## NOTICE OF APPEAL OF A JACKSONVILLE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

## I. INSTRUCTIONS

As provided in $\S 307.201$, Ordinance Code, any person with standing may appeal a Jacksonville Historic Preservation Commission final order on an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to the City Council. An appeal must be filed within 21 calendar days of the effective date of the final order granting, granting with conditions, or denying a Certificate of Appropriateness. To appeal a Commission final order on an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness, complete and submit this form to the Legislative Services Division, Suite 430, City Hall-St. James, 117 W. Duval Street, Jacksonville, Florida 32202 with the supporting documents (see Section III) and appropriate fees (see Section IV). A copy of the final order and the list of persons who testified before or wrote to the Commission about the Certificate (see Sec. III(1) and (4)) may be obtained from the Historic Preservation Section of the Planning and Development Department, $3^{\text {rd }}$ Floor, Ed Ball Building, 214 North Hogan Street, Jacksonville, Florida 32202.

## II. NOTICE OF APPEAL

I, Sonny Redmond , hereby file this Notice of Appeal from the final order of PRINT NAME CLEARLY
the Jacksonville Historic Preservation Commission concerning Certificate of Appropriateness Number 22-27456. I
am (Please circle one):
(a) X The person who filed the application for the Certificate of Appropriateness;
(b) A person who owns, lives, or operates a business on property within 350 feet of the property which has been granted or denied the Certificate of Appropriateness;
(c) A person, other than a member of the City Council, who provided a written statement or who testified before the Historic Preservation Commission and who is suffering or will suffer an adverse effect to an interest protected or furthered by Chapter 307, Ordinance Code. The statement must have been in writing, expressing a position on the merits of the application, other than a petition, such as a letter, a memo or an e-mail, containing a reference to the specific application number and the name and mailing address of the person making the statement. The statement must have been specifically addressed to the Chief of the Comprehensive Planning Division or any member of the historic preservation staff or the Commission, with a copy to the Chief of the Comprehensive Planning Division, and which was delivered to and received by the Department by hand delivery, mail, facsimile or e-mail at least two working days prior to the public hearing at which the Commission took final action, or which is read into the record at the public hearing or distributed to the Commission at the hearing with a copy to the staff secretary.

## III. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

To complete your Notice of Appeal, you must submit the following documents with this form:
(1) A copy of the Final Order on the Certificate of Appropriateness you are appealing. Attached as Exhibit A is a Copy of the Certified Final Order that is the subject of this appeal.
(2) You must provide a statement of your interest sufficient to show how you are or will be adversely affected by the Commission's decision. Please provide this statement in the space below.

The Appellant Amkin Hill Street LLC is the owner of the real property on which the application is madd, and seeks to develop and operate an industrial waterfront business as intended by the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code. The record requires that the Application be Granted.
-The Property at issue has structural damage such that it cannot be restored. The Commission had the report of a structural engineer and an architect to that end. There is no structural engineer opining otherwise.

[^0](3) A description of the specific error(s) you believe the Commission committed. Please provide this description in the space below.

```
A separate sheet is attached as Exhibit B, which contains the specific errors committed, statement of the
                    case, and applicable citation of law.
```

(4) The list of the persons (complete names and mailing addresses), certified by the staff secretary to the Commission, who testified before, or who provided a qualified written statement to the Commission the Commission regarding the subject of the appeal. (You must pay a $\$ 2.00$ notification fee for each person on the list.) See Attached Exhibit C, the Certified List.

## IV. FILING AND NOTIFICATION FEES

Section 307.203, Ordinance Code, requires persons appealing Final Orders on Certificates of Appropriateness to pay filing and notification fees. These fees must be paid at the time your Notice of Appeal is filed with the Legislative Services Division or your Appeal will not be accepted. You may include the filing and notification fees in one payment. Make checks payable to TAX COLLECTOR.

Filing Fee:
$\$ 550.00$
Enclosed with this submission is a check for $\$ 550.00$ and a Notification Fee, computed at $\$ 2.00$ for each notification in the amount of $\$ 16.00$. Copies are attached as Exhibit D, Filing and Notification Fees.

## V. Contact Information

Please complete the following:

| Name (Printed): | Cindy Laquidara, Partner Akerman LLP |
| :---: | :---: |
| Address: | 50 N. Laura Street, Suite 3100 |
|  | Jacksonville, FL 32202 |
| Daytime Phone Number: | (904) 806-2041 |
| Evening Phone Number | (904) 806-2041 |
| E-mail address: | Cindy.Laquidara@akerman.com |

## VI. CERTIFICATION

Please read, sign and date the following statement:
I have read and understand the information contained in this Notice of Appeal. I hereby certify that I have provided all the information required under $\S 307.203$, Ordinance Code, I understand that if this Notice of Appeal is incomplete, my appeal will not processed until it is complete, and that it may be rejected for incompleteness-I further certify that all my statements in this Notice of Appeal are true and correct to the best of my knowhedge.


## III. Supporting Documents

(2) You must provide a statement of your interest sufficient to show how you are or will be adversely affected by the Commission's decision. Please provide this statement in the space below.

- The staff's opinion on a limited restoration of the office does not have the support of a structural engineer and ignores the interdependence of the wharf pilings with the building pilings.
- The Staff misapplied the federal law on restoration, and failed to consider financial or physical impossibility as required. The property is in the Industrial Waterfront Sanctuary. The intended use brings much needed rehabilitations and 300 jobs to the Jacksonville workforce;
- The intended use is one that is necessary to consider under the guidelines, and will resurrect this property from a vacant industrial site to a hive of industrial activity.
- The building has been copied in part in a museum in Jackspnville and is not in a historic district.
- the existing order, results in the continued vacancy of this land, and its inability to be used in accordance with the intention of the Jacksonville City Council and the property owner
(3) A description of the specific error(s) you believe the Commission committed. Please provide this description in the space below.

Appellant appeals findings and determinations numberedi32 and 3 of the Final Order for this Application COA-22-27456 and thus appeals the denial of the application.

## A. The Commission's Order Should Be Reversed Because of the Following Errors

1. The Commission failed to interpret properly the structural implication of a severely structurally unsafe wharf, and how that structure ties into the building, which itself is on piling that is deteriorated.
2. The Commission failed to acknowledge and apply the effect of the structural issues identified by the City itself.
3. The Commission did not weigh properly the uncontestable fact that the real property is in a designated industrial waterfront sanctuary. Because of that zoning and land-use designation, any use of the structure in place would encounter the same prohibitive structural defects, and thus the property could not be used for its intended purpose.
4. The Commission failed to address the prohibitive cost of their finding - that an office section of a building that is structurally dependent on the remainder of the building and the wharf could be somehow separated successfully.
5. Staff's opinion that a portion of the building could be saved is contrary to the entire design of the building and contrary to the architect's and professional engineer's findings and conclusions.
6. The architecture that the Commission wishes preserved is preserved in other locations throughout the country, and cannot be preserved on the existing site for the foregoing reasons. Leaving the property to continually crumble and fall into the river is not a solution.

## B. The Staff Report Errors

1. The Staff Report cited Jacksonville Ordinance Code Sections $3.07 .106(k),(\mathrm{l}),(\mathrm{m}),(\mathrm{n})$, and (o). Of those provisions, only (k) and (n) are applicable:

- (k) provides the general standards for consideration of an application in all categories of applications and landmark designations;
- (l) applies only to certificates of appropriateness for alterations being sought within Historic Districts for Rehabilitating buildings which is not applicable here;
- (m) applies to a certificate of appropriateness for new construction, which is not applicable here;
- (n) applies to this certificate of appropriateness for demolition;
- (o) applies to a certificate of appropriateness for relocation, which is not applicable here.
- (p) is not cited, but addresses undue hardship, which was submitted to the Commission.

2. Staff erroneously cited the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation \& Illustrated Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings Standards.

- See The Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation \& Illustrated Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings - Standards, attached as Exh. E.
- These guidelines largely apply to historic designations with tax incentives as the guidelines are promulgated under 36 CFR 67 (discussed below) which is a tax incentives program.
- The Staff report held that they do not address demolition and therefor - in circular reasoning - the building cannot be demolished. Even if these guidelines were applicable to buildings that cannot be rehabilitated, contrary to the Staff's conclusions, the Guidelines require that the Commission consider impossibility, expense, and technical feasance, expressly stating: "The Standards are to be applied to specific rehabilitation projects in a reasonable manner, taking into consideration economic and technical feasibility."
- These Standards are authorized by 36 C.F.R. 67, attached as Exh. E. This program however, is a tax program (the full title being Title 36, Part 67, CFR. (entitled "Historic Preservation Certifications Under the Internal Revenue Code.") The Standards themselves were devised to advise federal agencies, and those eligible or listing in the National Register of Historic Places. There is nothing in the record indicating this building is in the National Register of Historic Places.
- The designation referenced to the Secretary is for the issuance of certifications in connection with certain tax incentives involving historic preservation.
- No tax incentive for historic preservation has been granted previously or is sought for this property.
- The record shows among other things, that rehabilitation is not feasible, is technically impossible, and not economically viable. One cannot repair the wharf without causing the destruction of the building.
- The staff reports conclusion that an office could be created is counter to their citation of the Standards, as the original structure was not used as an office, and none of the interior has been saved other than the structurally impaired walls.

For all of the above reasons, and those below, the staff report is in error, and the Commission's reliance on it is in error. The Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition should be issued.
3. The Staff Report is Contrary to the Application of $\mathbf{3 0 7 . 1 0 6 ( k ) , ( n ) , ~ a n d ~ o n e ~ n o t ~}$ cited, (p).
307.106(k) provides the Commission should consider:
(1) The effect of the proposed work on the landmark, landmark site or property within an historic district. The effect on the building is to remove the landmark.

- The property is not within an historic or even an area where pedestrians travel in any significant numbers.
(2) The relationship between such work and other structures on the landmark site or other property in the historic district;
- The are no other structures than the one being demolished, and this is not in a historic district;
- (3) The extent to which the historic, architectural, or archaeological significance, architectural style, design, arrangement, texture and materials of the landmark or the property will be affected;
- This was erroneously considered. There is another example of this type of structure, it is prevalent in other areas of the country, and it is recognized for its interior structural design, which was novel at the time and allowed
the creation of cost-effective cavernous areas for industrial use, not for the architectural detail on the outside or within the cavernous space.
- Whether the plans may be carried out by the applicant within a reasonable period of time.
- The City is desirous of the development on the industrial waterfront. This project would accomplish that goal. The applicant has a record of successful waterfront development.

The application, therefore, of $307.106(\mathrm{k})$ provides that the Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition should be issued. As stated above, the Order, in reliance on the Staff Report, also cites 307.106(n).
307.106(n) is set forth verbatim, below. Given the numerosity of this list, the Appellant's application of each term will be presented in different font, demonstrating that the application of these terms, when applied properly, requires that the Certificate for Appropriateness for Demolition be issued:
(n) In considering an application for certificate of appropriateness for demolition, the Commission shall consider the applicable Historic District Design Regulations, if any, ${ }^{1}$ and the following additional criteria.
(1) The historic or architectural significance of the building or structure;

The historic significance is of an architectural and engineering breakthrough, allowing for the construction of large buildings with the use of structural steel, without numerous interior pilings or supports, for industrial use. This was helpful in designing and building machines, such as automobiles, and there are many examples of this architecture in the United States and in Russia and Europe. The architecture is not known for its exterior design or integration with its surroundings.
(2) The importance of the building or structure to the ambience of the historic district;

This is not in the historic district; this provision is inapplicable.
(3) The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing such a building or structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;

The building could be reproduced; the method of construction is still being used although it has been improved. The purpose of the building is no longer viable, and hence, unlike an historic residential building, it would serve no purpose in reproducing a copy of this in this present location. The exterior is not known for any unique architectural qualities.

[^1](4) Whether the building or structure is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood, the County or the region;

There are many large buildings that have adopted the methods of design, and one - the Brumos Collection Museum - that has reproduced it in part, and is open to the public. There are no other such buildings in Jacksonville, although it should be noted that this one lay vacant for many decades and the land use and zoning designations require that it be replaced. These buildings, being numerous at the hey-day of automobile development and production, are not always registered. A quick check of the web shows that there are many such buildings throughout the country.
(5) Whether there are definite plans for reuse of the property if the proposed demolition is carried out, and what effect of those plans on the character of the surrounding area would be;

This is a key consideration for the property at issue. There are definite plans for the reuse of the property, within the present Industrial Waterfront Sanctuary, with an identified number of jobs and future use. This is an exciting project that revitalizes the industrial waterfront in this area by a developer with a proven record of success.
(6) The difficulty or the impossibility of saving the building or structure from collapse;

It is impossible. There is an opinion from a well-recognized, licensed, professional engineer, registered as such in the state of Florida, who specializes in waterfront structural design and analysis. He has concluded that the building cannot be saved due to the interconnection of the pilings on which the building is built, and the pilings for the wharf, and the erosion underneath and around those pilings. The building, which is defined by being a monolith, will collapse.

Whether the building or structure is capable of earning reasonable economic return on its value;

The building cannot meet either criteria as it is structurally unsafe, and hazardous to occupy; the cost of the land and the building does not allow for cost-recovery of other than a negligible, if any, basis, without demolition. Millions have been invested in this property, including in the analysis of the ability to rehabilitate the building. It cannot be done. The property cannot be economically developed without the demolition of the building. The Staff's gissessment that the office can be saved was not made by a licensed structurial professional engineer, and is contrary to the opinion of E. Morales, P.E. The office is not a separate building; it shares the foundation with the overall building. The foundation ©annot be saved. See Exh. F and G-Morales and Pappas Evaluations.

## (8) Whether there are other feasible alternatives to demolition;

The staff found, without any basis, that the office could be saved. They failed to note the absence of any utilities - sewage used to be dumped directly in the River; they generated their own power, and they had a well. Providing these utilities would require the destruction of the foundation - yet another reason that there is no feasible alternative to demolition. As stated in the Morales, P.E. letter, the building and office are one contiguous foundation, inter-related to the wharf. This will not work. The building will collapse. There is, no economically viable alternative, only off-the-cuff assessments by nonengineers that a part of the building could be saved. This, coupled with the erroneous application of the historical guidelines that were drawn to provide tax incentive requirements, requires the Application be granted. Contrary to the staff's conclusion that because they are restoration guidelines, demolition is not an alternative, the guidelines provide that demolition is sometimes necessary and appropriate. See Exh. E - Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and the Code of Federal Regulations on which it relies, 36 CFR 67, Federal Historic Preservation Tax Incentives Program)
(9) Whether the property no longer contributes to an historic district or no longer has significance as an historic, architectural or archaeological landmark; and

This building is not in an historic district. It's dilapidated condition, structural deficiencies, and obstruction to the development of an industrial waterfront demonstrate that it has no significant historic or architectural value. The record demonstrates that the area has long fallen into disuse, that it is an industrial waterfront sanctuary, and that the wharf therefore needs to rehabilitated. That wharf cannot be rehabilitated without causing the building to fall. Having it fall during construction of the wharf, rather than in a scheduled demolition, creates an unacceptable danger, followed by a clean up that is unacceptably expensive. It would simply be irresponsible to prevent the demolition of this building based upon the expert opinions of E. Morales, P.E. and Pappas (Exh. F and G).
(10) Whether it would be undue economic hardship to deny the property owner the right to demolish the building or structure.

Mr. Pappas opines on what is self-evident to the Appellant - there is no economically viable method of preserving the building or any portion of it. And that professional cost-assessment, by this licensed architect and designer, as well as by the Appellant, a successful waterfront developer, is unchallenged in the record. There is no office building to preserve for use - there is one foundation as expressed by the structural engineer. One foundation, that will fall -and with it the building on top of it, including the office. Moreover, the office space sought by staff is not the purpose of this industrial waterfront development. It is not an office park.

## C. Argument and Further Analysis of the Record.

The Appellant Amkin Hill Street LLC is the owner of the real property on which the application is made, and seeks to develop and operate an industrial waterfront business as intended by the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code. That business will bring 300 jobs to the Jacksonville workforce, and resurrect this property from a vacant industrial site to a hive of industrial activity. The Commission, however, seeks to require Appellant to somehow restore a site that has significant structural issues that are themselves structurally connected and dependent on a wharf that must be demolished. The opinion of all experts is that the interdependence results in the collapse of the building once any significant work begins on the wharf. Thus, the Appellant seeks to avoid the wasting of this industrial site, and the potential danger of construction, and to use the property as intended by the foregoing. The expense of attempting to maintain safety and security over a section of this property, as required under the existing order, results in the continued vacancy of this land, and its inability to be used in accordance with the intention of the Jacksonville City Council and the property owner; otherwise holding this property without the ability to develop it is the harm that is sought to be avoided by this Appeal.

## 1. Background.

This property has lain vacant for decades. It is not downtown, or in an historical preservation area - it is in a depressed industrial area badly in need of conversion into a working industrial plant. Amkin Hill Street LLC has expended approximately $\$ 16$ million to obtain the site, and has invested considerable funds replacing, failing bulkheads on the adjoining parcels. Amkin cannot begin work on the site at issue as it is the well-reasoned and undisputed opinion of the professional engineer signing off on such work that the work cannot be performed without causing the existing building to collapse.

The City designated this site as historically important in 2003, and the property, being labeled at that point as historic, in a complex waterfront site, with only an industrial use possible, is difficult and expensive to develop. Amkin Hill Street LLC has the ability to reinstate a working waterfront by expending approximately $\$ 15$ million - but only if the building that would be destroyed in repairing or reinstituting the waterfront can be demolished properly and safely. The decision by the Commission prevents that development.

Photographs are of some value, but limited, in the analysis of the Commission's findings. While the photographs so some level of the significant deterioration and impairment to structural steel, it is the pilings, tied into the waterfront, that are not shown, and that the Commission failed to interpret properly in reaching the decision.

## 2. The Commission Credited Mr. Kahn With Greater Impact In This Area Than The Impact He Actually Had.

The designer, Mr. Kahn, is not one of America's "most notable industrial architects" other than for the creation of the interior design of the building - allowing for large, cavernous spaces. This large, industrial, space, is the space that must be demolished in any event. This is not comparable to Frank Lloyd Wright, whose concepts of spatial design brought lighting, and
connection to the outside environment. Mr. Kahn's designs were about the ability to have large spaces due to the use of - ultimately - steel beams. So it is not the outside brick that made him national recognized; it was the interior that was his architectural signature. Mr. Kahn's work exists throughout the country, with numerous buildings in Detroit, for example.

Further, there is a building in Jacksonville, open to the public for set times each week, inspired by not only Mr. Kahn's design, but the very property at issue in this appeal. Indeed, an event commemorating Jacksonville's Bicentennial anniversary was hosted by the Jacksonville Historical Society in April, 2022 - at the cite containing the inspired building, that expressly credits the Old Ford Plant (See page 86 of the attached Jacksonville Magazine, Exh. I) This is open to the public for self-guided tours, Thursday-Saturday, with advance reservations only, for $\$ 15$ to $\$ 25$ per person. Accordingly, the finding that this dilapidated building that is the Old Ford Plant is the last one in Jacksonville, or Florida, is inaccurate. The preservation of this architecture is here, and is preserved, in this Brumo's Collection.

It is notable that Mr. Kahn's primary work included the training and design of "hundreds of industrial buildings" under the Soviet Union. His organization as a whole designed $19 \%$ of all architect designed industrial factories in the U.S. His works continue to exist outside of Jacksonville, Florida. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Albert_Kahn_(architect) https://www.britannica.com/biography/Albert-Kahn.

Mr. Kahn designed thousands of buildings, and many that remain in Detroit. Id. In fact, he re-set the design such that it became a signature of large industrial buildings - that is, the structural design. His importance in this field is the use of structural concrete, and subsequently, structural steel - not the outside of the building, the designs of which have received little or no notoriety. Id.

With regard to his work for the Soviet Union in the 1930s, it should be known that the Soviet Union eradicated and systematically attached the Russian Orthodox Church beginning in 1917. Almost all churches were closed and the clergyman executed or imprisoned. By 1940, with Pope Pius XI's voice joining those raised in approbation, only a handful of churches were left. Finally, Stalin's great purge occurred between 1936-1938. While history has its place, requiring the Appellant to shoulder a burden and lose the value of its property when 1) it was the interior, structural, design for which he was noted is the issue, not the outside appearance and 2) his history was not necessary something to revere when a large part of it was to Stalin's benefit.

Again, these issues are raised as they should have been considered along with the other issues that the Commission balanced in requiring the Appellant to take an action unsupported by engineers (the office cannot be saved), without considering the entire background. The errors in the facts and legal application to those facts are set forth below.
3. The Commission's Determination that the Office Could be Preserved Has No Factual Basis in the Record. The Evidence Establishes, Without Contradiction, that the Structure will collapse once Work Begins on the Bulkhead.
a. The Staff Report erroneously characterized the structure, and concluded, without evidentiary foundation, that the office could be saved.
"The applicant has documented that the bulkhead is failing and needs to be replaced. During repair, it is anticipated that the landmarked structure will collapse." And further stated "The office/administration/showroom portion of the building, closest to the rail line, is in much better condition."

There is no evidence of the condition regarding the office or showroom other than that statement and photographs. There is no recognition that the very structural design for which this particular architect is known - and which still exists throughout Detroit, as well as in other locations.
b. The Secretary's Standards for Rehabilitation Are Inapplicable Where the Structure is Unsound and Cannot be Rehabbed.

The Staff report uses circular reasoning in concluding that because the Act is for Rehabilitation a demolition would run counter to it. The proper interpretation is that the standards for rehabilitation cannot be applied to a building that cannot be rehabilitated. Under the analysis provided in the Report and relied upon by the Commission, the building could (as it will) collapse once the Wharf work begins, and then, with no building, there would be nothing to rehabilitate. The finding that, "in general, staff believes that the production portion of the building is beyond restoration but finds that restoration of the front office is possible" has no support at all in fact. The staff is no qualified to determine whether, despite its construction on pilings and the interaction of the structural aspects of the building with the wharf, the office could be saved. Saving a section of a contiguous building, designed as on structure, is not supported by any engineering detail, and is counter to the very reason that the architect, Kahn, was recognized: for his ability to create a large working space without numerous interior beams. As with the Pantheon, moving a wall affects the entire strength of the building. The structural engineer who examined the Old Ford Motor Company Assembly Plan is a Professional Engineer, specializing in structural waterfront construction issues, Edward Morales, P.E., of Morales Consulting Engineers. The opinion was given on the Old Ford Motor Company Assembly Plant building foundation. This eminently qualified structural engineer has opined that the structural foundation will not hold, and the building will collapse, once work begins on the wharf. (Morales Evaluation, Exh. G).

In order to determine whether the building would collapse, the engineer commissioned and relied in part on an underwater inspection. That inspection showed that the "timber pile supported Wharf around the building included sections with up to $100 \%$ section loss and loss of fill material under the building itself." (Morales Evaluation, Exh. G) The engineer even reported that he had been contacted by various potential tenants, but reported to them that the expense was not reasonable.

It is notable that the engineer stated the foundation of the building - which includes the office that the staff thought could be rehabilitated - is resting on untreated timber piles. Only the interior piles were tested - and that was 15 years ago - and found adequate. The issue - at least in 2007 was that even then the perimeter piles were not structurally intact. In 2013, a structural inspection indicated that there was progressive failure of the timber piles, which then led to the exposure of the interior piles, which needed to remain unexposed to maintain their integrity. Hence, placing
his expertise behind this analysis, Engineer Morales determined that due to the deteriorated condition, the restoration of the building is not structurally feasible. (Morales Evaluation, Exh. G) There is no evidence whatsoever to counter this. Staff, while well-meaning and trained in various aspects, is not qualified to opine that, despite the opinion of a licensed structural engineer, a portion of the building could somehow be retained, simply has no basis in the record. It should be noted, as a P.E., Engineer Morales was required to practice for 5 years, pass an examination to be a Florida Professional Engineer, and maintain continuing educational credits. The "PE" designation is important, and is not held by any staff member writing the report.

## D. Conclusion.

The Council Should Approve the Issuance of a Certificate for Appropriateness of Demolition.
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## VIA HAND DELIVERY

Jessica B. Mathews, MPA-Chief of Legislative Services
City of Jacksonville/Legislative Services Division
117 W. Duval Street, Ste. 430
Jacksonville, FL 32202

RE: Notice of Appeal of a Jacksonville Historic Preservation Commission Certificate of Appropriateness

Dear Ms. Matthews:
Attached please find a Notice of Appeal of a Jacksonville Historic Preservation Commission Certificate of Appropriateness. This Appeal is being submitted on behalf of Sonny Redmond, Amkin Hill Street LLC, who is the owner of the real property seeking approval for demolition.

You will find attached the following:

1. Notice of Appeal;
2. Appeal Packet received from Chief of Legislative Services which includes additional pages for continuation of Notice of Appeal Form, COA-22-27456 Certified Final Order, Certified List of Speakers and those that provided written comments regarding COA-22-27456, heard at the May 25, 2022 Historic Preservation Commission Meeting, The Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation \& Illustrated Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings- Standards, 36 C.F.R. 67, E. Morales, P.E. - Professional Engineering Structural Evaluation, Ted P. Pappas, FAIA - Architectural Evaluation, Jacksonville Magazine regarding an event commemorating Jacksonville's Bicentennial anniversary was hosted by the Jacksonville Historical Society in April, 2022 and City of Jacksonville, Municipal Code Compliance Division - Violations; and
3. Payments - $\$ 550.00$ Appeal filing fee and $\$ 16.00$ Written Comment Notification fee.

After your review, please advise if you require additional information.

cc: Sonny Redmond
akerman.com
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> "Rehabilitation" is defined as "the process of returning a property to a state of utility, through repair or alteration, which makes possible an efficient contemporary use while preserving those portions and features of the property which are significant to its historic, architectural, and cultural values."

## The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation Introduction to the Standards

The Secretary of the Interior is responsible for establishing standards for all programs under Departmental authority and for advising Federal agencies on the preservation of historic properties listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

The Standards for Rehabilitation (codified in 36 CFR 67 for use in the Federal Historic Preservation Tax Incentives program) address the most prevalent treatment. "Rehabilitation" is defined as "the process of returning a property to a state of utility, through repair or alteration, which makes possible an efficient contemporary use while preserving those portions and features of the property which are significant to its historic, architectural, and cultural values."


Initially developed by the Secretary of the Interior to determine the appropriateness of proposed project work on registered properties within the Historic Preservation Fund grant-in-aid program, the Standards for Rehabilitation have been widely used over the years--particularly to determine if a rehabilitation qualifies as a Certified Rehabilitation for Federal tax purposes. In addition, the Standards have guided Federal agencies in carrying out their historic preservation responsibilities for properties in Federal ownership or control; and State and local officials in reviewing both Federal and nonfederal rehabilitation proposals. They have also been adopted by historic district and planning commissions across the country.

The intent of the Standards is to assist the long-term preservation of a property's significance through the preservation of historic materials and features. The Standards pertain to historic buildings of all materials, construction types, sizes, and occupancy and encompass the exterior and interior of the buildings. They also encompass related landscape features and the building's site and environment, as well as attached, adjacent, or related new construction. To be certified for Federal tax purposes, a rehabilitation project must be determined by the Secretary to be consistent with the historic character of the structure(s), and where applicable, the district in which it is located.

As stated in the definition, the treatment "rehabilitation" assumes that at least some repair or alteration of the historic building will be needed in order to provide for an efficient contemporary use; however, these repairs and alterations must not damage or destroy materials, features or finishes that are important in defining the building's historic character. For example, certain treatments--if improperly applied--may cause or accelerate physical deterioration of the historic building. This can include using improper repointing or exterior masonry cleaning techniques, or introducing insulation that damages historic fabric. In almost all of these situations, use of these materials and treatments will result in a project that
does not meet the Standards. Similarly, exterior additions that duplicate the form, material, and detailing of the structure to the extent that they compromise the historic character of the structure will fail to meet the Standards.


## The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation

> The Standards (Department of Interior regulations, 36 CFR 67 ) pertain to historic buildings of all materials, construction types, sizes, and occupancy and encompass the exterior and the interior, related landscape features and the building's site and environment as well as attached, adjacent, or related new construction. The Standards are to be applied to specific rehabilitation projects in a reasonable manner, taking into consideration economic and technical feasibility.

1. A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.
2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.
3. Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.
4. Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.
5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.
6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.
7. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.
8. Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.
9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.
10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

The Standards are to be applied to specific rehabilitation projects in a reasonable manner, taking into consideration economic and technical feasibility.

Code of Federal Regulations<br>Title 36. Parks, Forests, and Public Property<br>Chapter I. National Park Service, Department of the Interior (Refs \& Annos)<br>Part 67. Historic Preservation Certifications Under the Internal Revenue Code (Refs \& Annos)

36 C.F.R. § 67.1
§ 67.1 Program authority and function.
Effective: June 27, 2011
Currentness
(a) Section 47 of the Internal Revenue Code designates the Secretary as the authority for the issuance of certifications of historic district statutes and of State and local historic districts, certifications of significance, and certifications of rehabilitation in connection with certain tax incentives involving historic preservation. These certification responsibilities have been delegated to the National Park Service (NPS); the following office issues those certifications: National Park Service, Washington Area Service Office, Technical Preservation Services, Heritage Preservation Services (WASO), 1849 C Street, NW., Washington, DC 20240.
(b) NPS WASO establishes program direction and considers appeals of certification denials. It is the responsibility of owners wishing certifications to provide sufficient documentation to the Secretary to make certification decisions. These procedures, upon their effective date, are applicable to future and pending certification requests, except as otherwise provided herein.
(c) States receiving Historic Preservation Fund grants from the Department participate in the review of requests for certification, through recommendations to the Secretary by the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO). The SHPO acts on behalf of the State in this capacity and, therefore, the NPS is not responsible for any actions, errors or omissions of the SHPO.
(1) Requests for certifications and approvals of proposed rehabilitation work are sent by an owner first to the appropriate SHPO for review. State comments are recorded on National Park Service Review Sheets (NPS Forms 10-168 (d) and (e)) and are carefully considered by the Secretary before a certification decision is made. Recommendations of States with approved State programs are generally followed, but by law, all certification decisions are made by the Secretary, based upon professional review of the application and related information. The decision of the Secretary may differ from the recommendation of the SHPO.
(2) A State may choose not to participate in the review of certification requests. States not wishing to participate in the comment process should notify the Secretary in writing of this fact. Owners from such nonparticipating States may request certifications by sending their applications directly to the appropriate NPS WASO listed above. In all other situations, certification requests are sent first to the appropriate SHPO.
(d) The Internal Revenue Service is responsible for all procedures, legal determinations, and rules and regulations concerning the tax consequences of the historic preservation provisions described in this part. Any certification made by the Secretary pursuant to this part shall not be considered as binding upon the Internal Revenue Service or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to tax consequences under the Internal Revenue Code. For example, certifications made by the Secretary do not constitute determinations that a structure is of the type subject to the allowance for depreciation under section 167 of the Code.

## Credits

[76 FR 30541, May 26, 2011]

SOURCE: 55 FR 6771, Feb. 26, 1990; 76 FR 30541, May 26, 2011, unless otherwise noted.

AUTHORITY: 16 U.S.C. $470 \mathrm{a}(\mathrm{a})(1)(\mathrm{A}) ; 26$ U.S.C. 47 and $170(\mathrm{~h})$.

Current through June 22, 2022, 87 FR 37239, except for 40 CFR § 52.220 , which is current through May 6,2022 . Some sections may be more current. See credits for details.
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April 1, 2022

Sonny Redmond
Amkin Hill Street
1901 Hill St. Jacksonville, Florida

## PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERING STRUCTURAL EVALUATION Old Ford Motor Company Assembly Plant

Dear Mr. Redmond

Morales Consulting Engineers (MCE) is pleased to provide this structural opinion on the condition of the OLD Ford Motor Company Assembly Plant building foundation.

Since 2015 Morales Consulting Engineering has been involved with the structural review of the Waterfront site known as the Old Ford plant. The Facility was built between 1923 and 1925. In 2015 we were provided with multiple reports dating back to 1975, where the site has been investigated for redevelopment. The reports consisted of geotechnical investigations, material testing of the existing timber piles and several Waterfront infrastructure inspection reports. During the investigation by Morales Consulting's Engineers several different tenants have expressed desire for the site. However, the condition of the existing building and the expense to modify the building to suit the various tenant requirements has proven not to be reasonable.

Our efforts have mostly been associated with the replacement of the existing bulkheads on the site including the Wharf section around a portion of the building. As part of our investigation, we commissioned a underwater inspection by Blacksmith Marine in 2016 which concluded that all of the bulkheads were in poor condition. The extent of the damage to the timber pile supported Wharf around the building included sections with up to $100 \%$ section loss and loss of fill material under the building itself.

The composition of the foundation of the building itself is untreated timber piles driven to a limestone layer approximately 35 feet below the surface with a poured in place concrete cap. If these piles remain surrounded by the fill material and deprived of oxygen, they will continue to provide up to the design support of 20 tons each. The condition of the interior piles was investigated by Law Engineering and Environmental Services, Inc. (LAW) / Mactec Engineering and Consulting Inc. between 1975 and 2007. They utilized FDH, Inc. in 2007 to test the integrity and verify the length of the timber piles. The results of which are in the Appendix. Basically, they found the interior piles to be in good condition.

MORALES
CONSULTING ENGINEERS

The problem with the foundations of the building is the perimeter piles. WBCM also conducted a Structural inspection of the Wharf 2013 and indicated that the perimeter Wharf surrounding half the building, was experiencing progressive failure of the timber piles and timber retaining walls. In turn the failure of the timber retaining walls permitted the fill material which previously protected the interior timber piles that support the building to slough off into the water. The condition of these treated timber piles and the concrete caps was very poor even as of the 2013 date of the report.
We have since then work on the design of several options to replace the Wharf itself. We have obtained the necessary permits from the Army Corps and the Florida Department of Environmental Protection for the projects. However, based on the condition of the existing Wharf and the exposure of the original untreated exterior building piles, and the demolition necessary for the installation of the new Bulkhead. The building foundation would be compromised.

It is my opinion that due to the deteriorated condition of the existing Wharf and its effect on the building perimeter foundation, along with the demolition necessary for installation of a new bulkhead the restoration of the building is not structurally feasible.

If you have any questions about this additional services proposal, please do not hesitate to contact me.
Respectfully,


Ed Morales Jr., P甲 President Morales Consultying Engineers, Inc.
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## Ted P. Pappas, FAIA

Principal In Charge
PBV Architecture F 904.355.1969

April 11, 2022

Mr. Ramon Llorens
c/o Mr. Jim Gilmore
The Southern Group
208 N. Laura Street
Suite 710
Jacksonville, FL 32202
Via email

## Re: Ford Assembly Plant Architectural Evaluation

Dear Mr. Llorens:
PBV Architecture (PBV) is pleased to present this evaluation and professional opinion regarding the Jacksonville Ford Assembly Plant (FAP), located at 1901 Hill Street. Our office was engaged by your representative to tour the Assembly Plant and to provide this letter detailing our observations. That tour took place on April 4, 2022. Herein is our report.

As an architect with nearly 40 years of experience preserving, rehabilitating, restoring, and reconstructing historic structures in Jacksonville, I welcomed the opportunity to provide my analysis and opinion about a 96 -year-old building located in the heart of our waterfront industrial district.

Understand that the following statements are based upon a one-day on-site visual inspection by me, along with a limited literature research of material prepared by other professionals. No structural testing was conducted or reviewed by our firm; no building plans or calculations were provided to us or prepared by us; and no third-party structural evaluation of the above-grade building components was provided to us.

However, we have reviewed the summary of available structural testing and engineering reports, including foundation and piling evaluations under and around the building. And we are familiar with redevelopment scenarios that have been proposed for specific uses, by previous FAP owners, over the past two decades.

The historic nature of the FAP is that it exemplified Assembly Line Architecture by the early $20^{\text {th }}$ Century industrial designer Albert Kahn. The FAP was designed to encompass an entire auto assembly plant under one roof; to have no dividing interior walls; to operate on one level; and to integrate natural lighting and ventilation to optimize Ford's revolutionary assembly line processes. The Jacksonville plant was intended to have automobile chassis and parts arriving by Ford's maritime shipping fleet and for completed automobiles to leave the plant via an on-site railcar siding.

The recurring elements that Kahn brought to the FAP and nearly a dozen other regional prototype Ford plants around the country in that era included operable glass window walls, sawtooth roofs with
mechanically operated roof ventilation, and brick façades to decorate the building frameworks and structure.

As the FAP is well documented historically, our charge was to visually inspect the current condition of the building and to provide basic professional conclusions of viability for the reuse of the building and site. Our task was not to speculate on the economic feasibility of the conversion of the existing structure to an adapted, non-automobile manufacturing use. That conclusion is left to future financial analysts for a specific end-user.

We have not reviewed and are not aware of any testing that has been done on specific building components such as the operable glass windows and roof ventilation features. Based upon our observations most of those systems are significantly deteriorated and/or functionally obsolescent and would likely have to be replicated by a remanufacturing effort. Visual inspection of thè few best examples of formerly operable windows suggests that some very limited restoration might be possible, but such preservation would be limited in scope, highly labor intensive and subject to meeting modern building codes for storm force winds and other environmental factors in the Coastal High Hazard Area. We did note, and the records of the City confirm, that overhead window hardware began to fail approximately 20 years ago and that by 2008 all the windows in the building had either fallen out spontaneously or been removed by a former owner. In any case the building was repeatedly ruled unsafe for occupancy by the City due to falling glass panels and other structural factors.

Our inspection of the building and site identified advanced deterioration of both concrete and steel structural members and, in our opinion, impending building failure in many areas. The extended periods of exposure to weather and saltwater corrosion for many decades without routine preventive maintenance has left the structure in very poor condition. The interior structural columns, beams and trusses are badly rusted and show areas of failure at the critical building corners and elsewhere. The concrete collars around the steel building support columns are cracked and disintegrating. The existing elevated toilet structure in the northwest end of the building is collapsing and pulling part of the roof structure along with it.

The FAP is a single-story structure with a limiting 45 -foot height (estimated interior height to the underside of the roof system). That vertical dimension was acceptable to the building function in the early $20^{\text {th }}$ Century, but now creates a challenge for meeting the building code and general functionality for reuse of the building. The single-story production facility of the past has been replaced with high-stack storage requirements and heavy-lift cranes that can run the length or width of a building without vertical or horizontal barriers.

The existing deep-water bulkhead around the FAP also presents risk to the building structure. At over 2,200 lineal feet, there are observable areas of structural failure, including the east building façade directly facing the river, where the southeast bulkhead is presently collapsing into the river and pulling the building with it.

Permits have been issued and work has been ongoing to replace the existing bulkheads and render the site usable for marine-related industrial activities. Replacing the bulkheads nearest to the building could create risk to the building integrity during construction or with use by marine vessels in the future. Vibration created by heavy lift cranes operating on the bulkhead are a concern for the ongoing integrity of the building.

As noted in the summary structural report by Morales Consulting Engineers (April 1, 2022) "the extent of the damage to the timber pile supported wharf around the building included sections with up to $100 \%$ section loss and loss of fill material under the building itself." That report concludes that the restoration of the building is not structurally feasible.

Factored into all the above unknowns is the City's $50 \%$ Rule that would seem to apply in the case of a restoration of the FAP. The $50 \%$ Rule requires that when the restoration cost of construction exceeds $50 \%$ of the Assessment Value of the building or structure that every aspect of construction must be brought up to City standards, including flood elevation/finished floor requirements, wind loads, accessibility requirements, site landscaping, parking, and so on. Even the most conservative rule of thumb cost estimate for building restoration of this type of facility would drive any conceivable reuse into the realm of significant restoration and replication of existing historical features to meet all applicable codes.

Please contact this office should you have any questions.

Sincerely,


Ted P. Pappas, FAIA
PBV Architecture




An 1894 Peugeot was a mechanical marvel in its day. It still is, in fact. While the vehicle was hard pressed to break 20 miles per hour even motoring downhill, she was a precursor of things to come. Polished and gleaming as bright as the day she wheeled out of the carmaker's shop in France, one of the 128-year-old Peugeots, a car that participated in the first officially sanctioned race, sits parked inside the Brumos Collection-a Jacksonville museum that houses some of the most prized motor vehicles ever built. Up until about two years ago, few in Northeast Florida knew these cars were here, let alone had ever seen them in person.
"Our goal is to accomplish a few things," says Brandon Starks, executive director of the Brumos Collection. "One, is to tell the stories of the men and women who created these amazing machines. Two, is to tell the Brumos story and to provide a home for fans and for the Brumos legacy. Lastly, we want to help grow the automotive community in Northeast Florida.
"We intend to accomplish these goals by providing a first-rate facility that uses modern technology to facilitate learning and exploration," he continues. "We also try to provide an accessible and approachable environment for each guest who passes through the doors. We plan to provide more events and programming and experiences for our visitors and guests as we move forward and toward a post-pandemic life."

The collection traces its roots back to 1953, when Hubert Brundage established Brundage Motors in Miami and became a Volkswagon


## 1910 Lion-Peugeot V2Y2

importer. The name "Brumos" was coined by combining the dealership's two names into one-Bru-Mos. A decade later and following Brundage's death in a motorcycle accident, acclaimed race car driver Peter Gregg acquired the dealership and formed a racing team. The Harvard educated Gregg was a naval intelligence officer during a three-year stint in the U.S. Navy. The Jacksonville-based aircraft carrier USS Forrestal [CV-59] was his inspiration for the Brumos team's number "59." The red and blue stripes he favored would become synonymous with the Brumos brand.

Selling Porsches was Gregg's weekday job. Racing was his weekend passion and his team was a force to reckon with on the track, winning its first 24 Hours of Daytona in 1973. Three more trips to the winner's circle at the 24 Hours of Daytona endurance race would follow, as did many more victories on other tracks. After Gregg's unexpected passing in 1980, his wife Deborah took the wheel of the dealership and racing team, eventually selling them ten years later to local businessmen Bob Snodgrass and Dan Davis. It was during this time that the collection that exists today really began to come together through targeted acquisitions.
According to the Classic Car Trust and its The Key, an exhaustive annual analysis of the classic auto market and something of a bible to high-end collectors, the Brumos stable ranks 13 th among the world's top 100 collections. By comparison, the collection of fashion icon Ralph Lauren is \#3. Comedian Jay Leno's sits in 48th position.
"In terms of significance, as far as the cars and artifacts are concerned, there are only a handful of collections in the world that compare." says Starks. "Most of them are not accessible to the public. Providing public access in this wonderful facility is an extremely unique situation. We are fortunate to have guests who have visited collections and museums all over the world, and the most common reaction from our visitors and guests is, 'wow.'"


1972 Porsche 917-10 with the 1970 Porsche 917K, driven by Steve McQueen in the movie Le Mans in the background.


Certainly, earning a "wow" or two is a 1914 Peugeot L45, one of only two of its kind that still exists today. Peugeot dominated racing in the early 20th Century and its fearless drivers pushed the envelope of speed and innovation with cars like this. Steps away is the 1917 Miller Golden Submarine, the very first enclosed race car. Early race car drivers subscribed to the idea that the best way to survive a crash was to be thrown clear of the vehicle. That philosophy was almost proved correct during a race in Atlanta. The sin-gle-door Golden Submarine lost a wheel and spun into a lake, nearly drowning the driver who was briefly trapped inside.

Porsche plays the starring role in the Brumos Collection. Among its leading actors is a 1955550 Spyder, considered the vaunted automaker's first true sports car. James Dean was driving a 550 when he died in an accident in September of 1955 in California. The vehicle in the Brumos garage was once owned by Ferry Porsche, son of Volkswagon and Porsche founder Ferdinand. It finished 8th in the 1955 Venezuela Grand Prix. It's looks practically new today, nary a rust spot to be found.

Another Porsche with a film pedigree is a 1970917 K . It's a true race car and, while it did see time on a track, it never competed in a real race. Steve McQueen drove the car in 1971 for the movie Le Mans. The hardware used to mount the camera equipment is still bolted to its underside.


A 1914 Peugeot L45-one of only two still in existence.

In addition to dozens of polished vehicles (including a vintage Porsche tractor and a team bus] legendary names in car racing and design live on here-Ettore Bugatti, Harry Miller, Armand Peugeot, Fred Offenhauser, Hurley Haywood and others are pictured and revered. Harry Miller's cars and engine designs, for example, won the Indianapolis 500 nearly 40 times between 1922 and 1976. Amazingly, a car he built in 1929 (now on display in the Smithsonian) could exceed 150 miles per hour.


1955 Porsche 550 Spyder


1959 Porsche tractor

The stories told here go on and on. So much so that one could fill a book with them. Well, actually, it would take three books. Brumos: An American Racing Icon [\$559] is a three-volume package covering 1,500 pages and illustrated by some 2,000 photos. Every race, every driver, every victory and every vehicle are chronicled within. And, while the team's racing program would shutter in 2013 (after 42 years of competition), its legacy rolls on, the preservation of which is part of the mission of the museum.

The 35,000-square-foot facility sits a bit off the beaten track, so to speak. There's no roadside billboard to grab one's attention. It's tucked down a quiet, tree-lined side street near the south end of San Pablo Road and behind a high privacy fence and an imposing, hand made steel gate which secures the collection at night Driving into the property, the slowly curving road and white wooden railings are nods to the racetracks of old. A salvaged Phillips 76 spotter tower and ball was brought from the Daytona Speedway and placed here as a trophy or sorts, rising above a small lake. Back in the day, race team "spotters" climbed inside the ball to observe and relay car positions and track conditions back to teams who, while sequestered along pit row, couldn't see what was happening on the far ends of the course.


Portions of the building's design are inspired by a Ford Model T assembly plant that was established in Jacksonville in 1924, some of which still stands in a mostly unused industrial site a few blocks from TIAA Bank Field near Downtown. Red brick walls and large bay windows pay homage to the city's automotive history.

At present, there are 70 vehicles in the collection (three cars were added in the last year), with about 40 on view to the public at any one time. Each car on display sits beside an interactive digital kiosk,
allowing guests to scroll through an exhaustive history that details every factoid and engineering innovation, complete with historical photos and technical specifications. Glass cases contain scores of trophies won, as well as memorabilia, vintage racing equipment, car parts and driver's gear.

The cars aren't static models, as one might see with historic airplanes hanging from the rafters at the Smithsonian. All of the vehicles are kept in operating condition and driven, even if sparingly so. A three-


AS PART OF AN ONGOING series of events commemorating lacksonville's Bicentennial anniversary, the Jacksonville Historical Society is hosting an exclusive gathering at the Brumos Collection on April 13, 6 PM The event will feature food and libations, and a social hour followed by a historical program and Q\&A session led by Bill Warner founder of the Amelia Island Concours d'Elegance. Tickets are $\$ 100$ and approximately 100 will be offered Proceeds benefit the lacksonville Historical Society. 眷
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person team of technicians utilizes a large garage and workshop space. Keeping the cars in top condition requires steady attention and should something break, the team likely won't find replacement parts for sale online or at a store. Classic Duesenbergs and Bugattis were made by hand, so repairs need to be done the same way.
Asked which cars he considers his favorites or attract the most attention from visitors, Starks hesitates to answer, offering that each one is special in its own way. "This has been one of the most interesting things
for us to observe. People have a wide range of favorites for a variety of reasons," he says. "That said, our 1910 Lion-Peugeot V2Y2 seems to get a lot of attention, as does our 1917 Miller Golden Submarine. The Porsche loyalists love the 1970 917K, and the 1959 Porsche Tractor also has many fans."

The cars were previously stored in a garage in the back of the Brumos Porsche dealership on Atlantic Boulevard. The existence of the collection was a closely guarded secret at the time. Times have changed, and when the dealership was sold in 2016, a new home needed to be found. After nearly four years of planning and building, the collection's new home officially opened in early 2020. The pandemic put the museum's visitor plans on idle for many months, but that's no longer the case.
"We hope our guests leave smiling. The wonderful thing about the cars and artifacts that we care for is that there are many different things you can appreciate about them," says Starks, whose previous post was general manager of the Brumos dealership. "It might be the technical innovations, the competitive achievements, or the personal stories associated with them. If the guests leave with a new appreciation or increased knowledge base, it makes us happy." *

The Brumos Collection, 5159 San Pablo Road, is open for self-guided tours Thursday-Saturday, 10 AM-4 PM. Tickets are $\$ 15$ to $\$ 25$ and must be reserved in advance. Group tours may also be arranged.

# MUNICIPAL CODE COMPLIANCE DIVISION Jacks nirle <br> Where Florida Begins. 

Case Recap - Case \# 2009-11122 - Case Status; Active
Printed: 02/03/2022 at 10:31.22
Violation Summary

| Complied | Location | Remedy | Definition | Inspector | Section |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Entire | Restore or Demolish | Structure is in violation of the electrical code. | Devron Cody | 518.111, 301 |
|  | Entire | Restore or Demolish | Structure is in violation of the plumbing code. | Devron Cody | 518.111, 301 |
|  | Entire | Restore or Demolish | Structure constitutes a fire/windstorm hazard due to deterioration/damage \& the health/safety of occupants or the public. | Devron Cody | 518.111,301 |
|  | Entire | Restore or Demolish | Structure is unfit for human habitation and poses a threat to the health and safety of the occupants. | Devron Cody | 518.111, 301 |
|  | Entire | Remove from Premises | Unlawful accumulation of junk, trash, debris and other property on premises where structure has been declared unsafe. | Devron Cody | 518.312 |
|  | Entire | Restore to Sanitary Condition | Accumulation of junk, trash, debris, or other derelict property on premises of unsafe structure. | Devron Cody | 518.413(a), (b) |
|  | Entire | Restore or Demolish | Structure is damaged or deteriorated to the extent it is dangerous to the health and safety of occupants or the public. | Devron Cody | 518.111, 301 |
|  | Entire | Board up per attached specs. | Structure is standing vacant, open, and unguarded; providing unrestricted access to the interior (tmp. securing may be allowed). | Devron Cody | 518.111, 301 |
|  | Entire | Restore or Demolish | Structure has inadequate light, air and/or sanitation facilities to protect health or safety of occupants. | Devron Cody | 518.111, 301 |
|  | Entire | Restore or Demolish | Structure lacks exits or fire protection, required by building code and/or fire prevention code. | Devron Cody | 518.111, 301 |
|  | Entire | Restore or Demolish | Structure has parts in danger of falling or of being dislodged by the elements. | Devron Cody | 518.111, 301 |
|  | Entire | Restore or Demolish | Structure is in violation of the Property Safety and Maintenance Code, Chapter 518, PART 3. | Devron Cody | 518.111, 301 |

# MUNICIPAL CODE COMPLIANCE DIVISION Jacks nidle Where Florida Begins. 

Case Recap - Case \# 2009-11122 - Case Status: Active
Printed: 02/03/2022 at 10:31.22
Completed Inspections

| Date Scheduled | Date Completed | Inspector | Visit Description | Status |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $10 / 17 / 2008$ | $10 / 17 / 2008$ | Devron Cody | Inspection: Initial | Complete |

Inspector's comments from inspection done on 10/17/2008:
*UNSAFE STRUCTURE* Vacant warehouse at the deadend of Wambolt St on the waterfront, structure is unsecure.
Electrical, mechanical and structural violations observed. Structure is full of used tires. dcody. (121960 0100)

| 10/20/2008 | 10/28/2008 | Marcia Cain | . Abstract Clerk: Conduct Owner | Complete |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $10 / 28 / 2008$ | $10 / 31 / 2008$ | Voria Lancaster | Inspection: Supervisor Field Audit | Complete |

Inspector's comments from inspection done on 10/31/2008:
2009-11122-audit E.Lancaster
10/28/2008 10/29/2008 Katie Urban Inspection: Assist another officer Complete
Inspector's comments from inspection done on 10/29/2008:
2009-11122, I was called to meet with fire marshall John Scott and the owners of this property. To look at the unsafe ca: on this property, The Supervisor was called to the cite as well. K.Urban.

| 10/29/2008 | $10 / 29 / 2008$ | Devron Cody | Abstract: Work Completed, Print | Complete |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 10/29/2008 | $10 / 29 / 2008$ | Devron Cody | Violation Notice: First Notice of | Complete |
| $12 / 01 / 2008$ | $12 / 05 / 2008$ | Cecil Laraque | Inspection: Subsequent, Unsafe | Complete |

Inspector's comments from inspection done on 12/05/2008:
2009-11122- property remains as cited. no work. non comply. pix 67-77 claraque
12/08/2008 12/08/2008 Devron Cody Board Hearing: Send to Senior Complete
Inspector's comments from inspection done on 12/08/2008:
2009-11122 - Case was reviewed by the Senior Officer, property remain in violation, refer to Code Board. dcody.

| $12 / 08 / 2008$ | $12 / 08 / 2008$ | James De Vera | Board Activity: Clerk /Pre-Board | Complete |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $12 / 08 / 2008$ | $12 / 08 / 2008$ | Cecil Laraque | Board Activity: Print Hearing | Complete |
| $12 / 08 / 2008$ | $12 / 08 / 2008$ | Cecil Laraque | Violation Notice: Request for | Complete |
| $12 / 12 / 2008$ | $12 / 12 / 2008$ | Mary Burton | Transfer: Owner to Code Board | Complete |

Inspector's comments from inspection done on 12/12/2008:
PIC \# 2009-11122 - MCEB \# 90557 pending Special Masters Hearing.mburton

| 12/15/2008 | $12 / 08 / 2008$ | James De Vera | Board Activity: Scan Document | Complete |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| $01 / 12 / 2009$ | $12 / 19 / 2008$ | April Maryland | Board Activity: Pending Board | Complete |
| $02 / 10 / 2009$ | $02 / 10 / 2009$ | James Quinn | Inspection: Pre-Board | Complete |

Inspector's comments from inspection done on 02/10/2009:
2009-11122, RE\#121960 0100 (unit 1900); property still in violation/no corrections. Continue to Board. J Quinn

| 02/17/2009 | 02/17/2009 | James Quinn | Board Hearing: Attend Board | Complete |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 02/17/2009 | 03/09/2009 | April Maryland | Board Hearing: Schedule Board | Complete |
|  |  | Case Recap for Case \# 2009-11122-Page 3 of 13 |  |  |
|  |  | NEIGHBORH | DS DEPARTMENT Phone: 904.255.7000 Fax: 9 |  |
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Case Recap - Case \# 2009-11122 - Case Status: Active
Printed: 02/03/2022 at 10:31.22
03/09/2009 03/09/2009 April Maryland Board Order: Issue Order to Correct Complete

Inspector's comments from inspection done on 03/09/2009:
Special Master C. Mirando issued a 30 day Order to Correct, on February 17, 2009.awalker
04/06/2009 04/06/2009 James Quinn Inspection: Board Ordered Complete

Inspector's comments from inspection done on 04/06/2009:
2009-11122, RE\#121960 0100; not corrected. Lower windows boarded (some), but access can still be gained and bay ds on SW corner (side) is completely open. Send to Fine Hearing. J Quinn
04/08/2009 04/13/2009 April Maryland Board Activity: Pending Fine Complete
Inspector's comments from inspection done on 04/13/2009:
Special Master Hearing scheduled for 5/5/09 10 am . awalker
04/30/2009 James Quinn Inspection: Pre-Board Complete

Inspector's comments from inspection done on 04/30/2009:
2009-11122, RE\#121960 0100; structure still vacant/open, broken windows, etc. Continue to Fine Hearing. J Quinn

| $05 / 05 / 2009$ | $05 / 05 / 2009$ | Devron Cody | Board Hearing: Attend Board | Complete |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| $05 / 05 / 2009$ | $05 / 05 / 2009$ | James De Vera | Board Activity: Scan Document | Complete |
| $05 / 06 / 2009$ | $04 / 13 / 2009$ | April Maryland | Transfer: Resend for Fine Hearing | Complete |

Inspector's comments from inspection done on 04/13/2009:
Special Master Hearing scheduled for 5/5/09 10 am. awalker

| $05 / 11 / 2009$ | $05 / 11 / 2009$ | Mary Burton | Board Activity: Update Board | Complete |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $06 / 15 / 2009$ | $06 / 16 / 2009$ | Cathy Wood | Board Activity: Deferral | Complete |
| $07 / 23 / 2009$ | $07 / 23 / 2009$ | James Quinn | Board Activity: Serve/Post | Complete |

Inspector's comments from inspection done on 07/23/2009:
2009-11122, RE\#121960 0100; property boarded up, Posted SPS. Sending to Supervisor Lancaster for review/determination. J Quinn
07/27/2009 James Quinn Inspection: Pre-Board Complete
Inspector's comments from inspection done on 07/27/2009:
2009-11122, RE\#121960 0100; property boarded, but not paintede and structure still in violation. Continue to Board. J
Quinn

| $08 / 03 / 2009$ | $08 / 03 / 2009$ | James Quinn | Board Hearing: Attend Board | Complete |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| $08 / 03 / 2009$ | $09 / 07 / 2009$ | April Maryland | Board Hearing: Schedule Fine | Complete |
| $08 / 04 / 2009$ | $08 / 04 / 2009$ | James Quinn | Inspection: Appointment with | Complete |

Inspector's comments from inspection done on 08/04/2009:
2009-1 1122, RE\#121960 0100; met with owner, Mr Sonny Redmond (229) 220-6050 at 1900 Wambolt. Pointed out the
boards utilized in securing the structure, that needed replacing and also informed owner of painting needed. Mr
Redmond stated he would correct this and initiate work for correcting other violations and jeep this Officer informed. J
Quinn
09/07/2009 09/07/2009 April Maryland Board Order: Issue Order to Correct Complete
Inspector's comments from inspection done on 09/07/2009:
Case Recap for Case \# 2009-11122 - Page 4 of 13
NEIGHBORHOODS DEPARTMENT

# MUNICIPAL CODE COMPLIANCE DIVISION 6 acksenville <br> Where Florida Begins. 

Case Recap - Case \# 2009-11122 - Case Status: Active
Printed: 02/03/2022 at 10:31.22
8/3/09 Special Master issued an order to correct in 90 days; PICS case \#2009-11122.awalker
09/10/2009 09/10/2009 James Quinn Inspection: Appointment with Complete
Inspector's comments from inspection done on 09/10/2009:
2009-11122, RE\#121960 0100; met with Supervisor Lancaster and Mr S. Redmond at property. Property was boarded u properly and painted. Supervisor Lancaster informed Mr Redmond of a pending meeting concerning status of property and would advise him of date. J Quinn 09/10/2009 09/10/2009 Voria Lancaster Inspection: Supervisor Complete

Inspector's comments from inspection done on 09/10/2009:
Met with Mr Redman on site, E.Lancaster

| $09 / 18 / 2009$ | $09 / 18 / 2009$ | John Buckley | .Sys Admin: Send Message to | Complete |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| $09 / 24 / 2009$ | $09 / 25 / 2009$ | Michael O'Loughlin | Inspection: Unsafe Case | Complete |

Inspector's comments from inspection done on 09/25/2009:
2009-11122 Conducted case review, Property is on correct tract. Mike O
10/01/2009 10/02/2009. Voria Lancaster Inspection: Supervisor Complete
Inspector's comments from inspection done on 10/02/2009:
2009-11122-Supervisor and mr Prado met on site with Mr Redmond and Mike Saylor to discuss details for stipulation agreement. E.Lancaster
11/20/2009 $\quad$ April Maryland $1 / 24 / 2009 \quad$ Board Activity: Pending Fine Complete
Inspector's comments from inspection done on 11/24/2009:
Special Master hearing scheduled for 12/14/06 10 am.awalker

| $12 / 03 / 2009$ | $12 / 03 / 2009$ | James De Vera | Board Activity: Scan Document | Complete |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $12 / 08 / 2009$ | $12 / 08 / 2009$ | Mary Burton | Board Activity: Update Board | Complete |
| $12 / 10 / 2009$ | $12 / 14 / 2009$ | April Maryland | Board Activity: Withdraw from | Complete |

Inspector's comments from inspection done on 12/14/2009:
withdrawn by code compliance. awalker
05/05/2010 $05 / 06 / 2010 \quad$ Vincent Tarver Inspection: Unsafe Case Complete
Inspector's comments from inspection done on 05/06/2010:
2009-11122 Case Re-Assessment; V.Tarver/1760.
05/12/2010 John Buckley Closed case in CARE due to Specia: Complete
Inspector's comments from inspection done on 05/12/2010:
Case closed in CARE due to adjudication. Remains active in Pics. Call (904) 255-7000 for information
02/28/2011 $02 / 28 / 2011 \quad$ Nelson Beard $\quad$ Inspection: Special Review lete
Inspector's comments from inspection done on 02/28/2011:
2009-11122-violations remain at this time. Building secure as required..Nbeard

# MUNICIPAL CODE COMPLIANCE DIVISION <br>  

Case Recap - Case \# 2009-11122 - Case Status: Active
Printed: 02/03/2022 at 10:31.22
05/03/2011 05/04/2011 Nelson Beard Inspection: Special Review

## Complete

Inspector's comments from inspection done on 05/04/2011:
2009-11122-violations remain, property remains secure...Nbeard

Inspector's comments from inspection done on 08/11/2011:
2009-11122-violations remain property is secure a this time...Nbeard
Inspector's comments from inspection done on 02/23/2012:
2009-11122-violations remain, will continue to monitor the property...Nbeard
08/08/2012
08/15/2012
Nelson Beard
Inspection: Unsafe Case
Complete
Inspector's comments from inspection done on 08/15/2012:
2009-11122-violations remain, continue to monitor...Nbeard
12/18/2012 Nelson Beard Inspection: Unsafe Case Complete
Inspector's comments from inspection done on 12/21/2012:
2009-11122-violations remain, continue to monitor...Nbeard
06/24/2013 07/08/2013 Nelson Beard Inspection: Unsafe Case Complete
Inspector's comments from inspection done on 07/08/2013:
2009-1 1122-violations remain, continue to monitor...Nbeard
07/22/2014 07/22/2014 Bruce Chauncey Inspection: Unsafe Case Complete
Inspector's comments from inspection done on 07/22/2014:
2009-11122 Violations remain, continue to monitor. 1808 B.Chauncey
06/10/2015 07/06/2015 Bruce Chauncey Inspection: Unsafe Case Complete
Inspector's comments from inspection done on 07/06/2015:
2009-11122 Violations remain, continue to monitor. 1808 B.Chauncey
01/14/2016 01/14/2016 Bruce Chauncey Inspection: Unsafe Case Complete
Inspector's comments from inspection done on 01/14/2016:
2009-11122 Violations remain, continue to monitor. 1808 B.Chauncey
07/14/2016 07/22/2016 Dennis Steele Inspection: Unsafe Case Complete
Inspector's comments from inspection done on 07/22/2016:
2009-I 11222 - Rolling fine - Exterior of property now being used for pallet company. Dsteele
01/03/2017 01/05/2017 Dennis Steele Inspection: Unsafe Case Complete
Inspector's comments from inspection done on 01/05/2017:
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Printed: 02/03/2022 at 10:31.22
2009-111222 - Violations remain. Property is now vacant. Dsteele
04/03/2017 04/07/2017 Thomas Register Inspection: Unsafe Case Complete

Inspector's comments from inspection done on 04/07/2017:
2009-11122, Structure appears vacant but grounds used for construction storage. Structure also has a Historic Designation. Continue to review. TRegister
07/07/2017 07/10/2017 Timothy Myers Inspection: Unsafe Case Complete
Inspector's comments from inspection done on 07/10/201.7:
2009-11122, The property is Posted at the front gate. The structure appears to be vacant and secure, but there are office trailers present and property is being utilized for various types of storage. Continue to monitor. TMyers
10/10/2017 11/13/2017 Timothy Myers Inspection: Unsafe Case Complete
Inspector's comments from inspection done on 11/13/2017:
2009-11122, The property is Posted at the front gate. The structure appears to be vacant and secure, but there are office trailers present and property is being utilized for various types of storage. Continue to monitor. TMyers
02/15/2018 02/21/2018 Timothy Myers Inspection: Unsafe Case Complete
Inspector's comments from inspection done on 02/21/2018:
2009-11122, The property is Posted at the front gate. The structure appears to be vacant and secure, but there are office trailers present and property is being utilized for various types of storage. Attempt to contact present owner.
TMyers
03/15/2018 03/16/2018 Timothy Myers Inspection: Appointment with Complete
Inspector's comments from inspection done on 03/16/2018:
2009-11122, I met on site with Sonny Redmond (Operations-project conultant) w/Amkin, he granted me complete acces
to the property and walked around with me. This property remains as cited, I will continue to monitor it. TMyers
08/22/2018 Timothy Myers Inspection: Unsafe Case Complete
Inspector's comments from inspection done on 09/12/2018:
2009-11122, There has been no change in this property, will continue to monitor. TMyers

## 01/10/2019 01/11/2019 Timothy Myers Inspection: Historic Review Complete

Inspector's comments from inspection done on 01/11/2019:
2009-1!122, There has been no change in this property, will continue to monitor. TMyers
05/10/2019 06/10/2019 Gary Roberts Inspection: Historic Review Complete

Inspector's comments from inspection done on 06/10/2019:
2009-11122 No trespass signs at front entrance. Unable to view conditions of building. GRoberts
09/11/2019 03/05/2020 Bradley Clayton Inspection: Historic Review Complete
Inspector's comments from inspection done on 03/05/2020:
2009-11122-No legal access to site to view structure based on no tresspass signs in front, setting out 3 months. B
Clayton
06/05/2020 07/10/2020 Bradley Clayton Inspection: Historic Review Complete
Inspector's comments from inspection done on 07/10/2020:
2009-11122-2009-1 1122-No legal access to site to view structure based on no tresspass signs in front, setting out 3 months. B Clayton
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Case Recap - Case \# 2009-11122 - Case Status: Active<br>Printed: 02/03/2022 at 10:31.22<br>10/12/2020 $10 / 14 / 2020 \quad$ Bradley Clayton $\quad$ Inspection: Historic Review $\quad$ Complete<br>Inspector's comments from inspection done on 10/14/2020:<br>2009-11122- No legal access to property, unable to view building conditions, setting out 3 months. B Clayton<br>01/15/2021 01/19/2021 Brian Naples Inspection: Historic Review Complete

Inspector's comments from inspection done on 01/19/2021:
2009-11122 No legal access to site to view structure based on no tresspass signs in front, setting out 3 months. BNaples
04/19/2021 04/20/2021 Robert Bautochka Inspection: Historic Review Complete

## Inspector's comments from inspection done on 04/20/2021:

2009-11122-No legal access to site to view structure based on no tresspass signs in front, setting out 3 months. RBautochka
07/20/2021 07/26/2021 Robert Bautochka Inspection: Historic Review Complete
Inspector's comments from inspection done on 07/26/2021:
2009-11122-No legal access to site to view structure based on no tresspass signs in front, setting out 3 months.
RBautochka
10/27/2021 10/28/2021 Robert Bautochka Inspection: Historic Review Complete
Inspector's comments from inspection done on 10/28/2021: 2009-11122-No legal access to site to view structure based on no tresspass signs in front, setting out 3 months. RBautochka
01/31/2022 02/02/2022 Robert Bautọchka Inspection: Historic Review Complete
Inspector's comments from inspection done on 02/02/2022:
2009-11122, I spoke to Sonny Redmond at 229-220-6050 via phone and advised him that I was trying to get an update a to the course of action being taken with this location. He advised that due to the number of calls that he is receiving from persons that he would rather discuss this location in person verses over the phone. I advised him that I am in the Office all day on Thursdays and that there is always a supervisor in the office and that he could speak with any supervisor on a day that he chooses to come in. Violations not correct by owner. No legal access to view property. RBautochka
Pending Requests

| Date Scheduled | Date Completed | Inspector | Visit Description | Status |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| $05 / 05 / 2009$ | $05 / 08 / 2009$ | April Maryland | Board Hearing: Schedule Fine | Cancelled |
| $07 / 24 / 2009$ | $07 / 23 / 2009$ | Voria Lancaster | Transfer: Refer Unsafe Structure to | Cancelled |
| $11 / 02 / 2009$ | $11 / 09 / 2009$ | Voria Lancaster | Misc: Research | Cancelled |
| $11 / 03 / 2009$ | $08 / 04 / 2009$ | James Quinn | Inspection: Board Ordered | Cancelled |
| $11 / 16 / 2009$ | $12 / 03 / 2009$ | Voria Lancaster | Inspection: Board Ordered | Cancelled |
| $12 / 07 / 2009$ | $12 / 03 / 2009$ | Voria Lancaster | Inspection: Pre-Board | Cancelled |
| $12 / 14 / 2009$ | $12 / 03 / 2009$ | April Maryland | Board Hearing: Schedule Fine | Cancelled |
| $02 / 03 / 2010$ | $02 / 20 / 2010$ | Voria Lancaster | Transfer: Refer back to Code | Cancelled |
| $05 / 03 / 2022$ |  |  | Inspection: Historic Review | Scheduled |

## NEIGHBORHOODS DEPARTMENT

# MUNICIPAL CODE COMPLIANCE DIVISION acksinví/e 

Case Recap - Case \# 2009-11122 - Case Status: Active Printed: 02/03/2022 at 10:31.22

Document History

| Date | Status | Party Name | Certified Mail \# | NoticeType |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11/03/2008 | Delivery Successful | STREET LLC, HILL | 70080500000115195116 | Initial Notice of Condemnation - UAI |
| 11/12/2008 | Delivery Successful | BANK OF <br> TALLAHASEE,GUARANT <br> Y NATIONAL | 70080500000115195178 | Initial Notice of Condemnation - UA1 |
| 11/03/2008 | Delivery Successful | N.A.,SOUTHTRUST BANk | 70080500000115195154 | Initial Notice of Condemnation - UAI |

# MUNICIPAL CODE COMPLIANCE DIVISION Iobe mulle <br> Where Florida Begins. 

Case Recap - Case \# 2009-11122 - Case Status: Active
Printed: 02/03/2022 at 10:31.22

## Additional Case Comments

| Date | Type | Comment | Inspector |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10/17/2008 | C | *UNSAFE STRUCTURE* Vacant warehouse at the deadend of Wambolt : on the waterfront, structure is unsecure. Electrical, mechanical and structural violations observed. Structure is full of used tires. dcody. $(1219600100)$ | system System |
| 10/17/2008 | N | *UNSAFE STRUCTURE* Vacant warehouse at the deadend of Wambolt ! on the waterfront, structure is unsecure. Electrical, mechanical and structural violations observed. Structure is full of used tires. dcody. $(1219600100)$ | Devron Cody |
| 10/28/2008 | N | ABSTRACT WORK COMPLETE SEND NOTICE TO OWNER, $, \ldots, \ldots, \ldots, 09-11122$ MCAIN | Marcia Cain |
| 10/29/2008 | N | 2009-11122, I was called to meet with fire marshall John Scott and the owners of this property. To look at the unsafe case on this property, The Supervisor was called to the cite as well. K.Urban. | Katie Urban |
| 12/05/2008 | N | 2009-11122- property remains as cited. no work. non comply. pix 67-77 claraque | Cecil Laraque |
| 12/08/2008 | N | 2009-11122 -- Case was reviewed by the Senior Officer, property remain it violation, refer to Code Board. dcody. | Devron Cody |
| 12/12/2008 | N | PIC \# 2009-1 1122 - MCEB \# 90557 pending Special Masters Hearing.mburton | Mary Burton |
| 12/19/2008 | N | Special Master Hearing scheduled for 2/17/09 a.m. awalker | April Maryland |
| 02/10/2009 | N | 2009-11122, RE\#121960 0100 (unit 1900); property still in violation/no corrections. Continue to Board. J Quinn | James Quinn |
| 02/17/2009 | N | PICS \#:09-11122; MCEB\#:90557 ;SPECIAL MASTERS HEARING: 02.1 10AM ; PRESIDED BY:Carol Morando; CASE OFFICER:J Quinn ; OWI DID NOTAPPEAR ; BOARD ORDER TO CORRECT 30days : ; by: jde | James De Vera |
| 04/06/2009 | N | 2009-11122, RE\#121960 0100; not corrected. Lower windows boarded (some), but access can still be gained and bay door on SW comer (side) is completely open. Send to Fine Hearing. J Quinn | James Quinn |
| 04/13/2009 | N | Special Master Hearing scheduled for 5/5/09 10 am . awalker | April Maryland |
| 04/30/2009 | N | 2009-11122, RE\#121960 0100; structure still vacant/open, broken window: etc. Continue to Fine Hearing. J Quinn | James Quinn |
| 05/05/2009 | N | PICS \#:2009-11122; MCEB\#:90557; SPECIAL MASTERS HEARING:05/05/09 10:AM ; PRESIDED BY:Ed Tannen; CASE OFFICER:Devron Cody / for JQuinn ; Representative DID APPEAR : Mike Saylor; BOARD ORDERTO CORRECT: defer 30 days : jdev | James De Vera |
| 06/16/2009 | N | Special Master Hearing scheduled for 8.3 .09 pm . CWood 6.16 .09 | Cathy Wood |
| 07/23/2009 | N | 2009-11122, RE\#121960 0100; property boarded up, Posted SPS. Sending Supervisor Lancaster for review/determination. J Quinn | James Quinn |
| 07/23/2009 | N | 2009-11122-Proceed to fine hearing. E.Lancaster | Voria Lancaster |
| 07/27/2009 | N | 2009-11122, RE\#121960 0100; property boarded, but not paintede and structure still in violation. Continue to Board. J Quinn | James Quinn |
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Printed: 02/03/2022 at 10:31.22

| 08/03/2009 | N | PICS \#:09-11122; MCEB\#: 90557; SPECIAL MASTERS HEARING:08-C 1P.M ; PRESIDED BY:C Morando; CASE OFFICER:Jquinn ;Represental DID APPEAR : Mr T Redmond ; BOARD ORDER TO CORRECT:90 : j | James De Vera |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 08/04/2009 | N | 2009-11122, RE\#121960 0100; met with owner, Mr Sonny Redmond (229? 220-6050 at 1900 Wambolt. Pointed out the boards utilized in securing the structure, that needed replacing and also informed owner of painting needed. Mr Redmond stated he would correct this and initiate work for correcting other violations and jeep this Officer informed. J Quinn | James Quinn |
| 09/10/2009 | N | 2009-11122, owner/representative Mr Sonny Redmond (229) 220-6050, e-mailed a request to meet at 1900 Wambolt St to review progress of corrective actions. J Quinn | James Quinn |
| 09/10/2009 | N | 2009-11122, RE\#121960 0100; met with Supervisor Lancaster and Mr S. Redmond at property. Property was boarded up properly and painted. Supervisor Lancaster informed Mr Redmond of a pending meeting concerming status of property J Quinn | Voria Lancaster |
| 09/16/2009 | N | 2009-11122-Supervisor inspection pictures taken for September 10, 2009 a in error.Please review inspector photos to show temporary borading of building. E.Lancaster | Voria Lancaster |
| 09/17/2009 | N | On September 16, 2009, I met with Deputy Director Derek Igou and property representative, Mike Saylor, to discuss case history and development of a Stipulated Agreement for subject property. Mr. Saylor will contact Zone Supervisor Elaine Lancaster to schedule an on-site assessment with Mr. Sonny Redmond; the assessment is required to development a detailed list of required repairs/corrections to comply outstanding violations for this case. Following this assessment, MCCD will develop a Stipulated Agreement. K. Scott, Division Chief | Kimberly Scott |
| 10/02/2009 | N | 2009-11122-Supervisor and mr Prado met on site with Mr Redmond and Mike Saylor to discuss details for stipulation agreement. E.Lancaster | Voria Lancaster |
| 11/24/2009 | N | Special Master hearing scheduled for 12/14/06 10 am.awalker | April Maryland |
| 05/06/2010 | N | 2009-11122 Case Re-Assessment ; V.Tarver/1760. | Vincent Tarver |
| 02/28/2011 | N | 2009-11122-violations remain at this time. Building secure as required..Nbeard | Nelson Beard |
| 05/04/2011 | N | 2009-11122-violations remain, property remains secure...Nbeard | Nelson Beard |
| 08/11/2011 | N | 2009-11122-violations remain property is secure a this time...Nbeard | Nelson Beard |
| 02/23/2012 | N | 2009-11122-violations remain, will continue to monitor the property...Nbeard | Nelson Beard |
| 08/15/2012 | N | 2009-11122-violations remain, continue to monitor...Nbeard | Nelson Beard |
| 12/21/2012 | N | 2009-11122-violations remain, continue to monitor...Nbeard | Nelson Beard |
| 07/08/2013 | N | 2009-11122-violations remain, continue to monitor...Nbeard | Nelson Beard |
| 07/22/2014 | N | 2009-11122 Violations remain, continue to monitor. 1808 B.Chauncey | Bruce Chauncey |
| 07/22/2016 | N | 2009-111222 - Violations remain. Property now being used for pallet company. Dsteele | Dennis Steele |
| 01/05/2017 | N | 2009-111222-Violations remain. Property is now vacant. Dsteele | Dennis Steele |

# MUNICIPAL CODE COMPLIANCE DIVISION - acks. nville <br> Where Florida Begins. 

Case Recap - Case \# 2009-11122 - Case Status: Active
Printed: 02/03/2022 at 10:31.22

| 04/07/2017 | N | 2009-11122, Structure appears vacant but grounds used for construction storage. Structure also has a Historic Designation. Continue to review. TRegister | Thomas Register |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 07/10/2017 | N | 2009-1 1122, The property is Posted at the front gate. The structure appears to be vacant and secure, but there are office trailers present and property is being utilized for various types of storage. Continue to monitor. TMyers | Timothy Myers |
| 11/13/2017 | $\bar{N}$ | 2009-11122, The property is Posted at the front gate. The structure appears to be vacant and secure, but there are office trailers present and property is being utilized for various types of storage. Continue to monitor. TMyers | Timothy Myers |
| $\overline{02 / 21 / 2018}$ | N | 2009-11122, The property is Posted at the front gate. The structure appears to be vacant and secure, but there are office trailers present and property is being utilized for various types of storage. Attempt to contact present owner. TMyers | Timothy Myers " |
| 03/13/2018 | N | 2009-11122, I spoke to Sonny Redmond at 229-220-6050, I have an appointment with him on 3-15-18 at 2:30 PM on site. <br> TMyers | Timothy Myers |
| 03/16/2018 | N | 2009-11122, I met on site with Sonny Redmond (Operations-project consultant) w/Amkin, he granted me complete access to the property and walked around with me. This property remains as cited, I will continue to monitor it. TMyers | Timothy Myers |
| 09/12/2018 | N | 2009-1 1122, There has been no change in this property, will continue to monitor. TMyers | Tirfiothy Myers |
| 01/11/2019 | N | 2009-11122, There has been no chiange in this property, will continue to monitor. TMyers |  |
| 06/10/2019 | N | 2009-11122 No trespass signs at front entrance. Unable to view conditions of building. GRoberts | Gary Roberts |
| 03/05/2020 | N | 2009-11122-No legal access to site to view structure based on no tresspass signs in front, setting out 3 months. B Clayton | Bradley Clayton |
| 07/10/2020 | N | 2009-11122-2009-11122-No legal access to site to view structure based on no tresspass signs in front, setting out 3 months. B Clayton | Bradley Clayton |
| 10/14/2020 | N | 2009-11122- No legal access to property, unable to view building conditions, setting out 3 months. B Clayton | Bradley Clayton |
| 01/19/2021 | N | 2009-11122-No legal access to site to view structure based on no tresspass signs in front, setting out 3 months. BNaples | Brian Naples |
| 04/20/2021 | N | 2009-11122-No legal access to site to view structure based on no tresspass signs in front, setting out 3 months. RBautochka | Robert Bautochka |
| 07/26/2021 | N | 2009-11122-No legal access to site to view structure based on no tresspass signs in front, setting out 3 months. RBautochka | Robert Bautochka |
| 10/28/2021 | N | 2009-11122-No legal access to site to view structure based on no tresspass signs in front, setting out 3 months. RBautochka | Robert Bautochka |
| 02/03/2022 | N | 2009-11122, I spoke to Sonny Redmond at 229-220-6050 in the office and advised that his plan is to demolish this location as soon as possible but is in talks with Historic Department to get permission to demolish and will keep us updated once he gets more information. RBautochka | Robert Bautochka |

# MUNICIPAL CODE COMPLIANCE DIVISION Where Florida Begins. 

Case Recap - Case \# 2009-11122 - Case Status: Active

Printed: 02/03/2022 at 10:31.22
02/02/2022
S 2009-I 1122 , I spoke to Sonny Redmond at 229-220-6050 via phone and
Robert Bautochka advised him that I was trying to get an update as to the course of action being taken with this location. He advised that due to the number of calls that he is receiving from persons that he would rather discuss this location in person verses over the phone. I advised him that I am in the Office all day on Thursdays and that there is always a supervisor in the office and that he could speak with any supervisor on a day that he chooses to come in. Violations not correct by owner. No legal access to view property. RBautochka

## Proposed Re-Use of Property

## Appropriateness of the Proposed Reuse with Respect to Land Use and Zoning

The Ford Automotive Plant (FAP) building ( 165,000 square feet/3.7 acres, under roof) lies on 14.6 acres of privately owned land within the Water Dependent/Water Related (WD/WR) Land Use Category of the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) of the 2030 Comprehensive Plan. The 14.6acre parent tract is combined with another 8.8 acres adjacent to the immediate south to create a contiguous 23.4 -acre waterfront property. The entire 23.4 acres is designated WD/WR land use and Industrial Water (IW) zoning district. A verbatim excerpt from the Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan states:

## WD-WR - GENERAL USES

The uses provided herein shall be applicable to all WD-WR sites in all Development Areas.

## Principal Uses

Ports; Harbors; Industrial docks; Facilities for construction; Maintenance and repair of vessels; Ship supply establishments and facilities; Freight, trucking, shipping or other transportation terminals; Non-manufacturing; Storage; Processing; Transportation; Dredge; and Disposal and other similar uses, which are related to and support the Port are also permitted, even though they may not require deep water access.

In addition to its WD/WR land use and IW zoning designation, the FAP site also lies entirely in the Industrial Sanctuary category depicted on the Industrial Preservation Map (Map L-23) that is a supplement to the FLUM. This designation implements Ordinance 2007-560-E, which addresses Comprehensive Plan Policy 3.2.32 as follows:

### 3.2.32

Where there is not an adopled neighborhood plan and/or study recommending the contrary, areas identified on the Industrial Preservation Map (Map L-23) as Industrial Sanctuary shall not be converted to non-industrial land uses.

Accordingly, the FAP site has been identified by the City of Jacksonville as a prospective development or redevelopment location for port or other maritime use with immediate access to deep, navigable water of the St. Johns River Channel and within a well-established Talleyrand industrial district that is characterized by JAXPORT and other private maritime industrial interests along the western shoreline of the river.

In addition, the FAP site affords a unique position for multi-modal, water-related transport integrated with rail service, which is provided by a CSX Railroad spur/track immediately adjacent to the west property line of the FAP site.

Per the Comprehensive Plan of the City of Jacksonville and its implementing Land Use and Zoning policies and rules, the FAP site cannot be developed as residential use and was specifically targeted by City Council via legislation in 2007 for maritime industrial activities that will help drive Jacksonville's economic/job-producing engine. For this reason, previous proposals by previous owners to create a mixed-use residential/festival marketplace product on the property, making use of the defunct automotive plant building, are now "off the table" as entitled options.


Excerpt, Map L-23, Industrial Preservation, 2030 LUE/Comprehensive Plan

## Functional Obsolescence

The Jacksonville FAP was constructed in 1924 by industrial designer Albert Kahn, following a prototype plant design that had already been replicated in over a dozen cities where Ford Motor Company had established regional assembly plants. The one-off building design was created to specifically accommodate the labor-intensive automotive assembly processes of that era. The Jacksonville plant plans were adapted from the Memphis and Charlotte plants that preceded it to suit the dimensions and opportunities of the riverfront site, and primarily to allow the delivery of automotive parts by ship for assembly of a finished automobile (in under two hours) using Ford's assembly line approach to manufacturing. Those completed cars often left the site by railcar from sidings on the north and west sides of the building.

Kahn built over 1000 buildings for Henry Ford in the early $20^{\text {th }}$ century and most of his industrial buildings share the common elements of one-story floorplans, operable glass window-walls, sawtooth/mechanically operated roof ventilation, and decorative brickwork facades over steel frame buildings.

Since the year 2001, there have been various investors and prospective tenants evaluating the FAP site and assembly building for adaptive reuse. Plans for a residential/multi-use "marketplace" emulating Boston's Faneuil Hall failed. Use as the home base for a marine construction firm failed. Carnival Cruise Lines and JAXPORT looked seriously at making Downtown Jacksonville a cruise ship destination and the FAP their cruise terminal. Various ships' repair and "breaking" contractors have tried to adapt the site to their use and failed to find a viable site plan to suit their needs. A recent luxury yacht-builder liked the building but found the column-spacing too tight and ceiling-height too low for indoor crane operations.

The common insurmountable hurdle for all the redevelopment opportunities that have presented to this property has been the inability of any potential user to convert economical reuse of the 165,000 square foot FAP building, which dominates the otherwise usable open areas of the site. The square footage under the roof is too large to make a maritime redevelopment plan work for an end-user that the site is best suited and entitled for.

## Highest and Best Use

From a land planning and legal entitlements perspective the highest and best use of the 23.4acre FAP site is a maritime-related industrial, manufacturing, or maintenance activity. The upland site is likely not large enough to achieve economies of scale in auto transport, bulk freight, or container operations.

Skilled artisans and laborers working in large numbers on high-end or high-technology maritime vessels, such as mid-sized US Navy warships, research vessels, or mid-sized coastal cruise ships, is the ideal "fit" for this site and the best possible economic generator for the surrounding neighborhood, given the Industrial Sanctuary designation of the Comprehensive Plan.

Over 2200 lineal feet of existing deep-water bulkhead and the prospect for a future 400 foot drydock in the internal basin makes the FAP site a candidate for intermediate-to-advanced seagoing vessel maintenance, repair and re-work. The missing component for a state-of-the-art ships' repair facility is the addition of rail-mounted cranes or dedicated heavy-lift craneways clear of horizontal and vertical obstructions.
In the ship's repair industry, there is no standard shipyard site design, but a highly desirable facility configuration such as found at the Norfolk Naval Shipyard in Portsmouth, Virginia incorporates a central craneway and adjacent horizontal clear zone of $80^{\prime}$ to $90^{\prime}$ (total) from the face of the working bulkhead to the nearest permanent structure or building. Separation distances from $100^{\prime}$ up to $200^{\prime}$ from the working bulkhead to the nearest building is ideal, allowing for maximum flexibility in the placement of portable shops, vans and CONEX boxes that are configured along the water's edge to accommodate the workflow of a given, unique contract vessel. The available clear "work-zone" from any of three bulkheads to the FAP building exterior wall today ranges from only 45 ' to $65^{\prime}$. This is not conducive to a modern or competitive shipyard operation.

## In Conclusion

The owner has investigated the feasibility of designing a reuse for the existing 165,000 square foot building that would be consistent with recently permitted, large-building-footprint construction in the Jacksonville marketplace. Such projects include dock-height transportation logistics transfer facilities, local distribution/product warehouses, high-stack modular storage facilities, and "big-box" retailers and office buildings. However, the existing FAP is not a candidate for adaptive reuse to any of those contemporary indoor uses. Residential, retail commercial use, and office buildings are not permitted within the waterfront-dependent Industrial Sanctuary in any case. Proximity to the deep-water channel of the River demands a port-related use. As the building is not suitable for an adaptive reuse, it is the intent of the owner to prepare the site for an appropriate marine industrial use.
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# Planning and Development Department 

Ed Ball Building
214 North Hogan Street, Suite 300
Jacksonville, FL 32202

## NOTICE OF CERTIFICATION

## RE: $\quad$ Certified Final Order for COA-22-27456

DATE: June 14, 2022

Please find attached:

- Certified final order for COA-22-27456, from the May 25, 2022 Historic Preservation Commission meeting

If there are any questions, please contact me at (904) 255-7800.

[^2]
## CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION NO.: COA-22-27456

IN RE: After the fact Certificate of Appropriateness Application of

## Amkin Hill Street, LLC

1900 Wambolt Street
Jacksonville, Florida 32202

## ORDER ON COA-22-27456: DENIED

This matter came to be heard upon the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) Application filed by Taylor Mejia, on behalf of Amkin Hill Street, LLC, the owner of certain real property located at 1900 Wambolt Street, R.E. No. 121960-0100, seeking approval for demolition of a local landmark structure.

Having duly considered both the testimonial and documentary evidence presented at the meeting and public hearing on May 25, 2022, including the COA Application and the Planning and Development Department's Staff Report and Recommendation and all attachments thereto ("Staff Report"), a portion of which is attached hereto as EXHIBIT A, and on file it its entirety in the Planning and Development Department, the Jacksonville Historic Preservation Commission hereby

## FINDS AND DETERMINES:

1. That the applicant did comply with the procedural and application requirements set forth in Section 307.106 of the Jacksonville Ordinance Code; and
2. That as stated in the record, substantial competent evidence demonstrates that application COA-22-27456 does not meet the standards and criteria set forth in Section 307.106 of the Jacksonville Ordinance Code; and
3. The Commission hereby adopts the findings in the Staff Report for application COA-22-27456, to the extent consistent with this Order; and
4. That the land which is the subject of application COA-22-27456 is owned by Amkin Hill Street, LLC.

NOW THEREFORE, it is ORDERED by the Historic Preservation Commission:
Application COA-22-27456 is hereby DENIED.

Executed this 9th_day of June_, 2022.

## FORM APPROVED:



Copies to:

Owner: Amain Hill Street LLC<br>1450 Brickell Avenue, Suite 1410<br>Miami, FL 33131<br>Applicant: $\quad$ Taylor Mejia<br>The Southern Group<br>208 North Laura Street, Suite 710<br>Jacksonville, FL 32202

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL. Persons listed in Section 307.202, Ord. Code, may appeal this decision to the City Council within twenty-one (21) days of the date of this Order by filing a Notice of Appeal with the Legislative Services Division of the Council as required by section $\mathbf{3 0 7 . 2 0 3}$, Ord. Code. Failure to file a Notice with the Legislative Services Division within the time prescribed waives the right to appeal this Order.

May 25, 2022

## Report of the Jacksonville Planning and Development Department Certificate of Appropriateness Application COA-22-27456

Address: 1900 Wambolt Street, RE\# 121960-0100
Location: North of the Arlington Expressway, between the CSX Rail line and the St. Johns River

Owner: $\quad$ Amkin Hill Street LLC 1450 Brickell Avenue, Suite 1410 Miami, FL 33131

Applicant: $\quad$ Taylor Mejia
The Southern Group 208 North Laura Street, Suite 710
Jacksonville, FL 32202

Year Built: $\quad$ c. 1924

Designation: Local Landmark

Request: Demolition

## Summary Scope of Work:

1. Demolition of a local landmark

## Recommendation: Deny

*The Planning and Development Department suggests, as a potential alternative, either a partial demolition with restoration of the street-facing, showroom portion of the structure; or a Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) recording (reference HABS Guidelines per the National Park Service website, https://www.nps.gov/hdp/standards/habsguidelines.htm).



## PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This application for a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) is for the demolition of the Ford Motor Company Assembly Plant, a locally designated landmark (LM-03-09, Ordinance 2003-1267). Per the designation report, the structure meets five (5) of the seven (7) designation criteria. The structure was built in 1924. Albert Kahn, one of America's most notable industrial architects, designed both the original plant and the 1926 addition. Two rail tracks entered the plant from the west to receive freight from ships or to deliver automobiles. The original plant was designed to produce 125 automobiles per day; by 1926 the plant was expanded to produce 200 cars per eight (8) hour day. Initially, the plant was used to make Model T's but began production of the Model A in 1928. The plant was one of the largest in the Southeast and remained in operation until 1932. After that, it was used as a parts distribution center for the state. Henry Ford was directly involved with the planning and operation of the Jacksonville plant.

The applicant has documented that the bulkhead is failing and needs to be replaced. During repair, it is anticipated that the landmarked structure will collapse. The owner would like to
demolish the entire structure and repurpose the site for an industrial waterfront use.

## STAFF SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS

Staff considered the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and the Ordinance Code criteria found in Sections 307.106(k), 307.106(I), 307.106(m), 307.106(n), and 307.106(o). The following is Staff's analysis:

- The Ford Assembly Plant structure is located north of the Mathews Bridge, in between the St. Johns River and the CSX rail line. The plant building is 165,000 square feet under roof and sits on 14.6 acres of land. A site visit was conducted on May 5, 2022. Significant damage to the bulkhead, foundation, and structure is visibly evident. Brickwork on the warehouse portion closest to the river is falling down, and all of the steel framing is thoroughly rusted, resulting in structural failures throughout the immense space. The office/administration/showroom portion of the building, closest to the rail line, is in much better condition. In general, staff believes that the production portion of the building is beyond restoration but finds that restoration of the front office is possible.
- The Secretary's Standards for Rehabilitation are not oriented towards demolition. The only guidance they offer relates to the preservation and restoration of structures. As such, the proposed demolition would run counter to the intent of the Standards.
- The Ford Plant used the assembly line process and produced the Model $T$ and its replacement, the Model A. At the time of construction, Albert Kahn's design of the Jacksonville plant was regarded as state of the art. The design allowed for boxcars loaded with parts to enter one side of the plant and then exit with finished automobiles. He designed motorized windows that were angled to catch prevailing breezes to maximize airflow to the interior. Bathrooms were built into the truss work above the floor to maximize floor space for production. Albert Kahn's design was an outstanding example of the modern industrial building, and its use of concrete, glass and steel embodies modern architecture. As such, even in its current condition, the structure remains historically and architecturally significant and would be a challenge to reproduce. (Sections 307.106(n)(1, 3 and 9))
- The Ford plant is not important to the ambience of a historic district because it is located outside of the boundaries of a locally designated historic district. However, the building is the last remaining assembly plant of its kind in the state. (Sections 307.106(n)(2 and 4))
- The property owner intends on combining the 14.6 acre subject site with an adjacent 8.8 acres to create a contiguous 23.4 acre waterfront property. The entire portion of land is currently designated Water Dependent-Water Related (WD/WR) on the Future Land Use Map of the Comprehensive Plan and has a zoning classification of Industrial Waterfront (IW). The property also lies entirely within the Industrial Sanctuary; per the Comprehensive Plan, areas identified as Industrial Sanctuary shall not be converted to non-industrial land uses. The applicant has submitted that these designations are some of the reasons why the current landmarked structure is not capable of earning reasonable economic return on its value. Information submitted by the applicant states that the owner has investigated the feasibility of designing a reuse for the existing 165,000 square foot building that would be consistent with recently permitted, large-building-footprint
construction in the Jacksonville marketplace. Such projects include dock-height transportation logistics transfer facilities, local distribution/product warehouses, highstack modular storage facilities, and "big-box" retailers and office buildings. The applicant argues that the existing Ford plant building is not a candidate for adaptive reuse to any of those contemporary indoor uses because residential, retail commercial use, and office buildings are not permitted within the waterfront-dependent Industrial Sanctuary, and proximity to the deep-water channel of the river demands a port-related use. As such, it is the intent of the owner to prepare the site for an appropriate marine industrial use. Given the fragility and immense size of the structure, relocation is also not a feasible alternative. (Sections 307.106(n)(5, 7, 8 and 10))
- The applicant has provided letters from a structural engineer and an architect, which discuss the current condition of the bulkhead and structure. Both letters contend that structural failure is imminent if the bulkhead is repaired (and repair is necessary under any development scenario). Having visited the site, staff agrees that the bulkhead and foundation have significant damage, and the steel frame of the structure is already collapsing in places. (Section 307.106(n)(6))
- While the production/warehouse portion of the building may be suitable for demolition, the Department finds that the administrative offices appear to be fit for restoration. Staff suggests that the owner consider either a partial demolition with restoration of the street-facing, showroom portion of the structure; or a Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) recording (reference HABS Guidelines per the National Park Service website, https://www.nps.gov/hdp/standards/habsguidelines.htm), to thoroughly document the site and mitigate the negative effects demolition would have on the City's historical and architectural resources.

For these reasons, it is the position of the Planning and Development Department that the proposed work is inconsistent with:

1. Section 307.106(n) Guidelines on Demolition: 1-10
2. Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation

## CODE CRITERIA AND DESIGN REGULATIONS

## Demolition

- $307.106(\mathrm{n})(1)$ - The historic or architectural significance of the building or structure;
- $307.106(n)(2)$ - The importance of the building or structure to the ambience of the historic district;
- 307.106(n)(3) - The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing such a building or structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
- 307.106(n)(4) - Whether the building or structure is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood, the County or the region;
- $307.106(\mathrm{n})(5)$ - Whether there are definite plans for reuse of the property if the proposed demolition is carried out, and what effect of those plans on the character of the surrounding area would be;
- 307.106(n)(6) - The difficulty or the impossibility of saving the building or structure from collapse;
- 307.106(n)(7) - Whether the building or structure is capable of earning reasonable economic return on its value.
- $\mathbf{3 0 7 . 1 0 6}(\mathrm{n})(8)$ - Whether there are other feasible alternatives to demolition;
- 307.106(n)(9) - Whether the property no longer contributes to an historic district or no longer has significance as an historic, architectural or archaeological landmark; and
- $307.106(n)(10)$ - Whether it would be undue economic hardship to deny the property owner the right to demolish the building or structure.


## Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation

1. A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.
2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.
3. Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.
4. Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.
5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.
6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.
7. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.
8. Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.
9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.
10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

## LOCATION MAP



## PICTURE OF PROPERTY WITH POSTED SIGN



| Application Info |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Tracking \# | 27456 | Application Status | FILED COMPLETE |
| Date Started | $04 / 25 / 2022$ | Date Submitted | $04 / 25 / 2022$ |


| Planning and Development Department Info |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| COA \# | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| Admin Review |  |
| Admin Recommendation | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| Admin Date Of Action | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| Forwarded to JHPC |  |
| JHPC Meeting Date | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| Staff Recommendation | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| JHPC Recommendation | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| JHPC Date Of Action | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| Admin Details |  |
| N/A |  |
| JHPC Details |  |
| N/A |  |


| Last Name MEJIA | First Name TAYLOR | Middle Name |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Company Name THE SOUTHERN GROUP |  |  |
| Mailing Address 208 N LAURA ST SUITE 710 |  |  |
| City <br> JACKSONVILLE | State <br> FL | Zip Code 32202 |
| Phone   Fax <br> 904 349 5954 904 |  | THESOUTHERNGROUP.COM |


| Agent represents Owner | Contractor | Architect | Consultant | Other |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Last Name MEJIA | First Name TAYLOR |  | Middle Na |  |
| Company/Trust Name THE SOUTHERN GROUP |  |  |  |  |
| Mailing Address 208 N LAURA ST SUITE 710 |  |  |  |  |
| City <br> JACKSONVILLE | State FL |  | 2ip |  |
| Phone Fax <br> 9043495954 904 | Email MEJIA@THESOUTHERNGROUP.COM |  |  |  |


| Description Of Property |
| :---: | :---: |
| Property Designation Local Landmark |
| Property Appraiser's RE \#(s) (10 digit number with a space \#\#\#\#\#\#\#\#\#\#) |
| Map |
| RE\# |
| 1219600100 |$\quad$ Page 81 of 168

## Companion Zoning Application Tracking \# (if known)

```
Location Of Property
General Location
    1900 WAMBOLT ST
House # Street Name, Type and Direction zip Code
    1900 WAMBOLT ST 32202
Between Streets
    FAIRFIELD PLACE and MATTHEWS BRIDGE
```

Type Of Improvement

| Addition | Drlveway | Demolition | Window Replacement |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Alteration | Relocation | New Constructlon | Reroof/Minor Repairs |
| Fencing |  |  |  |

Describe proposed work below, Note affected features and changes in design or materials. Be as specific, brief, and legible as possible.
(Example: reroof; replacing gray 3-tab shingles with black architectural shingles).
Proposed Work
DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDING.
-Addition Information
Is this a violation? Check the box if it is.
If you have been working with a planner choose one from the list KELLY, SUSAN

Demolition - Required Attachments For Complete Application

Written Statement - Applicant's written statement of reasoning.
Letter From Engineer - Letter from licensed registered engineer/contractor.
Statement Of Economic Vlability * Statement of economic viabillity of rehabilitation to code.

Proposed Re-use Of Property
Appointment With Staff - Appointment with staff to review condition.
Photos Of Structure - Photos of structure interior and exterior.

## Additional Documents Provided

## Description

CODE COMPLIANCE REPORT

## Application Certification

For applications that can be approved administratively, there is no application fee.
For all applications that must go before the Historic Preservation Commission, a fee will be applied based on the type of work performed.

Application completeness review applications for Certificate of Approprlateness
("Application") will be reviewed for completeness by Planning and Development Depai unent Staff. Any Application determined to be incomplete, will be returned to the applicant with comments detailing the deficiencies. No further action on the Application will take place until the application deficiencies are addressed. Once the Application is determined to be complete, Planning and Development Department Staff will prepare an invoice for the cost of the Application.

Payment deadline: The Invoice must be paid by the payment deadline in order to have the Application heard on the next scheduled Jacksonville Historic Preservation Commission (JHPC) regular meeting. The payment deadline is outlined on the City of Jacksonville's Planning and Development Department Website. Only Complete Applications will be invoiced. It is for the benefit of the applicant to supply staff with a complete Application in advance of the payment deadline. Due to the complexity and volume of Applications received by the Planning and Development Department, there is no guarantee that COA Applications submitted on the day of the payment deadline will be heard at the next regular meeting of the JHPC.

I, hereby, certify that I am the owner or the authorized agent of the owner(s) of the property described herein, that all answers to the questions in this application and all information contained in the material attached to and made a part of this application, are accurate and true to the best of my knowledge and belief. I also attest by my signature that all required information for this application is completed and duly attached in the prescribed order. Furthermore, if the package is found to be lacking the above requirements, I understand that the application will be returned for correct information.

I UNDERSTAND THE ABOVE DISCLAIMER REGARDING APPLICATION REVIEW. AGREED TO AND SUBMITTED.


## Planning and Development Department

Ed Ball Building
214 North Hogan Street, Suite 300
Jacksonville, FL 32202

## NOTICE OF CERTIFICATION

RE: $\quad$ Certified List of Speakers for COA-22-27456
DATE: June 14, 2022

Please find attached:

- Certified list of speakers and those that provided written comments regarding COA-22-27456, heard at the May 25, 2022 Historic Preservation Commission meeting

If there are any questions, please contact me at (904) 255-7800.


Stephanie Pejsa, Executive Assistant
Community Planning Division
Planning and Development Department
COA-22-27456
Jim Gilmore
208 North Laura Street, Suite 710
Jacksonville, FL 32202
Mike Saylor
12581 Sawpit Road
Jacksonville, FL 32226
Crissie Cudd
1419 Silver Street
Jacksonville, FL 32206
Kim Pryor
245 West $5^{\text {th }}$ Street
Jacksonville, FL 32206
Scott O'Connor
9008 Heckscher Drive
Jacksonville, FL 32226
Jenny Wolfe
2029 Vista Cove Road
St. Augustine, FL 32084
Dale Sinclair
2136 Post Street
Jacksonville, FL 32204
Deborah Early
4790 Ortega Blvd
Jacksonville, FL 32210


## Planning and Development Department

Ed Ball Building
214 North Hogan Street, Suite 300
Jacksonville, FL 32202

## NOTICE OF CERTIFICATION

RE: $\quad$ Certified Transcript of the May 25, 2022 Jacksonville Historic Preservation Commission Meeting

DATE: June 14, 2022

Please find attached:

- Certified Historic Preservation Commission Transcript for the May 25, 2022 meeting, including item COA-22-27456

If there are any questions, please contact me at (904) 255-7800.


Stephanie Pejsa, Executive Assistant
Community Planning Division
Planning and Development Department

| City of Jacksonville historic preservation COMMISSION <br> Proceedings held on Wednesday, May 25, 2022, commencing at 3:26 p.m., at the Ed Ball Building, 214 North Hogan Street, lst floor Training Room, Jacksonville, Florida, before Diane M. Tropia, FPR, a Notary Public in and for the State of Florida at Large. <br> PRESENT: <br> JACK C. DEMETREE, III, Chairman. <br> ANDRES LOPERA, Vice Chair. <br> ERIK C. KASPER, Secretary. <br> MICHAEL MONTOYA, Commission Member. <br> JULIA EPSTEIN, Commission Member. <br> ALSO PRESENT: <br> SUSAN KELLY, Planning and Development Dept. JERMAINE ANDERSON, Planning and Development. ARIMUS WELLS, Planning and Development Dept. SUSAN GRANDIN, office of General Counsel. STEPHANIE PEJSA, Planning and Development STEPHANIE PEJSA, Planning and Development Dept. | 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | We're going to move through Agenda A as quickly as we can as we're going to start there. <br> So we're going to take a break every two hours as needed. Any private conversations, please be had in the hallway. Any cell phone conversations, silence them, please. And we're going to move through this as quickly as possible. <br> I'll go ahead and take a motion for the minutes from the March 23rd meeting. <br> COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Motion to approve the minutes from the March 23rd meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission. <br> COMMISSIONER KASPER: Second. <br> THE CHAIRMAN: All those in favor? <br> COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye. <br> THE CHAIRMAN: Those opposed? <br> COMMISSION MEMBERS: (No response.) <br> THE CHAIRMAN: Hearing none, you have approved those minutes. <br> We're going to head straight into Agenda A. We're going to run through the consent agenda. We have COA-22-27134, 125 East 3rd Street; COA-22-27195, 1302 North Laura Street; COA-22-27196, 1306 North Laura Street; <br> Diane M. Tropia, Inc., Post Office Box 2375, Jacksonville, FL 32203 (904) 821-0300 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 |  | 4 |
| 1 PROCEEDINGS | 1 | COA-22-27202, 212 West 5th Street; |
| May 25, 2022 3:26 p.m. | 2 | , |
| 2 | 3 | COA-22-27216, 2242 Myra Street; COA-22-27229, |
| 3 THE | 4 | 2229 Riverside Avenue; and COA-22-27262, 2217 |
| 4 We're going to go ahead and kick off the | 5 | Herschel Street |
| 5 May 25th meeting of the Jacksonville Historic | 6 | Do any commissioners have any ex parte |
| 6 Preservation Commission. | 7 | any comments? |
| If we could start with some introductions. | 8 | COMMISSION MEMBERS: (No response.) |
| 8 Susan, if you'd start. | 9 | THE CHAIRMAN: We'll go ahead and open the |
| MS. GRANDIN: Susan Grandin, Office of | 10 | public hearing. |
| 10 General Counsel. | 11 | Is anyone here to speak |
| 11 MS. KELLY: Susan Kelly | 12 | this consent agenda? |
| 12 Preservation section. | 13 | AUDIENCE MEMBERS: (No response.) |
| 13 MR. ANDERSON: Jermaine Anderson, Historic | 14 | THE CHAIRMAN: Seeing none, we'll close |
| 14 Preservation. | 15 | the public hearing and I'll entertain a motion. |
| 15 COMMISSIONER EPSTEIN: Julia Epstein | 16 | COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Motion to approve |
| 16 commissioner. | 17 | consent agenda for Agenda A. |
| 17 COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Michael Montoya, | 18 | COMMISSIONER KASPER: Second. |
| 19 THE CHAIRMAN: J.C. Demetree, chairman | 19 | THE CHAIRMAN: All those in favor? |
| 20 COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Andres Lopera, | 20 | COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye. |
| 21 commissioner. | 21 | THE CHAIRMAN: Those opposed? COMMISSION MEMBERS: (No res |
| 22 COMMISSIONER KASPER: Erik Kasper, | 23 | COMMISSION MEMBERS: (No response.) <br> THE CHAIRMAN: Hearing none, that consent |
| 24 THE CHAIRMAN: As most of you have | 24 | agenda has been approved. |
| 25 probably realized, we have two agendas today. Diane M. Tropia, Inc., Post Office Box 2375, Jacksonville, FL 32203 (904) 821-0300 | 25 | We're going to move right into Section $D$, Diane M. Tropia, Inc., Post Office Box 2375, Jacksonviile, FL 32203 (904) 821-0300 |

Previously Deferred Items to be Heard. First on our docket, COA-22-27035, 1414 Talbot Avenue.

MS. GRANDIN: Is that the one that was administratively done?

THE CHAIRMAN: Oh, yes. That has actually been done administratively, so that is now off our agenda, so we're going to keep moving.

That gets us down to Section F, Historic Designations. First one on the docket is LM-22-04, 318 North Broad Street.

MS. KELLY: LM-22-04 seeks the local landmark designation for the structure at 318 North Broad Street. The Department found that the structure meets two of the seven criteria.

The building at 318 North Broad Street exemplifies the change of North Broad Street from predominantly residential to commercial. Based on Sanborn maps and City directories, 318 North Broad was built between 1901 and 1902 as a two-story, wood-framed residence.

The previous house on the parcel was destroyed by the 1901 fire. By 1913, the residence was moved to the back of the lot and

Diane M. Tropia, Inc., Post Office Box 2375, Jacksonville, FL 32203 (904) 821-0300

6
incorporated as part of the new two-story masonry commercial building fronting Broad Street.

318 North Broad is also significant as one of the few remaining buildings directly associated with the East European Jewish community that was established in LaVilla in 1934.

318 North Broad housed the Progress Furniture Company owned by Olga Burney and Leo Moskovitz. The Progress Furniture Company occupied the building until the late 1990s. After Progress Furniture Company left, the building was used for a period by the DeLoach Furniture Company for storage.

The Department finds that the structure meets the landmark designation criteria for its value as a significant reminder of the cultural and historical heritage of the city.

The most significant character-defining feature of the primary elevation fronting North Broad Street is the simple mission-style parapet. The mission style was popular from the 1890s through the 1920s.

It appears that the original front and Diane M. Tropia, Inc., Post Office Box 2375, Jacksonville, FL 32203

COMMISSION MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Hearing none, you have approved the historic designation.

I will move on to LM-22-05. That is 525 West Beaver Street.

MS. KELLY: LM-22-05 seeks the local landmark designation for the structure at 525 West Beaver Street. The Department found that the structure meets four of the seven criteria.

So 525 West Beaver is located in the historic LaVilla area. For over a century, the northern part of LaVilla was the commercial and social center of Jacksonville's African-American community. Having to create an economy within a segregated neighborhood such as LaVilla, many black-owned businesses flourished, along with a growing professional class.

One of the remaining examples of the heyday of LaVilla as the business center of Jacksonville's African-American community during the first half of the 20th century is the Lawton Pratt Funeral Home. Established in 1910 under prominent director Lawton Pratt, and
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1 moving to an attractive new building in 1914 at
525 West Beaver Street, the mortuary has served
3 Jacksonville's African-American population for
4 over a hundred years, making it one of the oldest funeral homes in Florida.

Lawton Pratt is recognized as the second licensed black funeral director in Florida.
After establishing his business in
Jacksonville, Pratt contracted with well-known builder Joseph Blodgett to design and construct a new funeral home at 525 West Beaver Street.

Born in 1858, Joseph Haygood
Blodgett became one of the most respected and successful African-American business and community leaders in Jacksonville during the first quarter of the twentieth century. By 1898, he had reportedly entered the construction and real estate business and had constructed numerous houses and businesses.

One of the more noted buildings reportedly designed and constructed by Blodgett in 1915 was the Lawton Pratt Funeral Home at 525 West Beaver Street. The Hillman-Pratt Funeral Home is in good condition and retains integrity of location and integrity of setting. The

Diane M. Tropia, Inc., Post Office Box 2375, Jacksonville, FL 32203 (904) 821-0300
property retains its integrity as a two-part commercial block building with intact chapel and offices on the first floor and residential and office space on the second floor.

The exterior retains significant architectural elements, including the corbeled brickwork; round, arched niches and vents; Gothic arched chapel windows; and unique textured brick and stucco facades. These architectural elements retain integrity of materials and their inherent workmanship of a master builder and architect of segregated Jacksonville.

Staff recommends approval of the structure at 525 West Beaver as a local landmark.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
Any questions for staff?
COMMISSION MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: All right. We'll open the public hearing.

Is anyone here to speak on this historic designation?

AUDIENCE MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: All right. We'll close the public hearing, and I'll entertain a motion.
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COMMISSIONER KASPER: Second the motion.
THE CHAIRMAN: Any comments or concerns?
COMMISSION MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: All those in favor?
COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.
THE CHAIRMAN: Those opposed? COMMISSION MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Hearing none, you have approved LM-22-05.

We'll move on to Section G, Certificates of Appropriateness, with only one on the docket, COA-22-27255, 1267 Avondale Avenue.

MS. KELLY: Application for COA-22-27255
is for the installation of steel shingles on
the roofs of a contributing single-family dwelling and attached garage.

The subject site is a corner lot with prominent site visibility. The applicant seeks to replace the existing gray architectural singles with gray KasselWood brand steel shingles. The majority of homes on this
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1 portion of the block have roofs with either
composition or asphalt shingles as the roofing material.

Originally constructed in 1925, the subject property currently contains a two-story, single-family contributing structure and a detached garage. Both structures have gray architectural shingles.

Given the nonoriginal nature of the existing shingles, the design guidelines generally allow for greater flexibility in terms of replacement. However, when reviewing replacement of nonhistoric roof surfacing, the guidelines recommend that the replacement material be substantially compatible with the overall design of the building and in keeping with the architecture features of the property and its environment.

Further, at this time, staff is unable to determine whether the proposed steel shingles will have a similar aesthetic to that of composition shingles or asphalt shingles.

For these reasons, staff finds that the proposed work is inconsistent with the design guidelines in Section 307.106. The Department
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recommends denial.
THE CHAIRMAN: Questions for staff? COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Yes.
Through the Chair, you had mentioned a couple of times that you were unable to determine whether the shingles meet the similar aesthetic. Were the physical samples presented to you?

MS. KELLY: No. We didn't see the physical -- I think the applicant may have brought the samples with them.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I have them.
COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Okay.
THE CHAIRMAN: Any other questions for staff?

COMMISSIONER KASPER: Similar question. I see a photograph within it. So the question is, what does it actually look like in person?

MS. KELLY: Yes. Through the Chair, we looked at the pictures and we looked at images of how it appeared on other roofs and things like that. And honestly, we just couldn't really make out how the aesthetic looks.

We're very interested in hearing what the Commission thinks about it because, you know, Diane M. Tropia, Inc., Post Office Box 2375, Jacksonville, FL 32203
we're not necessarily opposed to alternative materials, but it has to maintain that aesthetic. We're clearly not preserving the historic fabric in this case, but it's just about maintaining that aesthetic.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. We're going to go ahead and open the public hearing.

And you can come on up.
(Audience member approaches the podium.) THE CHAIRMAN: You can have a seat today. AUDIENCE MEMBER: That's different. THE CHAIRMAN: Yup. State your name and address.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Tina Collins Peterson, 1267 Avondale Avenue.

THE CHAIRMAN: And, Tina, she's going to swear you in.

MS. PETERSON: I do have two different product --

THE CHAIRMAN: Tina, she's going to swear you in.

MS. PETERSON: Oh, I'm sorry.
THE CHAIRMAN: No, you're fine.
THE REPORTER: If you would raise your right hand for me, please.

Diane M. Tropia, Inc., Post Office Box 2375, Jacksonville, FL 32203
(904) 821-0300

MS. PETERSON: (Complies.)
THE REPORTER: Do you affirm that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

MS. PETERSON: Yes.
THE REPORTER: Thank you.
THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Welcome.
MS. PETERSON: I have two different product samples that I'm considering for my home. One is a 16-by-16 (inaudible) tile. I actually have the original specifications for my house, and it actually is a 16 -by- 16 hex product that was used that's no longer usable.

And then my second choice would be the one that's part of the COA. That's this one (indicating). And there's various color choices, so whatever color recommendations to stay in the gray family or whatever is totally fine.

There are also two homes within two blocks from me that have metal roofing. 1338 Avondale Avenue, and I have a picture. And then also -I can see this house from my home --
1309 Challen has that as well.
Diane M. Tropia, Inc., Post Office Box 2375, Jacksonville, FL 32203 (904) 821-0300
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trying to change the historic nature. I want
this to kind of be the last roof I have to put
on this home, assuming no hurricanes.
COMMISSIONER KASPER: So could I follow up on that point?

MS. PETERSON: Sure.
COMMISSIONER KASPER: So you say you have
a photograph --
MS. PETERSON: I do.
COMMISSIONER KASPER: -- showing a diamond
pattern on the roof?
MS. PETERSON: I do.
COMMISSIONER KASPER: But that could have
been an asbestos tile or a slate?
MS. PETERSON: Yes.
COMMISSIONER KASPER: And not metal?
MS. PETERSON: Correct.
COMMISSIONER KASPER: Okay.
MS. PETERSON: Correct. But asphalt
wasn't a product used then either, so ...
COMMISSIONER KASPER: I'm just trying to get at the root of going to the metal.

MS. PETERSON: It's the longevity. It's
the -- I want a stronger roof. And like I
said, I'm trying to get a product that this
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roof that I put on is the last roof, hopefully, I have to put on the home.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Questions -- any other questions at the moment?

COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Through the Chair, I believe that this product carries a 40-year warranty from what I read online?

MS. PETERSON: Yes.
COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Through the Chair, is that for both of the tiles or just this one?
Or do you know the information about the diamond tile?

MS. PETERSON: The diamond one I think has -- I think they are both about 40 with the warranties.

The reason I'm going with two different choices is that I have to work back with them on the Florida Product Approval codes, right, as well. So that would be the next step. One is there and one isn't, so ...

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. We will call you back up when we need you. Thank you. I can give you these back.

COMMISSIONER EPSTEIN: Sorry. Really quickly, through the Chair, you're saying one
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of these does not have Florida Product Approval or you're working on getting --

MS. PETERSON: I'm trying to find out for sure if they do or don't. The one that you're holding has an approval code. This company does not yet, but they said they're in the process, so that's what I'm trying to see.

COMMISSIONER EPSTEIN: Okay.
THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
Is anybody else here to speak on this COA?
AUDIENCE MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Seeing none, we'll close the public hearing and I'll entertain a motion.

COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Motion to deny COA-22-27255.

COMMISSIONER KASPER: Second.
THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Conversation?
COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Through the Chair to staff, now that you've seen the product as far as, you know, the aesthetics of it and it, you know, appearing similar as far as the one that looked like a shingle, what are your thoughts now based on what's written here?

MS. KELLY: Through the Chair, so this
is -- what our concern was also when we saw
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1 pictures of it is that, installed, will it look
2 like -- I think there's about five or so
shingles together. So installed, does it look kind of seamless? Or visually, does it look like five installed shingles? And so we just couldn't get a feel for that. And I'm not sure the best way to do that.

Honestly, when we looked at the images online, it didn't look great, but I want to give that the benefit of the doubt. It is a computer and drone images and stuff. So that's our biggest concern. If it was -- if it had maybe a clearer delineation of each shingle, maybe that would help, so ...

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Through the Chair, question for staff. Now that you've seen the alternative shingle that's installed in a diamond pattern and the owner's discussion about the original house being roofed in a diamond shingle, although it's not the same material, and understanding wanting the longevity for the roof, especially in an insurance situation we find ourselves in right now, do you have an opinion about that shingle?

MS. KELLY: Through the Chair, so what
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drives our evaluation is the code and the guidelines, as you know. And so the guidelines suggest that it should mimic what went back. And there is language about potentially using a technologically advanced material. So I think that if the aesthetic could look the same installed, if it would look pretty similar, it would probably be okay. It's just really difficult to see how that is going to look to get an idea of that on a whole roof.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Yeah. Another question -- through the Chair, another question for staff. Do we know the -- the eave height and the roof slope of the structure?

MS. KELLY: I don't have that information with me.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right.
COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Just for conversation --

THE CHAIRMAN: Sure.
COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: -- that would play into visually how much of the roof you actually see --

THE CHAIRMAN: Right.
COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: -- since it's a
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two-story structure.
One more question for staff, through the Chair. The original roof, the applicant had mentioned, was in that diamond pattern, and now -- obviously, it's been replaced since then. So would the -- would you consider going back to the diamond pattern, you know, if we -with these different materials, would you consider going back to the diamond pattern first, or would you consider just replacing it with something that looks similar to the shingles that are on there now?

MS. KELLY: Through the Chair, if visually we could get a similar aesthetic to what was either in the photo she showed -- I think that would be okay. I think that that would work -or what she has now.

The reason that we end up saying, oh, shingles are fine, is because it's kind of like a -- the generic material. You know, it's like we have nothing else to go on. We're not doing these types of roofs anymore, so go with that. So the shingle is sort of the default, but if we can get something that looks similar to the aesthetic from the original, we would support
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## that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, we have a motion to deny on table at the moment.

Does anybody have thoughts as far as possibly the diamond shape goes?

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: I do. I think that -- I think it's an interesting proposition in regard to the history of the home, and yet having a more durable and, you could argue, more contemporary because it doesn't have the sort of dog-ear on the tip that the original shingle would have had.

But I think it's worth considering. I think the issue is not having the Florida Approval for it, and also that that shingle -and maybe this is a question for legal -- but I'm not sure, since that shingle wasn't part of the COA, how we consider it at this point. So it's a question of do we defer or do we -- you know, just entertaining ideas about how we move with another motion.

But I'd like to hear what the other commissioners have to say in regard to the material.

COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Through the Chair, Diane M. Tropia, Inc., Post Office Box 2375, Jacksonville, FL 32203

I'd like to hear perhaps the applicant, if they want to wait for that Florida Product Approval, which may or may not happen anytime soon, or potentially going with the shingle that you presented.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, the original shingle in the COA, I'm not sure how I feel about that one just because we haven't seen the product.

The original shingle -- can you hear me now?

The shingle presented today I'm not inclined to support. The diamond -- the diamond shingle, I would be more inclined to support personally, so ...

COMMISSIONER EPSTEIN: I agree with that.
I think the diamond shingle, going back to the historic house, is -- definitely makes sense. One of my main concerns when actually looking at the photos in the book as well as the sample that we just received is the actual thickness to that shingle. And it almost looks like it's not -- it's looking more like it's a stone or some kind of slate, and it doesn't look like asphalt.

So it's bringing in -- another question in
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my mind is, you know, is this going to look like a slate roof at the end of the day? And I'd much rather it be going back to the original design.

MS. PETERSON: Can I bring these pictures of the neighbor?

THE CHAIRMAN: Sure.
COMMISSIONER EPSTEIN: I don't have any problem with it being metal. I have no problem with the metal roof at all for this COA.

MS. PETERSON: (Inaudible.)
MS. GRANDIN: You need to talk into the --
MS. PETERSON: I was just saying, the 1308 Avondale one is very much like the one attached to my COA in look, and you can see it installed on a brick home. The other one for Challen is a wood roof, but it is a very -it's like a thatched look, which goes with that house.

THE CHAIRMAN: Right.
MS. PETERSON: And I thought it might help you if you could see the pictures because you can see it actually installed.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: SO I guess I have a question for staff. Through the Chair,
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question to staff.
You know, part of what we want to -- or at least part of what my goal in a situation like this would be not to have the homeowner come here numerous times, if something could be resolved with staff, you know, going forward with the COA.

And so it's a question of -- I think there's a pretty good -- maybe it's not a consensus, but a lot of us are leaning toward the diamond pattern that's not part of the original COA. And so what is a path for the owner here that we can take that -- and not having to just deny and then reapply for a COA?

MS. KELLY: Susan may need to weigh in on this, but I think if we know how you all feel about something, she could -- I guess we could amend her COA request or we could just withdraw this one and she could at least submit that, and then we could administratively approve it since we've already hashed it out. That's what I would think.

MS. GRANDIN: Through the Chair, I would recommend that you amend the application and then approve it based on the fact that it meets
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several of the criteria that it needs to meet.
It's historically accurate and the original shingles on the house were diamond shape and that type of thing.

And also, I would condition it obviously on getting its Florida Approval, which she's going to have to get anyway. I would just amend so we could move it along.

COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Through the Chair, then, I withdraw my motion to deny on COA-22-27255, and I make a new motion to approve COA-22-27255 with the diamond-shaped metal shingles by KasselWood, steel shingles, to be administratively approved -- what's that?

THE CHAIRMAN: It's not by KasselWood.
MS. PETERSON: It's a different company.
COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Sorry. Scratch that last part.

Then make a motion to approve COA-22-27255 with a new roofing material with a
diamond-shaped shingle that the applicant has presented at this meeting.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Pending that Florida Product Approval?

COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Well, pending the
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|  | 29 |  | 31 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Florida Product Approval, but that's -- you | 1 | parking pad. It's just the applicant then |
| 2 | know, that's out of our scope there. |  | widened it to 17 feet and made a concrete slab |
| 3 | COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Second. |  | of it. |
| 4 | THE CHAIRMAN: There's a new motion on the |  | That concludes the staff repor |
| 5 | table, as you've heard. | 5 | HE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. |
| 6 | Any conversation to be had for that? | 6 | Any questions for staff? |
| 7 | COMMISSION MEMBERS: (No response.) | 7 | COMMISSION MEMBERS: (No response.) |
| 8 | THE CHAIRMAN: All those in favor? | 8 | THE CHAIRMAN: All right. We'll open the |
| 9 | COMMISSION MEMBERS: | 9 | ic hearin |
| 10 | THE CHAIRMAN: Those opposed? | 10 | the applicant here? |
| 11 | COMMISSION MEMBERS: (No response.) | 11 | AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Indicating.) |
| 12 | THE CHAIRMAN: Hearing none, you have | 12 | THE CHAIRMAN: Come on up. |
| 13 | approved COA-22-27255, and we're going to move | 13 | (Audience member approaches the podium.) |
| 14 | , | 14 | THE CHAIRMAN: If you'll state your name |
| 15 | MS. PETERSON: Thank you. | 15 | address |
| 16 | THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. | 16 | AUDIENCE MEMBER: Phillipe De Macedo, 2223 |
| 17 | We're going to move on to Section H, Work | 17 | ellwood Avenue. |
| 18 | Initiated or Completed Without a COA. We have | 18 | THE CHAIRMAN: She's going to swear you |
| 19 | COA-22-27163, 2223 Dellwood Avenue. | 19 |  |
| 20 | MS. KELLY: Application for COA-22-27163 | 0 | TER: If you would raise your |
| 21 | is for an after-the-fact approval of a new | 1 | ht hand for me, please. |
| 22 | driveway at 2223 Dellwood, which is listed | 22 | MR. DE MACEDO: (Complies |
| 23 | contributing structure in Riverside. | 23 | THE REPORTER: Do you affirm that th |
| 24 | Prior to the applicant's request | 24 | estimony you are about to give will be the |
| 25 | property included a one-car driveway parking <br> Diane M. Tropia, Inc., Post Office Box 2375, Jacksonville, FL 32203 (904) 821-0300 | 25 | truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the <br> Diane M. Tropia, Inc., Post Office Box 2375, Jacksonville, FL 32203 <br> (304) 821-0300 |
|  | 30 |  | 32 |
| 1 | pad approximately 9 feet wide which was made of |  | h? |
| 2 | pavers and brick ribbons. And that was located | 2 | R. DE MACEDO: I do |
| 3 | between the street and the front plane of the | 3 | THE REPORTER: Thank you. |
| 4 | main structure within the required front yard. | 4 | THE CHAIRMAN: Welcome. |
| 5 | The applicant removed that feature and | 5 | MR. DE MACEDO: All right. So the |
| 6 | installed a 17-foot-wide concrete slab driveway | 6 | driveway was already moved to the left side due |
| 7 | and 4-foot-wide side alley -- or sidewalk way. |  | to a big tree on the right side being there |
| 8 | Driveway widths in the district and along | 8 | Seventy-five percent of the driveways -- first |
| 9 | this block are generally about 10 feet wide. | 9 | of all, we hired a contractor to do the |
| 10 | As such, the 17-foot driveway is out of scale | 10 | driveway for us. |
| 11 | and character with the district. In the | 11 | Seventy-five percent of the driveways |
| 12 | district, driveways are usually made of | 12 | thin a block of our street are all concrete |
| 13 | concrete ribbons, gravel, brick, or brick-like | 13 | driveways. They are not as wide. The reason |
| 14 | pavers, not typically concrete slab. | 14 | we made it wider is because, if you have a |
| 15 | As such, the staff finds that the work is | 15 | 10-foot, you can't get to the front door. So |
| 16 | inconsistent with the design guidelines and | 16 | if you have somebody in a wheelchair or if |
| 17 | Section 307.106. The Department recommends | 17 | there's anybody getting out of the car, you |
| 18 | denial. | 18 | step into the dirt to get into the house. |
| 19 | I will add, the applicant invited staff | 19 | That's the only reason why we made that wider. |
| 20 | out to the site, and there is -- originally the | 20 | We don't have access to the alleyway due |
| 21 | driveway would have been on the east side of | 21 | to the shrubbery and vegetation back there. |
| 22 | the property and gone back to a detached | 22 | And the COA, the people that we hired to do it, |
| 23 | garage. A large tree has now grown up, making | 23 | they said that they didn't know we had to do a |
| 24 | that access point not possible. So clearly, | 24 | COA on that side of town. And I didn't know, |
| 25 | that's why somebody had installed that 9-foot <br> Diane M. Tropia, Inc., Post Office Box 2375, Jacksonville, FL 32203 <br> (904) 821-0300 | 25 | and that's why I hired somebody to do it. So Diane M. Tropia, Inc., Post Office Box 2375, Jacksonville, FL 32203 (904) 821-0300 |

that's why it was done after the fact.
THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. So I know staff came
out to see. Did you guys discuss any
alternatives, by chance?
MR. DE MACEDO: Yes. We talked about it, you know, what we could do to keep it. I'd like to keep some type of sidewalk going to the front door, and so I don't know if we can do something to the driveway.

You know, we would like to keep it as it is. It's a nice driveway. And there's some other ones -- there's like one other one as wide as ours on the same street, so ...

THE CHAIRMAN: Any questions for the applicant at the moment?

COMMISSION MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: All right. We'll call you back up.

MR. DE MACEDO: Thank you, sir.
COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: One question.
THE CHAIRMAN: Hold on. One second.
COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Through the Chair, one question. How long have you owned the home? How long have you been at the home?

MR. DE MACEDO: Approximately six months. Diane M. Tropia, Inc., Post Office Box 2375, Jacksonville, FL 32203 (904) 821-0300
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COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Thank you.
THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
Anyone else here to speak on this COA?
AUDIENCE MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: We'll close the public hearing. I'll entertain a motion.

COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Motion to deny COA-22-27163.

COMMISSIONER KASPER: Through the Chair to counsel, procedural. If we intend to modify, do we start with an approval or do we start with a denial?

THE CHAIRMAN: Approval with conditions, then.

MS. GRANDIN: I might change it to an approval with conditions. I think the motion for denial -- did it get a second? So it dies for lack of a second.

THE CHAIRMAN: So we have a motion (off microphone).

MS. GRANDIN: Yes.
COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Second.
THE CHAIRMAN: So we can discuss. We have a second on the denial.

Ideas here?
Diane M. Tropia, inc., Post Office Box 2375, Jacksonville, FL 32203

COMMISSIONER KASPER: Through the Chair to the Commission, an idea would be to convert a portion of it to a sidewalk. So I did the math. You do a 10 -foot driveway, a 3-foot swath, and then you have a 4-foot sidewalk.

Unfortunately, Mr. De Macedo will have a 3-foot slice in his driveway, but at least he will have a sidewalk to walk up and down.

COMMISSIONER LOPERA: So through the Chair, you're proposing we're moving 10 feet of the driveway?

COMMISSIONER KASPER: No. Keeping 10 feet. Removing a 3 -foot slice from the public sidewalk to 4 feet short of the brick stoop there. So essentially you're approving a 10-foot-wide driveway, and you're approving a 4-foot-wide sidewalk if the applicant is open to that.

MR. DE MACEDO: Yeah.
THE CHAIRMAN: I think that's a pretty nice compromise, personally.

COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Through the Chair, we have approved in the past sidewalks to get around to the backyard, so it seems like there is access now to the backyard as we have
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previously approved a sidewalk to keep trash cans, to be able to walk trash cans out to the front.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you want to withdraw -COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Do I make a motion now or do I have to withdraw?

I -- there was no second.
(Simultaneous speaking.)
COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Then I would like to withdraw my motion to deny COA-22-27163.

COMMISSIONER KASPER: I'll make a motion to approve COA-22-27163 with conditions.

The condition will read that we will approve a 10 -foot-wide driveway from the sidewalk towards the house; and we'll approve a 4-foot-wide sidewalk from the driveway towards the house, requiring a 3 -foot-wide landscaped portion to be removed from the public walk up to 4 feet from the brick knee wall.

MS. GRANDIN: Mr. Chair, could I ask for clarification of that?

THE CHAIRMAN: Sure.
MS. GRANDIN: So let me just -- because I drew it, and I want to make sure I got it.

So we've got 10 feet of concrete from the
Diane M. Tropia, Inc., Post Office Box 2375, Jacksonville, FL 32203 (904) 821-0300

1 sidewalk up to the house, and then there's a 3-foot landscape strip that goes from the City sidewalk up to within 4 feet of the house. And then we've got 4 feet of sidewalk going from the sidewalk up to the house. So there's basicaily a 3 -foot-by-some-amount-of-feet landscape strip.

COMMISSIONER KASPER: You added the word "house." I used the word "brick knee wall" in case he chooses to put the landscape portion on the right-hand side. If he chooses to put the landscape portion on the left-hand side, then, yes, it would be 4 feet from the house.

MS. GRANDIN: Okay. But you're not saying that it's 10 feet plus 4 feet all together?

COMMISSIONER KASPER: That's not allowed.
The 3-foot slice would have to separate --
MS. GRANDIN: It separates them? Okay. COMMISSIONER KASPER: -- the 10 -foot piece and the --

MS. GRANDIN: That was my point. COMMISSIONER KASPER: -- 4-foot piece.
MS. GRANDIN: Thank you so much.
COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Second.
THE CHAIRMAN: Comments, concerns?
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COMMISSIONER LOPERA: I think that's a good compromise in keeping with the historic district, to have, you know, driveways broken up by landscaping, grass, or whatnot.

THE CHAIRMAN: All those in favor?
COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.
THE CHAIRMAN: Those opposed?
COMMISSION MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Hearing none, you have approved COA-22-27163.

So we will move right along to Section J, OOAs and Minor Mods. First on the docket, we have a minor modification, 22-27108, 1610 North Liberty Street.

Susan, these are pretty much hand in hand, yes?

MS. KELLY: Through the Chair, these items should be considered together because they're vacant lots right next to each other. And the reason the request is in -- relates to their context within the block.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let's go ahead and do them together. So we're going to do MMA-22-27108, 1610 North Liberty Street and MMA-22-27109, 1616 North Liberty Street.
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MS. KELLY: So both of these, they're in Springfield. They're new construction lots that have -- that have not been built yet. And the -- there's a house on the corner, a contributing structure on the corner that has an approximately 13-foot setback, and then vacant lot, vacant lot, and then contributing structures along the block that are approximately a 23-foot setback.

The vacant lot next to the 13-foot setback was conditioned in that new construction COA to match that setback at about 13 feet. The adjacent structure was conditioned to match the rest of the block at about 23 feet set back.

The applicant is requesting for both of these minor modifications to change that to an 18 -foot setback. So the idea being it basically splits the difference because, either way, you have a jog along that block front, so this would just be a bit more of a gradual jog is the idea.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right.
MS. KELLY: And staff is recommending approval of both of those.

THE CHAIRMAN: Questions for staff?
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COMMISSION MEMBERS: (No response.) THE CHAIRMAN: All right. We will -COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Just a question for staff. Through the Chair, when I looked through the drawings and reviewed the drawings, the COA, I didn't see, like, a larger site plan that you speak of that really sets the tone that they are requesting in regard to what they will gain by making those different kinds of alignments.

I think that would be good just to have as part of the record of the COA, is another drawing that I think should be submitted, just to see those adjacent structures relative to where they are proposing so that we can see that. I don't think it has to do with approval or denial today, but I think it should be a requirement for the filing of the COA.

MS. KELLY: Understood. And the diagram that they did submit, there's a line. I don't know if you can see it clearly, but there's a line where it measures the setback in -- in that image, it would be to the right of the house and then to the left and left of the house, but point taken.
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THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Any other questions for staff?

COMMISSION MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: We'll open the public hearing.

Is the applicant here?
AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yes.
THE CHAIRMAN: You can come on up.
(Audience member approaches the podium.)
THE CHAIRMAN: State your name and address.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Devin Scott, TerraWise Homes, 1334 Walnut Street.

THE CHAIRMAN: Devin, she will swear you in.

THE REPORTER: If you would raise your right hand for me, please.

MR. SCOTT: (Complies.)
THE REPORTER: Do you affirm that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

MR. SCOTT: I do.
THE REPORTER: Thank you.
MR. SCOTT: Yes, sir. Mostly for us, this
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is a procedural change to match the setbacks and site plans for each other. These houses are of similar design. They generally have mostly the same features. The only issue would
be, as a product, they would have dramatically
different front and backyards. And so it would
be difficult to establish a price comparison
for the two. This is the main reason we wanted to bring this back up.

You know, the original context of the COA was that the -- when staff approves new houses, it says generally they need to match the setbacks of the adjacent structures, and I think that there wasn't a lot of attention paid to the overall impact of the block when that happened.

And so that's kind of the -- going back through this process to get something that will have a much more calm appearance on the block instead of this kind of dramatic house and then a house and then 10 feet of difference between the two.

Right now with the vacant lot there, the difference is seemingly imperceptible between the two houses, even though they are 10 feet
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set back from each other because it's difficult to consume them with your eyes at the same time. But when these two houses are next to each other, it will be a dramatic difference. And so we think this is a positive change

I can field any questions you may have.
THE CHAIRMAN: Questions for the applicant?

COMMISSION MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: We'll call you if we need

MR. SCOTT: Thank you, sir.
THE CHAIRMAN: Thanks.
Is anybody else here to speak on this minor mod or these minor mods?

AUDIENCE MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: With that, I'll close the public hearing. I'll entertain a motion.

COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Motion to approve MMA-22-27108.

COMMISSIONER KASPER: Second.
THE CHAIRMAN: Comments, concerns? COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Do we approve both?
THE CHAIRMAN: We'll do them one at a
Diane M. Tropia, Inc., Post Office Box 2375, Jacksonville, FL 32203 (904) 821-0300

MS. GRANDIN: One at a time.
COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Okay.
THE CHAIRMAN: All those in favor?
COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.
THE CHAIRMAN: Those opposed?
COMMISSION MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Hearing none, you have
approved MMA-22-27108.
And I will take a motion on MMA-22-27109.
COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Motion to approve MMA-22-27109.

COMMISSIONER KASPER: Second.
THE CHAIRMAN: All those in favor?
COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.
THE CHAIRMAN: Those opposed?
COMMISSION MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Hearing none, with that,
you have approved MMA-22-27109.
Moving on to Section L, New Business, a
320 demolition request, 225 West Ashley Street.
MS. KELLY: The property owner is seeking
a building permit to demolish the commercial
structure located at 225 West Ashley Street.
This two-story commercial building is
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1 identified as a contributing property in the downtown National Register Historic District. Because the structure is contributing to the National Register district, its demolition requires a review by the Commission. application, the demolition may proceed. If the Commission denies the application, the City Council. The appeal must be filed within 14 calendar days from the date of the Commission meeting. status, will be forwarded to the City Council which will vote to approve the demolition request or to proceed with landmark designation. 225 West Ashley has been neglected for years prior to purchase by the current owner. The and construct a larger single residential apartment building on this parcel and the two
adjacent vacant parcels. project will include the rehabilitation of the two historic buildings at the southeast corner of the block, 211 West Ashley Street and 604 North Hogan Street, which were both newly designated as local landmarks. as part of the project associated with the historic rehabilitations if the new thus functions as an addition to the historic buildings at 211 West Ashley and 604 North Hogan. historic preservation consultant and the reviewer at the Park Service is included within your review package. the structure at 225 West Ashley Street, the least four of the seven criteria outlined in

If the Commission approves the permit property owner can appeal the decision to the

The case file, including the demolition application and the Commission's recommendation regarding the property's potential for landmark

The owner has stated that the building at current owner proposes to demolish the building
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In addition to the new construction, the

The National Park Service has agreed to allow the demolition of 225 West Ashley Street construction is not physically connected to and

The email correspondence between the

Since the owner is seeking demolition and is not in support of a landmark designation for Commission must find that the property meets at the designation procedures for landmarks before

Diane M. Tropia, Inc., Post Office Box 2375, Jacksonville, FL 32203
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forwarding any landmark recommendation to Council.

As stated in the Florida Master Site File, 225 West Ashley Street is a rectangular, two-story commercial office building.
Detailing is all but absent. A shallow ledge runs across the length of the first and second stories above entryways and windows. A series of windows runs along two sides of the building. The exterior fabric is brick and the fenestration fixed.

The building was constructed in 1948 by George P. Killinger as a medical office. The contractor was Fred Cox Company of Jacksonville.

The Florida Master Site File finds that the building is not sufficiently distinguished to warrant local designation or individual listing in the National Register of Historic Places, though by virtue of its location, it might contribute to a historic district.

Staff reviewed the demolition application package, researched the property, and conducted a site visit on April 13, 2022, to evaluate and document the property. Based on our
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evaluation, the Department finds that the structure would meet two criteria for local landmark designation.

These criteria are its value as a significant reminder of the cultural, historical, architectural, or archaeological heritage of the city, state, or nation; and its suitability for preservation or restoration.

And I'm happy to provide more details. And I believe the applicant is also here.

THE CHAIRMAN: Questions for staff?
COMMISSION MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: All right. We'll open the public hearing.
(Ms. Trimmer approaches the podium.)
THE CHAIRMAN: State your name and address.

MS. TRIMMER: Good afternoon.
Cyndy Trimmer, One Independent Drive, Suite 1200, on behalf of the applicant.

I do not want to duplicate everything Susan said, but want to put it into a little bit of context. I'm representing Jim and Ellen Wiss with Homekor. We are working with Studio9 Architecture; Craig Davisson, who sits on our
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incorporate it into the new multifamily project without having to do some sort of small building stuck between the historic structures.

If you look on the second page of the site plan, I've highlighted where the building would fall within that site plan.

So we've worked through NPS. NPS is agreeable to having this building demolished, and we have a plan for redevelopment of this site that you see in front of you today. We think that there is room for negotiation on whether that first condition is satisfied, but I think we can agree that we don't meet enough of them to warrant holding up the demolition.

And we appreciate your support.
THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
Any questions for the applicant?
COMMISSIONER KASPER: Through the Chair to the applicant, can you explain a little bit more about the NPS conversation, recommendation?

MS. TRIMMER: Yes, absolutely.
So as I mentioned, we have three
structures on the site, the two coming off the corner and then the third that is subject to
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this request for demolition.
The first structure, because of the floor plates and how it is laid out, isn't really appropriate for adaptive reuse for residential.
So the agreement on that one is it will be white-shelled, probably for office use on the upper floors with the intent to try to repurpose the ground floor for retail/restaurant use. And we believe that it can be retrofitted within the confines of the Secretary of State [sic] guidelines for that use.

The second structure, also not really suitable for residential use due to the floor plates. And we don't want to punch additional holes into that building, but what we have negotiated with them for incorporating it into the project is that that will be a unified amenity for all of the new residential construction.

So they have agreed to work with us in terms of activating the rooftop of that space as well. Looking at an outdoor kitchen-type area, a splash pool. We're working on the splash pool part of it to make sure that
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nothing about that is going to run afoul of guidelines, but to have an open outdoor amenity space available on that rooftop, without going through what it would take to try to do them as units.

And then the new construction, which will be integrated but not connected to those buildings, would be the units themselves.

Does that answer the question?
COMMISSIONER KASPER: Sorry. NPS --
MS. TRIMMER: Yes. They approved all of this.

COMMISSIONER KASPER: Okay. So how does that -- I'm just curious. Apologize.

So the National Park Service, so you contacted them and said, hey, there's these buildings. We want to adaptive reuse these two, but this one doesn't work. They said, okay, we're fine with that?

MS. TRIMMER: Pretty much. It's a negotiation. And they are applying for historic tax credits, so these have gone through Part 1, Part 2. They are working the whole way through the process. And through that negotiation, they did agree that this
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building could be demolished as part of this unified product.

COMMISSIONER KASPER: I see. Thank you.
THE CHAIRMAN: Any other questions for our applicant?

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Through the Chair,
what -- how far along is the project in terms
of funding? What's the guarantee that the
project will be completed? You know, it's
interesting. I can't help but think of when Mr. Spock says, "The needs of the many outweigh the needs of the few."

MS. TRIMMER: Sure.
COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: So the idea of tearing down one historic building to save two is an argument.

But I guess I'm looking for some kind of guarantee that the project is actually going to be executed, because I've seen promises -- and please, no offense, but I've seen promises made before that don't come to fruition, and then we're left with a historic building that's been demolished.

MS. TRIMMER: No offense taken. And I'm happy to speak to the timeline.

Diane M. Tropia, Inc., Post Office Box 2375, Jacksonville, FL 32203 (904) 821-0300

So with this, we're working through the Downtown Development Review Board on architectural approval of all of the horizontal and vertical improvements that are going to be done on the site. That's one body that's involved in this.

In addition, we're working with the Downtown Investment Authority on looking at the new Downtown Preservation \& Revitalization Program funding for the landmark structures as well as a REV Grant for the new multifamily construction. And then in addition to that, it will go through the City Council for the DPRP funding. And then we have state and federal bodies involved.

After all of those -- or in addition to all of those, we know we have to deal with COAs for the demolition and any work being done.

So trying to structure all of those alphabet agencies, we negotiated with the City that this was the appropriate time to come in for the approval of the demolition. We have been through DDRB approval for conceptual approval of this project.

We are about to go into the negotiations
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on the incentives, but the Downtown Investment Authority didn't want to spend the time looking at the construction budget and the plan for redevelopment until they knew from JHPC that was going to be okay, that we would agree with the Park Service that this building could come down in furtherance of the project as a whole.

So the City and the Park Service are all looking at this project as a whole, and they wanted us to come in and go through this hurdle before anybody else expended more time and energy on future approvals.

So part of our conditional approval from DDRB was that we came here before we came back. And then, again, the Downtown Investment Authority requires us to come and clear this with you before we go in. I understand I'm asking you to take my word for it.

No work is going to be done on this site until we go through for ten-set for the project as a whole, but everybody wanted the assurance that we weren't going to go through this exercise, expend all the time and energy of going through City Council, only to find after the fact that JHPC didn't want to go through
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this part of the process.
THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Any other questions for our applicant?

COMMISSIONER EPSTEIN: I have a question.
The reason that NPS is letting you demolish this is because it doesn't meet the landmark requirements or was this a little bit more of a bargaining chip, that we'll fix these two if we can take this one down?

MS. TRIMMER: Through the Chair, it wasn't that type of horse-trading on this project. It was looking at the three structures, recognizing the two on the corner do have architectural features that distinguish them from this third one, that the third one didn't have the same architectural features.

And looking at the history of it, the use of it, and then also, what has been done to this building since it was constructed, including modifications that aren't really consistent with the Secretary of Interior guidelines, that this one just didn't reach that level.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Any other
questions for our applicant at the moment?
Diane M. Tropia, Inc., Post Office Box 2375, Jacksonville, FL 32203
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COMMISSION MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: We'll call you back up.
Thanks.
Is anyone else here to speak on this demo request?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Indicating.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Come on up.
(Audience member approaches the podium.)
THE CHAIRMAN: If you'll state your name and address.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Kim Pryor, 245 West 5th Street.

THE CHAIRMAN: Kim, she will swear you in.
THE REPORTER: If you would raise your right hand for me, please.

MS. PRYOR: (Complies.)
THE REPORTER: Do you affirm that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

MS. PRYOR: I do.
THE REPORTER: Thank you.
MS. PRYOR: I appreciate the scale of the other projects that they are planning to undertake. I have a similar concern that
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Commissioner Montoya raised in that we have seen many, many times in the past that structures are demolished with the best of plans and intentions.

I'm not sure that I agree that this particular building should be allowed to come down. I think we need to take a better -closer look at the email interaction with the National Park Service.

But if this body approves the demolition, at the very least I think it should be conditioned that no demolition should take place at all until ground is being broken for the other projects. There should be absolutely no question that the entire project is going to happen before they start knocking one brick down out of this building.

And I would appreciate your concern and consideration.

Thank you.
THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
Is anybody else here to speak on this demo request?

AUDIENCE MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Seeing none, we'll close
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the public hearing, and I'll entertain a motion.

COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Motion to approve demolition request of 225 West Ashley Street.

COMMISSIONER KASPER: Second.
THE CHAIRMAN: Any conversation?
COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Yes. Through the
Chair, the discussions about I know nothing is
completely ever guaranteed, but is there language in this application that stipulates demolition will not occur until at least permits are in hand? Or, like, what's the reality of this? Like, if we approve this demolition, will they be able to demolish the building at will?

MS. KELLY: So through the Chair, and Susan might need to chime in on this, but in terms of the posture of what this item is -because it's not a COA, this is not a landmarked building, and this is not in a locally designated district.

So as I understand it, the only sort of options would be to either approve the demolition permit or to decide that you would like to have council take up whether or not
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they want to pursue landmarking the structure.
So it's not -- we can't condition it. That's not an option. So that's where it -- that's where it lives. And, again, Susan can chime in if I'm wrong.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Through the Chair, only meeting two of the criteria, landmarking
the structure is going to be quite difficult,
if not impossible, correct? So I mean, we're left with making a decision here, I think.

COMMISSIONER KASPER: Through the Chair, to echo Commissioner Montoya, I think it is going to evaluating the seven criteria. And staff has done their evaluation and concluded it meets two criteria. If we were -- we would have to find two other criteria that we feel the structure would meet, and I don't see that.

COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Through the Chair, I echo Commissioner Kasper's comments. In this particular case and seeing the condition of the building and the staff's findings of only two criteria, we would need at least four criteria to even consider landmark designation.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. With that, we'll call for a vote.
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All those in favor?
COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.
THE CHAIRMAN: Those opposed? COMMISSION MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Hearing none, you have approved the 225 West Ashley Street demo request.

And with that, we are adjourned for Agenda $A$.

That will take us to Agenda B. I'm going to keep working through before we take a break here because we've only been going about an hour. I'm going to at least get through consent.

All right. So we're going to go ahead and start. We'll take a break here in a few minutes, but let's go ahead and keep working through. I'm not going to go through introductions again or my whole spiel about conversations in the hallway and whatnot. We're going to go right into the consent agenda.

So on consent for Agenda $B$ we have COA-22-27293, 1127 North Liberty Street; COA-22-27310, 1720 North Market Street;
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COA-22-27330, 1849 Challen Avenue; COA-22-27434, 1806 Edgewood Avenue South; COA-22-27485,1242 Hollywood Avenue. And that is it on consent.

Do any commissioners have any ex parte or comments currently?

COMMISSION MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: All right. With that, we'll open the public hearing.

Is anyone here to speak on any of these COAs?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Indicating.)
THE CHAIRMAN: You can come on up.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: Do I need to wait until the one comes up? This is my first time here.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you on consent?
AUDIENCE MEMBER: Don't know what that means.

THE CHAIRMAN: If you look at your agenda -- what's your address?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: The first one.
THE CHAIRMAN: So you're on consent. So if you have agreed with staff on everything, we're going to vote on it, and you'll be good to go .
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AUDIENCE MEMBER: Thank you. Appreciate it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Not a problem.
Is anybody here to speak on any of these COAs?

AUDIENCE MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: With that, we'll close the public hearing. I'll entertain a motion.

COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Motion to approve the consent agenda for Agenda B .

COMMISSIONER KASPER: Second.
THE CHAIRMAN: All those in favor?
COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.
THE CHAIRMAN: Those opposed?
COMMISSION MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Hearing none, you have approved the consent agenda. And we will move right along.

Previously deferred items to be heard, COA-21-26737, 1627 Hubbard Street.

MS. KELLY: Application for COA-21-26737 was previously heard in March. The applicant provided a revised proposal on May 18th, 2022. This application is for after-the-fact approval of work done while renovating a two-story,
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frame vernacular, single-family structure in historic Springfield.

The scope of work includes wholesale window and trim replacement, a rear two-story addition, rear deck, siding replacement on the second floor of the front elevation, reopening the front porch/first floor, encapsulating the foundation, changing the front door opening, and enclosing two window openings on the south side.

The structure is on an interior lot in Springfield with a vacant lot to the north and a historic structure closely abutting to the south. The contributing structure at 1627 Hubbard has been heavily altered with several changes that are inconsistent with the historic district.

Based on photographic evidence from Google Street View, a staff site visit, and photos submitted by the applicant, the building previously had historic wood two-over-two windows, a traditional front door with transom, an open foundation, and asbestos siding with original wood siding underneath.

Pursuant to the authority granted to staff
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1 under the administrative matrix, the proposed
staff has no firsthand data on this feature.

After-the-fact alterations identified
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rear deck with lattice wall can be
administratively approved. The new design of the siding on the rear two-story addition, as conditioned, is to be a cementitious shingle design to match the existing asbestos siding.

The windows on the rear addition are a unique pairing, and, as conditioned, shall be a two-over-two design with trim to match the historic trim. A new gable vent is proposed for installation, and, as conditioned, it will match the vent placement and size of the gable vent on the front of the structure.

The foundation of the new rear addition is compatible with the historic finished floor height and will be screened with lattice, along with the rest of the structure's foundation.

The siding replacement on the front elevation's second-floor enclosed porch as conditioned will be a cementitious shingle to match the existing asbestos shingle. Since the first-floor, previously enclosed porch was opened without inspection or documentation,
based on photographic evidence include encapsulating porch columns, installing new front window, new siding, new porch ceiling, and lengthening of both the top front beam into the columns and the trim piece along the wall above the door and window.

The applicant revised their proposal to include restoration of the previously enclosed first-floor front porch feature to meet the design guidelines and restore the character of the structure. The revised proposal, as conditioned, will include the installation of appropriate trim work, column repair and restoration, porch ceiling repair, and siding repair and replacement.

Screening the foundation with lattice, as conditioned, is consistent with the character of the district and is an historically appropriate design. Foundation screening is traditionally brick, framed wood, or lattice, which includes openings to retain airflow.

The original proposal for replacement of the front door included removing the historic trim, transom, and also changing the size of the door and opening in the wall.
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Replacing these windows without being recessed in the wall and being of an incompatible size and design is inconsistent with the design guidelines and the code.

On May 18th the applicant proposed fixing the placement of the windows so that they are recessed within the wall plane and replacing the trim per the guidelines. The applicant did not seem to propose a solution for the incompatible window design. And the proposed windows, which are currently installed, are not consistent with the original window design of the contributing structure.

As such, the Department recommends denial of this request.

Because staff did not have the opportunity to evaluate the original windows, staff would consider a reasonable window product replacement to be double-hung, two-over-two, wood or wood-clad with clear non-textured glass.

As conditioned, staff finds that the request for all of the items except for the window at the front of the south elevation and wholesale window replacement to be consistent,
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and the Department recommends approval with conditions for these items.

And for the reasons already mentioned, the Department recommends denial of the request for the removal of one window towards the front of the south elevation and the request for wholesale window replacement.

THE CHAIRMAN: Questions for staff?
COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Thank you for all your hard work.

THE CHAIRMAN: We'll go ahead and open the public hearing.
(Audience member approaches the podium.)
THE CHAIRMAN: If you'll state your name and address.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: John Boback, 700 West Pope Road, St. Augustine.

THE CHAIRMAN: John, she will swear you in.

THE REPORTER: If you would raise your right hand for me, please.

MR. BOBACK: (Complies.)
THE REPORTER: Do you affirm that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the
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## truth?

MR. BOBACK: I do.
THE REPORTER: Thank you.
THE CHAIRMAN: Welcome back.
MR. BOBACK: Thank you.
Still want to reiterate that I had no part of this construction. I'm just the after-the-fact contractor fixing all this mess.

Well, the two items that they are recommending denial in part, I just want to clarify. Happy to put the window back in the front, south side, towards the front. Happy to put one back in there.

The windows, what we were going to do
is -- was going to recess them back in and try to replicate the existing historical trim -- or not the existing, but the original trim, and then putting an insert to make them two-over-two glass. So we were hoping to take the same windows rather than buy new windows and do it. Now this is, you know, up to you guys, but we can put inserts that replicate the older windows.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Questions for our applicant?
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COMMISSIONER LOPERA: So the -- through the Chair, the only thing you're stuck on is the windows? You're wanting to recess them into the wall plane and use trim around them, and then -- so the only thing is just making them two-over-two?

MR. BOBACK: Correct.
COMMISSIONER LOPERA: And then, the current windows, are they -- what's the material?

MR. BOBACK: They're aluminum.
COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Okay.
MR. BOBACK: But they'd be wood-clad all around, so it will look similar as they're recessed. Because they are installed in the front, they don't look historic. But once you recess them halfway back, it will look similar to that.

COMMISSIONER EPSTEIN: Through the Chair, the mullion you're talking about adding, would it just be a flat piece or would it have some sort of dimension to it?

MR. BOBACK: It would have a little depth, not too much. Probably about a half inch.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any other questions for our Diane M. Tropia, Inc., Post Office Box 2375, Jacksonville, FL 32203 (904) 821-0300

## applicant at the moment?

MR. BOBACK: I mean, you would definitely
see it. I mean, it would stick out, for sure.
COMMISSION MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: We'll call you back up when we need you.

Thank you.
MR. BOBACK: Thank you.
THE CHAIRMAN: Is anybody else here to
speak on this COA?
AUDIENCE MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Seeing none, I'll close the public hearing, and I'll entertain a motion.

COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Motion to --
THE CHAIRMAN: Sorry. You can come on up.
Let me reopen the public hearing again.
(Ms. Pryor approaches the podium.)
MS. PRYOR: Quick with that gavel.
Kim Pryor, 245 West 5th Street.
THE CHAIRMAN: Kim, you're already sworn
in.
MS. PRYOR: Yeah.
I've taken a look at this. And I
understand that we're kind of in a conundrum because there was work done before and we have
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someone here that's now coming in and trying to fix the issues, if you will.

I guess some of the concern here is we're talking about windows, and we're talking about allowing concessions to be made when things weren't done properly from the beginning. And
I'm concerned that that sets a bit of a precedence, that someone can come in and do something improper and then come and ask forgiveness after the fact.

And because we can't -- there's no way to fix something, the original windows are gone. So the house has to have windows. And so we -okay, well, we're going to agree to let them use those windows when we probably -- may not have done that if they had come first.

And now we're talking about letting them use the existing windows and trying to set them back and trying to put something on the outside of the glass that may or may not look proper. And I don't agree with any of that.

When people buy in historic districts, they know that they are buying in a historic district. They know that there are rules.
There was no permit pulled? I don't know. I
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pulled it up just a minute ago. There was a permit pulled in '21. I'm not sure if that's the one that was used for the inappropriate work or not, but there was nothing there requiring a COA.

So I don't understand how this happens. The windows need to be installed properly. We don't need to try to finagle what's there. They need to be recessed back. They need to have valid raised muntins. And where's the penalty to the homeowner for doing things improperly? We're just going to let them go -let them by with destroying historic fabric and, oh, well, we got windows. Where is the penalty? There should be something there.

We should not be conceding and allowing them to leave what's there there just because we didn't get a chance to see it beforehand. And I think that this body needs to take that a little bit more seriously. You know, just because we don't know what it was before -they did stuff the wrong way and people -- you know what the rules are. They have got to come in and get permission to do that kind of stuff.

So if we continue this route, then we're
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going to have all -- we could theoretically have all sorts of people coming in after the fact, and then we have no choice but to let them continue with what they have already done, because it's already done.

Thank you.
THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
Kim, I'll just speak to -- as far as precedence goes, we don't really like to say, is there any kind of precedence. We take each case individually. And this was deferred two months ago to try and come up with some sort of a solution because the house had a ton -- this is -- we've never had a situation like this.

This house was completely changed. And, again, sure, there is a penalty. I mean, we're making them spend a lot of money to go back and redo things already.

We do take it -- you know, we do take it heavily. So I don't want to --

MS PRYOR: May I respond?
THE CHAIRMAN: Sure.
MS. PRYOR: I did not intend to mean that you didn't take this seriously.

But regarding the precedence, it is
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precedent-setting. With the previous agenda, someone came up here and presented pictures of a roof that looked very similar to the one that she wanted to put on her house. So some -theoretically, someone could then -- once this is done, could take photos of this particular house and these windows and say, look, this was approved. So they did it this way, why can't precedence.

THE CHAIRMAN: I can understand that. We always take those things into consideration. But we do try and go, you know, case by case.

MS. PRYOR: Thank you.
THE CHAIRMAN: Is anybody else here to speak on this COA?

AUDIENCE MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: With that, we'll close the public hearing, and I'll entertain a motion.

COMMISSIONER KASPER: Before we get to that, through the Chair to staff, thank you for your exhaustive research. Did we really distill it down to just windows? That was the only concern?

MS. KELLY: Through the Chair, we worked
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with the applicant and said, if you can fix these things and meet these conditions -COMMISSIONER KASPER: Awesome. MS. KELLY: And they said yes, so ... COMMISSIONER KASPER: And then, just to be clear, so your denying part was denying the windows. Agreeing that they'd be recessed, agreeing that they have trim, but denying that the current window could achieve a two-over-two pattern?

MS. KELLY: Through the Chair, we did not receive confirmation from the applicant that that was the plan. We also have had mixed results with the stick-ons because sometimes you can't open the window, I guess, because of them. And also, I believe the glass is tinted on those windows. I might be wrong, but I believe it's tinted.

So there's just a few odd things about the product that's in place currently, so ... COMMISSIONER KASPER: Okay. So maybe -thank you.

Maybe we could approve with the condition. Go ahead, Commissioner Lopera. COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Through the Chair, Diane M. Tropia, Inc., Post Office Box 2375, Jacksonville, FL 32203
the use of the aluminum, I know that normally we require wood or vinyl-clad over wood. But as far as aluminum goes, do we have any other suggestions regarding that particular product?

MS. KELLY: Through the Chair, typically what we have done, if staff was not able to examine the product that is now gone, is we have requested that the applicant go back with a wood or wood-clad product. So that's what we typically would recommend. And, again, part of that is just because we didn't see it, so we're trying to get a -- closer to the original -- a material that's closer to the original.

COMMISSIONER EPSTEIN: Through the Chair to the staff, so just as a final understanding, you are recommending that the window portion of this still not be approved? There's no approve with conditions that were mentioned per your report?

MS. KELLY: Through the Chair, yes, that is correct. Part of that is because we -- we need the applicant to come through and say, here is what we would like to do. We need to see their proposal. We don't just want to propose it for them. And the applicant came Diane M. Tropia, Inc., Post Office Box 2375, Jacksonville, FL 32203 (904) 821-0300
through and said, the door, here's what we'll do for the door; check. Oh, we can fix that trim.

So we were able to get to those places, and we just didn't get all the way there on the windows. We got the recess back, which is great, but we just didn't get all the way there in terms of the design and product. Like, is the actual window going to be replaced or is it just going to be modified? Like, we just didn't get a clear understanding of that.

COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Through the Chair to Ms. Grandin, would it be possible to -- in case we don't come up with a resolution today on the windows, would it be possible to approve everything else with conditions and just defer one single section of this?

MS. GRANDIN: Through the Chair, I think you could do that. I mean, because that would at least allow them to start the process.
Sometimes we have let an approval -- approve based on staff approval, like the window issue. But it says they are fixed casement, so I'm kind of uncertain.

MS. KELLY: I don't know that they are Diane M. Tropia, Inc., Post Office Box 2375, Jacksonville, FL 32203 (904) 821-0300
fixed anymore.
MS. GRANDIN: They are not fixed casement. So the report's a little fuzzy on that, then.

I don't know whether that would require a separate application. So you would deny it (inaudible), and then you can't rehear it, right. That's a tough one. I've never had that question asked before.

MS. KELLY: (Inaudible.)
MS. GRANDIN: You know, one of the things that might be really helpful -- because it was kind of confusing to me reading the report and listening to it because so many things have been negotiated and whatnot, you've actually fixed it.

Maybe you should amend the application and come back next time. I hate to defer it again, but there was a lot of things done to this house. So if it was amended and then the report kind of reflected all the different things that you guys negotiated that you said, okay, check that off, and check that off, and then we still have windows.

And perhaps he can come with a sample or something or some kind of drawing to help you
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decide whether or not taking the existing product and recessing it and putting different kind of trim, some details or something. That might help you get into the track of approving it.

COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Through the Chair, would it be possible to -- like you mentioned, to withdraw just a section of the application, but approve everything else?

MS. GRANDIN: Yeah, I would --
COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Or do all paths lead to deferment?

MS. GRANDIN: Well, I would definitely defer it. But in terms of how to manipulate the application, I would probably leave that up to staff. But if you withdraw it, then you can't -- I mean, we're stuck with the bad windows that are there. So I wouldn't do that.

You would at least amend it to come up with a solution. And probably the application could be amended to check off all the things that they did negotiate, the doorway and the other things.

COMMISSIONER KASPER: Through the Chair, to play lawyer for a moment, could we go ahead

Diane M. Tropia, Inc., Post Office Box 2375, Jacksonville, FL 32203
,
and approve as it is, deny the windows, this is done, and then he comes back with a new application to modify the windows only, which would allow him to begin work?

MS. GRANDIN: Well, there's something called res judicata where you can't ask for the same thing over and over again.

COMMISSIONER KASPER: Oh.
MS. GRANDIN: It's in italics. You know, res judicata.

COMMISSIONER KASPER: I didn't know the fancy words --

MS. GRANDIN: It would have to be substantially different.

COMMISSIONER KASPER: -- because I'm not a lawyer.

MS. GRANDIN: But he would have to come back, and he wouldn't be able to use the same product and, you know, just put the stick-on things. If they are not fixed windows -- if they are fixed windows, then you don't have the problem of them going up and down and messing up the little stick-on thing.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Through the Chair, while they're talking, I think at the end of
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the day, there's an issue with the window itself. And I think it's that -- oh, gosh, I'm going to be the colloquialism guy today, but it's like perfume on the pig at a certain moment, right?

MS. GRANDIN: The director has made a suggestion.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: I'm just not sure how many Band-Aids we can provide for a product that it sounds like you're objecting to will be successful. And do we really want that kind of a solution to the issue at hand?

I think that's why I'm speculating, but I think that's why staff finds themselves in the position they are in, is because you run the course with the other things and you've come to a solution on them. But the windows, it's the product itself that's in question.

You can change its position. You can paste things on it, but is it -- it's tinted.
You can change the glass. At a certain point, you know, it's like pulling the thread on a sweater, and you're standing in a pile of yarn.

So I'm not sure changing or amending is really going to -- I think staff has made a
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1 really good effort to come to some kind of
agreement. And with the applicant, there's been a lot of effort here, but I think some things just need to be changed. I think that's really a tough question.

COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Through the Chair, just trying to look at all the different
possible solutions -- and yeah, we have made substantial concessions on a substantial project to try to modify as minimal as possible in keeping with our district.

However, the windows did change in size from the original based on some of these photos. So there's quite a significance with the window product, the lack of muntins, the change in size, and the window tinting.

MS. GRANDIN: Mr. Chair, the director did have a good suggestion. And this is kind of along the same lines we were coming up with.

So that he could get some work done and we could discuss the windows at the next meeting maybe, approve it with the condition that the window portion come back to you for approval. So at least he would be able to get some work done. But the windows are -- you know, they're
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kind of a major part of that ask.
THE CHAIRMAN: So I'll tell you what --
If you can come back up for a second.
(Mr. Boback approaches the podium.)
THE CHAIRMAN: So if I was gauging the
feel of the Commission at this point, my guess would be, if we voted on everything today, the windows -- we would say that we need new windows.

We can go with the option to approve and then condition you to come back with another option for windows, which would give you the opportunity to possibly use the current windows. But more than likely -- my guess would be you would still have to replace them. But that would be up to you if you want to take the --

MR. BOBACK: What type of windows do you do in new houses in the historic district?

MS. KELLY: Through the Chair, so the difference is that this is not a new house. This is a contributing structure.

So typically what we would say, had all this work not happened is, oh, you want to replace your windows? Let staff go out and
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take a look. Fill out the window survey. What's an original window? What shape is it in?

And then the decision becomes, okay, can the window be repaired? Because if it can be repaired, it should be repaired. If it is just really gone, then we would approve it for replacement. And then that opens up a lot of options because at that point the historic fabric is gone.

This case is just very, very different because, based on the few images that we have -- not a whole lot -- it doesn't look like the windows were maybe that bad off, and we know that the window design is two-over-two. So we have certain things documented.

Other than that, this is -- it's not a perfect system, but our best case is sort of to go -- we have to assume that they were in good shape, and that they maybe should not have been replaced, in which case we typically say, okay, you need to go back with a wood or wood-clad window. The design needs to match. It needs to have the sloped sill. It needs to be the two-over-two, have the historic trim, and be
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recessed into the wall plane.
So that's sort of generally what we have done in these cases. Like I said, it's not a perfect system, but that's the best we can come up with.

THE CHAIRMAN: So --
MR. BOBACK: I haven't ordered wood windows in 20 years. I mean, okay. I thought we were kind of close with recessing, which I think it would replicate because we would use that as the guideline. I guess the rub is the inserts?

THE CHAIRMAN: It sounds like --
MR. BOBACK: Accumulation of things?
THE CHAIRMAN: Right. I think that's --
MR. BOBACK: It's just an accumulation of things?

THE CHAIRMAN: -- what it's coming to at this point.

MR. BOBACK: I think we can get there, but --

COMMISSIONER EPSTEIN: Through the Chair, one of my main concerns is just saying, oh, we're going to set it back and we're going to apply something to it. I would appreciate
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seeing details of what you're actually going to do and what you're --

MR. BOBACK: A historic window is what we would use as a template to replicate the trim around it and recess it back. The single-hung windows don't have the depth that double-hung windows do because they both operate. So it's just a function of that gives it the depth look. So that's why they look different. But, yeah, I mean, we're open to anything if --

THE CHAIRMAN: So, again, I'm going to go back to give you the option to -- so we can -it sounds like we can condition out the windows today to have, hey, you need to come back with a plan. And we can vote on the rest, and we can call it a day today. And then you can come back, you know, next month with the options of either, hey, we're replacing all the windows or this is what we're going to try and do with the current windows and let's see if it works.

MR. BOBACK: So does this get continued or we've got to file another application?

THE CHAIRMAN: This gets continued -MR. BOBACK: Okay.
THE CHAIRMAN: -- correct? Or does he
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need a new application?
MS. GRANDIN: Well, no. He wouldn't have to do another application. Are you just deferring the whole item? Are you --

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, no.
MS. GRANDIN: -- approving in part and waiting --

COMMISSIONER LOPERA: I was going to actually approve everything except for having the window replacement. I'd amend that condition to be presented again to this commission at the next meeting with either additional solutions or basically your consensus to require replacement with a new wood product.

MR. BOBACK: Okay.
COMMISSIONER LOPERA: But that way, you could keep going with everything except for the windows.

MR. BOBACK: Sure. Understand.
COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Question to staff, that could actually go to the consent agenda as well if an agreement is made, right, rather than -- right?

MS. GRANDIN: So you would like it at the
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next meeting? You might want to put a time limit on it, after which it would be a denial and he'd have to replace everything, just so that it kind of moves along.

COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Through the Chair, would two months work to give you enough time to present solutions?

MR. BOBACK: I think a month would -- I mean, a couple of weeks is more than fine. I mean, we either find it or we don't.

MS. GRANDIN: Next month. Okay.
MR. BOBACK: We either make them satisfied or we don't. We'll get it done.

THE CHAIRMAN: I need a motion.
COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Well then, motion to approve with -- COA-21-26737, amending Item Number 2 regarding the wholesale window replacement, that the applicant shall provide to this commission drawings, an actual demo, or that they would -- or that the applicant may consent to replacing the windows with the standard wood windows or clad, vinyl-clad, wood windows, two-over-two with raised muntins. And that Condition Number 2 on the windows shall be presented at the next staff -- to this
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commission.
COMMISSIONER EPSTEIN: Through the Chair, sorry if this is -- also, no tint.

MR. BOBACK: Right.
COMMISSIONER LOPERA: And add that. The applicant shall provide a solution to the current tint that's on the windows.

MR. BOBACK: Right.
COMMISSIONER KASPER: Second.
THE CHAIRMAN: All those in favor?
COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.
THE CHAIRMAN: Those opposed?
COMMISSION MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Hearing none, you have approved COA-21-26737, and we will move on.

MR. BOBACK: Thank you guys. Appreciate all the help.

THE CHAIRMAN: We're going to move on to Section G, Certificates of Appropriateness.
First on the docket, COA-22-27290, 120 East 8th Street.

MS. KELLY: Application for COA-22-27290 is for the replacement of 13 historic wood windows out of a total of 39 windows on a contributing structure in Springfield. There
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are also six fixed casement windows that are not original to the structure included in the window replacement request, for a total of 19 windows requested for replacement.

To be clear, the 13 historic windows are the only historic windows. The remaining are nonhistoric.

This property is used as a community center for the Sanctuary on 8th Street, which provides activities for local children and families in the community. This structure has large parking lots on either side, and the building is highly street visible. The request also includes repairs to the window wood trim and encapsulating that trim with aluminum.

Based on a site visit on February 18th, 2022, 13 windows are historic. Staff assessed the condition of the historic windows, and they are in poor condition with evidence of severe rot in many places. Further, the majority of the windows have been previously replaced. All replacement windows on the structure, as conditioned, shall be vertical, two-over-two to match the historic design.

The applicant has also requested repairing
Diane M. Tropia, Inc., Post Office Box 2375, Jacksonville, FL 32203 (904) 821-0300
the window wood trim and then encapsulating the trim with aluminum. Encasing historic window trim with smooth, nonmatching aluminum is not historically appropriate.

Based on the proposed design, the sill step and trim detailing will not be replicated in the design of the aluminum trim and, instead, will have a square, smooth appearance.

For these reasons, staff finds that the
request for the window replacement as
conditioned is consistent with Section 307.106
and the design guidelines, but that the request for the trim encapsulation with the aluminum is not consistent.

As such, the Department recommends approval, with conditions, of the windows and denial of the trim request.

THE CHAIRMAN: Questions for staff?
COMMISSION MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: We'll go ahead and open the public hearing.

Is the applicant here?
AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yes.
THE CHAIRMAN: Come on up.
(Audience member approaches the podium.)
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THE CHAIRMAN: If you'll state your name and address.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: My name is Jamie Stater, here on behalf of (inaudible). My address is 916 Jasmine Place.

THE CHAIRMAN: She will swear you in.
THE REPORTER: If you would raise your right hand for me, please.

MS. STATER: (Complies.)
THE REPORTER: Do you affirm that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

MS. STATER: Yes.
THE REPORTER: Thank you.
THE CHAIRMAN: Welcome.
MS. STATER: Thank you.
THE CHAIRMAN: Whenever you're ready.
MS. STATER: I don't really have much to add. Kind of came here at the last minute on request of the director, but I think we just agree with the recommendations.

We provide a free after-school program and summer camp to at-risk youth, and we just want to make sure the building is as safe as
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possible for them. The windows are in pretty bad condition. So we're just looking to get them replaced and make sure we're following the historic guidelines in the neighborhood.

THE CHAIRMAN: Questions for our applicant?

COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Through the Chair, which aspect of this did you have an issue with? Was it something about the aluminum trim?

THE CHAIRMAN: The aluminum casing.
COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Aluminum casing.
THE CHAIRMAN: Well, staff had the issue.
MS. STATER: Yeah, I don't think we have the issue with it; I think staff did.

COMMISSIONER LOPERA: So you want to install the aluminum casing?

MS. STATER: That's what the window company recommended to us.

COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Okay. Thank you.
THE CHAIRMAN: Any other questions for our applicant at the moment?

COMMISSION MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: We'll call you back up if we need you.
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MS. STATER: Thank you.
THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
Is anyone else here to speak on this COA?
AUDIENCE MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Seeing none, we'll close the public hearing, and I'll entertain a motion.

COMMISSIONER KASPER: I'll make a motion
to approve with conditions in part and deny in part, COA-22-27290.

COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Second.
THE CHAIRMAN: Any conversation?
COMMISSIONER KASPER: I agree with staff.
I think the windows are beyond repair based on the photographic evidence, and they should be replaced. I also agree with staff that the trim should be a wood-look trim. And so I believe the aluminum encasement of the trim is not historical or in keeping with the neighborhood, so I would agree with staff's recommendations.

THE CHAIRMAN: Anybody else?
COMMISSIONER LOPERA: I echo Commissioner
Kasper's comments.
COMMISSIONER EPSTEIN: I do as well.
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THE CHAIRMAN: All those in favor?
COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.
THE CHAIRMAN: Those opposed?
COMMISSION MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Hearing none, you have approved and denied in part COA-22-27290.

And I think we're going to take a quick break. It's 5:15, so let's try and reconvene at $5: 25$ or $5: 30$, somewhere in there.
(Brief recess.)
THE CHAIRMAN: All right. We're going to go ahead and get started. We are on Section G, Certificates of Appropriateness, Number 2, COA-22-27311, 1829 Powell Place.

MS. KELLY: Application for COA-22-27311
is for the demolition of a two-story frame vernacular residence that is listed as contributing to the Riverside Avondale Historic District.

The property is bounded by a medical clinic and a parking lot to the north and a two-story residence to the south.

The structure was significantly damaged by a fire on August 3rd, 2021. While waiting for insurance to assess the structure, code
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violations were placed on the property.
Insurance has assessed the structure as a total loss.

A site visit was conducted on May 5th, 2022. The structure is not safe to enter and fire damage is evident around the structure. Smoke and water damage, charred wood, a collapsed roof and missing glass panes are apparent.

The applicant plans to demolish the property and sell the lot. Consistent with Section 307.106(n)(5), an application for a COA for new construction would require review by the Historic Preservation Commission in order to ensure compatibility with the district.

Significant historical or architectural materials are no longer present at 1829 Powell Place given the fire damage. No other feasible alternatives to demolition are apparent. And given the damage to the structure, it does not have enough structural integrity for relocation to be a reasonable alternative.

Staff finds that the request is consistent with the Section 107.306. The Department recommends approval.
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And I believe the applicant is here. And, obviously, they -- they agree with this. They can speak for themselves.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Questions for staff?

COMMISSION MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: All right. We'll open the public hearing.

And is the applicant here?
MS. TRIMMER: Yes.
THE CHAIRMAN: Come on up.
(Ms. Trimmer approaches the podium.)
THE CHAIRMAN: If you will state your name and address.

MS. TRIMMER: Good afternoon.
Cyndy Trimmer, One Independent Drive, Suite 1200 , on behalf of the owner.

I have Ms. Todd with me here today available for questions. Again, I won't repeat
Ms. Kelly. It's tragic and we're heartbroken,
but it is unfortunately a total loss. It's
taken a while to get to the point with
insurance that we can now move forward with demolition.

RAP has supported the demolition. We know
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the neighbors are very eager to see the
2 demolition move forward, as are we. And we
3 appreciate your support.
THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Questions for our applicant?

COMMISSION MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: All right. We'll call you back up.

Is anybody else here to speak on this?
MS. SCHIFANELLA: (Indicating.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Come on up.
(Ms. Schifanella approaches the podium.)
THE CHAIRMAN: If you'll state your name and address.

MS. SCHIFANELLA: Angela Schifanella, 1352 Avondale Avenue, Jacksonville, Florida.

I'm here on behalf of Riverside Avondale Preservation.

THE REPORTER: If you would raise your right hand for me, please.

MS. SCHIFANELLA: (Complies.)
THE REPORTER: Do you affirm that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?
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MS. SCHIFANELLA: We do. I do.
THE REPORTER: Thank you.
MS. SCHIFANELLA: You know, we are a preservation organization, so this is a very sad thing to have to support.

We just did want to clarify that we always try to preserve our historic building stock in our district and throughout the city, so we support this application. The demolition by the act of a fire is -- is kind of a -- it's an after-the-fact, so we did want to clarify that this is an unusual circumstance for us and -but we do respect the staff report and their expertise.

Thank you.
THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
Is there anyone else here today to speak on this COA?

AUDIENCE MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Seeing none, we'll close the public hearing and I'll entertain a motion.

COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Motion to approve COA-22-27311.

COMMISSIONER KASPER: Second.
THE CHAIRMAN: Does anybody have any
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comments or concerns?
COMMISSION MEMBERS: (No response.) THE CHAIRMAN: All right. All those in favor?

COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.
THE CHAIRMAN: Those opposed? COMMISSION MEMBERS: (No response.) THE CHAIRMAN: Hearing none, you have approved COA-22-27311.

We're going to move right along to COA-22-27338, 3804 Valencia Road.

MS. KELLY: Application for COA-22-27338
is for the construction of an attached
one-story garage with metal roofing. The subject site is located at the end of Valencia Street [sic], abutting Boone Park.

The proposed 476-square-foot, side-loading garage will be attached to an existing
two-story, single-family contributing structure and located along the front elevation of the home with clear street visibility.

As designed, the garage consists of a hip roof oriented towards the south. Primary materials of the garage addition include carriage-style garage doors, one-over-one
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windows, and fiber-cement lap siding.
Because the structure will encroach into the required front-yard setback set forth under Chapter 656 of the Zoning Code, the applicant has also filed for an administrative deviation.

Pursuant to the Section 656.399.13, the AD application is currently pending until action is taken by this body regarding the current request for COA.

According to the Sanborn maps, the subject property originally contained a one-story single-family home with composition shingles. In 1950, an addition to the home was created. And in 2003, a COA was approved by the Commission which allowed for a one-story addition along the front elevation and a two-story addition along the rear elevation of the home.

At the same time, asphalt shingles were approved as the primary roofing material in order to match the existing shingles. In 2020, another addition was made along the side elevation as well as a request to change the roofing material to a crimp metal roofing.

At the time, staff recommended that the Diane M. Tropia, Inc., Post Office Box 2375, Jacksonville, FL 32203
(904) 821-0300
replacement product, the roofing material, match the historic home's use of composite shingles. The Commission, at that time, ultimately approved the applicant's request for metal roofing.

According to the master site file and subsequent COA approvals, the two-story frame vernacular home has been heavily altered over the years. Nonetheless, the character of the block is one of two-story homes without street-visible, attached garages.

The proposed garage addition is located along the front elevation with the garage doors oriented towards Pine Grove Avenue. As such, the feature would be readily street visible and runs contrary to the district's design guidelines.

While the horizontal lap siding, vertical one-over-one-hung windows and overall height of the garage are consistent with the principal structure, the location and orientation of the addition is not.

Further, the proposed garage addition is located approximately 10 feet from the front property line and the adjacent contributing
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1 structures have larger front setbacks. So the
2 siding of an attached garage at the front of
3 the structure at that setback would be
4 inconsistent with the guidelines in the code.

7 s
rrounding contributing structures when
8 assessed in the context of massing, size and
9 scale. And the addition would further erode
10 the architectural integrity of the existing
11 structure by creating a building footprint that
12 is inconsistent with the development patterns
13 of other structures within the district.
With regard to the metal roof on the
16 denial of that just given our previous stance
17 on the previous COA. However, we admit there's
18 greater flexibility since there is already
19 metal roofing on the structure. Just in
20 keeping with the guidelines and the fact
21 that -- that we couldn't find that the home
22 ever had metal roofing, we stick with the
23 shingle recommendation.
So for these reasons, staff finds that the
25 requests are inconsistent with the code and the
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guidelines and the Department recommends denial.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
Questions for staff?
COMMISSION MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: All right. With that, we'll open the public hearing.

The applicant can come on up.
(Audience member approaches the podium.)
THE CHAIRMAN: If you'll state your name and address.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Hello my. Name is Duane Romanello. My address is 3804 Valencia Road, Jacksonville, Florida 32205.

THE CHAIRMAN: Duane, she's going to swear you in.

THE REPORTER: If you would raise your right hand for me, please.

MR. ROMANELLO: (Complies.)
THE REPORTER: Do you affirm that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

MR. ROMANELLO: I do.
THE REPORTER: Thank you.
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MR. ROMANELLO: Just a couple of comments to the staff report. I didn't have a chance to actually read the details on it.

I guess -- first thing I want to point out is the comment about the structure being heavily altered. It has been heavily altered for the last 70 years. I participated in some of those heavily -- heavy alterations, and I did that through this process.

And I don't agree with the statement that it's a contributing structure, although I have taken steps to try to bring it more in line with the district's appearance. For instance, the last major renovation we did, we removed vinyl siding that was on the structure and replaced it with lap siding, with the input from -- from the staff. We think that was a step forward in the right direction.

I can't -- I can't take away from the fact that this is not a classic Avondale bungalow. There's no architecturally significant features to the home that -- that are consistent with the rest of the neighborhood. My home is at the end of a dead-end street.

Before filing this application, I called
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1 the Commission, spoke to somebody. And although I wasn't given a green light or anything, they said, hey, we will definitely not support a front -- a front-entry garage. It's got to be a side-entry garage. So I designed it that way.

I am requesting an administrative deviation to allow the garage to be slightly wider. I can -- there's actually a 15 -foot front setback on a side-entry garage. And I have a picture of what that will look like. Basically, the elevation is the same as -- as presented. It's just not as functional. So I had applied for that administrative deviation.

At the end of the day, I'm at the end of a dead-end road. This is probably the last -this is the last renovation we could possibly do to this home. We think we've done what we could to make it a better home, more suitable home for our neighborhood.

I'm not sure where the -- the statement about additional two-story structures come from. There's one two-story structure within -- on my street that I'm aware of. Maybe there's some, you know, a significant
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distance away. I don't have a garage and so I kind of need one, but certainly understand staff's report.

Obviously, if I'm going to -- if this request is granted, I can't really put shingles on a home next to the previously approved metal roof.

And, again, we think we've taken steps to try to at least improve the overall appearance of our home and make it more consistent with at least some of the -- some of the features that you see in the neighborhood with respect to the lap siding, and we don't believe that this particular addition is going to degrade from the quality of the neighborhood in any way.

And I don't really think it's going to be seen by anybody other than a few people that might walk the park. We're literally at the end of a dead-end street. And the way Valencia works in my -- in front of my house, it rolls down, so I don't even think you could see this garage from Pine Grove, which is the nearest cross-street, although I can't -- I don't have photographs to --
(Timer notification.)
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MR. ROMANELLO: -- to show that, but -- so that's my position.

And I could -- and I have, you know, a drawing of what it would look like if I didn't have that extra 5 feet. And the -- again, the -- the front elevation is exactly the same. It would just, you know, be a slightly wider product. And I can share that with the Commission if -- if you think it's appropriate.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Questions for our applicant at the moment?

COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Yeah. Through the Chair, what was the reason to go with -- the existing house has metal shingles, correct?

MR. ROMANELLO: Pardon me?
COMMISSIONER LOPERA: The existing house has metal shingles?

MR. ROMANELLO: Yeah. It's a 5V crimp metal roof --

COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Okay.
MR. ROMANELLO: -- as it sits right now.
Those are -- those pictures on the lower part are older photos from before the approved roof. As you scroll down, the very first
picture shows the metal roof. So there's --
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that picture at the bottom shows the vinyl siding. And that vinyl siding has been ripped off and I put -- put, you know, cementitious lap siding on there which I thought was a step in the right direction, but there's not much more I can do to make it a -- what I consider a contributing structure.

But the -- the house does have the 5V crimp metal, replaced, old aluminum windows with the Fiberglass wood-looking windows. They're not -- I'm not sure if they're wood encased windows, but that -- I went through that process here and those were approved windows. I didn't do anything without, you know, board approval. Although the board might not have agreed with some of my requests, I -I did, you know, play by the rules the best I could.

Again, I'm at the end of a dead-end road. I don't believe this is a contributing structure. I'm not proud of it or -- but it is what it is; it's my house.

And so I -- this would be kind of a last piece of the puzzle for us, for my family, and I don't know that I've -- if there's anybody Diane M. Tropia, Inc., Post Office Box 2375, Jacksonville, FL 32203 (904) 821-0300
here in opposition to it, but I -- I don't think there's a lot of people that would be impacted or even be able to see this house.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Questions for our applicant?

COMMISSION MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: We'll call you back up. Thank you.
MR. ROMANELLO: Thank you.
THE CHAIRMAN: Is anybody else here to speak on this COA?

AUDIENCE MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Seeing none, we'll close the public hearing and I'll entertain a motion.

COMMISSIONER KASPER: Make a motion to deny COA-22-27338.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Second.
THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thoughts, comments? Who wants to go first?

COMMISSIONER EPSTEIN: Through the Chair, I think one of my biggest things I'm seeing looking at this is the overall aerial map and all the homes kind of lining up with the front of their house, and it does look like this addition would encroach upon that. And I know Diane M. Tropia, Inc., Post Office Box 2375, Jacksonville, FL 32203 (904) 821-0300

114
1 that's something that -- that's not very typical for the neighborhood and the historic fabric of the area. That's a concern of mine. COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Through the Chair, taking Condition 1 regarding the 5V crimp metal -- metal roofing for the addition, it seems that with the main house having the metal roof that I would -- you know, I would generally tend towards having the -- any new additions also match the main house.

Regarding -- let's see, point number 3 regarding its visibility, I'm looking at the Google Earth and this is a very small street. There's only eight houses on this street. So even though I see Commissioner Epstein's point about the extension, this is also a very -- not very visible street, so it --

The garage, even though it's going to be front-facing, it's only going to be front-facing to the -- to one neighbor, not to a street, not on a corner. And this property backs up to Boone Park, so really there's only -- like I said, there's only a few neighbors on this street, so I -- I don't really have any issues with the extension of
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the garage, especially if he gets, you know, the administrative deviation, I won't have any -- any concerns with that aspect of it because the garage door would be hidden, it wouldn't be visible, even to the very few people driving down this street.

And then regarding the massing, it seems like it would be in keeping with the massing of the overall structure. It's not adding a thousand square feet. It's, I believe, less than $\mathbf{5 0 0}$ square feet. I don't think it would be noticeable overall.

And I think that's it, so I would actually be inclined to approve as it's been drawn here.

THE CHAIRMAN: Anybody else have thoughts, comments?

COMMISSIONER KASPER: Through the Chair, I'll just maybe parrot what staff was saying, is that, you know, we -- we do review each project based on its compatibility with the historic neighborhood. Part of that criteria is how it faces the road, how it approaches the road, and that's the front setback, and it's normally a predominant setback. So when you go down the street, all the houses line up,
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similar. So this one would be protruding out pretty far.

Also, historically, you know, the garage is not in the front. There's a side road that goes past the house and the garage is in the rear. This particular house, through its evolution, decided that the side yard would be used, you know, as a yard, not as a driveway, which is fine, but I don't know if that is a reason to move the garage to the front.

So I think just on a historic compatibility, protruding further out in the front setback and then being a garage, front facing, is not historically compatible.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Through the Chair, just a statement. I think this is a peculiar -- it's a peculiar kind of situation because the original house, by records, say it was built in 1922, so it is of a historic nature by its sort of beginning, you know, its DNA, so to speak, but there's clearly been a lot of evolution over the years that have modified the house to something much different than it was in 1922, and I think that's the predicament that I at least find myself in.
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I recognize the comments about it really being a cul-de-sac, which is something different that we don't typically see in these kind of urban fabric communities. It is on Boone Park. It is a bit remote, but -- as Commissioner Epstein stated, but I also, as deliberating.

THE CHAIRMAN: I tend to agree with that as well. This is a tough one because it has been modified and the visibility factor is -- I personally lean more towards supporting this COA. I think the visibility factor is a -- is a big one for me and -- as well as its partnering with Boone Park. And the garage won't be -- I mean, the garage door itself will not be seen by just about anyone, so --

COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Yeah. And through the Chair, the reason that I looked at this one different was because of the substantial modifications that have occurred over the years
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where this house would not exist, you know, in -- within the historical area that we look at.

And also, if you -- I'd like to -- I'd like to point out at 1621 Pine Grove Avenue, which also has a front-facing garage which is fully facing Pine Grove Avenue -- and that's down the street from the applicant's structure, so -- but I understand the challenge of having the extension out into the road.

And what I considered was the minor visibility, considering it is at the very end of a very small street with only -- there's actually only seven houses on this street, or six houses on the street. I believe the other ones are actually Pine Grove Avenue addresses.

THE CHAIRMAN: So we've got a motion on the floor currently as a denial. Whose motion was that?

COMMISSIONER KASPER: That was me.
THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. So we can vote on that, if that's where we stand, and come back.

COMMISSIONER KASPER: So to clarify, there's a motion to deny, so when you say "yea" --
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THE CHAIRMAN: It would be for denial. COMMISSIONER KASPER: -- it would be for denial.

THE CHAIRMAN: Correct.
So let's go ahead and call the vote.
All those in favor?
COMMISSIONER KASPER: Aye.
COMMISSIONER EPSTEIN: Aye.
COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Aye.
THE CHAIRMAN: Those opposed? COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Nay. THE CHAIRMAN: Nay. With that, the motion [sic] is denied. So we will move on. MS. GRANDIN: The application is denied. THE CHAIRMAN: The application is denied, so COA-22-27338 is denied, and we will move on. So next on our docket -- we are going to skip over COA-22-27456 and come back to that, which I'm sorry to tell everybody.

We're going to go ahead and knock out Section H real quick, Certificates of
Appropriateness for Work Initiated or Completed Without a COA. So that's under Section H. Our first one is COA-22-27425, 34 East 4th Street.
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MS. KELLY: Application for COA-22-27425 is for foundation infill with pierced brick lattice; the creation of two new window openings on either side of the structure, which were done after the fact; and the replacement of all visible brick piers with a custom brick veneer over concrete block piers, which is also after the fact.

This two-story structure was originally a duplex located in the middle of a block along an alley surrounded by two-story structures. This contributing structure has a street-visible, open crawl space.

The applicant proposes one window opening at the location of the interior stair landing on the west elevation and another window opening aligned with an existing window in the middle of the east elevation. These locations aren't consistent with the design of historic structures in Springfield. And the master site file includes a photo of the structure with a -- what we call a stairwell window -evidence that it was previously enclosed. The restoration of this feature is supported by the design guidelines and the code.
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The new window opening on the east elevation, which fronts an alley, is located in the middle of the structure and aligns with other windows vertically and horizontally. The creation of this window does not have a negative effect on the architectural character of the structure.

Foundation infill or the crawl space infill, as conditioned with lattice or pierced brick that is recessed behind the outer edge of the piers, is consistent with the design guidelines. As such, the Department recommends to approve with conditions of the brick foundation screening and the two window openings.

Staff conducted a site visit on
April 22nd, 2022, and noted that the historic brick piers had been replaced with concrete block piers. Staff was unable to assess the condition of the historic material before its removal. As such, the request for concrete block piers is inconsistent with the design guidelines.

The applicant had originally requested to place brick around the visible concrete block
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piers; however, this would have the effect of brick piers that are out of scale with the home and project beyond the wall plane.

Instead, the applicant has proposed a custom half-inch brick veneer with a half-inch mortar to reflect the original brick pier design. This proposed solution to the current appearance of the foundation piers would have been an acceptable replacement if the piers were deemed irreparable and structurally unstable. But as previously mentioned, staff was unable to assess the condition of the feature; therefore, staff finds this request to be inconsistent with the design guidelines in the code and recommends denial of this request.

The Department recommends approval with conditions in part and deny in part.

THE CHAIRMAN: Questions for staff?
COMMISSION MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: All right. We'll open the public hearing.

Is the applicant here?
AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yes.
THE CHAIRMAN: You can come on up.
(Audience member approaches the podium.)
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THE CHAIRMAN: If you'll state your name and address.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Christopher Frazier, 2204 North Aft Bend, St. Johns, Florida 32259.

THE CHAIRMAN: Christopher, she will swear you in.

THE REPORTER: If you would raise your right hand for me, please.

MR. FRAZIER: (Complies.)
THE REPORTER: Do you affirm that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

MR. FRAZIER: I do.
THE REPORTER: Thank you.
MR. FRAZIER: Yes. Addressing the piers, the original brick piers were in very bad shape to the point where only a few held the house up. We noticed that when we were putting the foundation in to support the beams for the house. When the contractor went out to the house, he noticed that hardly any of the brick piers were touching the house to the point where he can grab them and move them with his hands.
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I have a note here from the engineer who put in a scope of work that indicates that, "In this case, the set of plans are designed to indicate that" -- "the areas of the house that were compromised due to time and deterioration."

So, therefore, we put the block columns to support the house, thinking we will wrap them with the brick. So the -- with the compromise of going a half-inch veneer with a half-inch mortar.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.
COMMISSIONER KASPER: So through the Chair to the applicant, so your structural engineer said that the existing brick piers needed to be replaced?

MR. FRAZIER: Yes.
COMMISSIONER KASPER: And that was the letter you -- or the --

MR. FRAZIER: And the scope of work due to the time they were there and the deterioration, they were unsafe. Of course, back then, when they made those piers, they didn't put the cement foundation to have -- hold them sturdy.
The sand around the house is very loose;
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1 therefore, they were moving about and began to 2 sink.

COMMISSIONER KASPER: Thank you.
COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Through the Chair, was that included in the application, that letter that you have?

MR. FRAZIER: No.
COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Can I see that please?

MR. FRAZIER: Sure.
(Tenders document.)
COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Thank you.
THE CHAIRMAN: Any other questions for our applicant at the moment?

You can take your time for a second, if anybody else has questions.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Question for the applicant, through the Chair. You stated earlier -- just to confirm -- that the -- the existing piers that were there were actually physically moveable? They weren't really holding up anything at all?

MR. FRAZIER: That is correct.
The majority of them. Of course, there were some giving support for the house, unless
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the house would have fallen, but the majority of them were not (inaudible) the house.

COMMISSIONER EPSTEIN: Through the Chair, a question. When the concrete blocks were put in and you noticed that the brick piers were having some issues, was there not any recommendation for how to repair those or was it -- is it deemed entirely that they were not sufficient anymore?

MR. FRAZIER: Yes. Verbally, it was deemed they're not sufficient with holding support of the house.

The brick piers were the recommendation with the engineer to support the house because, at that time, what -- we thought that -- the idea was to surround the block columns with the brick to keep the look of the historical value.

Now, unfortunately, hindsight is 20/20.
We did not discuss that with the Historical staff beforehand, just thinking that that's what we're going to do to keep the historical look.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Any other questions for the applicant at the moment?

COMMISSIONER LOPERA: And just so I'm
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clear, that -- a potential solution would just be doing the half-inch brick veneer across the piers?

MR. FRAZIER: Yes, to wrap -- yeah, across the piers and --

COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Thank you.
MR. FRAZIER: -- (inaudible) between the piers.

COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Okay.
THE CHAIRMAN: All right. We will call you back up.

Thank you.
Is anybody else here to speak on this COA?
AUDIENCE MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: All right. With that, we'll close the public hearing.

MS. PRYOR: (Indicating.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Oh, please. Sorry. I missed you again.
(Ms. Pryor approaches the podium.)
MS. PRYOR: I don't get up fast enough.
THE CHAIRMAN: No, you're fine. Just state your name and address again.

MS. PRYOR: Kim Pryor, 245 West 5th
Street.
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I'm still good on swearing in?
THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, ma'am.
MS. PRYOR: Okay. I've been to this particular house, and I -- I just want to make sure that the Commission is aware of some other things that are going on with it.

It appears to me as though all of the windows have been replaced. They got a COA to replace a couple and they were given
instructions on what they should be. I have photos that I can show you where the windows are -- they're a different size than what they were originally and you have a mishmash of types. You have some 1 -over-1s, we have some 2-over-2s, we have some -- I think there's some that are 6-over-1 or 9-over-1s.

So there's more going on with this particular house than what is being presented here today, and I think that that is important for you guys to know, and I just wanted to bring that up.

Thank you.
THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
Is anybody else here to speak on this COA?
AUDIENCE MEMBERS: (No response.)
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THE CHAIRMAN: Seeing none, I'll close the public hearing and I will entertain a motion.

COMMISSIONER KASPER: I will make a motion to approve COA-22-27425 with all staff conditions and no denial.

COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Second.
MS GRANDIN: (Indicating.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Please.
MS. GRANDIN: Mr. Chairman, just wanted to clarify something. So the replaced -- the brick foundation piers, they requested that, but they just requested it just to have the concrete block there. So what Ms. Kelly wrote into the record was the half-inch veneer being okay. So was that part of your -- was that part of your motion?

COMMISSIONER KASPER: Yes, ma'am.
The way I read Item 3, it says, replace brick foundation piers with brick-framed cinder block piers. So to me, that reads thin brick veneer on concrete block.

MS. GRANDIN: Yeah. What they actually asked for was the full thickness of the brick.
So what Ms. Kelly and the applicant talked
about was just him slicing the brick,
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basically, and making it a veneer.
COMMISSIONER KASPER: Very well. Then -COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: So brick tile.
MS GRANDIN: Right, basically.
COMMISSIONER KASPER: Well, did we get a second?

COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Yes.
COMMISSIONER KASPER: Okay. Then I'll amend -- make a motion for -- I'm sorry. Do I have to do that if it's already read into the --

THE CHAIRMAN: No, it hasn't been voted on. You can just withdraw and start over.

COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Just amend it.
COMMISSIONER KASPER: I'll make a motion to amend -- what am I amending? I don't see it here.

COMMISSIONER LOPERA: (Inaudible.)
COMMISSIONER KASPER: Sorry. I'll make a motion to amend requested Item Number 3 to allow concrete block piers with thin brick veneer.

COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Second.
THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Comments, concerns? COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Through the Chair,
Diane M. Tropia, Inc., Post Office Box 2375, Jacksonville, FL 32203
just to -- many times -- maybe we should also -- many times the thin brick doesn't match the real brick, and so if it's going to stay brick, we'd want that to look consistent, like it will -- that's the -- that's the idea here, so, you know --

COMMISSIONER KASPER: Through the Chair to Commissioner Montoya, is there any existing brick on the property?

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: It looks like it.
COMMISSIONER EPSTEIN: That's all gone.
COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: It's gone. But you can understand my point, right? You don't want the brick on the pier to look different than the brick in between the piers.

COMMISSIONER KASPER: Very valid point.
Thank you. I stand corrected.
COMMISSIONER EPSTEIN: Through the Chair, one thing I would just like to point out, sometimes with the veneer, it doesn't always come with the brick corner pieces when you actually turn a corner and you don't get that look of a brick. And I would stipulate that the brick needs to have that corner piece so that it does look like it's turning the corner.
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COMMISSIONER KASPER: Very well.
I will amend my amendment. So I make a motion to amend Request Number 3 to read, concrete block pier foundations with thin brick veneer, complete with thin brick veneer corner units, thin brick veneer to match pierced brick -- infill -- what was it called -foundation infill.

COMMISSIONER EPSTEIN: Second.
THE CHAIRMAN: Any more discussion here?
COMMISSION MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: All those in favor?
COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.
THE CHAIRMAN: Those opposed?
COMMISSION MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: And we can take a vote on the motion as amended, correct, or are we good?

MS. GRANDIN: You're good.
THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. With that, you have approved COA-22-27425.

We're going to move on to COA-22-27490, 1909 Perry Street.

MS. KELLY: Application for COA-22-27490 is for after-the-fact wholesale siding
replacement of both asbestos shingle siding and
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historic wood siding on a contributing,
2 two-story, residential structure in the
3 Springfield historic district.
Staff conducted a site visit on
November 30th, 2021, and noted that the section
of exposed wood siding appeared to be in
repairable condition. COA-21-26669 was
approved for the replacement of the damaged
asbestos shingles with cementitious shingles and for the asbestos and wood siding to remain.

At some point after that approval, the asbestos and historic siding were both removed in their entirety. The wholesale replacement of repairable original wood siding is inconsistent with the guidelines.

Via the administrative matrix, the proposed removal of the nonhistoric asbestos shingle siding can be administratively approved, and restoration of historic architecture features is encouraged, such as the wood siding.

The applicant proposes the -- as a solution to this situation, is the -- that the replacement material be wood siding to match the historic siding in material, size and
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design. If the original siding was beyond reasonable repair, this proposed replacement product would be the most appropriate.

As the request stands, staff finds that the request is inconsistent with the code and the guidelines. The Department recommends denial.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Questions for staff?

COMMISSION MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. We'll open the public hearing.
(Audience member approaches the podium.)
THE CHAIRMAN: If you would state your name and address.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Harpreet Singh, 1909
Perry Street, Jacksonville, Florida 32206.
THE CHAIRMAN: Harpreet, she's going to swear you in.

THE REPORTER: If you would raise your right hand for me, please.

MR. SINGH: (Complies.)
THE REPORTER: Do you affirm that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the

Diane M. Tropia, Inc., Post Office Box 2375, Jacksonville, FL 32203 (904) 821-0300

## truth?

MR. SINGH: Yes, ma'am.
THE REPORTER: Thank you.
MR. SINGH: So when I got this property in 2019, it was in a pretty bad condition, so -the siding was bad, the roof was bad, everything was exposed, the windows were bad. There was brushes [sic] growing in between the walls of this building.

So when they tried to fix it -- I mean, this would have been a fantastic, easy fix on the pocket as well because I would have just replaced this and covered everything. But when they tried to take it out, I was told that everything was mushy or burned or -- and they couldn't fix the asbestos because every time they would try to take it out, it would break in pieces, so --

And I'm a physician, so I'm not -- I was not there. I was busy with COVID and all that stuff. And I was fixing other historic buildings at that time, so -- this -- from 2019 till now, it's -- it's just been continuous progress of worsening condition of this building.

Diane M. Tropia, Inc., Post Office Box 2375, Jacksonville, FL 32203 (904) 821-0300

Eventually, this is going to be an old folks home. It's going to be a -- like an assisted living facility for old people.

So all this asbestos, it kept crumbling and -- so those people who were working there, they just took everything out and threw it in the -- in the garbage. And that's what I was told, so here we are.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Questions for our applicant?

COMMISSION MEMBERS: (No response.)
MR. SINGH: And there was a lot of burnt pieces as well, sections which were burnt.

I did submit a whole bunch of pictures showing that from the inside. And there was some termite damage as well to the -- to the siding, to the frame, which is all, of course, fixed, so ...

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Anybody have questions?

COMMISSION MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: We'll call you back up if we need you.

MR. SINGH: Thank you very much.
THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
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Does anybody --
MS. KELLY: Through the Chair, we did receive -- it was for a different COA. This house, like he said, has had a lot of work, so we have other COAs for them that have been approved. And we do have pictures. I thought this was about the windows previously, so I didn't include this with them, but they do show some charred pieces of wood from the interior.

And the applicant has been working in good faith with us. We think maybe the project manager was out sick for a little bit and some work happened in their absence, so -- and that's maybe how this happened, so ...

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Is anybody else here to speak on this COA?

AUDIENCE MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: All right. With that, we'll close the public hearing and I'll entertain a motion.

COMMISSIONER LOPERA: I've got a question.
Through the Chair, the applicant mentioned that they would -- it would be okay with going back with wood siding?

MS. KELLY: Uh-huh.
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COMMISSIONER LOPERA: So if we deny this, will they still be able to go back with wood siding or do they come back for a new application?

MS. KELLY: That's a great question.
Probably -- I'm guessing you would just do an approve with conditions and make the condition be the wood siding.

COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Okay.
COMMISSIONER KASPER: But -- through the Chair, isn't it -- we treat this as if it came in the first time. So what he's doing is he's asking to put new siding on this home. Staff's position is that the original siding is adequate and it does not need to be replaced, just like if it was an original window, it did not need to be replaced.

So I think what we're potentially reviewing is, are we going to allow new wood siding in lieu of the existing asbestos siding that was in the pictures and/or the original wood siding that was underneath the asbestos siding.

COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Through the Chair, the asbestos is gone, correct?
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MS. KELLY: Through the Chair, it's all gone. So that's why these after-the-fact ones are kind of tricky because --

COMMISSIONER LOPERA: And the wood siding currently is the -- the one in the diagonal shape?

MS. KELLY: Right now there's just the wood underlayment and then that -- the plywood on top.

COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Okay.
COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: It's either existing sheathing or new plywood sheathing, right? And some Tyvek.

I mean, it's sort of a predicament, really. Through the Chair, just as part of the discussion, there is no siding on the house, there is no recovery of existing material, so we -- we are in a situation where something is going to have to be put on the home.

The broader question is one that can't be answered, I guess, you know, like, what -- what do we do in a situation like this? Because it's an after-the-fact COA, but there's no recovery of the materials that were lost or any way to evaluate them. I guess that's a
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rhetorical question.
COMMISSIONER EPSTEIN: Through the Chair, when something is moved from a historic building through NPS, they make you go back and replace it with a -- you know, a similar item. Is that something that staff would recommend as well here?

MS. KELLY: Through the Chair, yes, it is.
Honestly, that's probably the best solution, like, reasonably and realistically that we come up with. And I believe when we've spoken with the applicant that they were okay with that, to do wood siding to match as much as possible the documentation that we do have of the historic siding.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Well, through the Chair, just a question to the group. The approval of this -- the denial -- the recommendation from staff for denial, it seems like a point of -- making a point of a situation, that it needs to be on record that it's denied, and then after the fact something needs to be done to side the house, right? Something needs to be done to get siding on the house because that's a separate matter, so I --
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my vote would be to agree with staff and deny the application and then take it from there.

I think the next thing that I would say that should be on record is -- this is a message for the people in the historic districts who are in attendance tonight. We've heard another -- it can't be confirmed or denied, but speculation about another home in the neighborhood. And when you see things like this going on, these are the things that need to be reported to staff earlier, not this late in the game so that it could be stopped.

Maybe it was very well what Ms. Kelly said earlier, that the boss was out of town and the staff was acting on their own. But as a community, we have to work together to see that these things don't happen as much as possible so that we don't lose our historic fabric, so that we don't lose the structures in our neighborhoods and communities.

COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Through -- go ahead.
MS. GRANDIN: Through the Chair to the Commission, if you deny the application, then they can't come back and ask for the same thing. So what I just understood from the
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staff was that at first they came in and were requesting Hardiboard siding and the staff said no because it's an after-the-fact problem here; it needs to be wood siding.

So I think if you approve it with the condition that it's wood siding with the same profile that -- whatever they -- the research determines is -- I mean, that's the best thing you can do. Otherwise, it's going to be a house with no siding.

COMMISSIONER LOPERA: So back to Commissioner Montoya's point, we will not be able to put on record that we denied -- that someone can read the minutes and see that we all would deny it.

THE CHAIRMAN: But let me -- this seems like two different means to the same end, right? Because, I mean, even if we deny it, there's going to be siding on that house eventually. It's got to go somewhere. I mean --

COMMISSIONER LOPERA: But would they legally be able to come back?

MS. GRANDIN: No.
THE CHAIRMAN: No, it would just be -- it
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would be deemed -- this gets taken care of elsewhere, not --

MS. GRANDIN: Okay. So for res judicata, you can't come back, ever, to ask for the same thing again. You could come back a year later and ask for something else. So it really would be -- I mean, you can go on record and say this was a really bad thing to do, and deny the -because their request was for Hardie siding, so you can deny that but say, we're going to approve it if it's wood siding -- you can even say what kind of wood, if you want to make it cypress or whatever, as long as it's got the same profile and whatever -- it probably was cypress back then.

You could condition it that way, and that's -- I mean, that's a lot more expensive than Hardiboard siding.

COMMISSIONER KASPER: So through the Chair to the Commission, I'm not a super fan of being punitive and saying it has to be wood only when we would normally approve Hardie siding. And we are in Florida and we're kind of setting them up for failure to cover the entire building with wood that is not old. I forget
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what the term is, like --
COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Seasoned?
COMMISSIONER KASPER: I don't know. I
guess back in the day when wood was better. So I would be moving in the direction of allowing the Hardie, which is in all the other buildings.

COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Well --
THE CHAIRMAN: We have no motion on the table at the moment, so --

COMMISSIONER LOPERA: I'm going to make a motion to -- I'm not amending. I'm just making a motion to approve COA-22-27490 with new siding, which can be either wood or Hardie panel, lap -- horizontal lap siding, per standard staff conditions.

COMMISSIONER KASPER: Second.
THE CHAIRMAN: Any other discussion?
COMMISSIONER LOPERA: I really don't like the fact that the siding was removed, the original was removed, for the record.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: And, again, through the Chair, it should be stated that this is not precedent-setting. These are things that we all need to recognize and work to report so
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they don't happen more.
THE CHAIRMAN: All right. All those in favor?

COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.
THE CHAIRMAN: Those opposed? COMMISSION MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Hearing none, you have approved COA-22-27490.

And we're going to backtrack. Next on our docket, COA-22-27456, 1900 Wambolt Street.

MS. KELLY: Application for COA-22-27456 is for the demolition of the Ford Motor Company assembly plant, a locally designated landmark, LM-03-09, under Ordinance 2003-1267.

Per the designation report, the structure meets five of the seven designation criteria. The structure was built in 1924. Albert Kahn, one of America's most notable industrial architects, designed both the original plant and the 1926 addition. Two rail tracks entered the plant from the west to receive freight from ships or to deliver automobiles. The original plant was designed to produce 125 automobiles per day. By 1926, the plant was expanded to produce 200 cars per eight-hour day.
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Initially, the plant was used to make Model Ts, but began production of the Model A in 1928. The plant was one of the largest in the southeast and remained in operation until 1932. After that, it was used as a parts distribution center for the state. Henry Ford was directly involved with the planning and operation of the Jacksonville plant.

The applicant has documented that the bulkhead is failing and needs to be replaced. During repair, it is anticipated that the landmark structure will collapse. The owner would like to demolish the entire structure and repurpose the site for an industrial waterfront use.

Staff considered the Secretary of the Interior standards for rehabilitation and the ordinance code criteria found in Section 307.106(n). The following is staff's analysis: The Secretary's standards for rehabilitation are not oriented towards demolition. The only guidance they offer relates to the preservation and restoration of structures. As such, the proposed demolition would run counter to the intent of the standards.
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A site visit was conducted on May 5th, 2022. Significant damage to the bulkhead, foundation and structure is visibly evident. Brickwork on the warehouse portion closest to the river is falling down and all of the steel framing is thoroughly rusted, resulting in structural failures throughout the immense space.

The office/administration/showroom portion of the building closest to the railroad line on land is in much better condition. In general, staff believes that the production portion of the building is likely beyond restoration, but finds that the restoration of the front office space and the showroom portion is possible.

The Ford plant used the assembly line process and produced the Model T and its replacement, the Model A. At the time of construction, Albert Kahn's design of the Jacksonville plant was regarded as state-of-the-art. The design allowed for boxcars loaded with parts to enter one side of the plant and then exit with finished automobiles. He designed motorized windows that were angled to catch prevailing breezes to
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maximize airflow to the interior. Bathrooms were built into the trusswork above the floor to maximize floor space for production.

Albert Kahn's design was an outstanding example of the modern industrial building and its use of concrete glass and steel embodies modern architecture. As such, even in its current condition, the structure remains historically and architecturally significant and would be a challenge to reproduce, a big challenge.

The Ford plant is not important to the ambience of the historic district because it is located outside of the boundaries of a locally designated historic district; however, it appears to be the last remaining assembly plant of its kind in the state.

The property owner intends on combining the 14.6-acre subject site with an adjacent 8.8 acres to create a contiguous 23.4 -acre waterfront property.

The entire portion of land has a land use designation of the Water Dependent/Water Related, WD/WR, and a zoning classification of the Industrial Waterfront, IW.
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The property also lies entirely within the Industrial Sanctuary. Per the comprehensive plan, areas identified as Industrial Sanctuary shall not be converted to nonindustrial land uses.

The applicant has submitted that these designations are some of the reasons why the current landmark structure is not capable of earning reasonable economic return on its value. Information submitted by the applicant states that the owner has investigated the feasibility of designing a reuse for the existing 165,000-square-foot building that would be consistent with recently permitted large-building-footprint construction in the Jacksonville marketplace. Such projects include dock height transportation logistics transfer facilities, local distribution product warehouses, high-stacked modular storage facilities, big box retailers and office buildings.

The applicant feels that the existing Ford plant building is not a candidate for adaptive reuse to any of those contemporary indoor uses because residential, retail, commercial use and
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office buildings are not permitted within the Water Dependent/Industrial Sanctuary and proximity to the deep-water channel of the river demands a port-related use. As such, it is the intent of the owner to prepare the site for an appropriate marine industrial use.

Given the fragility and immense size of the structure, relocation is not a feasible alternative.

The applicant has provided letters from a structural engineer and an architect which discuss the current condition of the bulkhead and structure. Both letters contend that structural failure is imminent if the bulkhead is repaired and repair is necessary under any development scenario.

Having visited the site, staff agrees that the bulkhead and foundation have significant damage and the steel frame of the structure is already collapsing in places.

While the production/warehouse portion of the building may be beyond repair, the Department finds that the administrative office/showroom area appear to be fit for restoration.
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Staff suggests that the owner consider either a partial demolition with restoration of the street-facing showroom portion of the structure or perhaps a Historic American Buildings Survey recording to thoroughly document the site and mitigate the negative effects demolition would have on the city's historical and architectural resources.

Staff finds that the request for demolition is inconsistent with Section 307.106 and the Secretary's standards. The Department recommends denial.

This concludes the staff report. I believe the applicant is here as well.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Questions for staff?

COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Yes. Through the Chair, the reports by the engineer and the architect mentioned a lot of other reports dating back to 1975, mentioned an appendix, mentioned a report by WBCM, which is another civil engineering firm. Do you have access to any of those reports? It was not included in the application.

MS. KELLY: Through the Chair, I don't Diane M. Tropia, Inc., Post Office Box 2375, Jacksonville, FL 32203 (904) 821-0300
believe so. I haven't seen them. It's
possible somewhere in our department that they exist, but no.

COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Okay. Thank you.
THE CHAIRMAN: Any other questions for staff?

COMMISSION MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: All right. We'll open the public hearing. And I presume the applicant is here.
(Audience member approaches the podium.)
AUDIENCE MEMBER: Good evening.
Jim Gilmore, 208 North Laura Street, Suite 710 .

THE REPORTER: If you would raise your right hand for me, please.

MR. GILMORE: (Complies.)
THE REPORTER: Do you affirm that the
testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

MR. GILMORE: I do.
THE REPORTER: Thank you.
MR. GILMORE: Mr. Chairman, members, thank you very much for allowing us to come and
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discuss this project with you tonight.
I'd like to first, if I may, introduce the team that's with us tonight that will be here to answer specific questions you may have and to discuss in specificity the recommendations of the Planning Department.

First off --
COMMISSIONER KASPER: I think we're going to give you adequate time, so if you could speak a little bit slower for the reporter --

MR. GILMORE: Oh, okay.
COMMISSIONER KASPER: -- that would be nice.

MR. GILMORE: I appreciate that.
I'm here with my colleague Taylor Mejia.
We're with The Southern Group, which is a statewide lobbying and economic development group and we've been working with the property owners, Amkin, to examine taking the property and turning it into a ship repair facility and increasing investment and creating jobs in Jacksonville.

Amkin is the property owner. They purchased the property in February of 2015.
Ramon Llorens is the president and CEO of Diane M. Tropia, Inc., Post Office Box 2375, Jacksonville, FL 32203 (904) 821-0300

Amkin. They are a large Spanish construction firm, one of the largest in the world, and they also have serious real estate holdings in Jacksonville, including the TIAA bank building and other large real estate holdings.

With us tonight is Mr. Sonny Redmond, who is the property asset manager for Amkin for this property here in Jacksonville.

We also have with us Mr. Mike Saylor, who will be coming before you to talk specifically about the recommendations from the Planning Department. Mike is a land development consultant that's been involved in many, many land developments around this entire region for many, many decades. And as many of you know, he is also a former director of the City of Jacksonville's Planning Department and has been involved in many studies relating to this property.

We also have Mr. Ed Morales with us. Ed is president of Morales Consulting Engineers, one of the leading waterfront structural engineers in our city. Among other things, he's the current design/build engineer for the City of Jacksonville as it relates to McCoy's
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Creek and is also working on the Emerald Trail.
The property owner is developing this property in accordance with that Industrial Sanctuary designation and the land use for Industrial Waterfront. And in that regard, you may have heard many months ago the announcement of Fincantieri, the large Italian ship repair and building company, coming to Jacksonville. This was a public/private partnership between the State and the City and Fincantieri to establish a major ship repair facility here to take care and maintain and repair the ships of the U.S. Navy along the East Coast and in Mayport.

As part of that -- and the Fincantieri company has committed to enter into a subcontract with the ship repair company that Amkin is currently finalizing lease negotiations with. That is an absolute firm commitment to develop this property.
Unfortunately, the property has got to be clear for that to happen. But when that does occur and that property is developed, it will increase another -- at least 300 new jobs in our community and move to cement our place in
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repairing and maintaining U.S. Navy ships along the East Coast.

So it's a -- unfortunately, a clean site is necessary to support this work and we certainly recognize the historic nature of it.

And if I may, I'd like Mr. Mike Saylor to please come forward and talk about the specifics of that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
(Mr. Saylor approaches the podium.)
THE CHAIRMAN: State your name and address.

MR. SAYLOR: Hi. I'm Mike Saylor. Address is 12581 Sawpit Road, Jacksonville, Florida.

THE REPORTER: If you would raise your right hand for me, please.

MR. SAYLOR: (Complies.)
THE REPORTER: Do you affirm that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

MR. SAYLOR: Yes, I do.
THE REPORTER: Thank you.
MR. SAYLOR: Is there a way to position
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1 myself so this thing doesn't break up and then
2 lose something important?
MR. SAYLOR: No.
I do have a question for you all. You have that slide show up there. It's on the screen. Do you have that before you?

THE CHAIRMAN: We do.
MR. SAYLOR: Okay. You all have those slides. Okay. I brought a handout to give to you all. If you want them, you can have them.

I wasn't sure that you had those photos. I took those photographs, and the reason I took them is I shot -- I did a photo shoot on the site March 22nd of this year, eight weeks ago. You will have seen on social media possibly and even in the staff report a lot of photographs that show the plant in much better shape than it was eight weeks ago.

I've been involved in this property for 20 years. I've worked for three different property owners, including the current. It has declined at an accelerating rate I will say. I had not been on the property for a couple of years. I went back out there possibly in
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You've got photographs here showing the corners of the building collapsing away from the steel framework. Some of that is a function of the bulkhead. There's been discussion about the bulkhead collapsing and bringing the building with it. Well, there's evidence of that. There's a photograph in there that shows two of the easterly corners of the building coming down as the bulkhead falls into the river. We're hoping to forestall that, but we are also here to request permission to demolish the entirety of the building.

Staff has come back with a suggestion that perhaps the -- the front portion -- we measured it out -- is 8,000 square feet. It's the old showroom and administrative offices of the -the plant facility, that -- perhaps that 8,000 square feet could be restored to perhaps a Class B or Class A office space. First time we'd heard that, I -- it's not the first time I heard that idea. Let's say that. I think that idea has been kicked around a bit recently.
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So that was on the table for us. Part of the -- the staff report recommends that that -that's one of the options. There's another option that we like a lot, and that is that perhaps the owner -- if a permit is issued, to demolish the entirety of the building, that we would conduct an American Buildings Survey under the -- the guidelines of the National Park Service, that would become, I presume, a documentary presentation, probably a static -static display in some museum or some landmark building where the public would actually have access to the history, the written and photographic history.

The guidelines, by the way, of the National Park Service are extremely rigid. And if that survey were conducted -- which, by the way, Amkin has -- has already agreed that they will do that if -- if we move on and take the entire building down, they'll do the survey, they'Il -- they'll commission that survey in coordination with the City, Park Service, will get a historic architect or a historic writer to produce that documentary. So that's -- you know, that's on the table. But we are here

Diane M. Tropia, Inc., Post Office Box 2375, Jacksonville, FL 32203 (904) 821-0300
to -- to press you-all for permission -- for the approval to seek a demolition permit.

Back to the notion of turning the front part of the building into 8,000 square feet of Class A office space, that's -- yeah, that is doable. Anything is doable with a blank check.

When I heard that option, I immediately talked to our architect of record, Ted Pappas, who's got a -- who's got his letter in the record. I asked Ted what he thought of the -that notion. And I gave him some assumptions. And together -- again, this would be -- for the record, this would be hearsay because we don't have documentation, but, you know, we -- we're always good at throwing out estimates or numbers or guesstimates, if you will.

I threw out the first number. I said, "What do you think of $\$ 600$ a square foot?" And he said, "I think that might get you there, but it scares me." Six hundred dollars a square foot. It doesn't scare me. I just spent $\$ 92$ a square foot remodeling a bathroom. So I -- I know costs and labor can go out through the ceiling, and we've got some pretty high ceilings to deal with here.
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There's a photograph sitting up there on the screen, the suspended lavatory with a sagging truss. That's kind of interesting. It just caught my eye. When I was out there taking that photograph, it didn't catch -- I didn't catch the fact that that -- those are elevated lavatories because they -- they didn't have, say, modern plumbing. Everything had to be above grade. The rest rooms were in those elevated rooms or buildings. And that one is collapsing. It's bringing the roof truss down with it. I didn't recognize that until I was Photoshopping the photo. And so that's just a -- sort of indicative of what we're dealing with there.

The building is coming down on its own. We'd like to -- to accelerate that because there is an alternative plan. Amkin has already spent approximately $\$ 11$ million buying the property, assembling the adjoining property, and -- and restoring the bulkheads because they have a specific intent.
(Noise interruption.)
THE CHAIRMAN: I'll tell you what, if we can pause for just a second.
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(Brief pause in the proceedings.)
THE CHAIRMAN: I think we're good.
MR. SAYLOR: So Amkin has already, to date, spent -- the acquisition of the property, acquiring additional properties around it, assembling land to do -- obviously, you know, economy of scale being a factor, it's his intent to do a -- an industrial use within the Industrial Sanctuary of the city of Jacksonville.

The only district we're in -- we're not in the historic district. We're in an Industrial Sanctuary district. That legislation of the City Council has been in place since 2007; strongly encourages and, in fact, prohibits residential development.

One of the -- one of the -- the -- I guess the -- the predecessors to that ordinance was the fact that -- this property was at one time proposed by a fellow out of Atlanta for a project called Assembly Lofts. They were going to turn it into a Faneuil Hall type of development that you would see in Boston, a combination of Festival Marketplace and residences -- high-end residences. It never
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penciled out. It -- financially, it failed.
Actually, every -- I've looked at the site with probably a dozen potential investors, and -- and in every case either the building itself was not functional for their use or it didn't pencil out. The only thing that pencils out is to have a flat site that can be used as a -- essentially, a shipyard where everything is done on a per-contract basis.

They set up their workshops alongside the pier or -- or the back side of the pier. They bring ships alongside, they bring ships up on dry dock or -- or on cranes. They bring them into a dry dock and they work on them with mobile workshops and mobile office space. They don't put their staff -- their support staff in Class A space on the pier. They do like Crowley does; they put all their administrators and -- and office people in the suburbs, in an office building where they belong, and they keep all the skilled labor up on the waterfront.

That's the intent. That's the model. And -- and that's -- frankly, that's the model since the first time I did a plan. First time
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I did a plan for this site, we were going to do a -- basically, a -- it wasn't going to be a shipyard -- not construction. It was going to be demolition of ships, barges, and railroad cars. And that deal collapsed because, again, we had to have mobility across the site to move cranes and -- and heavy equipment and stockpile materials, and the building just didn't work for us on that. So we've got a -- you know, we -- we've got an issue with the idea of office space.

As an aside, we're really not -- we're -we didn't approach this from the standpoint of trying to prove to you economic feasibility, but the $\$ 600$ a square foot is actually, we think, a midpoint number. It probably goes up from there.

And I wouldn't just take myself or an architect's word on that, so I verified it back with somebody who's doing historic restoration of an institutional building in Jacksonville right now, and he told me $\$ 600$ sounded about right as a budget number, but don't count on hitting it unless you get lucky. That's not a basis for moving forward with a -- a project as
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1 risky as restoring this building.

In 2004, my firm, a consulting firm here in Jacksonville, was engaged by the Planning -Planning Director, under funding provided by, at that time, District Council Member Pat Lockett-Felder, to do a revitalization study of this entire neighborhood, basically from the Mathews Bridge all the way up to the Jaxport offices from the water's edge back to MLK, Martin Luther King Boulevard, as a redevelopment -- a comprehensive redevelopment plan, but with this building as sort of the -you know, the -- the centerpiece that was going to stimulate the redevelopment.

I was given a laundry list of subcontractors to hire, and I did. And I managed those folks. And I hired a nationally recognized firm that had just completed doing the redevelopment plan for Cecil Field, Cecil Commerce Center, and -- and they did a comprehensive market analysis of the area, the study area, and specifically their pro forma analysis on the Ford building. And I've got a couple of quotes. I can provide you the study, but the City has it. The City actually
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accepted it, and it's -- it's in the library.
Two quotes. These are important as you're considering what I'm asking for, and -- and it's an excerpt. It's an excerpt, but -- I'm not cherry-picking, it's just an excerpt.
"As such, it is unreasonable to consider a private investor would undertake the expense of redeveloping the Ford assembly plant site for office utilization."

This is after, like, ten pages of analysis of why the market for office is flat in downtown. And we all know that, we live here. Nothing's changed about that in 2007 -- 2022.

There's another recommendation. "Given the results of the financial feasibility and market analysis, that we" -- RKG Associates out of Cambridge -- "would be most reasonable to continue the use of the Ford assembly plant site as industrial with an effort to mix more profitable flex space with industrial space over the near term."

Now, we all know that 20 years ago flex space was the -- was all the rage. And basically, if you -- if you extrapolate that, that's exactly what I'm asking for. We want to
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recognize a soft denial when I see one, so I was going to give a soft rebuttal, but then Ms. Grandin brought up the res judicata thing and it kind of scared me because I've -- I've heard that used as a reason to keep you from coming back. We're not -- we don't plan to come back, we don't want to come back, we want to get this over with.

The criteria by which we're being recommended for denial -- one of the two, the Secretary of Interior standard for rehabilitation doesn't include a -- an approach for demolition. We're not given an option under the Secretary's guidelines, but that's not really important to you and this board because you are governed by local ordinance.

Section 307 of the Land Development Code, the ten criteria that are listed in the -- in the report, under 307.106, ten criteria, it's the criteria that are important in rendering a decision. There are ten. I'm going to run through them real fast.

Historic or architectural significance of the building. We can see that.

Now, I, privately, would argue with you -Diane M. Tropia, Inc., Post Office Box 2375, Jacksonville, FL 32203 (904) 821-0300

COMMISSIONER KASPER: Through the Chair, I'm not sure if I'm allowed to interrupt, but I believe the building has already been designated a landmark. So the discussion of the ten points, I don't see it --

MR. SAYLOR: Oh, we concede the fact that it's historically significant and it is a landmark.

One of the owners I worked for asked for a landmark. And I can tell you the motivation there. It was about tax credits and transferrable tax credits. I don't believe he understood what he was getting into when he did that, but that's neither here nor there. It's designated. It was eligible and it's now a landmark. So we're asking for, obviously, a -an override on that.

So we concede item number 1 or criteria number 1 --

THE CHAIRMAN: So real quick, I'm going to -- real quick. Do we have other people to speak as well?

MR. SAYLOR: I'm sorry?
THE CHAIRMAN: Do you have other people to speak on y'all's team as well?

Diane M. Tropia, Inc., Post Office Box 2375, Jacksonville, FL 32203 (904) 821-0300
$+$

MR. SAYLOR: Sonny Redmond is here. He's part of one of the ownership groups, yeah.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.
MR. SAYLOR: I think he's got some personal knowledge on that. And he -- you know, you can ask him questions. He either knows the answer or not.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I'm going to give you about another, like, minute or two, but we've got to wrap it up and move on to the next speaker.

MR. SAYLOR: Sure. I just want to run through the criteria because this is the important part of the deal.

So I'm going -- on Page 4 of 7 of your staff report, we concede item 1. It says it's -- it's architecturally significant, yes. The importance of the building to the ambiance of the district. We're not in a district. The only district we're in is -- we're in an industrial sanctuary, but not a historic district.

Item Number 3, difficulty of reproducing a -- such a building or structure because of its design, texture, material. None of those
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things are available. You know that the -that the skills of the artisans who built that building do not exist anymore. The windows alone could not be replicated by anyone, and they're not available in a catalog.

Number 4, whether the structure is one of the last remaining examples of its kind. You know, this -- this building was built off a set of definitive drawings. It is essentially a prototype that was copied all over the country, but -- at the same time one was built, one was built in Memphis, one was built in Charlotte. Test of time -- Charlotte was occupied the entire time and it is still occupied today. It's been restored and it's the Festival Marketplace that's thriving in Charlotte. Ours was not occupied for at least 60 years, and -and the one in Memphis was torn down about five or six years ago. It was a landmark too.

Whether it's one of the last remaining examples in the county or region. Well, I consider Charlotte to be a region. If you need to see the building, you can drive to Chariotte. It's only a six-hour drive.

Item Number 5, there are definite plans
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for reuse of the property. Yes, I just gave them to you.

MS. GRANDIN: Wait a minute --
MR. SAYLOR: Difficulty or impossibility of saving the building or structure from collapse. It's -- we've got a structural engineer who says it -- it likely could.

Whether the building or structure is capable of earning reasonable economic return. I'm going to cite the study that's already in the City coffers, and -- and I will cite the -the cost estimate -- or cost -- yeah, the cost budget numbers, 600 or better.

Are there other feasible alternatives to demolition? They've been offered up by the City. We like Option Number 2, which is to do the survey, get the demo permit, and move ahead with creating a world-class port.

Number 9, whether the property no longer contributes to the historic district or no longer has significance as a -- I mean, it's not in a historic district, so we -- we can scratch that.

Significance as a historic, architectural or archeological landmark. We could restore
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it, but, you know, the site is not publicly accessible. No one gets an opportunity to enjoy whatever we do there. And as a shipyard, it's going to be probably behind an opaque fence.

Whether it would be undue economic hardship to deny the property owner. We think it's an undue economic hardship because the four-and-a-half acres -- it's under that roof, that collapsing roof, is -- is marketable land that could be better put to use in creating jobs and doing blue-collar industrial things in an industrial zone.

Sorry I've taken so much of your time.
I'm ready if you want to ask me a question or I'm ready to sit down.

THE CHAIRMAN: We'll bring you back up if we have questions.

Who else is here to speak on this COA?
(Audience member approaches the podium.)
THE CHAIRMAN: If you'll state your name and address.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Crissie Cudd, 1419 Silver Street, Jacksonville, 32206.

THE REPORTER: If you would raise your
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right hand for me, please.
MS. CUDD: (Complies.)
THE REPORTER: Do you affirm that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

## MS. CUDD: I do.

THE REPORTER: Thank you.
MS. CUDD: I'm a cat lover. And over the years my family has rescued a number of cats. We never took on one without recognizing that a responsibility came with it and that if that cat unexpectedly got sick, our responsibility didn't stop there. It was our responsibility to care for that cat.

I feel like, when you're talking about historic structures, that you're talking about something just as special, just as valuable. You don't take one on without assuming the responsibility. You sure don't own it for seven years and let it be neglected to the point that now it's falling apart, unless, of course, it does fit your original intent of saying you really wanted a flat site.

I'm not a math major. I'm not a
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construction person. I don't understand how 4-and-a-half million ballooned into 11 million with nothing done to the site. That's -that's surprising to me.

Asking for historical credits when what you really want is just a tax break in the short-term while you're planning your flat site that you can now either develop yourself or flip for a profit, I'm sorry, this just sounds a lot like demolition by neglect.

And if somebody were doing this to a cat, they'd be brought up on charges. So I think there's a special place reserved for people who do that to animals, and I'll just stop there.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
Who else would like to speak on this COA?
(Audience member approaches the podium.)
AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Tenders documents.)
My name is Kim Pryor. I live at 245 West 5th Street.

What I've handed to all the commissioners is a short PowerPoint presentation that was put together by Johnny Simmons. He was unable to stay tonight, but I think it's very important that we just take a look, and -- at this Khan
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1 building in Richmond, California called the
2 Craneway Pavilion, and take a look at what can
3 be done with this property here in
4 Jacksonville, because this was a Ford assembly
5 plant as well. This one is 45,000 square foot,
6 built in '31 with a 20,000-square-foot outdoor
7 patio, and now an award-winning event space and 8 conference center.

So the restoration work -- if you look at Page 3, the picture is beautiful. I'm sorry the people here in the audience can't see this, but --

I'm just going to read a little bit here into the record. "The restoration and preservation of the Ford assembly building on the San Francisco Bay waterfront saved an historic architectural icon from the wrecking ball and converted a long-vacant auto plant into a current-day model of urban revitalization and sustainability."

This is a 525,000 -square-foot building. It's huge. They did have some issues as well, but the architect, who is Marcy Wong Donn Logan [sic], they found a successful path to rejuvenation, and it was completely restored in
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If you want to do it, you can. And I think it's important that we keep that in mind.

Saving this particular Ford building from being razed was an enormous contribution to the cultural richness of the San Francisco community. The design team and the clients will to save the building was motivated by the desire to save the place, history, and irreplaceable architectural statement of the [sic] Ford while simultaneously introducing contemporary program elements that would financially -- be financially viable, functionally demand [sic] and architecturally compelling.

We can have something like this here in Jacksonville. The Ford assembly plant here is in a horrible state of disrepair. I agree with that. And it's a shame because it didn't have to be that way.

They say that it's difficult to repair the bulkheads and that it could cause the building to collapse. There are ways of shoring up the building. There are ways of shoring that bulkhead up.
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This particular building is -- is in a position to revitalize that area of Jacksonville. It could be the spark that the East Side needs. It could theoretically be a destination place for Jacksonville. Think of the open market in Seattle. People flock to that area.

I drove by it. You can get to it. There's a road that takes you right to it. You can't get to the building because they have it fenced off, but you absolutely can get to the building. And believe it or -- it looks like there's a lot of parking that would be available.

One of the things that this body is responsible for is protecting our historic structures. Chapter 307 indicates that demolition is to be a last resort. And I know the previous gentleman referenced that, that -they referenced that particular part of the statute and that everything else must be done, but what he didn't say is that they have not explored all other avenues.

If they don't want to put the money into restoring this property that was landmarked
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when they bought it -- and they knew it was landmarked when they bought it -- then guess what? One of the least intrusive means would be to maybe put it up for sale.

Now, our ordinance doesn't say that you have to make a profit on it. So if they happen to buy it and -- with the intent to demolish, thinking that they could wait long enough that it would deteriorate to such a mess that surely no one would be able to say that it could be saved and then they would get their demolition approval, then I'm hoping that this body is going to let them know that we care about our historic structures and not allow them to do that.

Attempt to put it up for sale. Maybe they can make a buck or two on it. I have no idea. I'm not Realtor. But don't let them demolish the building before they try everything possible to do something to save it, especially since it's been landmarked.

I'll leave you with this: You guys have a tough job. And I know you're volunteers and it's hard to sit up there, but I'm going to remind you that you don't have to be the bad
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guy. You know, you could deny their demolition request and make them take it to City Council. Let City Council make that decision. You guys can do here today what you are charged with, and that is to protect our historic structures.

Maybe somewhere in the back of your mind you're thinking, no, there's no way they can save this property, but you're -- I have to believe that you are preservationists. Otherwise, you wouldn't be sitting up there.

So if you're on the fence, vote to deny the application and let them appeal it to City Council, and let City Council make the decision. Y'all -- y'all don't have to be the bad guy today, so let's -- let's do what -what's right, what I would love to see, and let's deny this application.

And I do appreciate your time.
THE CHAIRMAN: Whoever is from the Historical Society, you can come up next.
(Audience member approaches the podium.)
AUDIENCE MEMBER: Good evening.
Scott O'Connor, 9008 Heckscher Drive, on behalf of the Jacksonville Historical Society.

THE REPORTER: If you would raise your
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right hand for me, please.
MR. O'CONNOR: (Complies.)
THE REPORTER: Do you affirm that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

MR. O'CONNOR: I do.
THE REPORTER: Thank you.
MR. O'CONNOR: Ninety years ago last week, the Ford -- Times-Union headlines -- and 800 men went back to work, 1932. In the midst of the depression, Ford company reopened this assembly plant, but --

Like I said, I'm here on behalf of the Historical Society, the Historic Sites Committee. That building has been on our most endangered list each year for -- since 2016, and we would like it to stay on that list.

The JHS opposes the total demolition. The engineering study that is part of the application, it's -- it's very thorough, and it concentrates on the east end, the one-third of the building that was built outward of the shoreline. So we believe that a partial demolition of the unstable eastern section
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would be warranted at this time, and -- and that's all I have to say. I'll make it short.

Thank you.
THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
We can just keep coming up, whoever else wants to speak.
(Audience member approaches the podium.)
AUDIENCE MEMBER: Good evening, Commission.

My name is Jenny Wolfe. Address is 2029 Vista Cove Road, St. Augustine, Florida 32084.

THE REPORTER: If you would raise your right hand for me, please.

MS. WOLFE: (Complies.)
THE REPORTER: Do you affirm that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

MS. WOLFE: Yes.
THE REPORTER: Thank you.
MS. WOLFE: I thank you for giving us the time to come up and speak to you. Again, my name is Jenny Wolfe. Currently, the president of the board of trustees of the Florida Trust for Historic Preservation. And I have master's

Diane M. Tropia, Inc., Post Office Box 2375, Jacksonville, FL 32203 (904) 821-0300
degree in architectural studies from the University of Florida and I've been spending the last 15 years working in local government and now in the private sector.

Sorry, this is not being regular tonight.
The only things that I really wanted to do is just call to your attention and emphasize some of the things that I reviewed in the Florida Master Site File records that might have been in your packet, I'm not sure, but one of them is confirmation that the building did have integrity at one point in time, that there were architectural drawings of the entire complex. And, in fact, the record in there shows that it was the only auto plant in Florida.

We know that there was a lot of manufacturing across Florida for citrus, shrimp and boat building of all types and sorts, but this was the only auto plant factory in Florida. The architect is of national and international significance. And, of course, we know the association with Henry Ford.

So with those facts in mind, there are various authors in the Florida Master Site File
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1 records that indicate that it's National

Register eligible. And, again, as -- you know, as a person representing the Florida Trust, we definitely can understand the significance of this building to the context of the state of Florida.

So there were -- as most recent as 2007, the State Historic Preservation Office found that it was eligible, and another one in 2003. And so that would make it eligible for federal tax credits, if that were to be pursued, for economic aspects of the redevelopment.

The other thing that's not been addressed is potentially information on the cultural associations of the property since there were 800 people employed over there, over the period of the 1920s to 1960. I haven't read anything in the site file that indicates who worked there, where they were from, but certainly being on the east side of Jacksonville, that would be something -- some history that should be further documented if the documentation route is what is pursued for this project.

Demolition should be last resort, but there may be some creative and selective
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demolition opportunities available. And just reviewing the letters from the architect and the engineer, it's not clear how much of those options have been pursued, but they certainly are from qualified individuals and would just encourage you all to consider whether there might be some creative opportunities for saving building elements and -- either in whole or in -- for reconstruction and rehabilitation.

So I support the staff report with emphasis, again, that this is the only building in Florida of its kind and that there may be reconstruction options available with accurate drawings and to consider all of those in your decision.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
Is there anyone else here today to speak on this COA?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yes.
THE CHAIRMAN: Come on up.
(Audience member approaches the podium.)
AUDIENCE MEMBER: My name is Dale
Sinclair. I live at 2136 Post Street, 32204.
THE REPORTER: If you would raise your
right hand for me, please.
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MS. SINCLAIR: (Complies.)
THE REPORTER: Do you affirm that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

MS. SINCLAIR: Yes.
THE REPORTER: Thank you.
MS. SINCLAIR: I don't really have a whole lot to add, except for -- I didn't know that if you denied it, it would go to the City Council.

There's a lot of people that wanted to be here today, but they thought they had to be here at 3 o'clock. I'm sure if they thought they could be here at 6:00, they could have made it, they would have. So if we denied it now, then those people would have a chance to have a voice, that didn't have a voice today.

That's all I have to add.
THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
MS. SINCLAIR: Thanks.
THE CHAIRMAN: Is anybody else here to speak on this COA?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yes.
THE CHAIRMAN: Come on up.
(Audience member approaches the podium.)
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AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm Deborah Early, 4790 Ortega Boulevard, Jacksonville, 32210.

THE REPORTER: If you would raise your right hand for me, please.

MS. EARLY: (Complies.)
THE REPORTER: Do you affirm that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

## MS. EARLY: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Thank you.
MS. EARLY: I wanted to share a couple of things. I'm here representing myself, but also I think a legion of folks in Jacksonville who really care about the history and the -- the prominence and the character of this city. And this is an incredible treasure that we have that I think is so important to -- to preserve.

And with all due respect to the folks -the gentlemen who have spoken on behalf of the owner, they sounded like they were pitching to the Business Development Council, not the Historic Preservation Commission. They talked about development, about jobs. That's all great. And we know that Jacksonville is
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1 booming, we're attracting people here, our port
2 is expanding, but that doesn't necessarily
3 serve as a really strong rationale to demolish
4 a building that has fantastic historical
5 prominence.

As others have mentioned, Albert Kahn has 60 buildings around the United States and perhaps some in other countries that have national historic preservation landmarked buildings, 60 buildings. He's known as the father of industrial architecture, and I'm sure I'm -- you know, many of these things you already know.

I've been doing some research on this and I'd be glad to share this article with the gentlemen to let them know there was a survey done of all the -- the plants that were built around the United States for Ford in the early 1900s. And according to this article, there were only three buildings -- plants rather, that were built outside the state of Michigan that were designed by Albert Khan. All the others were designed and built under a different architect, whose name I don't recall.

I'm a native Chicagoan. I have family
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from Detroit. I went to the University of Michigan. Albert Khan is known as the architect of Detroit. He built some of -designed and built some of the most significant buildings on the University of Michigan campus.

Being from Chicago, I can appreciate the significance of great architecture. It's something money cannot buy. Once you tear down something of historical significance, it will never come back. It can never be replicated.

And I know that you're here, as someone else said, to protect the history and integrity of -- of what we have here in Jacksonville. So I think that that is a -- the most important consideration in this situation, and that other avenues should be explored that could find other uses for the building, you know, things that we can do to make it economically viable.

Thank you.
THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
Is anybody else here to speak on this COA?
AUDIENCE MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Seeing none, we'll close the public hearing and I'll entertain a motion.

COMMISSIONER KASPER: Well, I'll start it
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out the gate. I make a motion to approve the demolition COA-22-27456.

MS. GRANDIN: Mr. Chair.
THE CHAIRMAN: Uh-huh.
MS. GRANDIN: If somebody is going to second that motion, the motion really needs to say why it would be approving the demolition because the staff report is to deny. So you'd have to go through the criteria as to why you would vote to approve, but nobody's seconded it yet, so -- just saying.

COMMISSIONER KASPER: Go through my spiel?
Then in support of my motion, I recognize staff's work and their analysis. I agree that the large portion or -- extremely large portion of the building is beyond restoration. The office represents 8,000 square feet of $165-$, which is less than 5 percent of the structure.

At one time this building was a significant structure. That's why it was landmarked. Unfortunately, today it's a different story.

I, personally, worked on the design and documentation of this building over 20 years ago when it was intended to be converted as a
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residential property, so I visited the site, I did architectural drawings, I did photographs, I did documentation, we completed design drawings to convert it.

And clearly today it is declining at an accelerated rate. Because of the leaky roof that was never repaired 20 years ago, the roof structure is -- continued to deteriorate. Because of the open windows, the steel window frames are deteriorated. Because of the openness and being near the water, the steel structure inside is continuing to corrode. Because of no maintenance, I'm assuming on the bulkhead, the foundations are collapsing and the building is moving with it. Because of the significant water damage to the steel structure and supporting of the brick, the brick is deteriorating as well.

So I do recognize that there are other buildings, other Khan buildings, and I appreciate the presentation of the Craneway building. That building was renovated in 2009.

Maybe 20 years ago as the design I personally worked on, there was an opportunity to -- to salvage the building, but now we seem
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to be in a horrible state of disrepair.
And we can agree that it is a -- that it was -- it is [sic] a significant structure at one time, but is -- and it -- and significant structures or treasures should be preserved. Unfortunately, in the last 20 years no one has stepped up to make that happen and, therefore, it's continued to deteriorate.

So it's my position that it is beyond repair and that we should move forward to recommend with the documentation. I don't know the lingo of the American builders -- something survey, but definitely could be preserved in a -- in a visual and a -- an electronic version that would be available for years to come.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Well, it's looking like that motion is not -- is going to fail. So with that, I will entertain a new motion, or another motion.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Through the Chair, I'd like to make a motion to deny the application for demolition in accordance with staff's report.

COMMISSIONER EPSTEIN: Second.
THE CHAIRMAN: All right. We can have
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more open discussion now.
COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Through the Chair, I understand where Commissioner Kasper is coming from, having personally visited the site 20 years ago, and -- frankly, I did not see enough photographs of collapsed portions of the structure to basically see the same thing that everybody else was seeing. I've not been out to the job site.

As the staff, you guys obviously went out there at one time?

MS. KELLY: Through the Chair, yes. We went out there May 5th.

COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Okay. And it looks like repairs are already starting on the wharf, on the east side, and it looks like it -there's a potential for it to have some effect on the foundation, but in both of these reports, especially in the one dated April 1st, 2022, there's a significant amount of reports and studies that have been done over the years that we don't have access to. It would be good to have access to those because these include geotechnical studies, they include a marine inspection by Blacksmith Marine done in 2016.
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It includes material testing of the timber piles. And even within this report, it mentioned that the interior piles remain in good condition and they could support -- sorry. I'll say that all over again.

The study by Blacksmith Marine and actually within this report indicated that the piles could still support their 10- and 20-ton load for timber piles. And this is a common issue with structures that are close to water, these industrial -- heavy industrial structures, pulp and paper mills that I've worked at, chemicals plants that I've worked at. They're all next to bodies of water. And this is something that we've dealt with for years and years and years, including the failure of the bulkheads along the waterfront and then, of course, the analysis of all the timber tiles and the, you know, replacement and the restoration of those piles continue keeping other plants in operation -- in an operational system, so --

But with this particular case, I just did not see enough photos or enough reports or enough investigation other than a one-page
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engineering letter with conclusions that were referencing appendixes and with another conclusion that referenced that -- because the wharf is failing on the east side of the structure, that that would potentially cause the failure of all of the structure and all of the foundation.

So -- yeah, so I -- I would, you know, require additional information to create -- be able to create a valid opinion on this because at this point I do not have enough information to agree with its current condition.

COMMISSIONER EPSTEIN: Through the Chair, I'm just kind of circling back to a section under the demolition, Section 320, that talks about an application for demolition, it must also document any effort that's been made to save the structure.

I understand that there has been many efforts put -- you know, and pretty pictures put together and the numbers never add up. Something that's sitting with me is, what has been done since this property has been owned to actually keep the structure from getting in worse shape? That's a question that I would
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have. What has been done to stop things from getting worse? And if something has been done and it's still getting worse, that's something I'd like to know about.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Through the Chair, I totally agree with that comment, Commissioner
Epstein. It's very -- there have been some comments made earlier in the meeting about taking on a historic property, and that -- that statement really rings true, right? If you're -- it's about intention, and just --

I'm not going to be long because we've been here a long time. We are here as a Historic Preservation Commission, so that's our job, number one.

I'm neither a magnate, I'm not a developer, I don't make a lot of money. I don't have a lot of people working for me, but I love historic buildings and I appreciate the community that we have here and the history that we have here, and it would be very hard for me at this point to get behind the demolition of that plant that I've been looking at since 1965 going over the bridge.

I caveat that with, sometimes demolition
Diane M. Tropia, Inc., Post Office Box 2375, Jacksonville, FL 32203 (904) 821-0300
is necessary. And I agree with Commissioner Lopera too, there's a bit more information that needs to be had, but this is a very historic structure, it is a very integral part of our history, and I just -- I don't think we can deny that.

THE CHAIRMAN: So I agree with things on both sides. I probably fall in line a little bit more with Commissioner Kasper. As he mentioned, this building, at one point, I think was worth saving, but I don't think it is there anymore. And I don't think it's the current owner's, necessarily, responsibility to -- to correct, you know, mistakes that have been made over the last 30 or 40 years rather than the last seven.

You know, they talk about saving a percentage of the building. Again, it's a very small percentage. Looking, you know, even at this Craneway model, that was a 525,000-square-foot building that is now down to 45-. So, you know, less than 10 percent. If that option was viable here, then, you know, maybe a middle ground can be found.

That's kind of where I stand on this
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project as it is.
We have a motion on the table, so we can go ahead and call for a vote.
(Discussion held off the record.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, I would.
Was there any ex-parte communication?
COMMISSION MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: No. Well, all those in favor?

COMMISSIONER KASPER: Sorry. What are we --

THE CHAIRMAN: We are voting to deny the request. So aye is to deny, nay is --

COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Not deny.
THE CHAIRMAN: Nay is not deny.
All those in favor?
COMMISSIONER LOPERA: Aye.
COMMISSIONER EPSTEIN: Aye.
COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Aye.
THE CHAIRMAN: Those opposed?
COMMISSIONER KASPER: Nay.
THE CHAIRMAN: Nay.
With that, the motion is denied, and -the application is denied.

With that, we're going to move on. That Diane M. Tropia, Inc., Post Office Box 2375, Jacksonville, FL 32203 (904) 821-0300
takes us to Section L, New Business.
We've got a park naming.
MS. KELLY: On May 10th, 2022, Ordinance 2022-0374 was introduced to propose naming a new park on land donated to the City by Relentless HD, LLC. The new park, real estate Number 108874-0200, is approximately 2.68 acres and is located along Heckscher Drive, adjacent to Nichols Creek. The proposed name for the park is Seiden Park.

Consistent with Chapter 122.105 of the Ordinance Code, the naming and renaming of public buildings, public facilities, and public parks requires a report from the Historic Preservation section and an advisory recommendation on the naming proposal from the Commission.

The report is required to address seven criteria, which are listed in the memo in your books. The proposed naming is at the request of the current owners of the parcel. And as a condition of their donating the land to the City, the name Seiden Park is in reference to the family name of the property owner who is donating land to the City. The owner's intent
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is to honor the family's name.
No historic significance appears to be tied to the site and family name and this land donation to the City would be the first for the family.

The subject site is not currently named and there does not appear to be any historical significance attached to the location. No historic structures or landmarks are located on the site, and staff is not aware of any other public facility named for any member of the Seiden family.

And that concludes the staff report.
THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Questions for staff?

COMMISSION MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: All right. We'll open the public hearing.
(Mr. Diebenow approaches the podium.)
MR. DIEBENOW: Mr. Chairman, Steve Diebenow, One Independent Drive, Suite 1200, and I'm here on behalf of the Seiden family.

The very quick background is that we originally proposed to rezone this property for a truck stop, and the council -- the district
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councilman, as well as the adjacent property owners, opposed this effort. And after months of trying to figure out how to resolve it, Mr. Seiden concluded that he would rather contribute the property to be a public park than to continue fighting with the neighbors and the district councilman.

The only reason I'm here is that we had asked that the property be named The Seiden Family Park. So inserting the word "family" was important to them.

The Parks Department at the City didn't like the use of the word "family" because they felt like it gave a connotation that it would be a family park when the park is intended to be passive in use and have a kayak launch and probably -- it's a beautiful piece of property.
It's a -- it's a bluff -- not quite a bluff, but it is a high piece of property, ten feet above the water, overlooking the creek. It has incredible views to the south and to the east.

And so we just would ask your consideration to insert the word "family" because even if the insertion of word the "family" creates confusion, which I don't
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understand how it could, of course, this public place would still be open for families.

And so that's the only reason I'm here today, is to ask that the name -- instead of it being Seiden Park, that it be called The Seiden Family Park.

And I appreciate the opportunity to answer any questions that you may have.

The district councilman, by the way, is in support of that change as well.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Questions for our applicant?

COMMISSIONER KASPER: Yeah, real quick. Through the Chair, maybe just -- I don't know if the word is "grammar."

Would it be "The Seiden Family Park" or just "Seiden Family Park"?

MR. DIEBENOW: Seiden Family Park is fine, but that's a great question. Just the insertion of the world "family" is of interest to the family.

COMMISSIONER KASPER: All right. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any other questions for our applicant?
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COMMISSION MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: All right. We'll call you if we need you.

MR. DIEBENOW: Okay. Thank you.
THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
Is anybody else here to speak on this?
AUDIENCE MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Seeing none, we'll close the public hearing.

And I entertain a motion on this, yes?
COMMISSIONER LOPERA: So through the Chair, the application is for a proposed name of Seiden Park, but the applicant, is he modifying that?

MS. KELLY: So through the Chair, here's how I understand this. You-all present an advisory recommendation to the City Council. This is an ordinance, so it will be -- the name will be decided on by the City Council. And because this name is already written into the legislation -- there are enough lawyers here that could, you know, comment on this, but I'm guessing that as long as your advisory recommendation is basically, like, we think it's fine or we're opposed to both or something
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1 to that effect, then that at least frees
2 council up to potentially alter the name 3 change.

Does that sound -- to the lawyers, does that sound like how that could work? We don't know?

So that's a -- that's kind of what I'm thinking. Parks couldn't be here, obviously, because it's extremely late at this point, but there -- it was as Steve said. Because this is passive recreation, they don't usually throw "family" in unless it's like a playground and stuff like that.

It might help if it's "The" Seiden Family Park. But at any rate, that was Parks feeling about it and it just didn't want it to have a different connotation.

But in terms of your role in exploring the Seiden name and the site and all of that, I think whatever you want to decide. And I would fill it in on the memo to council in terms of what your recommendation is.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.
COMMISSIONER LOPERA: I'm okay with either.
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THE CHAIRMAN: So somebody make a motion.
COMMISSIONER LOPERA: I'm going to motion
that either name would be acceptable. This is for park naming 2022-0374, to a proposed name of either Seiden Park or Seiden Family Park or The Seiden Family Park.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Second.
THE CHAIRMAN: Any discussion?
COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Through the Chair,
I think the suggestion that "the" be added
in front of it is a good one because it's
insinuating that there's kind of a code to the naming of parks. And if you say "family," it means playground or something. So I think that's a good signifier that goes with the recommendation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Fair enough.
All those in favor?
COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.
THE CHAIRMAN: Those opposed?
COMMISSION MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Hearing none, we'll move on.

Letter of recommendation for the Division
of Historical Resources, small matching grants.
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MS. KELLY: Okay. The Historic
Preservation section would like to request a letter of support from the Commission for a small matching grant application to the Florida Division of Historical Resources. The grant would be used to update the historic resources survey for Springfield, including some of the post-war structures that are now eligible for consideration having attained 50 years of age.

A draft of the proposed support letter is included in your book for review. I could read it if you like. It's up to you. I'm happy to do so. And that's that.

And Commissioner Montoya would like to speak as well.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Do I have to claim ex parte or anything for this? No?

MS. GRANDIN: It's not a quasi-judicial issue.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Okay. Through the Chair, I am looking out for me, you know, so ...

MS. GRANDIN: You would have the conflict on the vote, I guess.

THE CHAIRMAN: So what I do need to do Diane M. Tropia, Inc., Post Office Box 2375, Jacksonville, FL 32203 (904) 821-0300
here?
COMMISSIONER KASPER: I make a motion to approve this letter of recommendation for the FDHR grant.

MS. KELLY: And if you'd like, it is included in your book, so I can read it if you want.

COMMISSIONER LOPERA: I second that motion.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Am I allowed -should I talk about it a little bit just to state some things about it or should I just be quiet?

MS. GRANDIN: So I'm just trying to figure out if you have a conflict, a voting conflict or not.

MS. KELLY: (Off microphone.)
MS. GRANDIN: Oh, okay. So you probably do have a voting conflict. You can't vote, but you can talk about it.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Through the Chair, I will abstain from voting.

As an instructor at the University of Florida, I introduced the historic preservation group to the JHPC to help get this rolling
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1 because I saw opportunities for students and 2 faculty to work with our staff and the Historic 3 Preservation Commission.
4 THE CHAIRMAN: Great.

Diane M. Tropia, Inc., Post Office Box 2375, Jacksonville, FL 32203 (904) 821-0300
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Diane M. Tropia, Inc., Post Office Box 2375, Jacksonville, FL 32203 (904) 821-0300



| 110:9, 122:8 | 207:4 | 115:14, 121:13, | 149:3 | Atlanta [1] - 162:20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| appeared [2]-14:21, | applied [1] - 109:14 | 129:4, 138:7, 142:5, | argue [2]-24:9, | attached $[8]$ - 12:20, |
| 133:6 | apply (1] - 88 | 143:11, 143:22, | 169:25 | 103: |
| appearing [1] - 20:21 | applying [1]-52:21 | 144:13, 191:1, | argument [1]-53:16 | 105:1 |
| appendix [1] - 151:20 | appreci | 19 | ARIMUS [1] - 1:18 | 6:2, 106:5, 201:8 |
| appendixes [1] - | 50:15, 57:23, 58:18, | approved [31] - 3:20 | art [1] - 147:2 | attained [1] - 207:9 |
| 196:2 | 63:1, 88:25, 92:16 | $4: 24,9: 3,12: 13$ | article [2] - 189:15 | attempt [1] - 180:16 |
| applicant [79]-8:5, | 101:3, 153:14 | :14, 29:13, 35:23, | 89:19 | attend [1]-8:10 |
| 8:9, 8:10, 12:22, | 1:18, 190:6 | 1, 38:10, 44:9, | artisans [1]-172:2 | attendance [1] - 141:6 |
| 14:10, 17:9, 23:3, | 192:21, 197:19 | $44: 19,52: 11,61: 6$ | $\text { asbestos }[16]-18: 14,$ | attention [2]-42:14, |
| 25:1, 28:21, 30:5, | $203: 7$ | 63:17, 65:3, 77:8, | 64:23, 65:6, 65:21, | 184:7 |
| 30:19, 31:1, 31:10, $33: 15.35: 17.39: 1$ | approach [2] - 164:13, <br> 169:12 | $\begin{aligned} & : 15,9 \\ & 4: 14 . \end{aligned}$ | 67:13, 68:1, 132:25, | attracting [1] - 189:1 |
| 41:6, 43:9, 48:10, | approache | 34:20, 105:4 | $3: 12,133: 1$ | att |
| 48:20, 50:17, 50:19, | 15:9, 31:13, 41:9 | 110:6, 111:23 | 5:16, 136:4, | $8: 6,8: 13,11: 23$ |
| 53:5, 56:3, 56:25, | 48:15, 57:8, 70:13 | 2:13, 132:20 | 138:20, 138:22, | 14:12, 15:11, 15:14, |
| 63:22, 64:20, 66:7, | 73:17, 86:4, 94:25, | 33:8, 133:19, | 138:25 | 20:11, 31:11, 31:16, |
| 67:4, 67:20, 69:5, | 100:12, 101:12, | 137:6, 145: | Ashley [11] - 44:21, | 34:4, 41:7, 41:12, |
| 69:8, 71:25, 73:1, | 107:9, 115:22 | approves [3]-42:11 | 44:24, 45:21, 46:5, | 43:17, 57:6, 57:11, |
| 78:1, 78:12, 79:8, | 122:25, 127:20, | 45:6, 58: | :9, 46:14, 46:22, | 58:24, 62:12, 62:14, |
| 79:22, 79:25, 85:2, | 134:13, 152:11, | approving [5] - 35:15 | 47:4, 49:17, 59:4, | 62:17, 62:21, |
| 91:18, 91:20, 92:6, | 156:10, 174:20, | 35:16, 82:4, 90:6, | 61:6 | 63:6, 70:16, 73:11, |
| 93:25, 94:22, 96:6, | 176:17, 181:21 | 191:7 | aside [ 1 ] - 164:12 | 7:17, 94:23, 95:3, |
| 96:22, 99:10, 100:1, | 183:7, 186:21, | April [3]-47:24, | aspect [2] - 96:8, | 97:4, 102:19, |
| $100: 9,101: 5,104: 4$ | 187:25, 201:19 | $\text { 121:17, } 194: 19$ | $115: 3$ | 107:12, 113:12, |
| 107:8, 111:11, | appropriate [9] | archaeological [1] | aspects [1] - 185:1 | 2:23, 123:3 |
| 113:5, 120:14, | 49:19, 51:4, 54:21 | 48:6 | asphalt [5] - 13:2 | 27:14, 128:25, |
| 121:24, 122 | 66:13, 66:19, 9 | arched [2] - 11:7, 11:8 | 13:22, 18:19, 25:24, | 134:16, 137:17, |
| 122:22, 124:14, | 111:9, 134:3, 150:6 | archeological [1] - | 104:19 | 52:12, 174:23, |
| 125:14, 125:18, | Appropriateness [4] - | 73:2 | assembled [1] - 49:3 | 76:18, 181:22 |
| 126:24, 129:24, | 12:15, 92:19, 98:13, | architect [10]-11:12, | assembling [2] - | 183:8, 186:19, |
| 133:22, 136:10, | 119:23 | $150: 11,151: 1$ | 161:20, 162: | 186:22, 187:23, |
| 137:10, 137:22 | Approval [7]-19:18 | :23, 160:8 | assembly [9] - 145:13, | 188:1, 190:22, 204:7 |
| 140:12, 146 | 20:1, 24:15, | 77:23, 184:21, | 7:16, 148:16, | audience [1] - 177:11 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 149: 6,149: 1 \\ & 149: 22,150 \end{aligned}$ | 28:6, 28:24, | $186: 2,189: 24,190: 3$ | 8, 166:18, | Audience [16] - 15:9, |
| 151:14, 152:9, | approval [27] - 7:23 11:14, 20:5, 29:21 | 164:19 | $\begin{aligned} & 77: 4,177: 15 \\ & 78: 17,182: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 31:13, 41:9, 57:8, } \\ & \text { 0:13, 94:25, 107:9, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 203:12, 203:25, | 34:11, 34:13, 34:16, | architects [1] - 145:19 | Assembly [1] - 162:21 | 22:25, 134:13, |
| 204:13 | 39:24, 40:16, 54:3, | architectural [20] - | assess [4] - 68:17 | 152:11, 174:20 |
| applicant's [3] - $29: 24,105: 4,118: 8$ | 54:22, 54:23, 54:24, $55: 13,63: 24,70: 1$ | $11: 6,11: 10,12: 23$ $\text { 13:8. 48:6. } 49: 14 .$ | 98:25, 121:19, | 176:17, 181:21, $183: 7.186: 21$ |
| application (44) - | $80: 21,80: 22,85: 23$ | 13:8, 48:6, 49:14, 54:3, 56:14, 56:16 | 122:12 | 183:7, 186:21, 187:25 |
| 12:17, 27:24, 29:20, | 80:21, 80:22, 85:23 | $: 16,106: 10$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { assessed }[3]-93: 18 \\ & 99: 2,106: 8 \end{aligned}$ | 187:25 August [1] - 98:24 |
| 45:7, 45:8, 45:14 | 112:15, 122:16 | $1: 6,151: 8$ | asset [1] - 154:7 | Augustine [2] - 70:17, |
| 47:22, 59:10, 63:21, | 133:11, 140:18 | 9:23, 173:24 | assisted [1] - 136:3 | 183:11 |
| 63:24, 81:5, 81:16, | 160:2, 180:12 | :17, 178:10, | associated [2] - 6:6, | Authority [3] - 54:8 |
|  | approvals [2] - 55:12, | 184:1, 184:13, $192: 2$ | 46:10 | 55:2, 55:16 |
| , | 105:7 | architecturally [4] - | Associates [1] - | authority [1] - 64:25 |
| 90:3, 92:22, 98:15, | approve [44]-3:11 | 8:21, 148:9, | 166:16 | authorized [1] - 210:8 |
|  |  | :1 | association [1] - | authors [1] - 184:25 |
| 108:25, 119:15 | :20, 27:25, 28:12, | architecture [5] - | 184:23 | $\text { auto }[3]-177: 18 \text {, }$ |
| 119:16, 120:1, |  | $148: 7,189: 11,190: 7$ | associations [1] - | 184:15, 184:20 |
| 125:5, 132:23, | 44:11, 45:17, | Architecture [1] | 185: | automobiles [3]- |
| 138:4, 141:2, | 59:13, 59:23, 63:9, | 48:25 | $8$ | 147:24 |
| 141:23, 145:11, | 67:20, 78:23, 79:17, | area $[9]-9: 12,51: 24$, | $175: 19,192: 13$ | available [8]-52:3, |
| 151:24, 181:12, | 5, 80:21, 82:9, | 114:3, 118:2 | assumptions [1] | 100:19, 172:1, |
| 181:17, 182:21, | 1, 85:22, 86:10, | 150:24, 165:21 | $160: 1$ | 172:5, 179:14, |
| 193:22, 196:16, $199 \cdot 24,204: 12$ | 87:7, 90:9, 91:16, | 165:22, 179:2, 179:7 | assurance [1]-55:21 | 186:1, 186:13, |
| 199:24, 204:12, | 97:9, 102:22, | areas [2]-124:4, | at-risk [1] - 95:24 | 193:15 |




| charged [1] - 181:4 <br> charges [1] - 176:12 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 102:6, 102:11, } \\ & \text { 118:23, 129:10 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { COA-22-27134 [1]- } \\ & 3: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 122:15, 134:5, } \\ & \text { 146:18, 206:12 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 57:1, 61:2, 61:4, } \\ & \text { 62:7, 63:13, 63:15, } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Charlotte \{5] - 172:12, | Class [4]-158:22, | COA-22-27163 [6] - | codes [1] - 19:18 | 13, |
| 172:13, 172:16, | 160:5, 163:17 | 29:19, 29:20, 34:8, | coffers [1]-173:11 | 94:19, 96:23, 98:2, |
| 172:22, 172:24 | class [2]-9:19, | 36:10, 36:12, 38:10 | collapse [3] - 146:12, | :4, 100:6, 101:6 |
| charred [2] - 99:7 | 173:18 | COA-22-27195 [1] | 173:6, 178:23 | 103:2, 103:5, 103:7, |
| 7:9 | classic [1] - 108:20 | :2 | collapsed [3] - 99:8, | 107:5, 113:6, |
| check [5] - 80:2 | classification [1] - | COA-22-27196 [1] - | 164:5, 194:6 | :19, 132:11, |
| 81:22, 82:21, 160:6 | 148:24 | 3:25 | collap | 15, |
| chemicals [1] - 195:13 | clean [1]-156:3 | COA-22-27202 [1] | 0:20, 158:4 | 134:10, 136:11, |
| cherry [1] - 166:5 | clear [10]-55:16 | 4:1 | 8:7, 161:11 | 136:21, 145:4, |
| cherry-picking [1] | 69:20, 78:6, 80:11, | COA-22-27203 [1] - | $174: 10,192: 14$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 145:6, 152:7, 199:7, } \\ & \text { 201:16, 204:1, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 166:5 | 93:5, 103:21, 127:1, | 4:2 | collar [1] - 174:12 |  |
| Chicago (1) - 190:6 | 155:21, 167:2, 186:3 | COA-22-27216 [1]- | colleague [1]-153:15 | 206:19, 206:21, |
| Chicagoan [1] - | clearer [1]-21:13 | 4:3 | Collins [1] - 15:14 | 209:7, 209:11 |
| 189:25 | clearly [6] - 15:3, | COA-22-27229 [1] - | colloquialism [1] - | Commission [27]- |
| children [1]-93:10 | 17:15, 30:24, 40:21, |  | 84:3 | $14: 25,17: 7,35: 2$ |
| chime [2]-59: <br> chip [1]-56:8 | clients [1] - 178:7 | 12:16, 12:17, 20:15 | $\begin{gathered} \text { color [2] } \\ 16: 18 \end{gathered}$ | 45:5, 45:6, 45:8, |
| choice [2] - 16:15, | clinic [1] - 98:21 | 28:11, 28:12, 28:19, | column [1] - 66:13 | 45:12, 46:23, 86:6, |
| 76:3 | close $[20]-4: 14,8: 14$, | 29:13 | columns [4] - 66:2, | 109:1, 111:9, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { choices [2] - 16:18, } \\ & 19: 17 \end{aligned}$ | 11:24, 20:12, 34:5, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { COA-22-27262 [1] - } \\ & 4: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $66: 5,124: 7,126: 16$ | 128:5, 141:23, |
| choose | 73:12, 77:18, 88:9, | C | $162: 24$ | 143:20, 183:9, |
| 37:11 | 97:5, 102:20 | 92:20, 92:22, 97:10, | combining [1] - | 188:23, 197:14, |
| Christopher [2] - | 113:13, 127:16, | 98:6 | 148:18 | 200:17, 207:3, 209:3 |
| 123:3, 123:5 | 129:1, 137:19, | COA-22-27293 [1] - | coming [12]-50:2 | $45: 14$ |
| cinder [1] - 129:19 |  | 61:24 | 4:1, 76:2, 85:19, | COMMISSIONER [231] |
| circling [1] - 196:14 | 204:8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { COA-22-27310[1] - } \\ & 61: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $88: 18,154: 10$ | - 2:15, 2:17, 2:20, |
| circumstance [1] - | cl |  | 35:8 | 2:22, 3:11, 3:14, |
|  | $79: 12,79: 13$ | $\text { 98:14, } 98: 15$ | $183: 5,194: 3$ | 4:16, 4:18, 8:16, |
| 173:11 | closest [2] - 147:4 | 102:23, 103:9 | commencing [1] - 1:7 | 8:19, 12:1, 12:5, |
| citrus [1]-184:18 | 147:10 | $\text { COA-22-27330 }[1] \text { - }$ | comment [3]-108:5, | $17: 11,18: 4,18: 7$ |
| $\text { city }[6]-6: 19,48: 7$ | COA [44] - 16:16, | 62:1 | 197:6, 204:22 | 18:10, 18:13, 18:16, |
| 102:8, 154:23, |  | 103:11, 103:12 | comments [14] - 4: | 18:18, 18:21, 19:5, |
| 162:9, 188:16 | $: 12,27: 14,27: 18$ | $\text { 113:16, } 119: 1$ | 60:19, 62:6, 97:24 | 19:9, 19:24, 20:8, |
| City [29] - 5:20, 37:2, | $: 18,32: 22,32: 24$ |  |  | 20:14, 20:16, 20:18, |
| 45:10, 45:16, 54:13, | :3, 39:11, 40:6 | 119:25, 120:1, | $\begin{aligned} & 3: 1,108: 1 \\ & 3: 18,115: 1 \end{aligned}$ | 21:15, 22:11, 22:18, |
| 54:20, 55:8, 55:24, | 40:12, 40:18, 42:10, | $129: 4,132: 20$ | $117: 1,130: 24,197: 8$ | 22:21, 22:25, 24:6, |
| 154:16, 154:25, | $59: 19,73: 10,75: 5$ |  |  | 24:25, 25:15, 26:8, |
| 155:10, 159:22, | $7: 3,99: 12$ | COA-22-27434 [1] 62:2 | Commerce [1] - 165:20 | 26:24, 28:9, 28:17, |
| 162:14, 165:25, | $2: 18,104: 9$ |  |  | 28:23, 28:25, 29:3, |
| 173:11, 173:16, | 4:14. 105:7 |  | $5 \cdot 19 \quad 6 \cdot 2 \quad 7 \cdot 1 \quad 7 \cdot 1$ | 33:20, 33:22, 34:1, |
| 181:2, 181:3, | :17, 113:11 | 119:19, 145:10 <br> 145:11, 191:2 | 19, 6:2, 7:1, 7:1 | $4: 7,34: 9,34: 22,$ |
| 181:12, 181:13 <br> 187:10, 200:5 | 117:17, 119:24, | COA-22-27485,1242 | $44: 25,47: 5,149: 25$ | 35:1, 35:9, 35:12, |
| $187: 10,200: 5$, $200: 23,200: 25$ | 127:13, 128:8, | $[1]-62: 3$ | commission [4] - | 35:22, 36:5, 36:9, |
| 200:23, 200:25, | 128:24, 137:3, | [1] - $62: 3$ | commission [4] $90 \cdot 12$ 91:19 | 36:11, 37:8, 37:16, |
| 201:4, 202:12, | 137:16, 139:23, | COA-22-27490 [4] | 90:12, 91:19, | 37:19, 37:22, 37:24, |
| 204:17, 204:19 | 7:16, 139:23, | 132:21, 132:23, |  | 38:1, 40:3, 43:20, |
| $\operatorname{CITY}_{[1]-1: 1}$ | 4:19, 176:16 | 144:13, 145:8 | COMMISSION [66] - | 43:22, 43:24, 44:3, |
| $\text { city's }[1]-151: 7$ |  | COAs [4] - 54:17, | $1: 3,3: 16,3: 18,4: 8$ | 44:11, 44:13, 50:18, |
| civil [1] - 151:22 |  | 62:11, 63:5, 137:5 | 4:20, 4:22, 8:2, 8:22, | $52: 10,52: 13,53: 3$ |
| clad [7] - 69:20, 72:13, | COA-21-26669 [1] - $133: 7$ | Coast [2] - 155:13, | 8:24, 9:1, 11:18, | 53:6, 53:14, 56:4, |
| 79:2, 79:9, 87:22, |  | 156:2 |  | 59:3, 59:5, 59:7, |
| 91:22 | $63: 20,63: 21,91$ | Code [3] - 104:4 169:17 200:12 | 29:7, 29:9, 29:11. | 60:6, 60:11, 60:18, |
| claim [1]-207:16 | 92:15 |  |  | 63:9, 63:11, 70:9, |
| clarification [1] - | COA-22-27035 [1]- | code [11]-20:5, 22:1, |  | 72:1, 72:8, 72:12, |
| 36:21 | COA-22-27035 [1] - 5:2 | 69:4, 98:25, 106:4, |  | 72:19, 73:14, 77:20, |
| clarify [5] - 71:11, | 5:2 | 106:25, 120:25, | 44:15, 44:17, 48:12, | 78:3, 78:5, 78:21, |


(904) 821-0300


| department [ 11 - 152:2 | 130:4 | 201:19, 201:21 | 45:4, 47:21, 49:7, | 194:25, 196:23, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Department [21] - | designing [1] - 149:12 | DIEBENOW [3] - | 59:21, 64:17, 66:18, | 197:1, 197:2 |
| 5:14, 6:16, 9:8, | desire [1] - 178:9 | 201:20, 203:18, | 7, 74:24, 85:11, | Donn [1]-177:23 |
| 13:25, 30:17, 48:1, | destination [1]-179:5 | 204:4 | 86:19, 99:15, 102:8, | door [18) - 7:8, 32:15, |
| 69:14, 70:1, 70:4, | destroyed $[1]$-5:24 | dies [1] - 34:17 | 106:13, 133:3 | 33:8, 64:8, 64:22 |
| 94:15, 99:24, 107:1, | destroying [1] - 75:13 | difference [5] - 39:18, | 148:13, 148:15, | 66:6, 66:23, 66:25 |
| 121:12, 122:16, 134:6, 150:23, | detached $[2]-13: 7$, 30:22 | $\begin{aligned} & 42: 21,42: 24,43: 4, \\ & 86: 21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 162:11, 162:12, } \\ & \text { 162:13, 171:19, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 67:1, 67:5, 67:6, } \\ & \text { 67:7, 67:9, 80:1, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 134:6, 150:23, } \\ & \text { 151:11, 153:6, } \end{aligned}$ | 30:22 <br> detailing $[2]-47$ | 86:21 <br> different [26] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 162:13, 171:19, } \\ & \text { 171:20, 171:22, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 67:7, 67:9, 80:1, } \\ & \text { 80:2, 115:4, 117:20 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 154:12, 154:17 | :6 | 15:18, 16:9, 17:1 | 20, 173:2 | doors [2]-103:25, |
| 202:12 | details [4]-48:9, 82:3, | 16, 23:8, 28:1 | 25, 202:7, 203 | 105:13 |
| Dependent/ Industrial [1]-150:2 | 89:1, 108:3 | $\begin{aligned} & 40: 9,42: 6,81: 20, \\ & 82: 2,83: 14,85: 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { District }[3]-45: 2, \\ 98: 19,165: 5 \end{gathered}$ | doorway [1]-82:22 <br> double [3] - 7:8, |
| Dependent/Water [1] | d | 7:11, 89:9, 116:23, | district's [2]-105:16, | 69:19, 89:6 |
| 148:23 | deteriorated | 7:24 | 108:13 | double-hung [3] - 7:8, |
| depression [1]- | 14, 192:10 | 退:12, 131:14 | districts [2]-74:22, | 69:19, 89:6 |
| 182:12 | deteriorating [1] - | 2:17 | 141:6 | doubt [1]-21:10 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Dept [3] - 1:17, 1:18, } \\ & 1: 19 \end{aligned}$ | 192:18 deterioration [2] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 157:21, 189:24, } \\ & \text { 191:22, 205:17 } \end{aligned}$ | Division $[2]-206: 24$, 207:5 | down [23] - 5:9, 35:8, 53:15, 58:7, 56:9, |
| depth [3] - 72:23 |  | difficult [5] - 22:9 | DNA [1] - 116:2 | 7, 58:17, 77:2 |
| 89:6, 89:8 | determine [3] -7:16, | 1,60:8 | doable $[2]$ - 160: | 2, 110:21, |
| design [43]-10:10, | 13:20, 14:6 | diffic | dock [3]-149:17, | 11:24, 115:6, |
| 13:10, 13:16, 13:24, | determines [1] - 142:8 | difficulty [2]-171:23, | 63:13, 163 | 25, 118:8, |
| 26:4, 30:16, 42:3, | Detroit [2]-190:1, | 173:4 | docket [] - 5:2, 5:10, | 47:5, 158:11, |
| 65:3, 65:6, 65:9, | 190:3 | dimension [1] - 72:22 | 38:12, 92:20, | :20, 161:11, |
| 66:10, 66:19, 67:2, | develop [2] - 155:20, | direction [5] - 17:18, | 119:18, 145:10 | 61:16, 172:18, |
| 67:9, 68:25, 69:3, | :8 | 108:18, 112 | document [5] - 47:25, | :16, 190:8 |
| 69:10, 69:12, 80:8, | develop | 144:5, 168:8 | 49:12, 125:11, | 198:21 |
| 87:15, 87:23, 93:24, | 155:23 | directly [2] -6:5 | 151:6, 196:1 | Downtown [6] - 49:1, |
| 94:5, 94:7, 94:12, | developer [1] - 197:17 | 146:7 | documentary [2] - | 54:2, 54:8, 54:9, |
| 105:16, 120:19, | developing $\left.{ }^{1} 1\right]$ - 155:2 | Director [1]-165:4 <br> director $[6]-9 \cdot 25$ | 159:10, 159:24 | 55:1, 55:15 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 120:25, 121:11, } \\ & \text { 121:22, 122:7, } \end{aligned}$ | Development ${ }_{[8]}$ 1:17, 1:17, 1:18, | $\begin{array}{r} \text { director }[6]-9: 25, \\ 10: 7,84: 6,85: 17 \end{array}$ | documentation [8]65:23, 68:16, | downtown [2] - 45:2, 166:12 |
| 122:14, 134:1, |  | 5:21, 154:16 | :14, 160:1 | dozen [1] - 163:3 |
| 147:19, 147:21 | 99:17, 188:2 | directories [1]-5:20 | 5:22, 191:2 | DPRP [1] - 54:13 |
| 148:4, 171:25, | development 71 | dirt [1] - 32:18 | 192:3, 193:11 | draft ${ }_{11}$ - 207:10 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 178:7, 191:23, } \\ & \text { 192:3, 192:23 } \end{aligned}$ | 106:12, 150:16, | $\begin{gathered} \text { discuss [7] - 33:3, } \\ 34: 23,85: 21, \end{gathered}$ | documented [3] 87:16, 146:9, 185:22 | dramatic [2] - 42:20, 43:4 |
| design/build [1] | 154:12, | 19, 150:1: | documents [1] - | dramatically [1]-42:5 |
| 154:24 | $8: 2$ | 153:1, 153:5 | 76:1 | awing [3] - 40:13, |
| designated [6] - 46:7, | develo | discussion [8] | dog [1]-24:1 | 81:25, 111:4 |
| 59:21, 145:13, | 154:14 | 18, 132:10 | dog-ear [1]-24:1 | drawings $[8]$ - 40:5, |
| 148:15, 170:4, | deviation (4)-104:5, | 16, 144:18 | dollars (1) - 160:2 | 91:19, 172:9, |
| 170:15 | 109:8, 109:14, 115:2 | 58:7, 170:4, 194:1, | donated [1] - 200:5 | 34:13, 186:14, |
| designation [16] - | Devin [2]-41:12, | 206:8 | donating [2]-200:22, | 192:2, $192: 4$ |
| 5:13, 6:17, 9:3, 9:7, | 41:14 | Discussion [1] - 199:4 | 200:25 | drawn [1] - 115:14 |
| 11:22, 12:4, 45:19, | diagonal [1]-139:5 | discussions [1]-59:8 | donation (1)-201:4 | drew [1] - 36:24 |
| 46:21, 46:25, 47:18, | diagram [1]-40:19 | display [1]-159:11 | done [37] - 5:5, 5:7, | Drive [5] - 48:19, |
| 48:3, 60:23, 145:15, 145:16, 148:23, | diamond [18]-17:19, | Displays [1] - 17:1 | 33:1, 54:5, 54:18, | 100:16, 181:23, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 145:16 } \\ & \text { 155:4 } \end{aligned}$ | 17:22, 18:10, 19:12, | disrepair [2]-178:18, 193:1 | 8, 60:14, | 200:8, 201:21 |
| designations [1] | 13, 21:18, 21:20, | distance $[1]$ - 110:1 | $\begin{aligned} & 63: 25,73: 25,74 \\ & 74: 16,76: 4,76: \end{aligned}$ | drive [2] - 172:23, 172:24 |
| 149:7 | 24:5, 25:12, 25:13, | distill [1] - 77:23 | 77:6, 79:6, 81:18 | drives [1] - 22:1 |
| Designations [1]5:10 | $: 16,27: 11,28: 3$ | distinguish [1] - 56:14 | 83:2, 85:20, 85:25, 88:3, 91:13, 109:18 | riveway [17) - |
| designed [10] - 10:21, | :12, 28:21 | distinguished [1] | 88:3, 91:13, 109:18, 120:5, 140:23, | $30: 10$ 30:21 $32 \cdot 1$ |
| 103:22, 109:6, | 28:12, 28:21 | di | 0:24, 163:9, | $\begin{aligned} & 30: 10,30: 21, \\ & 32: 10,33: 9,3 \end{aligned}$ |
| 124:3, 145:19, | Diane [3]-1:9, 210:7, | 46:6, 149:1 | 8:12, 176:3 | 35:4, 35:7, |
| 145:23, 147:24, | 210:19 | district [32] - 30: | 7:3, 179:21, | 35:16, 36:14, 36:16, |
| 189:22, 189:23, | Diebenow [2] - | 30:11, 30:12, 38:3, | 189:17, 194:21, | 116:8 |







| 81:25, 82:3, 84:11, | 46:7, 46:25, 201:9 | 61:13, 80:20, 82:19, | LLC [1] - 200:6 | 163:2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 85:1, 85:18, 86:1, | landscape [4]-37:2, | 85:24, 110:9, | Llorens [1]-153:25 | looking [20]-25:19, |
| 88:9, 91:4, 95:20, | 37:7, 37:10, 37:12 | 110:11, 116:25 | LM-03-09[1]-145:14 | 25:22, 49:4, 49:20, |
| 102:10, 110:2, | landscaped (1) 36:17 | 155:24, 172:17 | LM-22-04 [3] - 5:11, | 51:23, 53:17, 54:8, |
| 116:17, 117:4, | landscaping [1]-38:4 | leave [3]-75:17, |  | 56:17, 96:2, 112:10, |
| 139:3, 143:12, | language [2]-22:4, | 82:15, 180:22 | 9:6, 12:2, 12:13 | 22, 114:12, |
| 143:23, 148:17, | 59:10 | ledge [1] - 47:6 | load (2) - 7:18, 195:9 | 8:12, 193:17, |
| 161:3, 169:4, 172:7. | lap [7]-104:1, 105:18, | left ( 7 - $6: 13,32: 6$, | load-bearing [1] - | 7:23, 198:19, |
| 186:12, 196:14, | 108:16, 110:13, | 37:12, 40:24, 53:22, | 7:18 | 207:21 |
| 198:25, 205:7, | 112:4, 144:15 | 60:10 | loaded [1] - 147:22 | looks [9]-14:23, |
| 206:12 | large [8]-30:23, | left-hand [1] - 37:12 | loading [1] - 103:17 | 23:11, 23:24, 25:21, |
| kinds [1] - 40:9 | 93:12, 149:15, | legal [1]-24:16 | lobbying [ ${ }^{1}$ ] - 153:17 | 131:10, 167:14, |
| King [1] - 165:10 | 154:1, 154:5, 155:7, | legally [1] - 142:23 | local [12]-5:12, 7:24, | 179:12, 194:14, |
| kitchen (1)-51:23 | 191:15 | legion [ 1 ]-188:14 | 9:6, 11:15, 46:7, | 194:16 |
| kitchen-type [1] - | Large [1]-1:10 | legislation [2] - | 47:18, 48:2, 49:1, | loose [1] - 124:25 |
| 51:23 | large-building- | 162:13, 204:21 | 93:10, 149:18, | Lopera (4)-2:20, |
| knee [2] - 36:19, 37:9 | footprint [1] - 149:15 | length [1]-47:7 | 169:16, 184:3 | 78:24, 117:7, 198:2 |
| knock [1]-119:21 | larger [3] - 40:6, | lengthening [1]-66:4 | locally [3] -59:21, | LOPERA [91]-1:13, |
| knocking [1]-58:16 | 45:24, 106:1 | Leo [1]-6:10 | 145:13, 148:14 | 2:20, 3:11, 4:16, |
| knowledge [1]-171:5 | largest [2]-146:3, | less [3]-115:10, | locate (1]-167:22 | 16, 12:1, 14:3, |
| known [3]-10:9, | 154:2 | 191:18, 198:22 | located [12]-9:11, | 14:13, 19:5, 20:14, |
| 189:10, 190:2 | last [19]-18:2, 19:1, | letter (8) - 124:19, | 30:2, 44:24, 103:15, | :18, 24:25, 28:9, |
| knows [1]-171:7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 28:18, 95:20, 108:7, } \\ & \text { 108:14, 109:16, } \end{aligned}$ | 125:6, 160:9, 196:1, | 103:20, 105:12, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 28:17, 28:25, 34:7, } \\ & \text { 35:9, 35:22. 36:5, } \end{aligned}$ |
| L | 10 | 207:10, | 121:2, 148:14, | \%9, 37:24, 38: |
|  | 148:16, 172:7, | letters (3) - 150:10, | 200:8, 201:9 | :20, 43:24, 44:3, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { labor }[2]-160: 23, \\ & 163: 21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 172:20, 179:18, } \\ & \text { 182:9, 184:3, } \end{aligned}$ | 150:13, 186:2 <br> letting [2] - 56:5 | location [6] - 10:25, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 44:11, 59:3, 60:18, } \\ & \text { 63:9, 70:9, 72:1, } \end{aligned}$ |
| lack [3] - 7:10, 34:18, | 185:24, 193:6, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { letting }[2] \\ & 74: 17 \end{aligned}$ | 55:21, 120:15, | 72:8, 72:12, 73:14, |
| 85:15 | 198:15, 198:16 | level [1] - 56:23 | 201:8 | 78:25, 80:12, 82:6, |
| laid (1] - 51:3 | late [3]-6:12, 141:11, | Liberty [4]-38:14, | locations [1] - 120:18 | 82:11, 85:6, 90:8, |
| land [14]-147:11, | 205:9 | 38:24, 38:25, 61:24 | Lockett [1] - 165:6 | 90:17, 91:5, 91:15, |
| 148:22, 149:4, | lattice [6] - 65:2, | library [1] - 166:1 | Lockett-Felder [ 1 ]-1 | 92:5, 96:7, 96:12, |
| 154:12, 154:14, 155:4, 162:6, | 65:16, 66:16, 66:20, 100:3, 121:9 | licensed [1]-10:7 | 165:6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 96:16, 96:20, 97:11, } \\ & 97: 23,102: 22, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 155:4, 162:6, } \\ & \text { 167:18, 174:10, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 120:3, 121:9 } \\ & \text { launch }[1]-202: 16 \end{aligned}$ | lies $(1)$ - 149:1 <br> lieu [1] - 138:20 | Lofts [1] - 162:21 <br> Logan [1]-177:23 | 111:12, 111:16, |
| 200:5, 200:22, | $\text { laundry }[1] \text { - 165:15 }$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lieu }[1]-138: 2 \\ & \text { light }[1]-109: \end{aligned}$ | logistics [1] - 149: | 111:20, 114:4, |
| 200:25, 201:3 | Laura [3]-3:24, 3:25, | likely [3] - 86:14, | long-vacant [1] - | 117:22, 119:11, |
| Land [1] - 169:17 | 152:13 | $147: 13,173: 7$ | 177:18 | 25:4, 125:8, |
| landing [1]-120:15 | lavatories [ 1 ] - 161:7 | limit [1]-91:2 | longevity [2] - 18:23, | 125:12, 126:25, |
| landmark [26] - 5:13, | lavatory [1] - 161:2 | line $[8]$ - 40:20, 40:22, | 21:22 | 127:6, 127:9, 129:6, 130:7, 130:14, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6:17, 7:24, 8:12, 9:7, } \\ & \text { 11:15, 12:3, 45:15, } \end{aligned}$ | Lavilla [5] - $6: 7,9: 12$, 9:13, 9:17, 9:21 | 105:25, 108:12, | look [40] - 14:18, 21:1, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 130:7, 130:14, } \\ & \text { 130:18, 130:23, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 45:18, 46:21, 47:1, | ${ }_{\text {La }}^{9}$ |  |  | 7:21, 138:1, |
| 48:3, 49:15, 54:10, | $9: 25,10: 6,10: 22$ | lines | :24, 26:1, 26:15, | 8:9, 138:24, |
| 56:7, 60:23, 145:13, | lawyer [2]-82:25, | lingo (1) - 193:12 | $6: 18,50: 4,58: 8 \text {, }$ | 139:4, 139:10, |
| 146:12, 149:8, | 83:16 | lining $[1]$ - 113:23 | $62: 19,72: 14,72: 16,$ | 1:21, 142:11, |
| 159:11, 170:4, | lawyers [2]-204:21, | list [3]-165:15, | 72:17, 73:23, 74:20, | 12:22, 144:2, |
| 170:8, 170:10, | 205:4 | 182:17, 182:18 | 77:7, 85:7, 87:1, | 8, 144:11, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 170:16, 172:19, } \\ & \text { 173:25 } \end{aligned}$ | lead [1]-82:11 | listed $[4]-29: 22$, | 87:13, 89:9, 97:17, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 144:19, 151:1 } \\ & \text { 52:4, 194:2, } \end{aligned}$ |
| landmarked $[8]$ - 49:6, | leading [1] - 154:2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 98:17, 169:18, } \\ & \text { 200:19 } \end{aligned}$ | 18:2, | 94:14, 199:14, |
| 49:16, 59:20, | $\text { leaky }[1]-192: 6$ | lis | $\begin{aligned} & 6: 24,178: 2, \\ & 6: 17,126: 22, \end{aligned}$ | 99:17, 204:11, |
| 179:25, 180:2, | lean [1] - 117:16 | listing $[1]-47: 19$ | 31:4, 131:14, | 205:24, 206:2, 208:8 |
| 180:21, 189:9, | $\text { leaning }[1]-27: 10$ | literally [1] - 110: | 31:23, 131:25, | lose [3]-141:18, |
| 191:21 | lease [1] - 155:18 | live $[3]$ - 166:12, | 176:25, 177:2, 177:9 | 141:19, 157:2 |
| landmarking [2] - | least [18] - 27:3, | 176:19, 186:23 | looked [9]-14:20, | loss [2] - 99:3, 100:21 lost [1] - 139:24 |
| 60:1, 60:7 | 27:19, 35:7, 46:24, | lives [1] - 60:4 | 20:22, 21:8, 40:4, | lost $[1]$ - 139:24 love $[2]-181: 16$, |
| landmarks [4]-8:10, | 58:11, 59:11, 60:22, | living [ 1 - 136:3 | 49:11, 77:3, 117:23, | love [2] - 181:16, |



| 167:20 | 102:22, 113:14 | 123:14, 123:16 | 22, 130:4 | 15, 58:9, 159:8, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| money [6]-17:24, | 113:15, 118:17 | 124:17, 124:20 | 132:18, 132:23, | 159:16, 185:1 |
| 6:17, 168:8, | 118:18, 118:24 | 125:7, 125:10 | 37:2, 137:25 | nationally [1] - 165:17 |
| 9:24, 190 | 119:13, 129:2 | 125:23, 126:1 | 138:5, 139:1, 139:7, | native [ 1 - 189:25 |
| 197:17 | 129:3, 129:16 | 127:4 | 140:8, 141:22, | natural [1] - 17:16 |
| month [3]-89:17, | 130:9, 130:15 | 134:22, 135:2 | 142:24, 143:3 | nature [4]-13:9, 18:1, |
| 1:8, 91:11 | 130:20, 132:3 | 13 | 151: | 116:20, 156:5 |
| months [5] - 33:25, | 132:17, 137:20 | 136:24, 152:1 | 173:3, 175:2, 175:7, | Navy [2]-155:13, |
| 76:12, 91:6, 155:6, | 144:9, 144:12 | 152:22, 152:2 | 175:9, 183:14, | 156 |
| 202:2 | 144:13, 190:2 | 153:11, 153:1 | :19, 183:2 | nay [6]-119:11, |
| MONTOYA [44]-1:14, | 191:1, 191:6, | 156:13, 156:18 | 187:1, 187:6, 187:8, | 119:12, 199:13, |
| 2:17, 19:9, 21:15, | 191:13, 193:17 | 156:23, 156:25 | 20, 188:5 | 9:15, 199:21. |
| 22:11, 22:18, 22:21, | 193:19, 193:21, | 157:4, 157:9, 162:3, | 8:10, 188:1 | 199:22 |
| 22:25, 24:6, 26:24, | 199:2, 199:23 | 170:6, 170:23 | 191:5 | near [2] - 166:21, |
| 28:23, 29:3, 33:20, | 204:10, 206:1, | 171:1, 171:4 | 4:12, 200:3 | 192:11 |
| 33:22, 34:1, 34:22, | 206:2, 208:2, 208:9, | 171:12, 173:4 | :15, 207: | nearest [1] - 110:22 |
| 40:3, 53:6, 53:14, | 209:5 | 182:2, 182:7, 182:9, | 7:18, 207:23 | necessarily [3] - 15:1, |
| 59:7, 60:6, 83:24, | motivated [1] - 178:8 | 201:20, 203:18, | :5, 208:14 | 189:2, 198:13 |
| 84:8, 90:21, 113:17. | motivation [1] - | 204 | 08:17, 208:18 | necessary [3] |
| 116:15, 119:9, | 170:10 | MS [160]-2:9, 2:11 | mullion [1] - 72:20 | 150:15, 156:4, 198:1 |
| 125:17, 130:3, | Motor [1] - 145:12 | 5:4, 5:12, 8:8, 9:6, | multifamily [2] - 50:1, | need [34] -7:15, |
| 130:25, 131:10, | motorized (1) - 147:24 | 12:17, 14:9, 14:19 | 54:11 | 19:22, 26:12, 27:15, |
| 131:12, 139:11, | move [29]-3:1, 3:7, | 15:18, 15:22, 16:1, | muntins [3]-75:10, | 42:12, 43:11, 58:7, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 140:16, 144:22, } \\ & \text { 193:20, 197:5, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 4:25, 9:4, 12:14, } \\ & \text { 24:20, 28:8, 29: } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 16:6, 16:9, 17:4, } \\ & \text { 17:19, 18:6, 18:9 } \end{aligned}$ | $\text { 85:15, } 91: 23$ <br> museum (1)-159:11 | 59:17, 60:22, 62:14, $77: 6,75: 7,75: 8,$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 193: 20,197: 5, \\ & 199: 19,206: 7, \end{aligned}$ | 29:17, 38:11, 63:17, | 18:12, 18:15, 18:17, | mushy [1]-135:15 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 73:6, 75:7, 75:8, } \\ & 75: 979 \cdot 2779 \cdot 2 \end{aligned}$ |
| 206:9, 207:16, | 92:15, 92:18, | 18:19, 18:23, 19:8, | must [4]-45:10, | :4, 86:8, 87:2 |
| 207:20, 208:10, | 23, 101:2 | 19:13, 20:3, 20:24, | 46:23, 179:21, | :14, 90:1, 91:14, |
| 208:21 | 103:10, 116:10 | 25, 22:15, 23:13, | 6:1 | 25, 110:2 |
| Montoya $\{61$ - 2:17, | 119:14, 119:17 | 26:5, 26:11, 26:12, | Myra [1] - 4:3 | 6:23, 138:15, |
| 58:1, 60:12, 131:8, 207:14, 209:8 | 123:24, 132:21 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 26:13, 26:21, 27:15, } \\ & \text { 27:23, 28:16, 29:15, } \end{aligned}$ |  | 38:17, 141:10, |
| oya's | $\begin{aligned} & 155: 25,159: 19 \\ & \text { 164:6, 171:10, } \end{aligned}$ | $29: 20,34: 15,34: 21,$ | N | 4:25, 167:3, |
| Morales [2] - 154:20, | :1 | 36:20, 36:23, 37:14, | me [35] - 15:12, | $07: 25$ |
| 154:21 | 199:25, 206:2 | 37:18, 37:21, 37:23, | 14, 41:10, 48:1 | needed [2] - 3:4, |
| mortar [2]-122:6, | moveable [1]-125:21 | 38:17, 39:1, 39:23, | :9, 70:14, 95:1, | 124:15 |
| 124:11 | moved [3]-5:25, | 40:19, 44:2, 44:22 | :3, 100:13, | needs [16]-28:1, |
| mortuary [1] - 10:2 | 32:6, 140:3 | 48:18, 50:22, 52:11, | 01:13, 107:10 | $53: 11,53: 12,75: 19,$ |
| Moskovitz [1]-6:11 | moves [1]-91: | 52:20, 53:13, 53:24, | 7:12, 123:1, | 87:23, 87:24, |
| most [10]-2:24, 6:20, | moving [9] - $5: 8$, | $\begin{aligned} & 57: 16,57: 21, \\ & 59: 16.63: 21 \end{aligned}$ | :27, 134:15 | 131:24, 140:21, |
| 10:13, 134:3, 145:18, 166:1 | 35:10, 44:20, 125:1, 144:5, 164:25, | 73:18, 73:22, 76:21, | $6: 19,183: 1$ | 40:23, 140:24, |
| 182:16, 185:7, | 168:14, 192:15 | 76:23, 77:14, 77:25, | 3:23, 186:22 | 191:6, 198 |
| 190:4, 190:14 | MR [84] - 2:13, 31:22, | 4, 78:11, 79:5 | 9:24, 200:9 | negative $[3]-67: 16$, |
| mostly [2]-41:25, | 32:2, 32:5, 33:5, | 79:20, 80:18, 80:25, | 0:23, 200:24 | $\text { 121:6, } 151: 6$ |
| 42:4 | 33:19, 33:25, 35:19, | 81:2, 81:9, 81:10 | 1:1, 201:3, 203:4, | neglect [1] - 176:10 |
| motion [ 76 - 3:9, | 41:18, 41:23, 41:25, | 82:10, 82:13, 83:5, | 04:12, 204:18, | neglected [2]-45:21, |
| 3:11, 4:15, 4:16, | 43:13, 70:22, 71:2, | 83:9, 83:13, 83:17 | 4:20, 205:2, | 175:21 |
| 8:15, 8:18, 11:25, | 71:5, 72:7, 72:11, | 84:6, 85:17, 86:20 | 205:19, 206:3, 206:4 | negotiate [1] - 82:22 |
| 12:1, 12:5, 20:13, | 72:13, 72:23, 73:2, | $0: 6,90: 25,$ | named [3] - 201:6, | negotiated 14 - 51:17, |
| 20:14, 24:3, 24:21, | 73:8, 86:18, | 95:14, 95:17, 95:19, | 201:11, 202:9 | 54:20, 81:14, 81:21 |
| 28:10, 28:11, 28:19, $29: 4,34: 6,34: 7$ | 16, 88:20, | 96:14, 96:18, 97:1, | 200:4, 200:12, | negotiation [3] - |
| 34:16, 34:19, 36:5, | $90: 16,90: 20,91: 8 \text {, }$ | $98: 15,100: 10,$ | 200:16, 200:2 | 50:11, 52:21, 52:25 |
| 36:10, 36:11, 43:19, | 91:12, 92:4, 92:8, | 100:15, 101:10 | 206:4, 206:13 | $\begin{gathered} \text { negotiations [2] } \\ 54: 25,155: 19 \end{gathered}$ |
| 43:20, 44:10, 44:11, | 92:16, 107:19, | 101:15, 101:21 | nation [1] - 48:7 | neighbor [2] - 26:6, |
| 59:2, 59:3, 63:8, | 107:24, 108:1, | 102:1, 102:3, | national [2] - 184:21, | 114:20 |
| 63:9, 73:13, 73:14, | 111:1, 111:15, | :12, 119:15 | 189:9 | neighborhood [12] - |
| 77:19, 91:14, 91:15, | 111:18, 111:21, | 124 | National [9] - 45: | 9:16, 17:15, 96:4, |
| 97:7, 97:8, 102:21, | 113:9, 123:9, | 128:3, 129:7, 129:9, | 45:4, 46:8, 47:19, | 97:20, 108:23, |


| 109:20, 110:12, |
| :--- |
| 110:15, 114:2, |
| 115:21, 141:9, 165:7 |
| neighborhoods [1]- |
| 141:20 |
| neighbors [3]-101:1, |
| 114:24, 202:6 |
| never [9]-76:14, 81:7, |
| 162:25, 167:10, |
| 175:11, 190:10, |
| 192:7, 196:21 |
| New $[2]-44: 20,200: 1$ |
| new $[46]-6: 1,10: 1$, |

10:11, 28:11, 28:20, 29:4, 29:21, 39:2, 39:11, 42:11, 46:2, 46:11, 49:22, 50:1, 51:19, 52:6, 54:9, 54:11, 65:3, 65:10, 65:14, 66:2, 66:3, 68:11, 68:12, 71:20, 83:2, 86:8, 86:19, 86:21, 90:1, 90:14, 99:13, 114:9, 120:3, 121:1, 138:3, 138:13, 138:19, 139:12, 144:13, 155:24, 193:18,
200:5, 200:6
newly [1] - 46:6
next [20]-19:19,
38:19, 39:10, 43:3, 67:14, 67:21, 81:17, 85:21, 89:17, 30:12, 91:1, 91:11, 91:25, 110:6, 119:18, 141:3, 145:9, 171:10, 181:20, 195:14
nice [3]-33:11, 35:21, 153:13
niches [1]-11:7
Nichols [1] - 200:9
Ninety $[1]$ - 182:9
nobody [1]-209:14
nobody's [1] - 191:10
Noise [1] - 161:23
non [2]-67:14, 69:20
non-street-visible [1]
-67:14
non-textured [1] -
69:20
none [29]-3:19, 4:14, 4:23, 9:2, 12:12,
20:12, 29:12, 38:9,
44:8, 44:18, 49:6,
58:25, 61:5, 63:16,
68:19, 73:12, 92:14, 97:5, 98:5, 102:20, 103:8, 113:13,

| 129:1, 145:7, |
| :--- |
| $171: 25,190: 23$, |
| $204: 8,206: 22$, |
| 209:12 |
| nonetheless [1]- |
| $105: 9$ |
| nonhistoric $[3]-$ |
| $13: 13,93: 7,133: 17$ |
| nonindustrial $[1]-$ |
| $149: 4$ |

94:3
nonoriginal $[1]-13: 9$
normally $[3]-79: 1$,
114:11, 160:17,
164:16, 164:23,
167:10, 170:18,
170:19, 175:10,
197:15
numbers $[3]-160: 16$,
once [3]-72:16, 77:5,
190:8
one $[116]-5: 4,5: 10$,
$6: 4,8: 8,9: 20,10: 4$,
10:13, 10:20, 12:15,
16:11, 16:15, 16:16,
17:20, 19:10, 19:13,
19:19, 19:20, 19:25,
20:4, 20:21, 23:2,
25:8, 25:18, 26:14,
26:16, $27: 19,29: 25$,
$33: 12,33: 20,33: 21$,
$33: 23,43: 25,44: 2$,
$51: 5,52: 18,53: 15$,
$54: 5,56: 9,56: 15$, north (2)-64:12, 98:21
North [21]-1:8, 3:24, 3:25, 5:11, 5:14, 5:17, 5:18, 5:21, 6:4, 6:9, 6:21, 7:24, 38:13, 38:24, 38:25, 46:6, 46:14, 61:24, 61:25, 123:4, 152:13 northern [1] - 9:13 notable [1] - 145:18
Notary [1]-1:10
note [1] - 124:1
noted (3)-10:20,
121:17, 133:5
notes [1]-210:11 nothing [22]-16:4,
23:21, 31:25, 41:21, 52:1, 57:19, 59:8, 70:25, 75:4, 95:12,
101:24, 107:22,
123:12, 134:25,
152:20, 156:21,
175:5, 176:3, 182:5,
183:17, 187:4, 188:8
nothing's [1] - 166:13
noticeable [1] -
115:12
noticed [3]-123:19,
123:22, 126:5
notification [1]110:25
notion [2] - 160:3,
160:11
November [1] - 133:5
NPS $[5]$ - 50:7, 50:20,
52:10, 56:5, 140:4
nPS [1] - 50:7
Number ${ }^{[111}$ - 91:17, 91:24, 98:13, 130:20, 132:3, 171:23, 172:6, 172:25, 173:16,
173:19, 200:7
number $[10]$ - 17:20,

118:16, 139:2
online [2]-19:7, 21:9
ons [1]-78:14
OOAs [1]-38:12
opaque [1] - 174:4
open [26] - 4:9, 8:4,
11:19, 15:7, 31:8,
35:17, 41:4, 48:13,
52:2, 62:9, 64:23,
70:11, 78:15, 89:10,
94:20, 100:7, 107:7,
120:13, 122:20,
134:11, 152:8,
179:6, 192:9, 194:1,
201:17, 203:2
opened [1]-65:23
opening [7]-64:8,
66:25, 67:5, 67:8,
120:14, 120:17,
121:1
openings [4] - 64:9, 66:21, 120:4, 121:15 openness [1]-192:11
opens [1]-87:8
operate $[1]-89: 7$
operation [3]-146:4, 146:8, 195:21
operational [1]195:21
opinion [2]-21:24, 196:10
opportunities [3] 186:1, 186:7, 209:1 opportunity ${ }^{[8]}$ 68:17, 69:16, 86:13, 167:16, 167:19, 174:2, 192:24, 203:7 opposed [22]-3:17, 4:21, 8:25, 12:10, 15:1, 29:10, 38:7, 44:6, 44:16, 61:3, 63:14, 92:12, 98:3, 103:6, 119:10, 132:14, 145:5,
199:20, 202:2,
204:25, 206:20,
209:10
opposes [1] - 182:19
opposition [1] - 113:1
option [8]-60:3,
86:10, 86:12, 89:12,
159:4, 160:7,
169:13, 198:23
Option (1)-173:16
options [6] - 59:23, 87:9, 89:17, 159:3, 186:4, 186:13
order [2]-99:14, 104:21
ordered [1]-88:7

| ```Ordinance [3] - 145:14, 200:3, 200:12 ordinance (5) - 146:18, 162:18, 169:16, 180:5, 204:18 organization [1] - 102:4 orientation [1] - 105:21 oriented [3]-103:23, 105:14, 146:21 original (40)-6:25, 7:6, 7:7, 16:12, 17:25, 21:19, 23:3, 23:25, 24:11, 25:6, 25:9, 26:4, 27:12, 28:2, 42:10, 64:24, 66:22, 68:2, 68:15, 69:12, 69:17, 71:17, 74:12, 79:12, 79:13, 85:13, 87:2, 93:2, 116:18, 122:6, 123:17, 133:14, 134:1, 138:14, 138:16, 138:21, 144:21, 145:19, 145:22, 175:23 originally 88 - 13:4, 17:21, 30:20, 104:11, 120:9, 121:24, 128:13, 201:24 Ortega [1] - 188:2 otherwise [2] - 142:9, 181:10 ourselves (1) - 21:23 outdoor [3]-51:23, 52:2, 177:6 outer [1]-121:10 outlined [1] - 46:24 outside [3] - 74:19, 148:14, 189:21 outstanding [1] - 148:4 outward [1] - 182:23 outweigh [1]-53:11 overall \([8]\) - 13:16, 42:15, 43:6, 105:19, 110:9, 113:22, 115:9, 115:12 overlooking [1] - 202:20 override \(\{1]\) - 170:17 own [3] - 141:15, 161:16, 175:20 owned (4)-6:10, 9:17, 33:23, 196:23 owner [20]-27:13,``` | $\begin{gathered} \text { 44:22, 45:9, 45:20, } \\ \text { 45:22, 45:23, 46:20, } \\ \text { 100:17, 146:12, } \\ \text { 148:18, 149:11, } \\ \text { 150:5, 151:1, } \\ 153: 23,155: 2, \\ 159: 5,168: 7,174: 7, \\ \text { 188:21, 200:24 } \\ \text { owner's }[3]-21: 18, \\ 198: 13,200: 25 \\ \text { owners }[5]-153: 19, \\ 157: 22,170: 9, \\ 200: 21,202: 2 \\ \text { ownership }[1]-171: 2 \end{gathered}$  | ```205:15 parrot [1]-115:18 Part [2] - 52:23 part [41]-6:1, 7:13, 9:13, 11:1, 16:16, 24:17, 27:2, 27:3, 27:11, 28:18, 40:12, 46:10, 51:25, 53:1, 55:13, 56:1, 71:6, 71:10, 78:6, 79:10, 79:21, 86:1, 90:6, 97:9, 97:10, 98:6, 111:23, 115:21, 122:17, 129:15, 129:16, 139:15, 155:15, 159:1, 160:4, 171:2, 171:14, 179:20, 182:20, 198:4 parte (4) - 4:6, 62:5, 199:6, 207:17 partial [2] - 151:2, 182:24 participated [1]- 108:7 particular [12] - \(58: 6\), 60:20, 77:6, 79:4, 110:14, 116:6, 128:4, 128:18, 178:4, 179:1, 179:20, 195:23 particularly (1) - 7:12 partnering [1] - 117:19 partnership \({ }_{[1]}\) - 155:9 parts [2]-146:5, 147:22 passive [2]-202:16, 205:11 past [3]-35:23, 58:2, 116:5 paste [1]-84:20 Pat \({ }_{[1]}\) - 165:5 path [2]-27:12, 177:24 paths \([1]-82: 11\) patio [1] - 177:7 pattern 88 - 17:20. 18:11, 21:18, 23:4, 23:7, 23:9, 27:11, 78:10 patterns [1]-106:12 pause [2] - 161:25, 162:1 pavers [2]-30:2, 30:14 Pavilion (1) - 177:2 peculiar [2]-116:17 PEJSA [1]-1:19``` | ```penalty \([3]-75: 11\), 75:15, 76:16 pencil (1]-163:6 penciled [1] - 163:1 pencils [1]-163:6 pending [3]-28:23, 28:25, 104:7 people [25]-32:22, 74:22, 75:22, 76:2, 110:17, 113:2, 115:6, 136:3, 136:5, 141:5, 163:19, 167:7, 167:10, 167:13, 167:15, 170:21, 170:24, 176:13, 177:11, 179:6, 185:16, 187:11, 187:16, 189:1, 197:18 per \([8]-69: 8,79: 18\), 144:15, 145:15, 145:24, 145:25, 149:2, 163:9 per-contract [1]- 163:9 percent (4) - 32:8, 32:11, 191:18, 198:22 percentage [2]- 198:18, 198:19 perfect [2]-87:18, 88:4 perfume [1]-84:4 perhaps [8]-25:1, 81:24, 151:4, 158:17, 158:20, 158:21, 159:5, 189:8 period [2]-6:14, 185:16 permission [3] - 75:24, 158:14, 160:1 permit \((8)\) - 44:23, 45:6, 59:24, 74:25, 75:2, 159:5, 160:2, 173:17 permits [1]-59:12 permitted [3] - 149:14, 150:1, 168:15 Perry [2] - 132:22. 134:17 person [3]-14:18, 176:1, 185:3 personal [1]-171:5 personally [6] - 25:14, 35:21, 117:16, 191:23, 192:24, 194:4 personnel [1] - 167:23 Peterson (1) - 15:14 PETERSON [23] -``` |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |



| proper [ 1 ] - 74:20 | proud [1]-112:21 | 124:23, 126:4, | raise [17] - 15:24, | reapply [1] - 27:14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| properly [2] - 74:6, | prove [1] - 164:14 | 138:13, 139:19, | 31:20, 41:16, 57:14, | rear [10]-64:4, 64:5, |
| 75:7 | provide [6] - 48:9, | 142:13, 163:16, | 70:20, 95:7, 101:19, | 2, 65:4, 65:7, |
| properties [1]-162:5 | 84:9, 91:18, 92:6, | 163:18, 167:5, | 107:17, 123:7, | 65:14, 67:11, 67:15 |
| property (59] - 11:1, | 95:23, 165:24 | 167:6, 168:6, | 134:20, 152:15, | 104:17, 116:6 |
| 13:5, 13:17, $29: 25$, $30 \cdot 22,44 \cdot 22,45 \cdot 1$ | provided [3] - 63:23, | $\begin{aligned} & 174: 11,176: 2 \\ & 179: 24,180: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 156:16, 174:25, } \\ & \text { 181:25, 183:12, } \end{aligned}$ | reason $[15]-19: 16$, $23: 18,32 \cdot 13,32 \cdot 19$ |
| 45:9, 46:23, 47:23, | provides [1] - 93:10 | 180:16, 196:20, | $186: 24,188: 3$ | $38: 20,42: 8,56: 5$ |
| 47:25, 93:8, 98:20, | proximity [1] - 150:3 | 196:2 | raised [3]-58:1, | 7:9, 111:13, |
| 99:1, 99:11, 104:11, | Pryor [6]-57:11, | putting [3]-71:18, | 75:10, 91:23 | 6:10, 117:23, |
| 105:25, 114:21, | 73:17, 73:19 | 82:2, 123:19 | Ramon [1] - 153:25 | 157:13, 169:5, |
| 131:9, 135:4, | 127:20, 127:24 | puzzle [1] - 112:24 | RAP [1]-100:25 | 202:8, 203:3 |
| 148:18, 148:21, | 176:19 |  | rate [3]-157:23, | reasonable [6] - |
| 149:1, 153:18, | PRYOR [12] - 57:16, | Q | 192:6, 205:15 | 69:18, 99:22, 134:2, |
| 153:19, 153:23, | 57:21, 57:23, 73:18, |  | rather [6]-26:3, | 149:9, 166:17, 173:9 |
| 153:24, 154:7, | 73:22, 76:21, 76:23, | qualified [1] - 186:5 | 71:20, 90:23, | reasonably [1] - |
| 154:8, 154:19, | 14, 127:17 | quality [1] - 110:15 | 189:20, 198:15, | 140:10 |
| 155:2, 155:3, | 7:21, 127:24 | quarter [1] - 10:16 | 202:4 | reasons [6]-13:23, |
| 155:20, 155:21, | 128:3 | quasi [1] - 207:1 | rationale [1] - 189:3 | 0:3, 94:9, 106:24, |
| 155:23, 157:20, | Public [1]-1:10 | quasi-judicial [1] - | razed [1] - 178:5 | 149:7, 168:23 |
| 157:22, 157:24, | public [44] - 4:10 | 207:18 | reach [1]-56:22 | rebuild [1]-67:5 |
| 161:20, 161:21, | 4:15, 8:4, 8:15 | questions [49]-8:1, | read [12] - 19:7, 36:13, | rebuilding $[1]$ - 67:7 |
| 162:4, 162:19, | 11:20, 11:25, 15:7, | 11:17, 14:2, 14:14, | 67:18, 108:3, | rebuttal [1]-169:2 |
| 73:1, 173:19, | 20:13, 31:9, 34:5, | 17:9, 19:3, 19:4, | $129: 18,130: 10$ | receive [3] - 78:12, |
| $174: 7,177: 3$, $179 \cdot 25,181: 8$ | 35:14, 36:18, 41:4, | 31:6, 33:14, 39:25, | 132:3, 142:14, | $137: 3,145: 21$ |
| $179: 25,181: 8$, $185: 15,192: 1$ | 43:19, 48:14, 59:1, | 41:2, 43:7, 43:8, | 177:13, 185:17, | received [1] - 25:20 |
| 185:15, 192:1, | 62:9, 63:8, 70:12, | 48:11, 50:17, 53:4 | 207:11, 208:6 | recent [1]-185:7 |
| 196:23, 197:9, | 73:13, 73:16, 77:19, | 56:3, 56:25, 70:8, | readily [1] - 105:15 | recently [2]-149:14, |
| $202: 1,202: 5,20$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 94:21, } 97: 6,100: 8 \text {, } \\ & 107.21 \quad 107 \cdot 7 \end{aligned}$ |  | reading $[1]$ - 81:12 | 158:25 |
| 202:17, 202:19 | 113:14, 122:21, | $100: 19,101: 4$ | reads [1] - 129:20 <br> ready $[3]-95: 18$, | $\begin{array}{r} \text { recess [6] - 71:15, } \\ 72: 3,72: 17,80: 6 \end{array}$ |
| property's [1] - 45:15 | 127:16, 12 | 107:4, 111:10, | 174:15, 174:16 | 89:5, 98:10 |
| proposal [7]-63:23, | 134:12, 137:19 | 3:4, 122:18, | real [10] - 10:18, | recessed [7]-69:1, |
| 66:7, 66:11, 66:22, | 152:9, 159:12, | 125:13, 125:16, | 119:22, 131:3, | $69: 7,72: 15,75: 9$ |
| $67: 4,79: 24,200: 16$ | 190:24, 200:13, | 126:24, 134:8, | $154: 3,154: 5$ | $78: 7,88: 1,121: 10$ |
| propose [3]-69:9 <br> 79:25, 200:4 | $11: 11,201: 18$ | $1: 15,152: 5$ | 169:22, 170:20, | recessing [2] - 82:2, |
| proposed [24]-13:20, | public/private[1] | 53:4, 168:17, | $\begin{aligned} & 170: 21,200: 6, \\ & 203: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 88: 9 \\ & \text { recognize }[7]-117: \end{aligned}$ |
| 13:24, 65:1, 65:10, | 155:9 | $8: 19,171: 6$ | realistically [1] | 144:25, 156:5, |
| 67:15, 69:5, 69:10, | publicly [ 1 ]-174:1 | 4:18, 201:14, | $140: 10$ | 161:12, 169:1, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 94: 5,103: 17 \\ & \text { 105:12, 105:2 } \end{aligned}$ | pulled [3] - 74:25, | 03:8, 203:11, $03: 24$ | reality [1] - 59:13 | 191:13, 192:19 |
| $6.5,122 \cdot 4,122 \cdot 7$ | :1, 7 | 203:24 ${ }_{\text {quick }}$ [] - 73:18, 98 | realized [1] - 2:25 | recognized [2] - 10:6, |
| 106:5, 122:4, 122:7 | pulling [1] - 84:22 |  | really [39] - 14:23, | 165:18 |
| 133:17, 134:2, | pulp [1] - 195:12 | $0: 21,201: 23$ | 19:24, 22:8, 40:7, | recognizing [4] - 49:7, |
| 200.9, 200.20 | punch [1] - 51:15 |  | 49:24, 51:3, 51:13, | 49:18, 56:13, $175: 11$ |
|  | punitive [1] - 143:21 |  | 56:20, 76:9, 77:22, | recommend [5] - |
| $206: 4,207: 10$ | purchase [1] - 45:22 | $19: 25$ | 81:11, 84:11, 84:25, | :14, 27:24, 79:10, |
| proposes [3] - 45:23, | $153: 24$ | quiet [1] - 208: | 5:19, 110:5, | $140: 6,193: 11$ <br> recommendat |
| $120: 14,133: 22$ | pursuant [2]-64:25, | quite [3] - 60:8, 85:14, | 110:16, 114:22, | -45:14, 47:1, 50:21, |
| proposing [2] - 35:10, 40:15 | 104:6 |  | 114:25, 117:1, | 106:23, 126:7, |
| proposition [1] - 24:7 | pursue [1] - 60:1 | 166:2 | 117:8, 125:21, | 126:13, 140:19, |
| protect [2] - 181:5, | $\begin{gathered} \text { pursued }[3] \text { - 185:11, } \\ 185: 23,186: 4 \end{gathered}$ |  | 139:15, 143:6, | 166:14, 200:16, |
| 190:12 | 185:23, 186:4 <br> put [35] - 18:2, 19:1, | R | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 143:8, 144:19, } \\ & \text { 164:12, 168:4, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 204:17, 204:24, } \\ & \text { 205:22, 206:16, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 179:16 | 19:2, 37:10, 37:11, | rage [1] - 166:23 | 69:15, 175:24, | 206:24, 208:3 |
|  |  | rail [1] - 145:20 | 187: | recommendations [5] |
|  | 71:22, 74:19, 77:4, | railroad [2]-147:10 | 8:15, 189:3, | 16:18, 95:22, |
| protruding ${ }^{[2]}$ - 116:1, | 83:19, 91:1, 110:5, | railroad [2] - 147:10, | 191:6, 197:10 | 97:21, 153:5, 154:11 |
|  | 112:3, 124:2, 124:7, | 164:4 | Realtor [1]-180:18 | recommended [5] - |







| 95:7, 95:10, 95:15, | 181:25, 182:3, | TIAA (1) - 154:4 | 141:14 | 101:25, 107:22, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 95:16, 95:18, 96:5, | 182:8, 183:4 | tied (1)-201 | track [1] - 82 | 107:23, |
| 96:11, 96:13, 96:21. | 183:12, 183:15, | tile [4]-16:11, 18:14, | tracks [1] - 145:20 | 123:13, 134:25, |
| 96:24, 97:2, 97:5, | 183:20, 186:16, | 19:12, 130:3 | trading [1] - 56:11 | 135:1, 152:20, |
| 97:12, 97:22, 98:1, | 186:20, 186:24, | tiles [2]-19:10, | traditional [1]-64:22 | 152:21, 156:21, |
| 98:3, 98:5, 98:11, | 187:2, 187:7, | 195:19 | traditionally (1) - | 156:22, 175:5, |
| 100:4, 100:7, | 187:19, 187:21 | timber [3]-1951 | 66:2 | 175:6, 182:5, 182:6, |
| 100:11, 100:13, | 187:24, 188:3 | 195:9, 195:1 | tragic [1] - 100:20 | 183:17, 183:18, |
| 101:4, 101:7, | 188:6, 188:11 | timeline [1]-53:2 | Trail [1]-155:1 | 187:4, 187:5, 188:8, |
| 101:11, 101:13, | 130:20, 190:23 | timer ${ }^{(1)}$ - 110:25 | Training [ 1 ]-1:8 | 188:9 |
| 101:19, 101:22, | 191:4, 193:16, 193:25, 198:7 | Times-Union [1] - | transcript [1]-210:10 | $\begin{gathered} \text { try }[14]-51: 7,52: 4, \\ 71: 15,75: 8,76: 12, \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 102:2, 102:16, } \\ & \text { 102:20, 102:25, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 193:25, 198:7 } \\ & \text { 199:5, 199:8, } \end{aligned}$ | 182:10 | transfer $[1]$-149:18 | 71:15, 75:8, 76:12, <br> 77:13, 85:10, 89:19, |
| 103:3, 103:6, 103:8, | 199:12, 199:15, | $\text { tina }(1)-15: 20$ | 170:12 | , 102:7, 108:12, |
| 107:3, 107:6, 107:10, 107:15, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 199:20, 199:22, } \\ & \text { 201:14, 201:17, } \end{aligned}$ | tint [2] - 92:3, 92:7 | transom [3]-64:22, | 110:9, 135:17, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 107:10, 107:15, } \\ & \text { 107:17, 107:20, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 201:14, 201:17, } \\ & \text { 203:11, 203:24, } \end{aligned}$ | tinted $(3)-78: 16$, | $66: 24,67: 8$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 180:19 } \\ & \text { trying }[14]-18: 1, \end{aligned}$ |
| 107:25, 111:10, | 204:2, 204:5, 204:8, | [1] | 149:17 | 18:21, 18:25, 20:3, |
| 113:4, 113:7, | 205:23, 206:1, | tip [1]-24:1 | trash [2]-36:1, 36:2 | :7, 54:19, 74: |
| 113:10, 113:13, | 206:8, 206:17, | today [22]-2:25, | treasure [1]-188:17 | 74:18, 74:19, 79:12. |
| 113:18, 115:15, | 206:20, 206:22, 207:25, 209:4, | 15:10, 25:11, 40:17, | treasures [1]-193:5 | 85:7, 164:14, 202:3, 28:14 |
| 118:21, 119:1, | 209:10, 209:12 | 10, 80:14, 84:3, | treat [1]-138:11 | TS [1] - 146: |
| 119:4, 119:10, | themselves [4]-52:8, |  | 3, 32 | $\text { turn }[2]-131: 2$ |
| 119:12, 119:16, | 84:14, 100:3, 168:11 |  |  | 162:22 |
| 122:18, 122:20, | theoretically [3] - | 1:4, 181:15, | $\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{tried}[2]-135: 10, \\ & 135: 14 \end{aligned}$ | turning [3] - 131:25, |
| 122:24, 123:1, | 76:1, 77:5, 179:4 | 6:17, 187:12, | trim [31]-7:8, 64:4, | 3:20, 160:3 |
| 123:5, 123:7, | therefore [4]-122:13, | 87:17, 191:21 | $65: 9,65: 10,66: 5,$ | twentieth [1]-10:16 |
| 123:10, 123:15, | 124:7, 125:1, $193: 7$ | 92:5, 203:4 | 66:13, 66:24, 67:8, | two [84]-2:25, 3:3, |
| 126:23, 127:10, | thickness [2]-25:21 | Todd [1]-100:18 | 68:13, 69:8, 71:16, | 5:15, 5:22, 6:1, 7:13, |
| 127:15, 127:18, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { thickness } \\ & \text { 129:23 } \end{aligned}$ | together $[9]$ - 21:3, | 71:17, 72:4, 78:8, | 16:9, 16:21, 19:16, |
| 127:22, 128:2, | thin (6) - 129:20 | 37:15, 38:18, 38:23, 67:19, 141:16, | :3, 82:3, 87:25, | 23:1, 42:8, 42:22, |
| 128:23, 129:1, | 130:21, 131:2, | $160: 12,176: 23$ | 89:4, 93:14, $93:$ | 42:25, 43:3, 44:25. |
| 129:8, 130:12, | 132:4, 132:5, 132:6 | 196:21 | 94:6, 94:7, 94:13, | 45:25, 46:4, 47:5, |
| 130:24, 132:10, $132 \cdot 12.132 .14$, | thinking [6]-17:14, | $\operatorname{ton}[1]-76: 13$ | 94:17, 96:10, 97:17, | 47:9, 48:2, 49:11, |
| 132:12, 132:14, | 124:8, 126:20, | $\text { tone }[1]-40: 7$ | 97:18 | 49:16, 50:24, 52:18, |
| 132:16, 132:19, 134:8, 134:11, | 180:8, 181:7, $205: 8$ | tonight [6]-141:6 | Trimmer [4] - 48:15, | 53:15, 56:9, 56:13, |
| 134:14, 134:18, | thinks [1]-14:25 third $\{6\}-49: 21$ | 153:1, 153:3, 154:6, | 48:19, 100:12, | $\text { 60:7, 60:15, } 60: 1$ |
| 134:20, 134:23, | 50:25, 56:15, | 176:24, 184:5 | 100:16 | 4:9, 64:21, 65:4, |
| 135:3, 136:9, | 168:12, 182:22 | took (44) - 136:6, | TRIMMER $[9]$ - 48:18, | 65:9, 68:24, 69:19, |
| 136:19, 136:22, | thorough [1]-182:21 | $\text { top }[3]-66: 4,13$ | :13, 53:24, 56:10 | 71:9, 71:19, 72:6, |
| 136:25, 137:15, | thoroughly [2] - | 168:6 | $100: 10,100: 15$ | 76:11, 78:9, 87:15, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 137:18, 142:16, } \\ & \text { 142:25, 144:9, } \end{aligned}$ | 147:6, 151:5 | torn [2]-117:10 | Tropia [3]-1:9, 210:7, | 7:25, 91:6, 91:23, |
| 144:18, 145:2, | th | 2:1 | 10:1 |  |
| 145:5, 145:7, | 115:15 | total [5] - 92:24, 93:3 | truck [1]-201:25 | 105:7, 105:10, |
| 151:15, 152:5, | thousand [1] - 11 | 99:2, 100:21, 182:19 | true [2]-197:10, | 9:22، 109:23 |
| 152:8, 152:15, | thread [1]-84:22 | totally [2]-16:19, | 210:10 | 20:3, 120:9, |
| 152:18, 152:23, | three [5]-49:5, 50:23, | ching $[1]-123: 23$ | 161:11 | 20:11, 121:14, |
| 156:9, 156:11, 156:16, 156:19, | 56:12, 157:21, | tough (4) - 81:7, 85:5, | trusswork ${ }^{11}$ - 148:2 | 33:2, 142:17 |
| 156:24, 157:3, | 189:20 | 117:14, 180:23 | Trust [2]-183:24, | 45:20, 158:10, |
| 157:8, 161:24, | threw [2]-136:6, | toward [1]-27:10 | 185:3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 166:2, } 169: 10, \\ & 1719 \quad 180: 17 \end{aligned}$ |
| 162:2, 170:20, |  | towards [11]-36:15, | trustees (1) - 183:24 | two-over-two [11]- |
| 170:24, 171:3, |  | :16, 67:11, 67:23, | truth (51) - 16:4, 16:5, | 64:21, 65:9, 68:2 |
| 171:8, 174:17, | throughout [2]- | 70:5, 71:12, 103:23, | $31: 25,32: 1,41: 21$ | 69:19, 71:19, 72:6, |
| 174:21, 174:25, | 102:8, 147:7 <br> throw (1)-205:11 | 105:14, 114:9, | 41:22, 57:19, 57:20, | 78:9, 87:15, 87:25, |
| 175:3, 175:8, | throw $(1]-205: 11$ throwing [1]-160:15 | 117:16, 146:21 | 70:25, 71:1, 95:12, |  |
| 176:15, 181:19, | throwing [1]-160:15 | town [2]-32:24, | 95:13, 101:24, |  |


| two-part [1] - 11:1 <br> two-story [20]-5:22, | 132:6 <br> Univers | V | $133: 4,147: 1$ | 195:17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6:1, 13:6, 23:1, | 190:1, 190:5, 208:23 | vacant [8]-38:19, | 192:1, 194:4 | 148:25, 155:5 |
| 44:25, 47:5, 63:25, | unless [4]-125:25 | 39:7, 39:10, 42:23, | Vista [1] - 183:11 | ways [2]-178:23, |
| 64:4, 65:4, 98:1 | 164:24, 175:22 | 46:1, 64:12, 177:18 | visual [1] - 193:14 | 178:24 |
| 98:22, 103:19, | 205:12 | Valencia [4]-103:11, | visually [3] - 21:4, | WBCM [1] - 151:21 |
| 104:17, 105:7, | unreasonable [1] - | 103:15, 107:13, | 22:22, 23:13 | WD/WR [1] - 148:24 |
| 105:10, 109:22 | 166:6 | 110:19 | voice [2]-187:17 | Wednesday [1]-1:6 |
| 109:23, 120:9, | unsafe [2] - 7:15, | valid [3] - 75:10, | volunteers [1] - | week [1] - 182:9 |
| 120:11, 133:2 | 124:22 | 131:16, 196:10 | 180:23 | weeks [3]-91:9, |
| type [6] - 28:4, 33:7, | unstable [2]-122:11, | valuable [1] - 175:18 | vote [13]-45:17, | 157:15, 157:19 |
| 51:23, 56:11, 86:18, | 182:25 | value [4]-6:18, 48:4, | 60:25, 62:24, 89:15, | weigh [1]-27:15 |
| 162:22 | unusual [1] - 102:12 | 126:17, 149:10 | 18:21, 119:5, | welcome [4]-16:8, |
| types [3]-23:22, | up [84] - 15:8, 18:4, | various [2]-16:17, | 132:16, 141:1, | 32:4, 71:4, 95:16 |
| 128:14, 184:19 | 19:22, 23:18, 30:23, | 184:25 | 181:11, 191:10, | well-known [1] - 10:9 |
| typical [1] - 114:2 | 31:12, 33:18, 35:8, | vegetation [1] - 32:21 | 199:3, 207:24, | WELLS [1]-1:18 |
| typically [6] - 30:14, | 36:18, 37:1, 37:3, | veneer [12]-120:7 | 208:19 | west [2]-120:16, |
| 79:5, 79:10, 86:23, | 37:5, 38:4, 41:8, | 122:5, 124:10, | voted [2] - 86:7 | 145:21 |
| 87:21, 117:3 | 42:9, 50:14, 57:2, | 127:2, 129:14, | 130:12 | West [23]-4:1, 9:5, |
| Tyvek [1] - 139:13 | 57:7, 59:25, 62:13, | 129:21, 130:1, | voting [5] - 199:12, | $9: 8,9: 11,10: 2$ |
| U | $73: 15,75: 1,76: 12$ | $132: 5,132: 6$ | 208:22, 209:9 | $4: 21,$ |
|  | 77:2, 80:14, 82 | vent [3]-65:10, 65:12, |  | 46:5, 46:9, 46:14, |
| $\text { U.S }[2]-155: 13,156: 1$ | 82:19, 83:22, 83:23, | 65:13 | W | 46:22, 47:4, 57:11, |
| ultimately [1] - 105:4 | 85:19, 86:3, 86:16, | vents [1] - 11:7 |  | 59:4, 61:6, 70:16 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { unable }[6]-8: 10, \\ & \text { 13:19, 14:5, 121:19, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 87:8, 88:5, 94:24, } \\ & 96: 24,100: 11, \end{aligned}$ | verbally [1]-126:10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { wait }[4]-25: 2,62: 14, \\ & 173: 3,180: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 73: 19,127: 24, \\ & 176: 19 \end{aligned}$ |
| 122:12, 176:23 | 101:8, 101:11, | vernacular [3]-64:1 | waiting [2]-90:7, | wharf [2]-194:15, |
| uncertain $[1]$ - 80:24 | 107:8, 113:7, | $98: 17,105: 8$ | 98:24 | 196:4 |
| under [13]-9:25, 65:1, | 113:23, 114:22, | version [1] - 193:14 | walk [4]-35:8, 36:2, | whatnot [3]-38:4, |
| 104:3, 119:24 | 115:25, 122:24 | vertical [4] - 54:4, | $36: 18,110: 18$ | 61:20, 81:14 |
| 145:14, 150:15, | 123:19, 125:22, | $68: 24,93: 23,105: 18$ | wall [11]-36:19, 37:9, | wheelchair [1]-32:16 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 159: 8,165: 4 \\ & 169: 14,169: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 127:11, 127:21, } \\ & \text { 128:21, 136:22, } \end{aligned}$ | vertically [2]-68:3, | $\begin{aligned} & 65: 2,66: 5,66: 25, \\ & 68: 12,69: 2,69: 7, \end{aligned}$ | white [1]-51:6 |
| 174:9, 189:23, | 140:11, 143:24, | $\begin{aligned} & 121: 4 \\ & \text { via }[1]-133: 1 \end{aligned}$ | 72:4, 88:1, 122:3 | white-shelled [1]- 51:6 |
| 196:15 | 157:1, 157:6, 161:1, | viability [1] - 7:1 | walls [2]-7:18, 135:9 | whole [28]-16:4, |
| underlayment [1] - 139:8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 163:10, 163:12, } \\ & \text { 163:21, 164:16, } \end{aligned}$ | viable [3]-178:13, | Walnut [1]-41:13 <br> Wambolt [1]-145:10 | 22:10, 31:25, 41:21, |
| 139:8 | 163:21, 164:16, $165 \cdot 8$ 169:3 | $190: 18,198: 23$ | Wambolt [1] - 145:10 | 52:24, 55:7, 55:9, |
| underneath [2] - <br> 64:24, 138:22 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 165:8, 169:3, } \\ & \text { 171:10, 173:15, } \end{aligned}$ | Vice [1]-1:13 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { wants [2]-113:19, } \\ & 183: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $55: 21,57: 19,61: 19$ <br> 70:25, 87:13, 90:4 |
| understood [3] | 174:17, 176:12, | View ${ }^{[2]}$ - 64:19, 68:21 | 183:6 <br> war [1]-207: | $\begin{aligned} & 70: 25,87: 13,90: 4, \\ & 95: 12.101: 24 . \end{aligned}$ |
| 40:19, 141:25, | 178:23, 178:25, | views [1] - 202:21 | war [1]-207:8 | 95:12, 101:24, |
| $170: 13$ | $180: 4,180: 16$ | vinyl [5] - 79:2, 91:22, | warehouse [1] - 147:4 warehouses [1] - | 107:22, 123:12, <br> 134:25, 136:14 |
| undertake [2] - 57:25, | 180:24, 181:10, | $108: 15,112: 1,112: 2$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { warehouses [1] - } \\ & \text { 149:19 } \end{aligned}$ | 134:25, 136:14, <br> 152:20, 156:21, |
| 166:7 | 181:20, 183:5, | vinyl-clad [2]-79:2, | warrant [2] - 47:18, | 175:5, 182:5, |
| undue [2] - 174:6, | 183:22, 186:20, | violations | 50:14 | 183:17, 186:8, |
| 174:8 | 187:24, 193:7, | virtue [1]-47:20 | warranted [1]-183:1 | 187:4, 187:8, 188:8 |
| unexpectedly [1] - | 196:21, 205:2, | visibility [7]-12:22, | warranties [1] - 19:15 | wholesale [7]-64:3, |
| $175: 13$ | 207:12 | 103:21, 114:12, | warranty [1] - 19:7 | $68: 10,69: 25,70: 7$ |
| unfortunately [7] - | upper [1] - 51: | 117:8, 117:15, | $\text { water }[8]-7: 12,99: 7$ | 91:17, 132:24, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 35: 6,100: \\ & 126: 18,1 \end{aligned}$ | urban [2] - 117:4, | 117:17, 118:12 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 150:3, 192:11, } \\ & \text { 192:16, 195:10 } \end{aligned}$ | 133:13 <br> wide [4]-30:1, 30:9, |
| $\text { 156:3, 191:21, } 193: 6$ | 177:19 | visible [11]-67:14, | 195:14, 202:20 | $32: 13,33: 13$ |
| unified [2]-51:18, | usable [1] - 16:14 | 68:4, 68:22, 93:13 | Water [2] - 148:23, | widened [1]-31:2 |
| 53:2 | uses [3] - 149:5, |  | 150:2 | wider [4]-32:14, |
| Union [1] - 182:10 | 149:24, 190:17 | 20:6. 120:13, | water's [1]-165:9 | 32:19, 109:9, 111:7 |
| unique [2]-11:8, 65:8 | utilization [1] - 166:9 | 121:25 | waterfront [7] | widths [1] - $30: 8$ |
| United [2] - 189:7, |  | visibly [1] - 147:3 | 146:14, 148:21, | window [54]-7:7, |
| 189:18 |  | $\text { visit }[7]-47: 24,64: 19$ | 154:22, 163:22, | 49:8, 64:4, 64:9, |
| units [3] - 52:5, 52:8, |  | 93:16, 99:4, 121:16, | 168:7, 177:16, | 66:3, 66:6, 67:10, |


(904) 821-0300


[^0]:    A separate sheet is attached as Exhibit $B$, which contains the continuation of the statement of interest.

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ These design regulations are inapplicable to a demolition by their own terms.

[^2]:    Stephanie Pejsa, Executive Assistant
    Community Planning Division
    Planning and Development Department

[^3]:    Diane M. Tropia, Inc., Post Office Box 2375, Jacksonville, FL 32203

