

# OCALA HISTORIC PRESERVATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

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

Thursday, May 2, 2019

## Minutes

### The following members were present:

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

### Staff in Attendance:

Gus Gianikas, CRA Manager  
Peter Lee, Planning Director  
Holly Lang, Fiscal Manager  
Ian Rynex, Redevelopment Analyst/Planner  
Peggy Cash, Office Manager/Administrator

Public attendance: 6

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

Chairman McCullough called the meeting of the Ocala Historic Preservation Advisory Board (OHPAB) to order on Thursday, May 2, 2019 at 4:01 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 April 26, 2019.

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

Mr. James Riched moved to approve the April 4, 2019 meeting minutes. Ms. Jane Cosand seconded the motion, which unanimously carried.

### **Item #4: Certificates of Appropriateness**

Chairman McCullough advised that the Board's decisions are based on The National Secretary of the Interior's Standards, Ocala's Historic Preservation Code and the Ocala Historic Preservation Guidelines. He briefly reviewed procedures to follow when requesting the approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA).

**a. Case File #112; COA19-0018 – 1204 SE 7<sup>th</sup> Street – Windows**

Sheppard Dozier, 1204 SE 7<sup>th</sup> Street, said he and his wife are owners of the property.

Mr. Inex reported that the single-family home was built circa 1930 and the property is zoned R-1. The architectural style is standard frame vernacular and the building is classified as a contributing structure in the Ocala Historic District. He showed various photos of the house pointing out where the replacement windows would be located on the rear of the house. He showed close-up views of the existing windows and pointed out the deterioration. He showed a photo of the proposed new windows, which are Pella 450 (double-hung, six-over-one).

There were no public comments.

Mr. Smith said he appreciates the selection of Pella 450 windows. He said the board struggles with replacement windows that don't have the reveal that historic windows have. The proposed window has the depth and reveal of historic windows. Mr. Dozier advised that windows on the front of his house are Pella 750 windows, but Pella stopped making them. The Pella 450 windows are aluminum clad wood frame and will look very similar to existing windows. Mr. Dozier briefly discussed the deteriorated condition of the existing original windows.

Mr. James Richard moved to approve COA19-0018 as requested with a finding of fact based on Section 94-82(g)(1). Mr. Ted Smith seconded the motion, which carried unanimously without further discussion.

**b. Case File #111; COA19-0019 – 621 SE 5<sup>th</sup> Street – Fence**

Mr. Gianikas reported that the applicant was not in attendance. He asked the Board to consider the next COA application and come back to this one.

**c. Case File #171; COA19-0020 – 804 SE 8<sup>th</sup> Street – Shed**

Mr. Brian Mathes, 804 SE 8<sup>th</sup> Street, said he and his wife recently purchased the property and they moved in approximately one month ago.

Mr. Gianikas reported that the single-family home was built circa 1912 and the architectural style is frame vernacular. He noted that the property fronts 3 streets with the house fronting SE 8<sup>th</sup> Street. The rear yard fronts SE 9<sup>th</sup> Street and the west side of the property fronts SE Wenona Avenue, which is a narrow roadway only wide enough for one vehicle, but it is considered a two-way roadway. He showed various photos of the property. He noted the rear yard and pointed out a number of large trees. The rear yard is enclosed with a 6-foot high wood privacy fence.

Mr. Gianikas said setback requirements have not been finalized and the property owner will explain constraints in the rear yard with the trees.

Mr. Mathes said there is a large tree in the center of the rear yard and limbs extend across the rear yard property line. He said the function of the 10' x 12' shed is for storage of a lawn mower and lawn equipment. He said that he reviewed minutes from meetings over the last 3 years to try and determine the type of shed the Board would allow. He said he has tried to address concerns that the Board might have. He advised that the shed will have hardiplank siding, which is an upgrade. It will have a hip

roof with shingles that match the house, which are upgrades, and the shed will be painted to match the house. Mr. Mathes said they originally wanted to place the shed in the very back corner of the lot next to SE Wenona Avenue and SE 9<sup>th</sup> Street, but with being located along the 3 roads, it will need to be shifted to another location toward the center of the lot. He doesn't want to interfere with existing trees by removing limbs that create shade for the backyard and family.

Ms. Cosand noted that on the application there was a question about having a window. She suggested that a window will add to the attractiveness of the shed. Mr. Mathes agreed explaining that the manufacturer of the shed has limited window options. There can be an opening for a window and he will need to install the window. It is a preconstructed building that will be brought on-site. He wants the window in the shed to look the best it can in comparison to windows in the house. They don't want to have a window added that will take away from the house.

There were no public comments.

Mr. Smith noted that there is no overhang on the shed, which makes it look more modular. An overhang would help it to blend more with the neighborhood. Mr. Mathes said it wasn't easy to find a pre-fabricated shed that has hardiplank siding, a hip roof and matching shingles. He said he would talk to the manufacturer to see if an overhang can be added. He noted that placement on the lot will be so that the shed cannot be seen from SE 8<sup>th</sup> Street, which is located in the Ocala Historic District; SE 9<sup>th</sup> Street is not located within the Historic District. Mr. Smith said an overhang on the shed would look better, but if the manufacturer doesn't provide the option, he "wouldn't press the point."

Mr. Ira Holmes moved to approve COA19-0020 in accordance with the Historic Preservation Guidelines, page X-11, with the suggestion that was made, but it is not mandatory. Mr. Ted Smith seconded the motion, which carried unanimously without further discussion.

**d. Case File #127; COA18-0027 – 1255 East Fort King Street – Amendment/Pool**

Ms. Nancy Bolton, 1255 East Fort King Street, said that they received an approval for a cabana house where they were going to locate a Michael Phelps endless swim spa. She advised that they have not been able to find a contractor willing to construct a small building. She explained that she wants to locate the above-ground swim spa, with a wood deck around it, in the rear yard where the building was to be located. She said that her husband medically needs the exercise pool for physical therapy otherwise he cannot walk.

Mr. Gianikas showed various photos of the property and the proposed swim spa pointing out where the spa will be located.

Mr. Richard asked how Mr. Bolton will get into the above-ground pool. Ms. Bolton said there will be a ramp with four steps that he should be able to climb. She said she and her brother will also be there to help him.

Ms. Cosand said she doesn't think that the spa is compatible with surroundings. Ms. Bolton asked if it might be situated at a different location closer to the home so that it can be approved. Mr. Gianikas interjected that the spa is set back a distance from the road at approximately 50 feet. Ms. Bolton pointed out that there is also a tall hedge around the property. Ms. Dreyer suggested locating a hedge around the spa. Mr. Kaylor suggested a privacy fence to obscure the view.

Mr. Smith asked if the spa can be partially recessed into the ground. Mr. Gianikas said it cannot be done because it will flood. Ms. Bolton said it was going to be recessed when it was in the cabana, but it isn't possible to do that with it being outside.

Discussion ensued concerning whether a 6-foot high fence or shrubbery can be located on the property to obscure the view. Ms. Bolton said they will have a red brick sidewalk for the wheelchair from the house to the spa.

John Torrey, 1202 SE 14th Avenue, said he has a direct view of the spa from his property at 1241 East Fort King Street. He complimented the work the Boltons have done on their property. He understands the Boltons' inability to find a contractor willing to build a cabana as he is having the same issue with finding a contractor to build a porte-cochere. He said the pool will be far off the street and if its screened with a fence or fast-growing hedge he doesn't have an issue with it. He suggested that there is a precedent for the endless swimming pools. He believes that someone else had one of the pools located on their property on SE 5<sup>th</sup> Street.

Mr. Kaylor suggested that creeping fig be planted along the fence; it is fast growing.

Ms. Cosand suggested that the motion include a choice between a privacy fence with creeping fig or a hedge.

Ms. Kristen Dreyer moved to approve COA 18-0027 based on a finding of fact in Section 94-82(g)(5) with the stipulation that a fast-growing hedge be planted or a 6-foot high wood privacy fence with creeping fig be located around the pool. Ms. Jane Cosand seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

### **Case File #111; COA19-0019 – 621 SE 5<sup>th</sup> Street – Fence**

Richard Mutarelli, 621 SE 5<sup>th</sup> Street, apologized for being late.

Mr. Rynex reported that historically the building is known as the R.H. Floyd House. The contributing structure built circa 1928-1930 has a frame vernacular Tudor architectural style. The property is zoned R-3, multi-family and the use is single-family. He showed various pictures of the property including the adjacent vacant parcel (also owned by Mr. Mutarelli) where the fence will be located. He also showed manufacturer information concerning the 5-foot high simulated wrought iron fence.

Mr. Smith noted that the proposed fence is 5-feet high and there is a 4-foot high restriction. Mr. Gianikas noted that the Board has discretion on a case-by-case basis to allow a higher fence. Mr. Mutarelli said the reason they need the 5-foot fence is that they have a rescue greyhound. They are trying to keep him fenced in.

A brief discussion ensued concerning exactly where the fence would be located as shown on a sketch included with the COA application submission. It was noted that the fence will not be located in front of the house; it will extend from the northeast corner of the house at a 45-degree angle and be located along the front of the vacant lot extending down the north property line until it meets up with an existing chain-linked fence.

May 2, 2019

Mr. Ted Smith moved for approval of COA19-0019 as requested with a finding of fact based on Section 94-82(g)(1) and 94-86. Ms. Cosand seconded the motion.

Mr. Richard asked that the record reflect that one of the Board's considerations in allowing a 5-foot high fence is for the purpose of fencing in a large (greyhound) dog.

Chairman McCullough called for the vote, which was unanimous in approving the motion.

**Item #5: Affirmative Maintenance / Demolition by Neglect**

**a. 704 East Fort King Street**

Mr. Gianikas reported that three permits had been pulled for work to be done, and work was not completed. Two permits expire this month and one expires in June.

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

Mr. Gianikas said the property was sold to an adjoining property owner across SE 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, who has been making repairs. He showed pictures of when the property was cited for a lack of affirmative maintenance and current pictures.

Ms. Kelly Carvalho, 205 SE Sanchez Avenue, said her husband is replacing the siding. They've gutted the inside of the house. The roof will need to be replaced. She said the windows need to be repaired or replaced and asked if there is an approved window replacement list. They have received a couple of quotes from window suppliers who said they've supplied windows that were approved for the Historic District. She believed the windows were Mi 3540, but she asked if there is a standard window that would be acceptable. She said they didn't really want to wait until the next meeting and then order them and wait another month. They received a quote to fix the windows, which is more expensive than replacing them. They would use replacement windows that are appropriate with the trim "bumped out" so that they look historic and not contemporary.

Mr. Drake said windows have been approved that looked like the glass was inset because trim was added to make them look historically appropriate. Mr. Smith said the glass should be set back from the edge of the frame. Some vinyl windows have absolutely no reveal. There are numerous manufacturers and the Board doesn't have a list of appropriate windows.

A discussion ensued concerning the windows needing to have depth and that muntins need to be applied to have a 3-dimensional look, and not inserted between two panes of glass. Mr. Drake said that numerous homeowners have recently had vinyl Mi windows approved, that are not cladded, and trim needs to be located around the window for the 3-dimensional look. There are windows made of wood and cladded with aluminum that have depth and are historically appropriate; they're very high-end. He has seen the Mi windows used in the Historic District and trim encases the windows creating the depth. Mr. Smith said there are some manufacturers that make vinyl windows that have a good depth, but there are many windows that are flat and not acceptable. Ms. Carvalho asked if they'll be able to get windows approved or if they should move forward with having existing windows repaired. She had talked with someone with the window supplier who said that they add something afterwards to create the depth.

Discussion continued concerning vinyl windows, wood clad windows, the depth and the cost.

Ms. Carvalho said that they'll need a new roof and she understands that some houses are allowed to have metal roofs and others are not. Chairman McCullough said metal roofs have caused a lot of debate, but it depends on the architectural style of the house whether a metal roof is appropriate. Ms. Carvalho said she has a metal shingle roof on her house but didn't know if a metal roof would be acceptable on this house. She said it has a shingle roof, which is the second time it has had a shingle roof on it that she knows of. Mr. Gianikas said that Sanborn maps sometimes include a note as to the type of roof, but it isn't very specific. The master site files were done in the early 80's when the Historic District was created and they list the type of roof that was on the house at that time.

Ms. Cosand advised that a former Board member researched metal roofs and found that metal roofs were original to two story buildings and not bungalows. Mr. Holmes said there are Historic Preservation Guidelines and there are extenuating circumstances, which can be economic. He said that Ms. Carvalho mentioned that they've considering making repairs to the existing windows, but most of the discussion involved replacing them. He said according to the Historic Preservation Guidelines, anytime something can be repaired, it is preferable to replacing it. It isn't mandatory; it's a guideline.

Mr. Drake asked if it would be safe to say that the Board prefers a shingle roof to replace a shingle roof, unless there is evidence that it wasn't originally a shingle roof. Mr. Holmes said it may be safe to say that unless there are extenuating circumstances that the Board isn't aware of.

Ms. Carvalho said that they found wood floors and wood shiplap when carpeting and paneling was removed. That interior will be restored and remain original. They'd like for the windows to be original but they're in bad shape. She explained that there were window air conditioning (ac) units in some of the windows and those windows are even more damaged and severely rotted from the AC units.

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

Mr. Gianikas showed photos of the property from last August and current photos. He pointed out that vegetation growing against the building was removed and the roof was replaced. Referring to a photo, he said that windows need maintenance, but suggested that they may only need to be painted. A new AC unit was also added. It was noted that progress is being made.

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

Mr. Gianikas said all repairs have been completed except for the back porch. A permit that required engineered plans was pulled for the back porch and work has started and will hopefully be done next week.

Mr. Richard said that cars are parked in the front yard on a routine basis. He advised that this issue was discussed a few years ago and thought parking in the front yard is not permissible. He suggested that parking in the front yard should be discouraged. Mr. Gianikas said he would check with Code Enforcement to see whether this is an issue the City can address with a Code Enforcement action.

**Item #6: Old Business**

**a. Historic Building Survey Update**

Mr. Gianikas advised that the Building Survey Report will be presented by the consultant at the June 6 meeting.

**b. Other old business**

Mr. Lee reported that staff is continuing to work on moving the building located at 121 SE Watula Avenue. He said there are three potential sites. The City has made an offer to buy from CenturyLink a property currently used as a parking lot at the southeast corner of SE Broadway Street and SE Watula Avenue. The house would fit on the lot and some of the parking would still be available. Staff is concerned that the timing won't work for moving the building to this lot. Another lot owned by Ambleside School is located further east on SE Broadway Street. The third lot is owned by the Church and located between the other two lots, but staff is not sure that the Church is amenable to locating the building on that lot.

Mr. Lee said that he, Ken Ausley from Ambleside, and the owner of the moving company walked the routes for all three lots. Cable and electric lines may need to be taken down temporarily. The building would be moved on a Saturday and it will take between 8 and 14 hours. The mover loads it on beams located on a "dolly" that is 4 ½ to 5 feet in the air and the dolly can tilt. The building can be moved over fire hydrants by tilting it. A lot of trees will need to be trimmed and electric/cable lines are of concern. From eave to eave the building is 48 feet wide, so an approximate 50-foot wide path is needed. The mover is going to try to move the building without removing the porch. If the building needs to be moved to the Ambleside owned lot, most of the landscaping along SE Broadway Street will need to be removed, but the dolly can go up over the curbs. It would just miss the Blakely House, but there is a tree in the next block that might be on private property that will probably need to be removed. Mr. Lee said he is hopeful that the City will end up with the CenturyLink lot; the move will be easier. The CenturyLink lot is off-grade and he suggested that the building will probably face west. There would be one access point and not two like there currently is. The City would like to have the house moved by July 31.

**Item #7: New Business**

Mr. John Torrey, 1202 SE 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue, said he received a letter concerning an expired permit for a porte-cochere on his East Fort King Street property. He had a photo of the building that showed the designated location of where the porte-cochere would be located but explained issues he had with that location. He said he came up with a solution to off-set the porte-cochere from the front of the house and provided numerous photos of examples of porte-cocheres that are off-set. He said he has to have new plans drawn and he'll come back before the Board for an approval.

**#8: Adjournment**

Mr. Holland Drake moved to adjourn at 5:12 pm. Ms. Kristen Dreyer seconded the motion and the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted by: Peggy Cash, Board Secretary