MINUTES
CITY OF EUSTIS HISTORICAL PRESERVATION BOARD (HPB)
Regular Meeting Agenda
City of Eustis Commission Room, 10 N. Grove Street
Wednesday, January 18, 2023 – 5:30 pm

REGULAR MEETING

ROLL CALL:	**Monte Stamper, Vice Chairperson** **Dina John** **Ronald "Kirk" Musselman** **Dorothy Stevenson (joined meeting at 5:37 p.m.)** **Robyn Sambor, Alternate**
MEMBERS ABSENT:	**Matthew Kalus, Chairperson**
STAFF PRESENT:	**Heather Croney, Senior Planner** **Mary Montez, Deputy City Clerk** **Jeff Richardson, Deputy Director of Development Services** **Mike Lane, Director of Development Services**
OTHERS PRESENT:	**Sasha Garcia, HPB Attorney** **Cheyenne Dunn, HPB Associate Attorney**

CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chair Monte Stamper called the Regular Meeting to order at 5:34 p.m. Pledge of Allegiance was conducted followed by roll call. Let the record show that a quorum was established.

AGENDA UPDATE

Heather Croney, Senior Planner, stated the dates for the remaining board meetings is inaccurate due to the January meeting being rescheduled from January 11th to January 18th due to an issue with a notification on the Certificates of Appropriateness.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

There were no completed minutes ready for consideration. The Board asked Ms. Croney to confirm the last minutes approved. Ms. Croney indicated she would verify the last minutes approved.

PUBLIC INPUT

Ms. Garcia opened the floor to public comment at 5:38 p.m. No one came forward at that time.

NEW BUSINESS

Consideration of Certificate of Appropriateness (2022-COA-06) for a shed at 403 S. Mary Street

Ms. Croney announced for the audience that anyone wishing to speak on the item would be given three minutes to speak. She then reviewed the application for Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) 2022-COA-06 for a shed at 403 S. Mary St. She presented a copy of the tentative site plan and explained they would also have to have the building permit approved. She explained how the shed is proposed to be situated on the site and provided elevations of the shed.

Ms. Croney then explained the criteria to be used in evaluating the request. She stated the roof pitch of the proposed shed is not consistent with the frame vernacular style. She indicated it would need to match the color of the existing home. She cites ways the shed could be altered to be more compatible with the home. She reviewed the timeframe for the project including issuance of the building permit. She stated the proposal does not have any significant inconsistencies and commented on changes they were making to make it more consistent. She stated no landscaping plan was provided or needed for the application. She indicated that if they could provide a shed with a roof that more closely matches the existing home that would be preferable. She stated that staff is recommending denial with a suggestion that the applicant propose a shed more compatible.

Mr. Stamper commented on how the shed could be altered to be more consistent.

Mr. Musselman asked if there was anything in front of the shed or if there is a photo of the other side of the home.

Renee Isabelle, 730 E. Lemon Avenue, stated there is a fence on the other side of the home so they probably wouldn't see much of the shed.

Discussion was held regarding how previous applicants have been asked to install something as close as possible to the home's architecture.

Attorney Garcia opened the floor to public comment at 5:52 p.m. There being no public comment, the hearing was closed at 5:52 p.m.

A motion was made by Dina John to disapprove the Certificate of Appropriateness based on staff's recommendation. Seconded by Kirk Musselman. On a roll call vote, the motion to disapprove passed unanimously.

Consideration of Certificate of Appropriateness (2022-COA-07) for construction of a new single-family residence at 805 E. Lemon Avenue

Ms. Croney reviewed the application for COA 2022-COA-07 for construction of a new single-family residence at 805 E. Lemon Avenue. She explained there was previously a home on the property that burned. She provided photos of various angles of the property. She stated the surrounding properties have the frame vernacular style which is predominant in the area. She indicated the proposed home should be designed to resemble the same era. She provided elevations of the proposed home including a detached garage. She explained that it is not considered an accessory dwelling unit just because it contains a bathroom. She again provided photographs of samples of the frame

vernacular style and reviewed the required criteria for evaluation. She emphasized that the majority of the homes within the immediate area and adjacent are in the frame vernacular style although there are other styles within the district. She noted the previous home was in the frame vernacular style. She stated the proposed new home and garage do not resemble one single architectural style but a combination of a new of styles. She indicated it does not match the frame vernacular style. She commented on the proposed timeframe and indicated it should be completed within normal construction time.

Ms. Croney continued the review of the request based on the required criteria. She indicated the height is not consistent with the other homes in the area or the frame vernacular style. She compared the proposed windows with the frame vernacular style and indicated the applicant could add more windows and provide them more evenly spaced across each façade. She stated the applicant did not provide a site plan or plot plan but that was not realized until too close to the meeting; therefore, staff cannot comment on the setbacks or location of the driveway. She reviewed the various details lacking in the application and compared with specific aspects of the frame vernacular style. She noted that the applicant has indicated they will be utilizing shingles but did not provide specific information. She stated the proposed porch does not match what is usually seen for the style. She cited other elements that do not match the frame vernacular style as follows: 1) Style of porch; 2) Roof shape and elevations; 3) Landscaping; and 4) Decorative elements.

Ms. Croney stated that a landscape plan was not provided. She stated it is new construction so they are not having to match what is on the property but they do need to match surrounding properties. She stated that staff is recommending denial and suggesting that the applicant make some revisions and bring it back to the Board.

Mr. Stamper cited the layout and type of windows do not match the style. He also cited the roof pitch and the eave and the use of stucco versus wood. He then indicated the type of columns proposed also do not match. He indicated they need more windows.

Mr. Musselman stated if they come back he would want to see a site plan showing the location of the house and driveway.

Ms. John commented that is a lot of house to place on the property.

Ms. Garcia opened the public hearing at 6:09 p.m.

Dillon Shelton commented on why he and his wife moved to the area and stated the proposed home does not match the other homes in the area and cited specific issues with the roof, porch and other elements. He stated the proposed size of the home is much larger than the surrounding homes.

Chris Lancaster stated the proposed home does not meet any of the required criteria and asked that it be denied.

Cynthia Concklin expressed opposition to the home as designed.

Renee Isabelle requested that they deny the application and stated the belief that the garage does not have a garage door and may not be used as a garage.

Mr. Lancaster noted that the man who left the meeting is the owner of the property.

Ms. Concklin indicated the applicant could utilize hardyboard to replicate the look of the other homes. She commented on the other porches in the area.

Ms. John expressed concern regarding the size of the home and lack of a site plan.

The Board confirmed that the building department had not yet reviewed the application.

Ms. Croney explained she just returned from medical leave the previous week and contacted the applicant regarding the lack of a site plan.

A motion was made by Dorothy Stevenson to deny the Certificate of Appropriateness based on staff's recommendation. The motion was seconded by Kirk Musselman. On a roll call vote, the motion passed unanimously.

Update on Administrative approval of COA 2022-COA-05 for a driveway addition at 830 E. Lemon Ave.

Ms. Croney provided a report on the administrative COA approval of 2022-COA-05 for a driveway addition at 830 E. Lemon Avenue which was completed since the last meeting. She indicated there would be two applications on the next agenda.

OLD BUSINESS

Ms. Croney provided an update on the CLG Grant and stated staff is working with Finance to issue an RFP for a consultant to help with the grant. She then reported that the annual report to the state was not submitted by the end of November. She provided a copy of the report that was sent to the state. She indicated a report would be also submitted to the City Commission. She announced that the next meeting would be held on March 8th and asked that they all mark their calendars for the remaining meetings.

BOARD REPORTS

Mr. Stamper expressed concern regarding the possibility that the applicant could go to the City Commission and get their denial overturned.

Ms. Garcia stated that the applicant does have the right to appeal their denial to the City Commission.

Discussion was held regarding a member of the HPB attending the Commission meeting should the applicant appeal to the Commission.

Ms. Garcia explained they can attend the City Commission meeting and explain why they made their decision; however, they could not discuss it among themselves in case the applicant brings it back again to them.

Mr. Stamper asked about demolition that occurred on Pendleton Avenue with Jeff Richardson, Development Services Deputy Director, explaining that was in preparation for construction of the assisted living facility.

Ms. Croney explained the facility was approved some time ago. She commented on changes in the building department and stated Development Services does not normally review demolition permits. She indicated she would try to keep them informed about upcoming projects. She then asked what information they were looking for regarding 217 W. Badger.

Mr. Stamper expressed concern regarding the age of the building and his belief that it was not in significant disrepair. He asked if she could provide a picture of the building prior to destruction. He asked if whoever approves demolition permits could keep the historic aspect in mind prior to approving those.

Mr. Richardson explained the reason for demolition and the cost of renovation. He indicated that frequently the outside of the buildings look good but the inside may require extensive renovation in order to be utilized and a lot of the owners don't want to go through the remediation process.

Ms. Croney commented that the grant could help with something like that to update the City's historic inventory. She added that, if it isn't located in the historic district, then there is probably nothing they can do about it.

STAFF REPORTS

Ms. Garcia introduced Cheyenne Dunn who will be serving as the HPB attorney in the future. She noted that she will now be serving as the City Commission attorney.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, a motion to adjourn was made by Dorothy Stevenson, seconded by Kirk Musselman and approved by an unanimous vote. The HPB Meeting was adjourned by Mr. Stamper at 6:41 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:

_____	_____
Heather Croney	Matthew Kalus
Senior Planner	Chairperson
Date Signed:_____	Date Signed:_____