

# City of Gainesville

*City Hall  
200 East University Avenue  
Gainesville, Florida 32601*



## **Minutes - Final**

**September 1, 2020**

**5:30 PM**

**Virtual Meeting**

## **Historic Preservation Board**

*Jay Reeves - Chair  
Bill Warinner - Member  
Michelle Hazen - Member  
Danielle Masse - Member  
Kyra N. Lucas - Member  
Elizabeth Hausauer - Member  
Nicole Nesberg - Member  
Elizabeth Hauck - Member  
Michael Hill - Member  
Jason Simmons - Staff Liaison*

*If you have a disability and need an accommodation in order to participate in this meeting, please contact the Office of Equal Opportunity at (352) 334-5051 at least two business days in advance. TTY (Text Telephone Telecommunication Device) users please call 711 (Florida Relay Service). For Speech to Speech (STS) relay, please call 1-877-955-5334. For STS Spanish relay, please call 1-877-955-8773. For STS French Creole relay, please call 1-877-955-8707.*

**CALL TO ORDER****ROLL CALL**

Members present: Jay Reeves, Bill Warinner, Michelle Hazen, Kyra Lucas, Elizabeth Hauck, Danielle Masse, Nicole Nesberg, Elizabeth Hausauer, Michael Hill

Staff Present: Sal Cumella, Yvette Thomas

**ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

Motion to approve

Motion by: Member Warinner

Seconded by: Member Hill

Motion passes following a 8-0 vote

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES: na**

**ANNOUNCEMENT: Section 30-3.5 of the Land Development Code establishes the Historic Preservation Board including its composition and duties and authority. The Historic Preservation Board procedures are set forth in Sec. 30-4.28G of the Land Development Code. Appeals of Historic Preservation Board decisions are to the City Commission and must be filed within 14 days from the date the decision by the Historic Preservation Board is reduced to writing and served by certified or registered mail. The appeal procedure is specified in Sec. 30-4.28G. of the Land Development Code.**

[200280.](#)

**RECOMMENDATION**

*Staff finds that the requested action, as presented, is consistent with the City of Gainesville's Code of Ordinances - Article IV Tax Exemption for Historic Properties.*

*Staff to the Historic Preservation Board - Approval of HP-20-3*

Motion to approve

Motion by: Member Hazen

Seconded by: Member Hill

**Motion passes following a 8-0 vote**

[200281.](#)

**RECOMMENDATION**

*Staff finds that the requested action, as presented, is consistent with the City of Gainesville's Code of Ordinances – Article IV Tax Exemption for Historic Properties.*

*Staff to the Historic Preservation Board - Approval of HP-17-51 Part II Ad Valorem Tax Exemption*

**Motion to approve**

**Motion by: Member Nesberg**

**Seconded by: Member Lucas**

**Motion passes following a 7-0 vote**

[200164.](#)

**RECOMMENDATION**

*Staff finds that the requested action, as presented, is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, and the Historic Preservation, Rehabilitation, and Design Guidelines.*

*Staff to the Historic Preservation Board - Approval of HP-20-40*

**Motion to approve with exception that carriage house be located as far north as possible with a minimum setback of 5 ft from the south property line and that the windows be eliminated from the south elevation.**

**Motion by: Member Hausauer**

**Seconded by: Member Warinner**

**Motion passes following a 9-0 vote**

[200168.](#)

**RECOMMENDATION**

*Staff finds that the requested action, as presented, is substantially consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, and the Historic Preservation, Rehabilitation, and Design Guidelines.*

*Staff to the Historic Preservation Board - Approval of HP-20-49*

**Motion to continue**

**Motion by: Member Nesberg**

**Seconded by: Member Hazen**

**Motion passes following a 9-0 vote**

[200282.](#)

**RECOMMENDATION**

*Staff finds that the requested action, as presented, is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, and the Historic Preservation, Rehabilitation, and Design*

*Guidelines.*

*Staff to the Historic Preservation Board - Approval of  
HP-19-39 Amendment #1*

**Motion to approve with condition that the windows are either 2/ 2 or 6/1 as a  
final decision**

**Motion by: Member Hausauer  
Seconded by: Member Nesberg  
Motion passes following a 9-0 vote**

[200169.](#)

**RECOMMENDATION**

*Staff finds that the requested action, as presented, is  
substantially consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's  
Standards, and the Historic Preservation, Rehabilitation, and  
Design Guidelines.*

*Staff to the Historic Preservation Board - Approval of  
HP-20-50*

**Motion to Continue**

**Motion by: Member Nesberg  
Seconded by: Member Hazen  
Motion passes following a 9-0 vote**

**NEW BUSINESS:**

**OLD BUSINESS:**

[200273.](#)

**RECOMMENDATION**

*Staff finds that not enough information was provided about the  
context of the project in relation to the neighborhood to make  
an informed recommendation on the overall design of the  
home or the modification of setbacks.*

*Staff to the Historic Preservation Board - Continuation of  
HP-20-59*

**Motion to approve with condition that the west setback be a minimum of 4 ft.  
Accept setback changes to the north (front) and south (rear) elevation**

**Motion by: Member Hazen  
Seconded by: Member Nesberg  
Motion passes following a 8-0 vote**

[200271.](#)

**RECOMMENDATION**

*Staff finds that the requested action, as presented, is  
substantially consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's  
Standards, and the Historic Preservation, Rehabilitation, and*

*Design Guidelines.*

*Staff to the Historic Preservation Board - Approval of HP-20-63 with the condition:*

- 1. The metal roof be standing seam in design.*

**Motion to approve with standing seam or architectural grade shingle**

**Motion by: Member Warinner**

**Seconded by: Member Hazen**

**Motion passes following an 8-0 vote**

[200272.](#)

**RECOMMENDATION**

*Staff finds that the requested action, as presented, is substantially consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, and the Historic Preservation, Rehabilitation, and Design Guidelines.*

*Staff to the Historic Preservation Board - Approval of HP-20-65 with the condition:*

- 1. The metal roof be standing seam in design.*

**Motion to approve with standing seam or asphalt shingle**

**Motion by: Member Hausauer**

**Seconded by: Member Hazen**

**Motion passes following a 8-0 vote**

**PUBLIC COMMENT: Gary Anglin; Eric Leightman**

[200268.](#)

Gary Anglin spoke about a proposed project located within the University Heights North Historic District. Mr. Anglin requested some feedback for his project.

Eric Leightman spoke about a proposed project that would be built in front of a structure located within the University Heights North Historic District.

**STAFF APPROVED CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS:**

[200269.](#)

[200270.](#)

**BOARD BUSINESS:**

Sal Cumella, Planner, provided presentation on some of the research regarding solar installations on historic structures.

City Attorney-Sean McDermott spoke. Key language in the state statute is that cities can't prohibit or has the effect of prohibiting solar installations. There's

not a lot of case law surrounding this language so this makes it difficult to establish parameters. It doesn't say that we can't do anything. It doesn't say that we can't have regulations. The key is going to be pressing the regulations that we do have. The concern is that when applicants counter any requests by staff or the board and have a solar expert stand up and say that everything that you want us to do has the effect of prohibiting the solar array. When you hold a quasi-judicial hearing the owner or applicant has the burden of proof by providing competent and substantial evidence to show that they meet the burden. It then becomes the city's responsibility to provide counter evidence. In that, if we present enough evidence that counters evidence presented by the applicant. If the city doesn't have counter evidence it becomes more difficult so the code allows for us to hire our own independent outside expert to weigh in on the applicants assertions of meeting the code. The applicant should make the case of proving what prohibits their use of solar. Hausauer asked about cost and efficiency and whether those two things prohibit the use of solar. McDermott's response is that they have some discretion in that it may hinder the installation or that it is not as ideal but ultimately does it prohibit the installation.

## **STAFF REPORT:**

## **ADJOURNMENT**

9:14 PM