

HISTORIC PRESERVATION ADVISORY BOARD (HPAB) MEETING MINUTES

Date: Thursday, October 8, 2009

Time: 1: p.m.

Location: Pinellas County Planning Department Conference Room

Attendees: Brian K. Smith, W.H. (Wally) Clark, Gina Clayton, Terry Fortner, Ellen Babb, Becky Nielsen, Sam Casella, Cyndi Tarapani, Charlie Harper

Others present: Gordon Beardslee, Marcel Mohseni, Dave Sadowsky,

I. Call to Order – In the Absence of Commissioner Seel Board Chairman, Brian Smith called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

II. Minutes of August 13, 2009

The first item taken were the minutes of the August 13 board meeting. It was noted that the minutes did not distinguish between the Historic Preservation Advisory Board (HPA) members and others in attendance and that it would be a preferred procedure in the future to do this. It was agreed that the minutes would be corrected to reflect that distinction. The minutes were then approved.

III. Refinement of Charts on Review Process

The next item concerned charts on the review process. It was indicated that as previously agreed to the Planning Department was pursuing the Certified Local Government or CLG designation with the state. To accomplish that, the HPA Board needed to be recognized in the current ordinance for historic preservation. The Board reviewed the flowchart for designations under the current ordinance and how the Advisory Board would be included in that process. Because the designation would result in a zoning district designation the Local Planning Agency was required to be involved to make a recommendation to the County Commission. The Board discussed the fact that a number of other jurisdictions in the County do not make this a zoning designation but merely another form of historic designation. It was concluded that if it was just a historic designation then only the Advisory Board recommendation would be necessary. The Board concluded that the County ordinance for historic preservation should not include the action as a zoning action. The planning department staff agreed with that conclusion. With that decision the chart could then be modified to reflect that the advisory board would make a recommendation to the County commission, not the Local Planning Agency. The Planning Department staff agreed to make this modification in the chart and to proceed with a modification to the ordinance to reflect the thinking.

There was also considerable discussion concerning how the designation would be initiated. The flowchart had a footnote indicating that 60% of the people should agree before a designation is initiated. After much discussion the Board concluded that that should be replaced with such a designation being initiated by either a property owner or by the Planning Department. The Board concluded this provided the most flexibility for how a designation could be initiated and that such flexibility was important to the designation process. A second footnote on the chart indicated that if the property owner was not supportive of the proposal for designation, than a majority plus one of the County Commission would be required to approve such a proposal. After much discussion the Board voted to remove that stipulation from the chart.

The transition of already established historic districts and other designated properties were discussed and staff indicated that it would work on the subject and develop a proposal as to how the currently designated properties would transition to a yet to be drafted revised ordinance.

The second part of this agenda item concerned the review process for the Certificate of Appropriateness, or COA. The Planning Department staff reviewed the chart and then noted it was desired to make a distinction between a threshold for Advisory Board action versus staff action on proposals that were reviewed. An example was introduced where Tarpon Springs made a distinction by listing the various situations and when the Board would be involved, and when the staff would be involved to make a decision. The Board agreed this was a preferred procedure and the Planning Department staff agreed to incorporate that into the proposal with some refinement. The chart will be modified accordingly to reflect this distinction.

A discussion regarding minimum number of HPA Board ensued and it was decided that a minimum of seven members would constitute a quorum for the HPA Board to review designation and COA applications.

IV. Historic Designations

The first part of this item concerned the two designations in Ozona for the Hall and the community. It was reported that the Ozona Village Improvement Society, or OVIS, had discussed these designations at its last meeting. As background the County Commission had previously approved resolutions recognizing the historic significance of both the Village Hall and the Ozona community. However in light of the new Historic Preservation Program, the question had come forward as to whether to initiate designations under this new program and procedure. It was reported that OVIS was willing to pursue the designation of the Village Hall. It was also reported that OVIS recognized that the procedures for designating a community might be in the process of refinement and adjustment and OVIS is interested in pursuing a designation, but with the understanding that there was some caution in light of the fact that the procedures or program requirements might be modified. It was recognized by OVIS that there may be some greater flexibility in the choice of designation applications in the future.

The second part of this item concerned the Board determining a proposed set of designations for historic properties this coming year as part of the program that the Board would pursue. It was noted that at the last meeting a number of properties had been discussed and that there was a need for some conclusion or definition as to which properties would be pursued. After some discussion the Board concluded that properties with a national designation would be the easiest to pursue this coming year to refine the program. With that definition, the Board concluded the following designations would be pursued with the responsible partners: Weedon Island, Philippi Park, Anclote Key Lighthouse, Fort DeSoto Park, old County Courthouse, and Bay Pines. The Board also agreed to pursue designations for the Ozona Village Hall. It was recognized there were other properties that could also be considered as well, but that the list should be kept short due to limited resources. The Board discussed the availability of a detailed report conducted by Search, Inc. on Taylor property.

V. Comprehensive Plan Amendment Schedule concerning Policies for Historic Preservation

It was reported that the County LPA had just taken action to recommend the Historic Preservation policies developed by the Board for inclusion in the County's Comprehensive Plan. Those policies would now be taken to the County Commission for action on November 17th. The Planning Department staff agreed to provide notice to the Board members so they would have an opportunity to attend this meeting.

VI. Subcommittee Reports

The Committee reviewed the fact that the subcommittees have not met since the last meeting. However it was noted that the Board's current discussion and business items were based upon the work of the Demolition/Finance subcommittee's previous work. It was highlighted that the toolbox project was still a priority and should be pursued. It was noted that this project had received a high rating in the state but that there was no money this past year to fund that, or many other worthwhile projects. It was agreed that the project should still be pursued as the upcoming grant cycle with the state and that the next deadline is December 18. The Planning Department agreed to provide a copy of the previous application for the Subcommittee to review in November. It was indicated that the Toolbox Subcommittee membership may be deficient and should be reviewed. Gina volunteered to be a member of the subcommittee to work on the toolbox. Kimberly Hinder is the other remaining member, so others will need to be added. The Committee will meet to produce an updated proposal. That updated proposal will then be reviewed by the Advisory Board at its next meeting on December 10th before it is sent to the State. It was noted that the application can be filed online.

VII. Other Business

The next item for discussion concerned the procedure for school sites that are historic in nature. The Board members concluded that those present were not the ones that were involved in this project and it should be taken up at the next meeting. Karen Seel will follow up on the school site issue at the next meeting.

It was announced that the subcommittees could meet in November as need be and that the next Advisory Board meeting was December 10th.

VIII. Adjourn

The Board meeting was adjourned at 3 p.m.