



CITY OF FORT PIERCE HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD

Minutes

OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY OF FORT PIERCE HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD HELD ON **TUESDAY, May 28th, 2013**, IN FORT PIERCE CITY HALL, COMMISSION CHAMBERS, 100 NORTH US HIGHWAY 1, FORT PIERCE, FLORIDA.

1. Call to Order

2. Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

3. Roll Call

Upon roll call those present were: Mr. Enns, Mr. Sampson, Ms. Boardman, Ms. Wilson, Vice-Chair Harris.

Those absent: Mr. Culverhouse, Ms. Jackson and Chairwoman Gates.

Staff present: Karen Emerson, Board Attorney; Kori Benton, Historic Preservation Officer; Clarissa Davis, Planning Specialist.

4. Approval of Minutes

Mr. Benton requests that the Board delay the approval of the April 22, 2013 minutes until they are completed.

Mr. Enns makes a motion and is seconded by Mr. Sampson – to defer the approval of the April 22nd minutes.

A roll was taken.

All those in favor: Mr. Enns, Mr. Sampson, Ms. Boardman, Ms. Wilson, Vice-Chair Harris.

Motion passes unanimously.

5. Public Hearing

a. Certificate of Appropriateness 13-11, 101 Avenue D – Rehabilitation of Contributing Structure within the Edgar Town District.

Mr. Harnett (1104 Hernando St.) requests for the Board to make the exception of the proposed cupola since it ties into the historic architecture of the area.

Mr. Enns asks if the cupola would be a deal breaker for the project.

Mr. Harnett states that it wouldn't be a deal breaker, but he would rather prefer it was an addition to the house.

Mr. Enns questions if the cupola meets historic criteria.

Mr. Benton states that the addition of the cupola changes the peak structure of the roof. The trusses for the roof would have to be altered to allow the addition. The addition of a cupola is common historically.

Mr. Enns asks if the structure was previously 4 apartments.

Mr. Harnett answers yes.

Mr. Benton states that a photo of the structure from 1999 possibly shows that the previous chimney that has now been removed was placed at the peak of the roof; however, under further speculation of the photo it would appear that the chimney was located at the south west end of the building and not on the peak.

Mr. Sampson asks when the structure was built originally and was it a single-family structure at that time.

Mr. Benton states that the structure was built in roughly 1901. At first the building was constructed to be a waterfront single family home and was later converted into a number of uses. He further states that the Board should consider the two modern vents on the south west side of the structure. He is unsure if the applicant wants to remove those in place of the cupola.

Mr. Sampson asks if the turbine is going to continue to stay on the structure.

Mr. Harnett states that the turbines will be removed.

Mr. Benton states that there are renderings showing the cupola being integrated structurally to the roof.

Ms. Boardman asks if the applicant is going to add the deck in the back of the structure and the external stairs along the side as well.

Mr. Harnett answers that they will still be adding the back deck, but not the stairs.

Mike Menard (Cook & Menard Architecture) states that the cupola, if designed and added properly, should have a minimal effect on the roof. The cupola could be easily removed and the roof could be put back to its original state if not better than before. The Building Department and the applicant's insurance company would want confirmation that the design on the railings does not appear to be a ladder for a small child.

Ms. Enns asks if Mr. Menard is the architect on the project.

Mr. Menard answers no.

Ms. Boardman makes a motion and is seconded by Mr. Sampson – to approve the porch and balcony, approve the asphalt shingle roof with a single standing seam metal roof, and the cupola.

A roll call was taken.

Those in favor: Mr. Enns, Mr. Sampson, Ms. Boardman, Ms. Wilson, Vice-Chair Harris.

Motion was passed unanimously.

b. Certificate of Appropriateness 13-12, 301 S U.S. Hwy 1- Request to construct a parking lot and 2 ground signs.

Mike Menard (Cook & Menard Architecture) states that they are keeping the driveway where it is located with the current curb cut and keeping the utility pole where it is currently located as well. Keeping the driveway where it is currently located keeps it further from U.S. Hwy 1 to deter accidents.

Mr. Enns asks if the retaining wall will be brought further west on the site.

Mr. Menard answers yes, unless the drainage calculations don't permit. Exfiltration will have to occur on the site.

Mr. Enns asks if water will be maintained on site.

Mr. Menard answers that all, including storm water, will be maintained on the site.

Mr. Benton states that the exfiltration plans have been submitted to the Planning and Engineering department for approval.

Mr. Sampson asks if Mr. Menard can explain exfiltration.

Mr. Menard explains that it is a concrete catch basin where the parking lot slopes with the addition of corrugated piping that goes underneath the parking lot that allows water to bleed into a rock bed.

Mr. Benton states that a total of 7 letters were sent to abutting properties indicating the extent of the request the Board is considering this evening. Two responses were given in support of the request.

Mr. Enns asks if the signs will be separate from the other variances.

Mr. Benton states that they should be independent of the other variance requests.

Mr. Enns makes a motion and is seconded by Mr. Sampson - to approve the design of the parking lot.

A roll call was taken.

All in favor: Mr. Enns, Mr. Sampson, Ms. Wilson, Ms. Boardman, Vice-Chair Harris.

Motion passes unanimously.

Mr. Enns makes a motion and is seconded by Mr. Sampson – to approve the deviation from City Code Section 22-60 (c)(5) b. 2. to reduce the required combined isle and stall width for 2 way traffic from 64 feet to 58 feet.

A roll call was taken.

All in favor: Mr. Enns, Mr. Sampson, Ms. Wilson, Ms. Boardman, Vice-Chair Harris.

Motion passes unanimously.

Mr. Enns makes a motion and is seconded by Mr. Sampson - to approve the request to deviate from City Code Section 22-61(b)(3) to reduce the required driveway width for a 2 way commercial driveway from 24 feet to 22 feet.

A roll call was taken.

All in favor: Mr. Enns, Mr. Sampson, Ms. Wilson, Ms. Boardman, Vice-Chair Harris.

Motion passes unanimously.

Mr. Enns makes a motion and is seconded by Mr. Sampson – to approve the request to deviate from City Code Section 22-187 (4)a. to reduce the width of the required landscape strip between the street right-of-way and vehicular use for the subject site from 6 feet to 3 feet.

A roll call was taken.

All in favor: Mr. Enns, Mr. Sampson, Ms. Wilson, Ms. Boardman, Vice-Chair Harris.

Motion passes unanimously.

Mr. Enns makes a motion and is seconded by Mr. Sampson – to approve the request to deviate from City Code Section 22-187 (6)(a) to reduce the width the required landscape strip between the vehicular use and between the abutting properties to the south and west boundaries of the site from 10 feet to 3 feet.

A roll call was taken.

All in favor: Mr. Enns, Mr. Sampson, Ms. Wilson, Ms. Boardman, Vice-Chair Harris.

Motion passes unanimously

Mr. Benton states that in addition to the previously considered request, the applicant is also proposing a landscape plan and two ground signs on the site: One towards the parking area on the western portion of the property and one on the north east side of the property towards U.S. Hwy 1. These ground signs are 6 square feet in sign area and roughly 6 feet in height and will be quite minimal.

Ms. Boardman asks if the COA is for the design of the sign.

Mr. Benton states the Board is asked to approve the design of the sign.

Mr. Enns asks Ms. Emerson if the Board needs to make the motion separate from the two variances.

Ms. Emerson answers yes.

Mr. Enns makes a motion and is seconded by Ms. Boardman - to approve the sign design.

A roll call was taken.

All in favor: Mr. Enns, Mr. Sampson, Ms. Wilson, Ms. Boardman, Vice-Chair Harris.

Motion passes unanimously.

Mr. Sampson makes a motion and is seconded by Mr. Enns – to deviate from Section 15-8(4)(a)2 to permit two ground signs to be established on a main street on a lot footage of 50 feet.

A roll call was taken.

All in favor: Mr. Enns, Mr. Sampson, Ms. Wilson, Ms. Boardman, Vice-Chair Harris.

Motion passes unanimously.

Mr. Sampson makes a motion and is seconded by Mr. Enns – to deviate from Section 15-6(b)(3)b. to permit one ground sign to be located 3 feet from the public right-of-way.

A roll call was taken.

All in favor: Mr. Enns, Mr. Sampson, Ms. Wilson, Ms. Boardman, Vice-Chair Harris.

Motion passes unanimously.

c. Request for Demolition – 500 S 10th street (911 Delaware Avenue)

Keith Pickering (property owner; 3209 S Lakeview Circle Apt 101) states that is in need of a demolition. It would cost an outstanding amount of money to be rehabilitated.

Mr. Enns asks if Mr. Pickering has read staff recommendation to bring the main structure to Code Enforcement and the Building Department.

Mr. Pickering states that he understands. Wanting to demolish the property is purely a monetary issue.

Mr. Sampson makes a motion and seconded by Mr. Enns – to approve staff's recommendation on COA 13-10.

A roll call was taken.

All in favor: Mr. Enns, Mr. Sampson, Ms. Wilson, Ms. Boardman, Vice-Chair Harris.

Motion passes unanimously.

6. New Business

a. Distribution of Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness

There were no administratively approved COA's since the last Historic Preservation Board Meeting.

b. Edgar Town Historic Street Name change.

Mr. Benton speaks of changing two streets within the Edgar Town Historic District to their original historic names. Avenue D was once Selene Street and Avenue E was once named Spruce Street. The name change would have to be approved by the City Commission. Notice was given to property owners who would be affected by the change. Two responses were returned in support of the street name change.

Mr. Enns asks where the name change would take place.

Mr. Benton explains that the name change would take place east of U.S. Hwy 1. It would be up to the City Commission if they would like to extend it to the train tracks; however, notice was given to property owners that it would end at U.S. Hwy 1. Furthermore, Mr. Benton has coordinated with USPS in the past and came to the conclusion that dual addresses could be established so that there is no confusion in mail delivery.

Mr. Enns states that the name change may disrupt a property owner who owns a large area in the district.

Mr. Benton states that the property owner's address would not change, but would love to speak with the property owner.

Vice-Chairman asks if the Board can consider the matter further and express their thoughts in the next meeting.

Mr. Benton answers certainly.

Ms. Boardman states that she lives in the vicinity of the proposed sign change area and states that the historic name of her street was "Pine Street". She would like to take action into getting that name changed as well to help in clarifying directions to properties in that specific area.

Tony Minokian states that there is already a Pine Avenue in the City of Fort Pierce and that name change may cause confusion. Perhaps "Old Pine Street" could be considered as the name.

Mr. Benton states that he will do additional research and speak with more property owners and bring that information back to the Board in the June meeting.

7. Consideration of Absences.

Mr. Benton states that he received notice from Ms. Jackson and Chairwoman Gates indicating that they would be absent this evening; however, no notice has been given about Mr. Culverhouse.

Mr. Sampson makes a motion and is seconded by Mr. Enns – to approve the absences for Ms. Jackson and Chairwoman Gates.

A roll call was taken.

All in favor: Mr. Enns, Mr. Sampson, Ms. Wilson, Ms. Boardman, Vice-Chair Harris.

Motion passes unanimously.

8. Adjournment

Vice-Woman adjourns the meeting.

***Update on the 604 Beach Ct. structure discussed in the previous meeting.**

The owner ship was determined to be the original owner of the property. When the deed was issued to Wells Fargo, Wells Fargo made a motion to have the sale and transfer set aside and canceled the Certificate of Title. The deed was voided, but was never recorded; therefore the order was not recorded in the public record. A new motion has been made to reopen the case to have a new sale.

