

RESOLUTION NO 2025-HPA-COA-02
CITY OF LAKE CITY, FLORIDA

A RESOLUTION OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION AGENCY OF THE CITY OF LAKE CITY, FLORIDA, DENYING AN APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO REPLACE THE EXISTING METAL SHINGLE ROOF WITH A NEW ASPHALT SHINGLE ROOF WITHIN THE HISTORIC DISTRICT AND WITHIN THE CORPORATE LIMITS OF THE CITY OF LAKE CITY; REPEALING ALL RESOLUTIONS IN CONFLICT; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the City of Lake City, Florida (the City”) Land Development Code (the “Code”), empowers the Historic Preservation Agency of the City (the “Board”), to approve, approve with conditions, or deny an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness located within the corporate limits of the City, in accordance with said code; and

WHEREAS, an application, COA 25-02, for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace the existing metal shingle roof with a new asphalt shingle roof, as described in said application (the “Application”) was filed with the City; and

WHEREAS, the Application pertains to real property (the “Subject Property”), described as Tax Parcel Number: 12765-000, with the physical address of 227 SW Columbia Ave, Lake City, FL 32025; and

WHEREAS, notice was published on January 30, 2025, in a newspaper of record in Columbia County, Florida, providing notice to the public and interested parties of the hearing before the Board on February 11, 2025 to consider the Application; and

WHEREAS, notice was mailed on January 24, 2025, to the owners of properties located within three hundred (300) feet of the Subject Property, informing them of the hearing before the Board on February 11, 2025, to consider the Application; and

WHEREAS, notice was posted on a sign conspicuously placed on the Subject Property on January 29, 2025, providing notice to the public of the hearing before the Board on February 11, 2025, to consider the Application; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Code, the Board reviewed the Application in a quasi-judicial manner during a scheduled meeting on February 11, 2025, as part of a previously prepared agenda, and considered all testimony and evidence presented during the quasi-judicial hearing; and

WHEREAS, based on the testimony and evidence presented at the referenced quasi-judicial

hearing, the Board has determined and found that there is competent and substantial evidence to support the conclusion that the Application does not conform to the Code in that:

- a. the Application and the evidence presented indicate the intent to replace the existing historic metal shingle roof with an asphalt shingle roof; and
- b. testimony presented by Steve Stanley indicated the roof of the Subject Parcel was damaged during the hurricanes causing water leakage to occur in the interior of the home; and
- c. testimony presented by Steve Stanley indicated that the cost of a metal roof would exceed that of a shingle roof; and
- d. pursuant to Section 10.11.6.9 of the Code, the installation of new roof coverings or replacement roofing that is inconsistent with the architectural style or character of the neighborhood shall be considered Major Work; and
- e. Section 10.11.10 of the Code sets forth the criteria for modifications to structures within the two (2) National Historic Districts; and
- f. Section 10.11.10 provides an issue to be considered by the Board when determining whether to approve or deny an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Work is the extent to which the historic, architectural or archeological significance, architectural style, design, arrangement, texture, materials, and color of the landmark or the property will be affected; and
- g. in the instant case, the existing metal shingle roof is a significant architectural feature of the subject structure and replacing said metal shingle roof with asphalt shingles is a substantial departure from the architectural style of the subject structure, such that the aesthetics and character of the subject structure will be negatively affected in a substantial way; and
- h. pursuant to Section 10.11.2.2, the design guidelines outline the criteria used by the Board to review proposed changes to structures within the two (2) National Historic Districts; now therefore

BE IT RESOLVED by the Historic Preservation Agency of the City of Lake City, Florida:

1. For the foregoing reasons, and based upon the competent and substantial evidence presented at the quasi-judicial hearing regarding the Application, the Board hereby denies the Application for the Subject Parcel; and
2. The City's Land Development Regulation Administrator is hereby authorized to take all

actions consistent with the decisions of the Board set forth herein and in accordance with applicable laws and regulations, including, but not limited to, the City's Land Development Regulations; and

3. All resolutions or portions of resolutions in conflict with this resolution are hereby repealed to the extent of such conflict; and
4. This resolution shall become effective upon adoption.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED by an affirmative vote of a majority of a quorum present of the Historic Preservation Agency of the City of Lake City, Florida, at a regular meeting, this 11th day of March 2025.

BY THE CHAIRMAN OF THE HISTORIC
PRESERVATION AGENCY OF THE CITY OF LAKE
CITY, FLORIDA

Chairman Christopher Lydick

ATTEST, BY THE SECRETARY TO THE HISTORIC
PRESERVATION AGENCY OF THE CITY OF LAKE
CITY, FLORIDA:

Secretary Robert Angelo

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND LEGALITY:

Clay Martin, City Attorney