

**MINUTES
HISTORIC LANDMARK PRESERVATION BOARD**

REGULAR MEETING

September 19, 2011

4:00 p.m.

**Ormond Beach City Hall
Training Room
22 South Beach Street
Ormond Beach, Florida**

I. Call To Order

Chairman Dr. Shapiro called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

II. Roll Call

Members present were: Dr. Daniel Drake, Ann Eifert, Geneva Jackson, Shannon Julien, Sue Parkerson, Damien Richards, Dr. Philip Shapiro and Robert Walsh. Member excused was Sean O'Sullivan.

Staff present was Leisure Services Director Robert Carolin, Planning Director Ric Goss, Senior Planner Laureen Kornel, Deputy City Attorney Ann-Margret Emery and Recording Secretary Shá Moss.

III. Approval of Minutes – June 20, 2011

Mr. Walsh stated the word “not” needed to be added to the first paragraph on page 3 regarding the Certificate of Appropriateness.

Ms. Julien moved seconded by Ms. Parkerson to accept the minutes as amended of the June 20, 2011, meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

Dr. Shapiro introduced staff for the benefit of those members and audience that had not met them.

IV. Public Hearing

None at this time

V. Discussion Item

A. Administrative Review for Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition – 100 Old Kings Road

Ms. Kornel stated the property was located at 100 Old Kings Road, was not a locally designated property, and was not surveyed in the 1986 Historic properties Survey. It was frame vernacular in architectural style and built in 1947. Staff determined the property was in a severely deteriorating condition and not architecturally significant and therefore determined that no Certificate of Appropriateness was necessary for demolition.

The general consensus of the board was agreement with staff's determination.

B. Long Term Vision – 38 W. Granada Boulevard MacDonald House (Local Landmark)

Dr. Shapiro stated in 2009, the members of the Board at that time voted to keep the MacDonald House and the Ames House preserved, occupied and operational. Since there are a number of new members on the Board, the City Commission wanted to know whether the Board still agreed with the position the previous Board made in 2009. He stated repairs were needed and noted they were expensive.

Ms. Kornel stated she would like the discussion of the properties to be independent from each other. She noted the City Commission requested the Board to discuss the long range vision of each property.

Ms. Kornel stated the MacDonald House is located at 38 W. Granada Boulevard and functions as a welcome center and offices. The 2nd and 3rd floors have been assessed as unsafe due to structural issues. The 2½ story Queen Anne architectural style house was built around 1900. The Staff Report includes an engineering report dated 12/19/07, indicating the distressed condition of the property and the need for repairs with an estimated cost of \$234,000. At the time of the Boards discussion of this property, the Board indicated the property had a high level of significance and was worthy of preservation. The City Commission was requesting input on the questions listed in the Staff Report.

1. Is the general consensus of the HLPB still that the MacDonald House has a high level of historic significance as an historic resource in the City of Ormond Beach?

Dr. Shapiro stated the Historical Society and the Preservation Committee of the Historical Society met last week and voted unanimously to continue the

preservation of the MacDonald and Ames Houses. Dr. Shapiro stated the MacDonald House has a very high level of historic significance.

Ms. Parkerson, Ms. Jackson, Ms. Eifert, Mr. Richards, and Ms. Julien stated the house should be preserved, kept under city ownership and that the historic resource has significant value to the City as well as it being a part of the community.

Mr. Walsh and Dr. Drake agreed it had historic significance, but indicated concerns about the cost associated with maintenance and restoration work.

2. What recommendation would be made to maintain the MacDonald House under City ownership and pursue renovations vs. selling the property?

Dr. Shapiro stated he believed that using point of contact repairs, which meant to do necessary repairs to keep it safe, open, operational and standing would be appropriate. He stated there was no reason to spend \$234,000 when doing patchwork would suffice in the interim since the building was not in any eminent danger. Dr. Shapiro stated the property was a welcome center and most of the visitors are from out of town/state who receive referrals to businesses in the community. He was hopeful that if the building was ever sold, the developer might consider making an arrangement for a new welcome center in the same area.

Mr. Richards asked how many people visit the Welcome Center.

Pat Sample, Historical Society, stated there were about 20 people per day visiting the welcome center.

Mr. Walsh asked has any of the work been done that was listed in the engineering report. He indicated concern about the project becoming a money pit and suggested the engineering report be updated.

Dr. Shapiro noted some of the floor boards have been replaced.

Ms. Kornel stated she didn't think any of the work has been done. She advised she had asked the city engineer for an updated cost estimate and was advised the cost would likely be the same or possibly more.

Ms. Julien agreed the Engineering Report should be updated.

Ms. Sample stated some of the windows had been replaced.

3. If the 2nd and 3rd floors of the MacDonald House were renovated such that they were safe to occupy, what uses might be recommended?

Dr. Shapiro stated it would be costly to bring the building up to code, but noted parking would also be an issue if the 2nd and 3rd floors were occupied. He did not think the City should spend that amount on repairs.

Ms. Julien stated an elevator would be needed to be ADA compliant. She noted if someone wanted to occupy the building, then it might be appropriate that they be responsible for repairs in addition to adding an elevator, but that parking would be an issue.

Dr. Shapiro noted it would be the same cost to demolish the building.

Mr. Carolin stated along with the cost to demolish the building, the cost would include a comparable space for the operation of the tennis facilities.

4. Should the City amend the Downtown Redevelopment Plan to add as a project the MacDonald House for restoration and reconstruction?

Dr. Shapiro stated the MacDonald House should be added to the Downtown Redevelopment Plan. It should be made safe for occupation at the first floor but he does not see a reason to spend a lot of money on all the renovations at one time. He noted there was some water damage in the wall on the upper floors.

Mr. Walsh stated the 1st floor has the best utilization. He stated it was not cost effective to bring the 2nd and 3rd floors to code at this time. Some of the work must have been done over the years.

Mr. Carolin stated the City did some structural reinforcement to the wall in the past.

Mr. Richards asked whether a request for occupancy was ever done.

Dr. Shapiro stated there was a Request for Proposals through the Quality of Life Advisory Board a few years ago that did not produce any responders.

Ms. Julien stated it should be added to the Downtown Redevelopment Plan so that it was eligible for grants to work on the building.

Ms. Parkerson moved, seconded by Ms. Julien that the Historic Landmark Preservation Board recommends the MacDonald House remain a high priority, City owned maintained structure, and be added to the Downtown Redevelopment Plan. The motion passed unanimously.

C. Long Term Vision – 173 S. Beach Street - Ames House (Local Landmark)

Ms. Kornel stated the Ames House was located at 173 S. Beach Street, is a masonry vernacular style concrete block house, built in 1915, and is on the city's Historic Landmark List. The property is a part of the General Adelbert Ames property. On April 20, 2011, the City Commission discussed the use of the Ames house, various alternatives and the condition. The building has issues associated with water intrusion and air quality. The estimated cost for repairs of the building are \$284,574. Ms. Kornel handed out a copy of an email from Mrs. Susie Plimpton, who is a relative of the Ames family.

1. What level of historic significance is placed on the Ames House as an historic resource in the City of Ormond Beach?

Dr. Shapiro stated Ms. Plimpton's husband is a descendant of General Ames. The property is historic, which included property across the street and south on Beach Street to Mound Avenue. He noted the previous Board also voted that the Ames House should be a high priority project. He noted there was some issue of neglect because of the water intrusion and air quality issues associated with the water intrusion. Dr. Shapiro stated point of contact repairs could not be done because of the work that was needed. He stated the historic significance was very high especially since General Ames was a Civil War hero.

Dr. Drake asked what the building was being used for; wherein Dr. Shapiro stated it was being used as the City Attorney's office.

Dr. Drake asked whether any other attorneys worked in the building, how the legal department moved into the building and whether there was space available so they might move back to City Hall as mentioned by the Commission stated in the previous City Commission meeting minutes provided.

Mr. Goss stated City Hall has reduced staff significantly over the years, so there is space with some consolidations.

Ms. Parkerson stated the Legal Department moved into the Ames House in about 1999.

Mr. Walsh and Mr. Richards agreed the building had a high level of historic significance.

Ms. Parkerson agreed there was a high level of significance and also added that the cost of replacing the windows was extremely high since some of them had already been replaced.

Ms. Emery stated she does not have any difficulty breathing when in the building and her office is located on the second floor. The conference room is a separate building and there may be some mold issues with that building.

Dr. Shapiro stated the high window cost may be for replacing them with hurricane resistant windows.

Ms. Jackson, Ms. Eifert and Ms. Julien agreed the building has a high level of historic significance but may be too expensive to repair.

2. What recommendation would be made to maintain the Ames House under City ownership and pursue renovations vs. selling the property?

Dr. Shapiro stated the market was flat and he was not aware of anyone interested in purchasing the property. He emphasized the issues with water intrusion and indicated something had to be done to fix the property so that it was not neglected.

Ms. Julien asked whether the water damage was from the roof, windows leaking or ground intrusion. She suggested continuing to maintain the Ames House under City ownership and pursue renovations and to not sell the property. She stated the Legal Department could move into City Hall and lease the building after repairs were made.

It was commented that the water was entering through appendages and not from the roof or windows.

Ms. Eifert asked whether there were any offers to purchase the property. Would the City be allowed to sell the property and could there be restrictions placed on the property for the new owner.

Mr. Goss stated the City has not put the property on the market, so there have been no offers to purchase.

Dr. Shapiro stated it was on the city's Local Landmark List and the next owner would have to abide by the landmark regulations. He didn't know if the property was a local landmark when the City purchased it.

Ms. Parkerson stated the landmark houses were designated in 1986 and the property was purchased in 1973.

Mr. Goss stated if someone asked to purchase the property, the City would have to go through normal procurement procedures. It would need to go through an RFP process.

Ms. Jackson stated she would like to see the building renovated but it may not be cost effective.

Ms. Parkerson stated Mayor Kelley stated in a meeting in July that he didn't want to renovate the property and suggested selling it privately. She noted the property could not be sold easily because of the parcels that were attached to it. She noted that renovation was needed and once renovated, continued maintenance was needed.

Ms. Julien asked whether the seawall was being renovated.

Mr. Carolin stated the seawall was being renovated with a joint filler and the work would begin at Rivera Park and continue north through a CIP project.

Mr. Richards stated it seemed to be costly and asked what else would need to be done.

Mr. Walsh stated he would like the City to maintain the building but would like to see it for public use and not private use. He stated it could be used to display Ormond Beach artifacts or rent it out for weddings. He agreed that it was going to cost a lot in maintenance just to use it as a City facility.

Dr. Drake stated the expense was a concern and wondered about long-term structural issues.

Ms. Emery stated there were several restrictions on the property with the grants received, how the property is used, and agreed there was limited parking.

Susan Heddy, Director of the Ormond Historical Society, stated the Ames House was a gemstone of the City and a very unique part of Ormond Beach.

Dr. Drake stated there had been comments about a possible interest from Mr. Bill Jones and offering his services.

Mr. Walsh moved, seconded by Ms. Julien that the Historic Landmark Preservation Board recommends that the Ames House be identified as a highly valuable historical resource for the City of Ormond Beach and should remain under the per view of City ownership with renovations as needed. The motion passed unanimously.

VI. Member Comments

Dr. Shapiro thanked the Board for taking the time to serve on the board and the time spent on the items that are up for discussion.

VII. Adjournment – Next Meeting

The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Shá Moss, Recording Secretary

ATTEST:

Dr. Philip J. Shapiro, Chairman