Call Meeting To Order

Chairman Rudy Molinet called the Key West Historic Architectural Review Commission (HARC) Meeting of May 09, 2012 to order at **5:30 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 there were no changes.

Actions/Motions:

A motion was made by Mr. Bryan Green, seconded by Mr. Theo Glorie, that the Agenda with no changes be **Approved**. The motion **Passed** by a unanimous voice vote.

Approval of Minutes

1 **April 25, 2012**

Actions/Motions:

A motion was made by Mr. Daniel Metzler, seconded by Ms. Maggie Gutierrez, that the Minutes be **Approved**. The motion **Passed** by a unanimous voice vote except for Mr. Green who abstained from voting since he was absent from the meeting.

HARC Planner's Report

2 **HARC Applications Monthly Reports**

Ms. Torregrosa presented the HARC Applications Monthly Reports for April, which was included in the meeting package. Ms. Torregrosa highlighted the application statistics:

- 726 HARC applications have been processed to date this year.
- 164 were received in March.
- Of the 164 applications processed in April, 126 have been Staff approved.
- 75.40% of the applications processed in March were processed in 2 days or less

Ms. Torregrosa reminded the Commission that May is Historic Preservation month, which is a Nationwide event. Ms. Torregrosa stated that for the first time in a very long time Key West will be celebrating by holding a Historic Forum on May 10-11 and briefly covered the agenda speakers and topics for the two-day event.

Ms. Torregrosa announced that she has received the first draft of the Historic Survey and has one month to review the results and respond.

Assistant City Attorney's Report

Mr. Ramsingh informed the Commission that he had been notified that the Cushman vs. City of Key West (White Roof Case) has petitioned for declaratory release a motion summary judgment hearing in circuit court.

Mr. Molinet commented that he had noticed numerous ticket booths popping up around town and inquired as to how some of these are taking place without HARC ruling on their placement. Mr. Ramsingh responded stating that there were numerous discussion concerning the new versions of

	ticket booths appearing around town and that the City Attorney and Code Compliance has been involved. Mr. Ramsingh added that the bottom line is that it has been decided that if there is no construction involved that then it is not considered a ticket booth if just furniture is involved.
Old Business	
3	Change HARC meetings schedule to the second and fourth Tuesday of each month. Chairman Molinet stated that Judge Overby has asked HARC to move the meetings to a different time so as not to impact the Code Hearings. Ms. Torregrosa explained how it was determined to move the meetings to the 2nd and 4th Tuesdays. Mr. Molinet also suggested changing the time to 5:00pm. Mr. Green stated that he would like to see it stay at 5:30pm in order to allow the public to attend the meetings. Ms. Bennett reminded the Chair that moving to 5:00pm would cause more conflicts. **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
4	Install two signs on columns to be located on the pier at the end of Margaret Street for the Fort Jefferson Museum and the Historic Seaport Interpretive Center housed in the historic Thompson Fish House - **#231 Margaret Street – City of Key West/ FMH Builders, Inc. (H12-01-123)** Marilyn Wilbarger presented the project on behalf of the City. Ms. Wilbarger stated that the Bight Board has voted unanimously in support of the sign. Ms. Wilbarger explained that this sign is an effort to attract visitors down the pier to visit the museums. Ms. Wilbarger explained the reasoning for the sign is due to the City's need to have fuel trucks deliver to Old Thompson's Fish House fuel area. Mr. Ed Swift on behalf of Historic Tours of America explained the need for the sign and the history behind how the design was determined. Mr. Swift explained that the sign is to promote the interpretative Dry Tortugas museum. Mr. Swift stated that no ticket sales will take place in the museum it will simply be free of charge museum to the public and a opportunity to understand the history of Fort Jefferson. Mr. Swift stated that the sign would not block the view of the Old Thompson's Fish House. Ms. Wilbarger and Mr. Swift remained to respond to questions from the Commissioners. **Public Comments:** There were no public comments. **Staff Report:** Brendon Cunninham presented his Staff report. Mr. Cunningham stated that the columns and signs will be made of wood and be painted white, blue and gold. Mr. Cunningham stated that the columns are to be 6" x 6" and approximately 13 feet in height with a 12 foot clearance to accommodate any necessary vehicle passage. Mr. Cunningham stated that the applicant understands that there are no guidelines for this type of signage. Mr. Cunningham stated that it is Staff's belief that the proposed design is inconsistent with many of the Guidelines for additions and alterations as well as Guidelines for signage. The scale of the construction will detract from the integrity of the existing structure, which will blocked from view by the construction. Mr. Cunningham stated that it is Staff's opinion that the proposed construction is not appropriate in design and location to the historic Thompson Fish House. **Commission Discussion:** Michael Miller asked the applicant what other signage will be used to direct the visitors to the building and why not use the sign on the building. Mr. Swift responded that the plan is to request one additional old looking sign "Thompson's Fish House", that will be placed on the building. Mr.

	Swift responded to the question concerning placing the proposed sign on the building stating that they need something closer to land that will entice visitors to come down the docks to visit the museum. Bryan Green stated that the Thompson's Fish House is on the National Registry and he thinks this use will afford the opportunity to use the building and thus the building should be well maintained. Mr. Green stated that secondly he acknowledges the fact that the building is remote and thus requires different signage to attract visitors. Mr. Green continued stating that he acknowledges Staff's recommendation for denial but he cannot make this applicant adhere to restrictions that others have not been held to. Maggie Gutierrez stated that she agrees with what Mr. Green just stated. Ms. Gutierrez stated that she herself has experienced issues with finding the building and thinks something to attract and direct the visitors. Daniel Metzler stated that he does not like the mass of the sign and would like to see it lightened up. Theo Glorie asked if the sign is the same as was presented at a previous meeting but just different verbiage. Mr. Cunningham responded that yes it is the same sign just different verbiage. Donna Bosold inquired as to if the Bight had plans for a Directory Kiosk rather than cluttering up the waterfront with multiple signs. Ms. Wilbarger responded that is one of the things that they are looking into as part of the overall "plan". Ms. Bosold asked if the thoughts are that the sign would be "temporary" until such time the Bight completes its overall "plan". Ms. Wilbarger responded that the expectation is that the signage in the overall 3-year "plan" will be small and not eye-catching. Ms. Wilbarger concluded stating that the visitors need the eye-catching signs. Rudy Molinet stated that he cannot support the new signage, adding that the he thinks the area is becoming too commercial. **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: 3 – Ms. Gutierrez, Mr. Miller, Mr. Green No: 4 – Ms. Bosold, Mr. Glorie, Mr. Metzler, Chairman Molinet A motion was made by Mr. Daniel Metzler, 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
5a	New two story house and new fence-**#914 James Street - Seatech of the Florida Keys (H12-01-345)** Bill Horn presented the project. Mr. Horn explained the history of the project and what is being proposed. Mr. Horn handed out a map that depicts the one and two story buildings in the area. Mr. Horn stated that he has tried to "skinny down" the scale and elevations of the house. **Public Comments:** There were no public comments. **Staff Report:** **Design:** Enid Torregrosa presented her Staff report. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the plans propose the

demolition of a one story non contributing house. Ms. Torregrosa stated that on February 8, 2012 the Commission approved the design of the "restoration" of the historic portion of the house and a new two story addition. Ms. Torregrosa stated that a second reading for the demolition of non historic portions of the house was approved on the February 21 public meeting. On March 28 a new application was postponed by the Commission for the demolition of the entire house and the new construction of a two-story structure. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the revised plans include a new two story house with a two bay front porch. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the house to the east side is a non-historic 2-story frame structure and to the west a one story structure. The new building will sit across the City parking garage and the majority of the structures abutting the back yard are two stories. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is Staff's opinion that the proposed plans are inconsistent with many of the guidelines for new construction. Ms. Torregrosa stated that Staff understands that although the building will be setback from the sidewalk approximately 13', due to the proposed side gable roof it will be perceived more taller than the non-historic house on the east side. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the main façade of the East side house is also setback from the sidewalk, but approximately 15'. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the scale of the proposed house will not be in keeping to the scale and massing of the existing historic houses on that urban block. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is Staff's understands that most of the historic urban context on this part in town has been lost but what is still left as historic should be protected.

Demolition:
Ms. Torregrosa stated that this is the first reading for the demolition request of a non-contributing building. Ms. Torregrosa continued stated that on February 8 and 21 the Commission approved the demolition of non-historic additions that have been attached to a historic structure. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is Staff's opinion that what will be left of the historic part of the house once demolition takes place will be the west side of the house and the roof. Ms. Torregrosa stated that although the historic part of the house is not irrevocably compromise by extreme deterioration it has been altered through time and there is no much left of the historic fabric. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is Staff's understands that the Commission can consider the request for demolition as it is consistent with the criteria for demolitions in the historic district. If the demolition is approved a second reading will be requested.

Commission Discussion:
Michael Miller stated that the new plan is a vast improvement from the plan presented at the previous meeting. Mr. Miller stated that he does not have an issue with the mass and scale of the proposed structure.

Theo Glorie stated that he agrees with Mr. Miller.

Maggie Gutierrez stated that she agrees with Staff Report and cannot support the project. Ms. Gutierrez stated that she is familiar with the area and that she cannot support a two-story structure at this site.

Daniel Metzler suggested that maybe the structure would be better accepted if it were to have a hip roof.

Rudy Molinet stated that he agrees with Ms. Gutierrez and much prefers the originally HARC approved plans or start from scratch with a smaller design.

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

A motion was made by Ms. Maggie Gutierrez, seconded by Mr. Bryan Green, that the item

	be **Denied** based on paragraph 4 page 38a and 38b. The motion **Failed** by the following vote: Yes: 3 – Ms. Gutierrez, Mr. Green, Chairman Molinet No: 4 – Ms. Bosold, Mr. Glorie, Mr. Metzler, Mr. Miller A motion was made by Mr. Daniel Metzler, 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
5b	Demolition of house-**#914 James Street-Seatech of the Florida Keys (H12-01-345)** 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. Donna Bosold, that the item be **Postponed**. The motion **Passed** by a unanimous voice vote
6	New wall sign-**#1019 White Street - Carrie Johnston- (H12-01-386)** Carrie Johnston presented the project. Ms. Johnston reviewed the history of the project and covered the signs remaining at the location along with the revised sign. **Public Comments:** There were no public comments. **Staff Report:** Enid Torregrosa presented her Staff report. Ms. Torregrosa stated this is a request to install a 1'-6" tall by 10' wide wall sign on the north side wall. Ms. Torregrosa stated that sign has the business logo and the following words: "Old World Italian Cuisine & Pizzeria Free Delivery Courtyard & Indoor Seating". Ms. Torregrosa stated that according to the submitted documents the maximum height of letters will be 6". Ms. Torregrosa stated that the existing business obtained a business license in March 14, 2011 under the name of Vito's Piazza. Ms. Torregrosa stated that according to the applicant all pennants, banners and window lettering has been removed. Ms. Torregrosa stated that an Italian flag was installed in the front façade. Ms. Torregrosa stated that on April 11 the Commission motioned to postpone the item. Ms. Torregrosa added that the building located on #1019 White Street is not listed in the surveys. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the structure is not located on a corner lot. Ms. Torregrosa concluded that it is Staff's opinion that the proposed design is consistent with the guidelines as well as with the Land Development Regulations. **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
7	Major Development Plan- Revision to previous approved plans (H11-01-625) to incorporate a flat roof instead of a gable one and color scheme **- Mallory Square - City of Key West/ William P. Horn (H12-01-430)** Donna Bosold recused herself from deliberations on the project due to a perceived conflict of

interest.

Bill Horn and the applicant Joe Walsh presented the project. Mr. Horn covered the history of the project for the Commissioners who might not be familiar with the project. Mr. Horn stated that even though they already have a HARC approved project, they continue to make changes to the project to change the height of the building in order to limit the need for variances.

Public Comments:
Sharon Wells – 812 Thomas Street – Spoke against the project design.
Louise Weithas - 317 Peacon Lane – Spoke against the project design.

Staff Report:
Enid Torregrosa presented her Staff report. Ms. Torregrosa stated that this is the review of revisions to a previously approved Major Development Plan. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the first approved revision was for reducing the building's footprint in order to comply with required setbacks. Ms. Torregrosa stated that for this new application the applicant is proposing a flat roof and minor changes to the facades in order to comply with required height for this particular historic zoning district. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the building is located on a Velocity 13 Flooding Zone or Costal High Hazard Area. Ms. Torregrosa stated that FEMA requires any new structure for that particular area will have the first 13 feet below the lowest horizontal structural member of a new building cannot be use for habitable space and needs to be free of obstructions. Ms. Torregrosa stated that breakable walls are required on new buildings. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the maximum height allow in that historic zoning district is 25'. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the total building height will be approximately 24'-6", 4'-6" lower than the Hospitality house. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the building will keep the same footprint of what was approved before. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is Staff's opinion that the proposed plans that were submitted for review on March 28, 2012 are consistent with many of the guidelines for new construction. Ms. Torregrosa stated that Staff understands that the new proposed flat roofs will improve the mass and the scale of the building. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is Staff's opinion that the form, configuration, mass, proportions, transparencies and design of the proposed building are in keeping with the waterfront context. Ms. Torregrosa stated that if the plans are approved the new changes will require Planning Board review.

Commission Discussion:
Bryan Green stated that he has three questions:

1. Is there an intention to have outdoor seating along the downstairs in the front? Mr. Walsh responded that there would be no service nor consumption in front of the building.
2. Where will be air conditioning unit be located? Mr. Horn indicated on the plans being displayed the location of the units.
3. How will the first floor be closed off at night? Mr. Horn stated that he expect there to be doors that can be pulled down at night to secure the location.

Theo Glorie stated that he agrees with Ms. Wells and that he thinks the design is out of place.

Michael Miller asked why they didn't go with the pitched roof if they were going to need variances any way. Mr. Horn stated that the reason is that they are trying to appease the neighbors. Mr. Miller asked Ms. Wells if it was her opinion if the Westin would be against a restaurant. Ms. Wells stated that they are not against a restaurant but the height and location.

Bryan Green stated that the design is good but it does not fit the location. Mr. Green stated that the structure is too brash for the location.

Maggie Gutierrez inquired if Ms. Wells was representing the Westin. Ms. Wells stated that she was hired by the Westin.

Rudy Molinet stated that he is conflicted with the application but the design is to contemporary for

	the location. Mr. Molinet stated that it is his understanding that the problem is FEMA requirements. **Actions/Motions:** A motion was made by Mr. Bryan Green, seconded by Mr. Theo Glorie, that the item be **Denied** based on Guidelines page 37-4. The motion **Passed** by the following vote: Yes: 4 – Mr. Glorie, Mr. Miller, Mr. Green, Chairman Molinet No: 2 – Ms. Gutierrez, Mr. Metzler Recused: 1 – Ms. Bosold
8	Demolition of non-historic back addition- #**629 Caroline Street - William Horn (H12-01-638)- Second Reading** Bill Horn was present for the project. Mr. Horn 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 request for demolition as it is consistent with the criteria for demolitions in the historic district, as stated in Sec. 102- 218 of the Land Development Regulations. This project will require an easement approval and Planning Board review. **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
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- **#730 Southard Street- Adele V. Stones (H12-01-655)** Ginny Stones presented the project. Ms. Stones explained the history of HARC applications for the project. Ms. Stones explained the two proposals that are being presented to the Commission. Ms. Stones also explained the challenges of building a new chimney to the new building code standards. **Public Comments:** There were no public comments. **Staff Report:** Enid Torregrosa presented her Staff report. Ms. Torregrosa stated that 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. Ms. Torregrosa stated that 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. Ms. Torregrosa continued stating that the second option is not building any chimney and the installation of wood siding in the area where the chimney used to be. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the historic chimney was a character defining element of the historic house, which is listed as a contributing resource. Ms. Torregrosa stated that after reviewing both

proposals it is Staff's 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. Ms. Torregrosa stated that 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. Ms. Torregrosa stated that no building back the chimney will be an option of not creating a *false historic chimney*.

Commission Discussion:
Michael Miller inquired – "Now you don't want to rebuild?". Ms. Stones responded that "yes" the applicant is now thinking that not building is a option – no fireplace / no chimney.

Maggie Gutierrez stated that any re-build would be nothing more than a reproduction.

Daniel Metzler stated that it is his opinion that it is a mistake to do a false chimney.

Rudy Molinet reviewed the history of the events at the site. Mr. Molinet also stated he had strong feelings concerning the removal of the historic chimney and other events at this site. Mr. Molinet stated that he could support a third option, which is a reproduction of the original chimney to honor the history of the house.

The Commissioners asked Mr. Ramsignh for an opinion on if by approving the re-build of the chimney would potentially imply they were giving their approval for the demolition of the historic chimney. Mr. Ramsignh responded that even though they approve a design for a re-build that does not imply they are approving the demolition. The demolition was denied January 11, 1012.

Actions/Motions:
A motion was made by Mr. Theo Glorie, seconded by Mr. Michael Miller, that the item be **Approve** proposal #1 design - step back chimney and with the understanding that the after the fact demolition request that was denied in January 11, 2012 is still in effect. 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

New Business

10a Raise existing house 28" above grade. New roof at rear- **#319 Grinnell Street- Michael Skoglund (H12-01-601)**

Michael Skoglund presented the project. Mr. Skoglund stated that the last time this project was before HARC the Commissioners did not like the roof and as a result of that discuss they have changed the roof.

Public Comments:
There were no public comments.

Staff Report:
Design:
Enid Torregrosa presented her Staff report. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the report is for a small addition to the south east corner of the house, a new side gable roof for the back portion of the house and for raising the house 28" above grade for flood prevention. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the plans also include the removal of an above ground swimming pool, which is located where the old cistern used to be, in order to build the proposed back addition. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the applicant has submitted an Elevation Certificate indicating that the structure is on an AE 7 Base Flood Elevation and that the top of bottom floor is 4'-3". Ms. Torregrosa stated that

	substantial improvements done to historic properties do not require compliance with FEMA regulations; the request to elevate the house is for flood prevention and not a requirement by the Florida Building Code. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is Staff's opinion that the proposed design is consistent with the guidelines. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the proposed addition as well as the new roof will be sensible to the historic fabric. Ms. Torregrosa stated that Staff recommends the Commission to verify how much more the house will be elevated from its current height and to request that new footings be visually compatible with the existing ones, including location. **Demolition:** Enid Torregrosa presented her Staff report. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the demolition request is for a small shed roof located on the back portion of a contributing house. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the house located on #319 Grinnell Street is listed as a contributing resource and was built in 1924. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the plan also includes the demolition of a pool that is located where the old cistern used to be. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the existing back sawtooth will be kept. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is Staff's opinion that the actual configuration of a sawtooth and a small shed are illustrated in the 1962 Sanborn map. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is Staff's opinion that the actual shed roof is not historic since it is larger in footprint than the one depicted in the Sanborn map. Ms. Torregrosa stated that Staff understands that the Commission can consider the request for demolitions since they are consistent with Sec. 102-218 of the Land Development Regulations. Ms. Torregrosa stated that if the demolitions are approved a second reading for demolition will be required. **Commission Discussion:** Bryan Green stated that he is in support of the project but he feels that more detail documents are needed. Michael Miller stated that he too found the documents lacking but also supports the project. Daniel Metzler asked just how much the house is being raised about grade. Ms. Torregrosa responded that was one of her questions as well and why she would like to see the more detailed documents. **Actions/Motions:** A motion was made by Mr. Bryan Green, seconded by Mr. Daniel Metzler, that the item be **Approved** with the condition that detailed schematic documents be submitted for Staff's review. 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 rear roof and demolition of above ground swimming pool- **#319 Grinnell Street- Michael Skoglund (H12-01-601)** 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. Theo Glorie, seconded by Mr. Bryan Green, 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
11	Install a temporary mobile information and ticket booth- **#1105 Simonton Street- Ratcliff Welding (H12-01-680)** Dave Ratcliff was present for the project. Mr. Ratcliff stated that he had nothing to add to the

	package but would be glad to answer any questions. **Public Comments:** There were no public comments. **Staff Report:** Enid Torregrosa presented her Staff report. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the report is for installation of a mobile booth that will be located on a private lot and set back from the corner at least 5' from property lines. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the main structure on the site is not listed in the surveys. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the applicant is requesting approval for the installation of a mobile booth that will have casters. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the booth will be approximately 8' wide by 8' long by 10' high. The booth will be over casters and is made of T1-11 wood. The booth will have a gable roof covered with 5-v crimp metal panels. Ms. Torregrosa stated that since there was conflictive information about the dimension of the cart and the submitted drawings the applicant submitted a second drawing of a cart with a hip roof. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the dimensions of this option will remain as 8' by 8' by 10'. The site is located across the Old Gato Cigar Factory. Ms. Torregrosa stated that in order to locate the booth on the desired location the existing chain link gate will need to be relocated. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is Staff's opinion that the proposed mobile booth is in conflict with guideline 5 but complies with guideline 6. Ms. Torregrosa stated that if approved the footprint of the booth must be reduced, right now the proposed booth will be 64 square feet but will have overhangs (awnings) on three sides when in use. **Commission Discussion:** Michael Miller stated that there was not enough detail in the package to allow the Commissioners to understand just what the proposed cart will look like. Bryan Green asked the applicant if the cart is going to be located inside the fence. Mr. Ratcliff responded that they were planning to locate it inside the fence so that it would be secure when not in use. Mr. Green stated that more detail is needed showing the colors and actual cart design. Daniel Metzler stated that he does not like ticket booths that all they end up being is a bunch of junk. Rudy Molinet stated that he agrees with Mr. Miller that there is not enough detail. The Commissioners discussed if they would be inclined to approve a cart / ticket booth no mater what the detailed design looks like and their inclination is not to approve ticket booths. **Actions/Motions:** A motion was made by Mr. Michael Miller, seconded by Mr. Theo Glorie, 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
12a	Major Development Plan- Construction of new hotel including color scheme- **#223 Elizabeth Street- Pritam Singh (H12-01-685)** Pritan Singh presented the project. Mr. Singh began by outlining the history of the site. Mr. Singh stated that what is currently in place is a very specific settlement agreement. Mr. Singh outlined the buildings, their function, and site placement as part of the project. Mr. Singh stated that what they have tried to design is something that will fit with the surrounding neighborhood. Mr. Singh along with Liz Newland outlined the proposed landscape design. Mr. Singh remained to respond to any questions from the Commission. **Public Comments:**

Bob Goldman – PO Box 1001 – Representing 3 neighbors in opposition to the project.

Staff Report:
Design:
Enid Torregrosa presented her Staff report. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the report is for the development of a vacant lot for a new hotel. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the property has four sides facing right of ways; Elizabeth, Caroline and William Streets and Lazy Way. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the proposed design includes a main building and three detached structures, two of them facing Caroline Street. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the development will be for a new hotel with 96 rooms, three swimming pools, a garage under the main building and supportive facilities such as meeting, spa, and fitness. Ms. Torregrosa stated that a restaurant only for guests with a kitchen is also included in the plans. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the main challenge of this urban block is its location; this lot is between the bight and the Commercial corridor of Caroline Street, where historically mixed uses of commercial and upper floor residential buildings merge with residences. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the proposed materials, color scheme and textures will be similar to the ones found in new construction in the historic district. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is Staff's opinion that the proposed plans comply with some of the guidelines. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the architectural vocabulary that has been proposed for the project is compatible with the residential urban context that surrounds the project that the main building does not relate architecturally to the historic bight context. Staff's understands the big challenges of the applicant during the design phase including multiple contexts- waterfront, residential, utilitarian/industrial and multiuse; challenges with zoning and planning restrictions, FEMA requirements and the need to create a feasible and marketable project. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is Staff's opinion that the proposed design will not obscure or overshadow adjacent and surrounding historic structures. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the use of deep setbacks from the right of ways and the use of a perimeter fences and large green areas behind them will create an urban green space that will add to the pedestrian experience. Ms. Torregrosa concluded stated that if approved this project will require Planning Board and City Commission review.

Demolition:
Enid Torregrosa presented her Staff report. Ms. Torregrosa stated that this is the first reading for demolition of a non-historic building that was built six years ago. Ms. Torregrosa stated that it is Staff's opinion that the Commission can consider the request for demolition as it is consistent with the criteria for demolitions in the historic district. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the building in question is not historic nor can be deemed contributing in a near future. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the applicant has submitted plans for a new development in the site. Ms. Torregrosa stated that if the demolition is approved a second reading will be requested.

Commission Discussion:
Bryan Green stated that he like the design and the use of two architects for the project.

Michael Miller stated that he too appreciates the design. Mr. Miller additional commented on the roof pitch of the proposed buildings verse the roof pitch of the neighboring structures. Mr. Signh responded that there had been much thought of the appearance of the site as they were creating the plans.

Maggie Gutierrez asked what is the relationship of the project with the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Ramsignh stated that the Comprehensive Plan restrictions were covered as part of the settlement plan.

Rudy Molinet stated that he is in 100% of the project and appreciates the efforts that have been taken to make it fit in.

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
12b	Major Development Plan- Demolition of exiting building- **#223 Elizabeth Street- Pritam Singh (H12-01-685)** In an effort to expedite the meetings all discussion took place during the discussion of item 12a. **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
13	Paint door trim and mullions red- **#500 Truman Avenue- Trepanier and Associates (H12-01-719)** Owen Trepanier presented the project. Mr. Trepanier explained that they are proposing painting the trim red and white which are the franchise colors. **Public Comments:** There were no public comments. **Staff Report:** Enid Torregrosa presented her Staff report. Ms. Torregrosa stated that this is a request to paint door trims in red color. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the structure where the business is located has two glass garage doors facing Truman Avenue. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the applicant wants to paint in red all the mullions. Ms. Torregrosa stated that for the existing doors and fixed glass panels the applicant is proposing red painting in all the trims and borders. Ms. Torregrosa stated that red and white are the franchise colors. Ms. Torregrosa stated that all trims and borders of the interior were painted in red. Ms. Torregrosa stated that although the guidelines address colors the list presented is for traditional colors of Key West. Ms. Torregrosa stated that according to page 35 of the guidelines exterior trims are traditionally white or off white. Ms. Torregrosa stated that Staff included this item in the agenda because the building is not a historic or traditional structure within the historic district and if approved may create a precedent since trims are supposed to be white. **Commission Discussion:** Michael Miller stated that he would prefer to postpone until a professional presentation showing the colors along with color chips. Daniel Metzler suggested a photo-shopped presentation would be helpful. Donna Bosold stated that she agreed with Mr. Metzler and Mr. Miller that a more professional presentation is needed. Bryan Green stated that he is concerned about approving the red and establishing a president. Rudy Molinet stated that he could not support the red. **Actions/Motions:** A motion was made by Mr. Michael Miller, seconded by Ms. Donna Bosold, that the item be **Postponed**. The motion **Passed** by the following vote: Yes: 6 – Ms. Bosold, Mr. Glorie, Ms. Gutierrez, Mr. Metzler, Mr. Miller, Mr. Green

	No: 1 - Chairman Molinet
14	Replace existing siding with new lap siding. Proposed windows on northwest side of house to be sound proof**- #1009 Grinnell Street- Seatech of the Florida Keys (H12-01-721)** Owen Trepanier was present to represent the project. Mr. Trepanier stated he brought the wrong Authorization letter. Mr. Ramsignh advised that the Commission could continue to hear the item contingent on Mr. Trepanier supplying a valid Authorization letter the next day. Mr. Trepanier outlined the details of the project stating that since the application the applicant has changed direction concerning the windows therefore just replacing the siding will need consideration. **Public Comments:** There were no public comments. **Staff Report:** Enid Torregrosa presented her Staff report. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the report is for removal of 90 % of existing siding and its replacement with new lap siding. The house exhibits novelty, board and batten and lap siding in the exterior walls. According to the applicant there are two factors for this request, decay of some siding and to have a uniform siding material on the exterior. The proposal also includes the introduction of soundproof windows on the north side of the house. After the Agenda was published, the applicant clarified to Staff that the soundproofing for the windows will be done in the interior. Ms. Torregrosa stated that the building in question is listed as a contributing resource. The frame vernacular house was built circa 1924. On October 11, 2011 the Commission approved the removal of back and side attached structure, new deck on the back, replacement of existing windows and repairs to damaged wood members. It is Staff's opinion that the proposed plans are inconsistent with the guidelines. It is fairly common to find board and batten siding on the sides of a building while lap or novelty siding is observed on the main façade. Staff understands that the there is a percentage of siding that can be save and should be preserved. For the historic portion of the house, what needs to be replaced must match the existing in form, material, and dimensions. **Commission Discussion:** Theo Glorie stated that it is a totally different look. Daniel Metzler stated that he likes the differences of the board and batten. Michael Miller stated that the presentation does not give enough information to justify such a massive change. Mr. Miller stated that we need to be careful about modernizing such a distinctive building. Bryan Green stated that he thinks that the building is very distinctive and that he cannot support the project. **Actions/Motions:** A motion was made by Mr. Bryan Green, seconded by Mr. Michael Miller, that the item be **Denied** based on Guidelines page 24-1. 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	
	Mr. Miller stated that he finds the process of review backwards when it is between the Planning Board and HARC. Mr. Miller stated that he thinks that HARC should not review a project until it is "legal". Mr. Ramsingh responded that he thinks it is a "chicken or the egg" discussion in that if it was the Planning Board they may think the opposite way.

	Mr. Glorie asked if it would be possible for the Commission to make a resolution to require a say 75-foot setback to allow a 2 story building on the waterfront. Mr. Ramsingh stated that would require changes to the LDRs and suggested that a City Commissioner would need to be on board from the start to make the process successful. Mr. Green asked if it is possible to add a discussion concerning the level of details for applications. Mr. Molinet suggested that the discussion should take place early in the meeting.
Adjournment	
	Actions/Motions: A motion was made by Ms. Maggie Gutierrez, seconded by Mr. Bryan Green, that the meeting be **Adjourned**. The motion **Passed** by a unanimous vote. Meeting adjourned at **9:33 pm.**

Submitted by,
Jo Bennett
Administrative Coordinator
Planning Department