelines 26-4, 37-1, 26-3, 26-4, 26-5, 26-6, and 26-7. The motion **Passed** by the following vote
Yes: 7 – Ms. Bosold, Mr. Glorie, Ms. Gutierrez, Mr. Metzler, Mr. Miller, Mr. Green, Chairman Molinet

7b Removal of existing rear roofs- **#319 Grinnell Street- Michael Skoglund (H12-01-298)**

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

Mr. Molinet asked the attorney that since the design was denied was it necessary to vote on the demolition. Mr. Ramsingh recommended the Commission to vote on postponing the demolition in order to give the applicant the chance to submit a different design that may be more acceptable to the Commission and postponement of the demolition would allow it to be reviewed again at a later date.

Actions/Motions:
A motion was made by Mr. Bryan Green, seconded by Ms. Donna Bosold, that the item be **Postponed**. The motion **Passed** by the following vote:
Yes: 7 – Ms. Bosold, Mr. Glorie, Ms. Gutierrez, Mr. Metzler, Mr. Miller, Mr.

Green, Chairman Molinet

8 Reconstruction of chimney with brick to match previously existing brick, as approved in H11-01-1757. Deleting the condition to step back chimney from kitchen wall- **#730 Southard Street- Thomas E. Pope (H12-01-339)**

Application was **Withdrawn** by the applicant prior to the meeting.

9a Addition at the rear of buildings, one story timber frame with board and batten**-#1216 White Street- William Rowan (H12-01-342)**

Bill Rowan presented the project. Mr. Rowan stated that this proposed rear addition that would combine two one story buildings. Mr. Rowan explained how the addition will allow the combination of the two structures. Mr. Rowan explained how the combination of the two older structures will be accomplished. Mr. Rowan stated a cupola will crown the new gable roof and will be centralized with the complex main entrance. Mr. Rowan stated that the addition will be setback from the front property line approximately 42'. Mr. Rowan remained to respond to the Commissioner's questions.

Public Comments:
There were no public comments.

Staff Report:
Design:
Enid Torregrosa presented her staff report. Ms. Torregrosa stated that this is for new additions attached to the back of both existing structures. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the main building on the site is listed as a contributing resource and was built circa 1889. Ms. Torregrosa added that the ancillary building is depicted in the 1948 Sanborn map but is not listed as a contributing resource. Ms. Torregrosa stated that this building use to be a shop. Ms. Torregrosa stated that both existing buildings are one story frame structures. Ms. Torregrosa stated that by observing the Sanborn maps and comparing them with the actual survey map it is evident that the main building and the ancillary structure were altered on their back with attached expansions. Ms. Torregrosa stated that on March 22, 2011, the Commission approved plans for the rehabilitation of the facades of the ancillary structure. Ms. Torregrosa stated that this building use to be an eyesore to the surrounding community. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the proposed plans include the replacement of part of the back portions of both structures with a one story frame structure that will connect them. Ms. Torregrosa stated that a cupola will crown the new gable roof and will be centralized with the complex main entrance. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the new building will have the same height as the main house, which is higher than the ancillary structure. Ms. Torregrosa added that behind the ancillary structure a front gable roof will create a transition into the main addition. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is staff's opinion that the proposed design is inconsistent with many of the guidelines for additions, alterations, and new construction. Ms. Torregrosa added that the proposed mass, scale and design of the new addition will be incompatible with both historic structures. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the height of the proposed addition will be equal to the existing historic house and the proposed cupola will extend that height. Ms. Torregrosa stated that although the addition is proposed on the back of the buildings the roof forms and height will alter the architectural character of the old shop and the historic frame house. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is staff's opinion that the proposed design will have an adverse effect on the two historic buildings. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the design will not conform to actual side setbacks.

Demolition:
Ms. Torregrosa stated that her report is for the demolition of the non historic back additions to the main house and to the old shop. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is staff's opinion that the proposed demolitions will be done on non historic back portions of the buildings. There is evidence in the Sanborn maps that the actual back portions of the buildings were added after 1962; therefore are not historic. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the back portions of both buildings cannot be deemed contributing to the historic fabric on a near future. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is staff's opinion that the proposed demolitions can be considered by the Commission since they comply with the criteria for demolitions in the historic district as stated in Chapter 102 of the Land Development Regulations. Ms. Torregrosa concluded that if the first reading for demolition is approved a second reading is required.

Commission Discussion:
Mr. Glorie stated he likes the overall project but does not like the copula nor the windows which look a little like a cabin.

Mr. Metzler stated that he too likes the design. Mr. Metzler stated that he thinks it is far enough back not to deter from the historic value of the front buildings. Mr. Metzler stated that he could support the application.

Mr. Miller stated that he also likes the design. Mr. Miller stated that it was a nice way to marry two ugly sisters. Mr. Miller asked about the doors and their functionality. Mr. Rowan explained what he was trying to accomplish with the design.

Ms. Gutierrez inquired if the buildings were ever together. Ms. Torregrosa responded no that they were not. Ms. Gutierrez stated that she agrees with the Staff Report.

Mr. Molinet stated that he agrees with the Staff Report and reminded the other members that they are not to vote on something based on if they like it but if it meets the Guidelines which this project does not. Mr. Molinet stated that he cannot support the application.

Mr. Green stated that the project does not set will with him and he also agrees with the Staff Report. Mr. Green stated that he found the connections of the buildings did not work because it looks just like it a building butted up against another building.

Mr. Miller addressed the question of the proposal meeting the Guidelines by outlining each guideline (1-8) and addressing any issues or non-issues. Mr. Miller also stated that once again he feels we have the cart before the horse when it comes to the variances and that Planning Board should be hearing the variances prior to HARC approving the plans.

Actions/Motions:
A motion was made by Mr. Michael Miller, seconded by Mr. Daniel Metzler, that the item be **Approved**. The motion **Passed** by the following vote:
Yes: 4 – Ms. Bosold, Mr. Glorie, Mr. Metzler, Mr. Miller
No: 3 - Ms. Gutierrez, Mr. Green, Chairman Molinet

9b Demolition of back additions **-#1216 White Street- William Rowan (H12-01-342)**

In an effort to expedite the meetings all discussion took place during the discussion of item 9a.

Actions/Motions:

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

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

10a Renovations to include repairs to siding, windows and trim. Re roofing with victorian shingles. Reconstruction of back porch- **#1021 Fleming Street- Robert Delaune (H12-01-343)**

Rob Delaune presented the project. Mr. Delaune stated that this is a little Conch house that has been modified over the years. Mr. Delaune stated the intent of the project is to fix and repair this old house. Mr. Delaune stated that the biggest change to the structure will be the removal of the shed roofed back porch and build back an improved back deck.

Public Comments:
There were no public comments.

Staff Report:
Design:
Enid Torregrosa presented her staff report. Ms. Torregrosa stated that this is for renovations to an existing historic house and the reconstruction of a back porch, which part of it will be covered. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the building is listed as a contributing resource in the surveys. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the building is a one and a half story frame structure and was build circa 1892. Ms. Torregrosa added that it is staff understanding that the building at some point, and before the 1960's underwent some alterations; the front porch and the main roof eaves presents architectural details which have characteristics of Bungaloid style. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is staff's opinion that the proposed design is consistent with the guidelines. Ms. Torregrosa added that the proposed deck will be less than 50% of the total lot minus the house footprint. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the new shed is well proportioned and will be in scale with the historic house. Ms. Torregrosa concluded that the proposed restoration of architectural elements is in much need since the house is presenting some decay.

Demolition:
Enid Torregrosa presented her staff report. Ms. Torregrosa stated that this is for a demolition request for a covered porch attached the back portion of a contributing house. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is staff's opinion that the proposed demolition is consistent with the LDR's. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the actual roof's size and proportions are not the same as the one depicted in the Sanborn maps. Ms. Torregrosa concluded that if approved a second reading will be required.

Commission Discussion:
Mr. Green stated that he very much likes the project. Mr. Green added that it is very nice to see someone take one of these old houses and not try to make it much larger.

Actions/Motions:

A motion was made by Mr. Bryan Green, seconded by Mr. Theo Glorie, 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

10b Demolition of back porch- **#1021 Fleming Street- Robert Delaune (H12-01-343)**

In an effort to expedite the meetings all discussion took place during the discussion of item 10a.

Actions/Motions:
A motion was made by Mr. Bryan Green, 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

11a Renovate existing two story house. New wood frame porch to match existing. Repair portions of existing roof. Replace doors and windows throughout. Repair all damaged areas to match existing. New carport to replace existing- **#421 Virginia Street- Seatech of the Florida Keys (H12-01-346)**

Owen Trepanier presented the project. Mr. Trepanier introduced Todd Kemp the owner of the property. Mr. Trepanier stated that this house is in danger of being demolished due to neglect and described the condition of the structures on the property. Mr. Trepanier stated that Mr. Kemp would like to rebuild this house and carport as allowed by the LDRs. Mr. Trepanier and Mr. Kemp remained to respond to any questions.

Public Comments:
There were no public comments.

Staff Report:
Design:
Enid Torregrosa presented her staff report. Ms. Torregrosa stated that this is for the restoration of a historic house that has been abandoned and neglected for years. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the plans also include the replacement of an existing carport with a new one. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the one and a half story house is listed as a contributing resource and was built circa 1948. Ms. Torregrosa added that the ancillary building is not depicted in the 1962 Sanborn map; nevertheless a photo circa 1965 shows the structure. Ms. Torregrosa stated that on April 14, 2009 the Commission approved similar plans for the rehabilitation of the house and the carport, but the owners never formalized the variances required for obtaining the building permits. Ms. Torregrosa stated that this building became one of Commissioners Muench examples of demolition by neglect and has become an eyesore in the community. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the new carport will have a hip roof covered with metal v-crimp. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is staff's opinion that the proposed design is consistent with many of the guidelines. Ms. Torregrosa stated that this house is in need of restoration. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the proposed three bay front wooden porch is the appropriate design for an almost non existing porch. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is staff's opinion that all new windows must be 2 over 2 true divided wood windows and that all doors will be wood. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is staff's opinion that the northeast side double doors should not be 15 lite doors, since those doors are not compatible with the character of the house, doors with less lites and more solid wood will be more appropriate for the new entryway. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the proposed mass, scale and design of the new carport are in keeping with the house and its surrounding structures. Ms. Torregrosa concluded that it is staff's opinion that the proposed plans will bring this house back to its historic condition. Ms. Torregrosa stated that if approved the plans may need to be reviewed by the Planning Board.

Demolition:
Ms. Torregrosa stated that her report for the demolition a deteriorated front porch that has a concrete floor and partial demolition of the existing roof, which is also deteriorated due to neglect. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the plans also propose the demolition of a non historic carport. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is staff's opinion that the proposed demolitions are proposed on non historic architectural elements that are deteriorated. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the existing carport although non historic is also deteriorated by neglect. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is staff's opinion that the proposed demolitions can be considered by the Commission since they comply with the criteria for demolitions in the historic district as stated in Chapter 102 of the Land Development Regulations. Ms. Torregrosa concluded that if the first reading for demolition is approved a second reading is required.

Commission Discussion:
Mr. Green asked about the placement of the carport and why it was left in the rear of the property. Mr. Trepanier responded that they left the carport where it was mainly because they did not want to cause any issues. Mr. Green suggested moving the carport forward might create a better site plan. Mr. Trepanier suggested that they bring back plans with the carport re-located to the second reading of the demolition.

Mr. Miller stated that moving the carport forward would definitely make for a better site plan. Mr. Miller also stated that he could not support the impact windows.

Mr. Molinet stated that Nils Muench would be pleased with this project.

Mr. Metzler questioned the windows and new Florida building codes (effective 03/15). Mr. Metzler stated that he would support the impact windows on the side and back. Mr. Metzler asked if requiring the wood windows is legal. Mr. Ramsingh stated that requiring the wood windows is legal but would need to research what the new Florida building codes cover.

Actions/Motions:
A motion was made by Mr. Michael Miller, seconded by Mr. Theo Glorie, that the item be **Approved** with the condition that true divide lite wood windows be used. The motion **Passed** by the following vote:
Yes: 7 – Ms. Bosold, Mr. Glorie, Ms. Gutierrez, Mr. Metzler, Mr. Miller, Mr. Green, Chairman Molinet

11b Demolition of front porch, partial demolition of roof and demolition of carport- **#421 Virginia Street- Seatech of the Florida Keys (H12-01-346)**

In an effort to expedite the meetings all discussion took place during the discussion of item 11a.

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

Commissioners Comments
The Commissioners discussed projects with incomplete information and what could be

done to improve the situation. Mr. Green asked if there could be a minimum list of requirements for the applications. Ms. Torregrosa responded by stating that Staff does request more information. Ms. Torregrosa also drew the Commissioner's attention to page 56 of the Guidelines, which list the submission requirements. The Commissioners agreed with Mr. Green that maybe it is time to start working on modifying/improving that section of the Guidelines.

The Commissioners also discussed the Sign Workshop and that there needs to be prep work accomplished before the Workshop is scheduled. Ms. Bolsold and Mr. Miller will work separately on researching existing Historical Areas Sign Ordinances, which will be reviewed by the other Commissioners at a future meeting.

Adjournment

Actions/Motions:

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

Meeting adjourned at **7:56 pm.**

Submitted by,

Jo Bennett

Administrative Coordinator
Planning Department