

# OCALA HISTORIC PRESERVATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

City Hall  
City Council Chambers, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
110 SE Watula Avenue, Ocala, FL 34471

Thursday, January 3, 2019

## Minutes

### The following members were present:

Jane Cosand, Chairman  
Tom McCullough, Vice Chairman  
Holland Drake  
Ira Holmes  
Ron Kaylor  
James Richard  
Ted Smith  
Claudia Tatom

### The following member was not in attendance:

Kristen Dreyer

### Staff in Attendance:

Tye Chighizola, Growth Management Director  
Gus Gianikas, CRA Manager  
Peggy Cash, Office Manager/Administrator

Public attendance: 0

### **Item #1: Call to Order & Roll Call**

Chairman Cosand called the meeting of the Ocala Historic Preservation Advisory Board (OHPAB) to order on Thursday, January 3, 2019 at 4:03 pm. Ms. Cash called the roll; a quorum was present.

### **Item #2: Proof of Publication**

It was acknowledged that a Public Meeting Notice was posted with the City Clerk's Office on December 20, 2018.

### **Item #3: Review of Minutes**

Ms. Claudia Tatom moved to approve the November 1, 2018 meeting minutes. Mr. Tom McCullough seconded the motion, which unanimously carried.

### **Item #4: Affirmative Maintenance / Demolition by Neglect**

#### **a. 114 NE Tusawilla Avenue**

Mr. Gianikas reported that the new property owner has done a lot of work on the property and intends to use the building as a duplex with units on the first and second floor.

#### **b. 704 East Fort King Street**

Mr. Gianikas said repair work on the house has not progressed recently. The property owner has

applied for a permit for a single-family residence. He commented that even though the house is very large, the lot is very small; therefore, the property cannot be used as a multi-family residence.

**c. 719 SE 2<sup>nd</sup> Street**

The owner passed away and the property is going through probate. There are code enforcement liens against the property and the City intends to foreclose on the property. Chairman Cosand noted that HOPS is interested in purchasing the property and turning it back into a single-family residence. Mr. Gianikas said he's received several calls from people interested in purchasing the property. Chairman Cosand asked if someone is still living at the house. Mr. Gianikas said a man lived on the property for a while with the owner and it seems he has some rights to continue living there, but Mr. Gianikas wasn't certain. Neighbors said that other people, considered "squatters" are living on the property also. Neighbors are actively informing the City as to what is going on at the property.

Mr. Richard said he was contacted by a neighbor concerning 719 SE 2nd Street. He said the property was not in probate as of last week; a will has been deposited with the Clerk of the Court. He has ordered a death certificate and spoken to the attorney who prepared the will. He is going to try and contact the beneficiary to find out his intentions with the property. He said he'll keep the City informed.

**d. 216 SE 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

Mr. Gianikas reported that the property was purchased at the end of November. Work has not been done on the property, and the new owner has contacted the Code Enforcement Office that is administering the case. The first issue he intends to address is the roof, which has asbestos shingles. There was an active code enforcement case, but it had not gone before the Code Enforcement Board or Special Magistrate because the previous owner was cooperating with making some progress in bringing the property into compliance. Since there is a new owner, the process starts over. If the new owner does not make progress with bringing the property into compliance, the case will go to the Code Enforcement Board.

**e. 709-715 East Fort King Street**

Mr. Gianikas said work has started on the property. He showed photos of the building before repairs were made and current photos showing that siding and windows have been replaced and repaired, and walls have been painted. A representative of the owner has been working with Mr. Gianikas on the repairs. Because of rainy weather, repairs have taken longer.

\*\*\*

Chairman Cosand commented that she thought Mr. Gianikas was in contact with the new owners of the Edwards property (810 SE 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue). She said she heard the pool pump squealing and then it blew up, and also heard the air conditioning stop working, and there is no emergency phone number. Mr. Gianikas said that the owners occasionally email him to inform him of their progress, and they are supposed to be in town this week. He said he'll email them. Chairman Cosand said she tried to call City staff but they were off during the holidays.

\*\*\*

Chairman Cosand said that it does not appear like any repairs have been made to John Torrey's property on East Fort King Street since he came before the Board. Mr. Gianikas agreed that nothing has been done, and said he'll contact Mr. Torrey.

\*\*\*

Chairman Cosand noted that a fence was located on a property at the corner of SE Wenona Avenue and SE 2<sup>nd</sup> Street. Mr. Gianikas said he would contact the property owner.

\*\*\*

Chairman Cosand noted the removal of a gazebo, fence and landscaping at a house on SE 2<sup>nd</sup> Street. Mr. Richard said that the property (819 SE 2<sup>nd</sup> Street) was purchased, and he heard that the new owner intends to build a garage. Chairman Cosand asked Mr. Gianikas to contact the new property owner.

**Item #5: Old Business**

**a. Historic Building Survey Update**

Mr. Gianikas reported that the consultants began the historic survey right after Thanksgiving. They'll probably provide an interim report in February or March. The Survey will be completed in June. He noted that an article was in the Ocala Star Banner regarding the survey.

**b. Other old business**

Mr. Holmes asked what is happening with the property located at 121 SE Watula Avenue. Mr. Gianikas said he took Ambleside School students from the 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> grades on a tour of the building. The building was shown to them as being their new facility.

Mr. Chighizola said he also took a representative of the national headquarters from Ambleside School on a tour of the facility at the beginning of December. An agreement between the City and the Ambleside School is being drafted. The school has been doing its due diligence. It isn't certain which lot the building will be moved to, but more than likely it will be the property on SE Broadway Avenue. He said they do not intend to make major renovations. The existing multiple rooms fit their need for classrooms. They intend to reattach the enclosed porch that was an addition. Mr. Chighizola said he hopes that by the end of January there will be a signed agreement.

Mr. Chighizola briefly described a recent situation in Orlando where a historic building was moved. He called the owner who had the building moved and found out that the cost to move it was significantly less than the bids the City received. He gave the information to Ambleside School.

**Item #7: New Business**

**a. Historic Preservation Code Change**

Mr. Chighizola said there is a proposed change to the Code concerning the size of signage along certain roadways for non-residential uses. He said the Presbyterian Church approached him several years ago concerning an increase in the size of their sign located on SE Watula Avenue. It is being proposed that the maximum size requirement be increased from 12 square feet to 32 square feet along East Silver Springs Boulevard, where there is one property in the Ocala Historic District, and along SE Watula Avenue. He said 32 square feet is consistent with signage that is allowed on East Silver Springs Boulevard in the Tusawilla Park Historic District. He noted that the United Methodist Church on East Fort King Street, which is just outside the Ocala Historic District has a sign that is probably 24 square feet. He noted that residential properties are not included such as the new Watula South project. The sign that the Presbyterian Church proposed years ago has a brick base, and it would have changeable copy like the existing sign. Electronic signage would not be allowed. Chairman Cosand suggested 24 square feet like the sign at the Methodist Church. Mr. Chighizola said the Presbyterian Church requested 32 square feet because that is the size allowed in Institutional zoning. Mr. Holmes confirmed that the sign would still come before OHPAB for review. Mr. Chighizola said that it will.

Mr. Chighizola said another Code change being proposed concerns a property related to the former fire

station property. Several years ago, a house was demolished on the lot located at 220 NE Tuacawilla Avenue for a new fire station. That fire station ended up not being built at that location; it was determined that the fire station needed to be further north for its service area. The cost was also significant. The City now wants the former fire station property along with adjacent city-owned lots to be redeveloped. All the properties were included in an RFP (Request for Proposal) for redevelopment. It was stipulated in that RFP that the lot located in the Tuscahill Park Historic District required Historic Board approval. It is more than likely that the former fire station building would be repurposed, it was proposed that it be a brewery. Another RFP is going to be issued because only one proposal was received from the previous RFP and it did not move forward. During negotiations of the proposal the developer questioned what exactly would need to be done to build on the lot located in the Tuscahill Park Historic District. The City Attorney ultimately recommended that construction on the vacant parcel, surrounded on three sides by properties not located within the Tuscahill Park Historic District, and as part of a common development scheme, not require the approval of a COA from OHPAB. He noted that the Code allows the Board to review, as a courtesy, alterations to historic resources. There have been some buildings downtown where OHPAB provided input when alterations were proposed. OHPAB would provide a courtesy review, but a COA would not be required with the proposed Code change. Mr. Chighizola pointed out that a developer has to have an assurance that a property can be redeveloped as proposed.

Mr. McCullough asked if the property will remain within the Tuscahill Park Historic District. Mr. Chighizola said the property will still technically be located within the District, but if the lot is included with the other properties in a common redevelopment project, a COA wouldn't be required. If the lot ends up not being developed with the other lots, and a single-family home were proposed for the lot, it would require the approval of a COA from OHPAB.

Mr. McCullough asked if the area being proposed for redevelopment might be rebuilt with single-family homes. Mr. Chighizola responded that the City hasn't said the area cannot be redeveloped with single-family homes. When the Midtown Master Plan was created, the type of redevelopment that might be located on the property took into consideration the adjacent Tuscahill Park Historic District. He advised that the proposal that was received included two-story townhouses. Negotiations didn't get to the point where exact architectural details were determined. One issue that was discussed during negotiations was using properties, not just existing rights-of-way, to add parallel parking to the street in front of the buildings around the entire block. The City wants new development to fit in with the Historic District, and street scape. Power lines may be taken down and installed underground. The City hopes that the area will be developed so that it brings back owner-occupied homes instead of rentals.

Mr. Chighizola said a recommendation from OHPAB is needed for the proposed changes to the Code. The next step is sending it to the State for review. The code changes will then go to City Council.

Mr. Richard confirmed that OHPAB will have the ability to approve up to 32 square feet, but that doesn't necessarily mean that it will approve a 32 square foot sign.

Mr. Holmes said he is comfortable with the signage size increase. He is not comfortable with an exception for a lot where a COA is not required. He said if an exception is approved, it seems to open the door for other exceptions in the future. He said the proposed change will require the plan to come before OHPAB for a courtesy review, so why not have OHPAB consider a COA submittal. Mr. Chighizola said a developer wants assurance that a proposal will not meet resistance after it is basically accepted by the City. A developer can proceed with a recommendation. A developer is not going to

want to be concerned with the possibility of a COA being denied and having to go through the appeal process with City Council. This lot is an anomaly for the entire development.

Mr. Smith asked what is the range of projects that could be located on the property. Mr. Chighizola responded that the Form-Based Code dictates how the property will be developed with buildings up to the roadway and no parking in the front. Chairman Cosand suggested that the buildings might be modern and wouldn't co-exist with the Historic District. Mr. Chighizola said OHPAB only has control over one lot, not the entire development. He reiterated that not requiring the approval of a COA gives assurances to the developer that the proposal only requires a review and approval by staff; it can't be held up with the denial of a COA. When the last proposal was being negotiated with the developer, staff didn't know how to handle it when the developer expressed concern with having to receive an approval of a COA for one lot. Mr. Richard said he understands what the City is trying to do, and it makes sense. Mr. Chighizola said there aren't any other properties that would meet the criteria as outlined in the proposed Code change. Chairman Cosand commented that it will be easier for the City to obtain proposals if developers do not have restrictions. Mr. Chighizola said he didn't want to remove the property from the Historic District just in case the area, as a whole, is not redeveloped and single-family homes end up being built. Staff also did not want to go through the laborious process of having a property taken out of an Historic District.

Mr. James Richard moved to recommend approval, based on staff's recommendation and the unusual circumstances of the single lot. Mr. Ted Smith seconded the motion, which carried with one dissenting vote from Mr. Ira Holmes.

**b. Other new business**

Mr. Chighizola said that new wayfinding signage is still being designed for the Historic District. He'll be bringing back the final design for OHPAB's review before signs are ordered. Staff is still working on locations for the signs. The sign at SE Watula Avenue and East Fort King Street will be removed because of the new development and Mr. Chighizola said he's been talking to Ms. Lewis about locating the new sign on her property in a buffer area on the side of the lot.

\*\*\*

Mr. Smith expressed concern with OHPAB and name recognition within the community. He said very few people know about OHPAB, and people are confused between OHPAB and HOPS (Historic Ocala Preservation Society). He suggested that anything that can be done in the community to let people know that OHPAB exists and what OHPAB's function is would be helpful. He said a notice for Dunnellon Historic Board meetings is located in the newspaper. He said the only notification for OHPAB meetings is located on-line, and people aren't going to look for the meetings on Ocala's website. Mr. Chighizola said he believes the meeting is still noticed in the newspaper in the front of the local section where various meetings in the community are listed. Mr. Smith commented that in the recent newspaper article concerning the historic survey being done, OHPAB wasn't acknowledged.

**#8: Adjournment**

Mr. Ron Kaylor moved to adjourn at 4:51 pm. Ms. Claudia Tatom seconded the motion and the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted by: Peggy Cash, Board Secretary