PINELLAS COUNTY
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD

AGENDA

9:30 A.M. – 11:30 A.M.

May 17th, 2017

310 Court St., Clearwater, FL 33756

I. Call to Order and Introductions

II. Approval of Minutes – March 15, 2017 meeting

III. Becket Bridge Replacement Aesthetics Committee Update
    • The third Aesthetic Committee meeting was held on May 10th and an update will be provided to the Board.

IV. FY17 Work Plan Updates/Discussion
    • Small Matching Grant application submittal
    • Palm Harbor Master Plan update
    • State Historical Marker Program updates
    • October Historic Preservation Summit
    • Speaker’s Bureau presentation

V. Public Comments

VI. Board Member Comments

VII. Chairman’s Comments

VIII. Adjournment
Historic Preservation Board Agenda Item II.

Approval of March 15, 2017 Meeting Minutes

- The minutes of the March 15th meeting are attached for review and approval.

Attachment(s):

- Historic Preservation Board minutes of March 15th, 2017 meeting.

Action Required:

- Approval of minutes.
I. **Call to Order and Introductions:**

A regular meeting of the Historic Preservation Board was held in Clearwater on March 15, 2017. Chairman Justice called the meeting to order at 9:33 a.m. and welcomed new member Ric Ortega to the Board.

II. **Approval of Minutes**

Minutes of the January 18, 2017 meeting of the Historic Preservation Board were approved unanimously.

III. **Becket Bridge Replacement Aesthetics Committee presentation**

Chris Moore introduced Nancy McKibben, Project Coordinator in the Transportation Division of Pinellas County Public Works. Ms. McKibben presented on the Beckett Bridge replacement project. The bridge was originally built in 1924 as a wooden approach, concrete piers and a steel drawbridge span and was called the Chilito Street Bridge. It was renamed in 1948 for Pinellas County Commissioner Edward Beckett. In 1956 the existing bridge was built with a concrete approaches and the piers were rebuilt with reinforced concrete. The existing bridge is historically significant due to its rolling-lift bascule bridge engineering design, which was patented by William Scherzer.

The existing bridge has previously been scheduled for demolition due to safety concerns related to deteriorating pilings and their location in relation to a relic sink hole discovered in a geotechnical
investigation. The replacement bridge is currently in the design phase and an Aesthetics Committee has been formed as the result of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between Pinellas County and the State Historic Preservation Office, as the bridge is listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The MOA stipulates the design of the new bridge must feature the single-leaf, rolling lift bascule bridge design, which is the basis of the bridge being listed on the NRHP. The Aesthetic Committee includes representation from Tarpon Springs residents, the Tarpon Springs Historical Society, the Tarpon Springs Yacht Club, the City of Tarpon Springs, the U.S. Coast Guard, the State Division of Historical Resources and Department of Transportation, as well as representation from the County’s Historic Preservation Board (HPB) and the County’s Transportation Division staff.

To date, two Committee meetings have been held, and Ms. McKibben provided a summary of those meetings as well as the initial design concepts proposed with the intent of seeking feedback from the HPB. A summary of Board member comments on the concepts presented included:

1. One member raised concern that no “traditional” design concept had been offered, as in whether the aesthetic qualities of the original wood bridge design was considered in these conceptual designs. While many of the design elements featured in the original design may not be replicable due to current safety standards, it is important to considering its original proportions and form, and to try to replicate them to whatever extent possible when designing a modern day bridge.

2. Arches: multiple members indicated a preference to include arches in the design both to soften the contemporary themes present in all four concepts, and because arches would also complement the curved nature of the existing rolling-lift bridge span.

3. A member highlighted the uniqueness of not only the original design, but the uniqueness preserving the technology of the time, and recognizing its need to be preserved despite all of the engineering improvements that have been made over the last 100 years.

4. Railings: multiple Board members stressed the importance the railings have on the overall aesthetics and raised concerns that all four designs feature the same style with no variation offered.

5. Shade structures: one members raised concerns that the shade structures shown in the designs would not actually provide sufficient sun shade or protection from the rain, and that they should be considered on this basis, and not merely as an architectural aesthetics element.

6. Lighting: a member commented that it would be good to incorporate lighting on the underside of the bridge so it will reflect down on the water and not into the sky, thereby reducing the potential for “light pollution.”

7. Overall the discussion focused two different approaches: preserving the architectural aesthetic qualities and alternatively recognizing the fact that the historical significance lies in the engineering design, not the architectural design. While this was recognized one member felt the designs needed to go further to highlight the historical significance of the bridge.
IV. FY17 Work Plan Updates/Discussion

Mr. Moore gave an update on research to designate the Crystal Beach waterfront path as a Historic Landmark Site. It was discovered that Pinellas County does not have fee simple ownership of the right of way. All property owners along the path would be required to agree to the designation. Historically this path has been a controversial issue within the community as multiple property owners along the path have unsuccessfully petitioned to have portions of the right of way vacated so that they would be allowed to install decks or boat slips along the water. Given the property owners would individually need to willingly participate in the designation process, it is not recommended to proceed. However, this site is a prime candidate for a historical marker and given the application due date for the next State marker review panel meeting is on March 20th, staff has taken the initiative to complete an application to submit should it please the Board.

The discussion continued with Mr. Moore reviewing the list of previously prioritized sites to consider for a landmark designations, noting the significant challenges each present as discussed in previous meetings. In lieu of pursuing a designation at present time, staff proposed submitting a Small Matching Grant application through the State Division of Historic Resources in this year’s cycle, which would be due at the end of April or May. The due date has not been announced yet. The focus on the application would be a survey of all historical resources in Unincorporated County. Best preservation practices are to update surveys every 20-30 years, so given the last survey specifically focused on this area was conducted in 1993, an update is due. This would allow the Board to better understand the universe of resources to consider for designation, which would alleviate some of the challenges presented by the current list of prioritized sites. The Board was supportive of this idea and recommended staff proceed with an application.

The conversation turned back to the historical marker program, with the Board supporting applying to have a marker along the Crystal Beach waterfront path. Additional marker applications in this cycle will be for the South Ward School Site and at the Ft. De Soto Military and Batteries Post. Mr. Moore thanked Board Member Gina Clayton for his assistance with the South Ward application, as well as the Clearwater Historical and the Pinellas County School Board, which owns the site. Board Member Barie asked staff to create some form of checklist document showing markers that are in process, have been approved and installed for future Board discussions.

Chairman Justice asked Mr. Moore to provide the group a summary of the distinction between designating a structure locally, on the National Register of Historic Places and the State’s Historical Marker Program. It was explained that the County must have jurisdiction over the site and the agreement of the property owner to designate a site or structure at the local level. This form of designation provides the strongest level of protection for historic resources as an ordinance must be passed designating the structure and all alterations to the site in the future must apply for a Certificate of Appropriateness, which is reviewed and approved by the Historic Preservation Board.
The National Register designation provide less protection as the property owner is still allowed to make alterations without seeking approval from any agency. However, federally funded projects must go through a Section 106 review under the National Historic Preservation Act to ensure development does not negatively impact historic resources in the area. Designation at this level also provides eligibility to various federal tax credits.

The State’s Historical Marker Program involves applying for cast iron markers that allow for text to describe the historical significance of the particular site and/or structure. While the site officially becomes designated by the State as a Florida Heritage Site, the process has no impact on future alterations to the site.

Mr. Barie made a motion was made to support the submittal of the Crystal Beach path/parkway historical marker application, it was seconded and passed unanimously. The discussion continued and a second motion was made by Board Member Ortega instructing staff to explore placing two markers along the Crystal Beach parkway – one at the intersection of the shell path and paved road portion of Gulf Dr., and one at the park area further to the north. It was seconded and passed unanimously. Mr. Ortega indicated his support for public spaces to again be considered in future marker site discussions in addition to structures. He also voiced his support for any efforts the Board can make to promote historic resources, including areas where the County may not have jurisdiction to locally designate a site or structure.

The Florida Trust for Historic Preservation annual conference to be held in St. Petersburg May 18-20 was discussed next. Mr. Barie will be making a presentation on the challenges posed by new construction in traditional neighborhoods.

V. Other Business

An update on completed and upcoming Speaker’s Bureau presentations by Board Member Barie was provided.

Mr. Moore announced a State Certified Local Government Training on April 24th and 25th. Attendance on both days was not required and if anyone is interested, they can contact Mr. Moore for more information.

VI. Public Comments:

No members of the public were present to provide comments.

VII. Board Member Comments:

Ms. Phyllis Kolianos announced she has secured the Heritage Museum for October 20, 2017 for the Fall Historic Preservation Summit. A flyer will be prepared for Mr. Barie to distribute at the Florida Trust conference.
Mr. Barie asked about the previous update to the Design Review Manual and Mr. Moore indicated all edits had been made and the updated version is posted on the Historic Preservation Board website.

VIII. **Chairman’s Comments:**

No comments.

IX. **Adjournment:**

March 16, 2017 meeting was adjourned at 11:35 a.m.
Historic Preservation Board Agenda Item III.

Becket Bridge Replacement Aesthetics Committee Presentation

- The third Aesthetic Committee meeting was held on May 10\textsuperscript{th} and revised renderings will be discussed.

Attachment(s):

- Meeting minutes from the second Beckett Bridge Aesthetics Committee meeting
- Presentation materials received at the third Aesthetics Committee meeting, including revised renderings of the proposed bridge

Action Required:

- Provide feedback on the revised renderings to be submitted the Beckett Bridge project team.
Beckett Bridge Replacement - PID 001037A

Aesthetics Committee Meeting #1-Minutes

Type of Meeting: Aesthetics Committee Meeting #2
Meeting Date/Time: March 1, 9:30 am – 12:30 pm
Meeting Facilitator: Hardesty & Hanover Project Team
Location: Tarpon Springs Yacht Club, 350 N. Spring Blvd, Tarpon Springs, 34689
Prepared by: Ann Venables, Hardesty & Hanover
Project: PID 001037A – Beckett Bridge Replacement (Design)

Attendees: See Attached Attendee List

Summary of Discussion

A. Bradley Touchstone provided an Introduction which included a brief review of the following:
   a. Project description and history
   b. Section 106 Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) requirements
   c. Proposed design concept and bridge terminology

B. Results of the 1st meeting were summarized and discussed.
   a. A summary of the meeting comments was reviewed.
   b. Key words that the committee suggested for the theme of the bridge aesthetics were reviewed.

C. Jim Phillips discussed maintenance considerations that should be considered.

Jim Phillips, Nancy McKibben and Erin Lawson met with the County maintenance staff and presented the concepts that were shared with the Aesthetics Committee members prior to this meeting. County maintenance staff expressed the following concerns.

   a. Concrete is preferred over coated steel for traffic barriers and vertical structures at overlooks.
   b. The preferred materials for the pedestrian/safety railings are aluminum or stainless steel.
   c. It is very important to secure the bridge control areas that house equipment from vandals or animals. The current design shows the bridge control areas more open than the staff prefers.
   d. County staff currently parks in the Yacht Club parking lot to open the bridge, or do maintenance. In addition, the standby generator for the electrical systems is located on Yacht Club property. Unless other areas can be provided on these two locations needs to be preserved.

Jim Phillips stated that the steel traffic barriers were not “off the table” at this time. Information from other municipalities that are maintaining this type of rail will be shared with Pinellas County Maintenance staff. The rails are made of galvanized steel, and maintenance is much less than with older steel railings.

D. Bradley Touchstone presented the concepts developed since the last meeting.

Comments applicable to all of the design concepts include the following:

- The main focus which creates the “main user experience” for the public is treatment of the bascule pier.
- The overlook on the north side of the bridge which houses the bridge controls will be restricted to equipment and operators. There will be no pedestrian access.
- The curved outside of the bascule pier will lead to the stair.
- Smooth lines were emphasized to define the overall aesthetics.
• A texture can be added to the lower section of the pier that works well with the natural environment including weathering and growth of barnacles.
• Lighting (night) could be added to any of the concepts.

a. Contemporary Design Concept
  • Timely, modern design with a quiet statement
  • The railing system provides a big impact visually.
  • Installation of a panel between the railings offers additional opportunities for aesthetic treatments.
  • As discussed previously, access to the south “overlook” would be restricted, possibly with a stainless steel mesh that still allows the area to appear open.
  • Colors are muted white.
  • The shade structure for the overviews is translucent material, which is understated, quiet and represents a simple solution.

b. Nautical Design Concept
  • Sail forms, more dynamic, visual movement, more vertical components
  • Color is “more” white than Contemporary design.
  • Sail Canopies are more dynamic, with staggered heights. They are tensile structures rated for wind, a tried and true system.
  • Color lighting could be added easily.

c. Greek Modern Design Concept
  • Very strong horizontal planes
  • Bold geometry and visual mass.
  • Blue pane on overlook appears to “hover”.
  • One blue or a combination of blues could be applied.

e. Motion Design Concept
  • Opportunity to control opacity and backlight at night.
  • Pillars of light.
  • Wind turbines will have ability to generate a small amount of electricity, but not enough to run the bridge.
  • Highlights the theme of sustainability
  • Canopy design accentuates the sense of motion.
  • Vertical elements create a relationship to the environment.

E. Discussion about Concept Designs

Comments on Greek Concept
  • Concern that perhaps bright white is not representative of Greek design. There are places in Greece where the paint is more “white-yellow” to cut glare on the eyes.
  • The area in the vicinity of the bridge was settled prior to the Greek settlement in Tarpon Springs. This design seems (historically) out of place in this location.
  • Use of arches was suggested based on historic pictures of the area where arches were incorporated. The arch could reflect the arc of the bascule span.
  • Guide wires could be added to reflect a more nautical theme.

Comments on Motion Design Concept
  • Moving parts would discourage osprey nesting.
  • Moving parts can be an additional maintenance problem.
• Concerns were raised that moving parts may not hold up well in an aggressive marine environment.
• The tower could be tapered to avoid the look of a smokestack.
• The tower could be designed to be more “nautical” like a sailboat mast.

General Comments

• If lit, lighting needs to be subtle, soft, glowing to prevent light pollution.
• Is it possible to allow the bottom level of north side be “open” so that you could see the machinery even though that area is closed to pedestrians?
• Care should be taken to preserve openness when designing a way for the control area to be secure.

F. Bradley Touchstone presented opportunities for “Interpretive Elements”

• The existing historic plaque is required by the MOA to be preserved and placed in an area that can be viewed by pedestrians.
• Opportunities to reuse salvaged parts were discussed.
  o Gears from the machinery could be incorporated into the railing.
  o The “track and tread” portion of the movable bridge could possibly be removed and installed on the bottom level of the overlook, or it could be placed on a cantilevered platform off of the overlook.
• Pinellas County has a historic marker program. This could be discussed with the Historic Preservation Board.

G. Miscellaneous Comments/Issues

Jim Phillips discussed the safety issue of clearing pedestrians from the overlook prior to opening the bridge.

County records show that the bridge opened 66 times in 2016. This was three times more than the number of openings/year between 2012-2014 when the PD&E study was conducted.

A “rub rail” will be installed on the bridge pier in lieu of a fender system to protect boats from bumping up against the concrete pier. (A fender system is self-supported. The rub-rail is not, but will be attached to the pier.)

H. Group Exercise

The concept drawings were displayed on large (7 ft x 3 foot) banners and placed outside on the Yacht Club’s patio. Aesthetic Committee members were each given five yellow “dot” stickers. Members were asked to place the dots on the elements that they liked best and would like see incorporated into the final aesthetic concept. The banners with the dots were photographed for the record.

There was a high level of excitement about the project and the opportunities that exist to create a meaningful project for this community. The following is a summary of the preferences expressed during the Group Exercise:

1. There is a strong desire to maintain the open railings system in lieu of concrete barriers.
2. There is a preference to maintain the vertical element on the Motion concept but marry it to the Nautical theme. Recommendations were given to convert the vertical element into a mast-like motif. That Nautical theme can the influence the design of the canopy.
3. The members of the committee preferred to keep the interpretive element on the bridge if possible.
4. The main interpretive piece should be the track and tread assembly.
5. Secondary level interpretive elements can include the gears integrated into the railing or protective barrier at the overlook.
6. It was understood that the lower lever of the bascule pier will not be accessible to the general public (maintenance staff only.)
7. Arched forms will be explored for the pier caps.
8. A alternative color palette will be presented that incorporates softer yellow tones.
9. Soft lighting is appropriate in this environment.
3rd Aesthetics Committee Meeting

May 10, 2017

Tarpon Springs Yacht Club
Meeting Schedule:
A total of four meetings is anticipated.

1st Aesthetics Committee Meeting - November
• Establish an “overarching theme and/or vision statement” for the project.

2nd Aesthetics Committee Meeting - March 2017
• User experience and primary architectural components

3rd Aesthetics Committee Meeting - April 2017
• Refinement of Details

4th Aesthetics Committee Meeting - December 2017
• Refinement of Details
MEETING #2 RECAP

1. Contemporary
2. Nautical
3. Greek Modern
4. Motion
Preferences:
• Open Barrier System
• Vertical Element from “Motion” option that mimics a mast
• Canopy that incorporates vertical element and the “Contemporary” lines with engineering history elements
• Secondary platform for display of rolling leaf from existing bridge
• Incorporation of gears from existing bridge into railing/ wall systems
• Introduce arch forms into composition
• Exploration of colors for bridge
• Refine safety and maintenance requirements
CONCEPT REFINEMENTS

- Increased Approach Span Length
- Expanded Sidewalk for Interpretive Area
- Enclose Lower Level of Bascule Pier
- Enclose Operator Area
- Eliminate Stair
- Add Maintenance Parking

Beckett Bridge
(Bridge No. 154000) – Engineering Consulting Services
PROJECT NO.: 145-0317-NC (SS)
Aesthetics Committee Meeting #3
CONCEPT REFINEMENTS

Beckett Bridge
(Bridge No. 154000) – Engineering Consulting Services
PROJECT NO.: 145-0317-NC (SS)
Aesthetics Committee Meeting #3
CONCEPT REFINEMENTS

Beckett Bridge

(Bridge No. 154000) – Engineering Consulting Services
PROJECT NO.: 145-0317-NC (SS)
Aesthetics Committee Meeting #3
CONCEPT REFINEMENTS

Beckett Bridge
Beckett Bridge

RAILING COMPARISON
Beckett Bridge
(Bridge No. 154000) – Engineering Consulting Services
PROJECT NO.: 145-0317-NC (SS)
Aesthetics Committee Meeting #3

RAILING COMPARISON
RAILING COMPARISON/ PIER OPTIONS

Beckett Bridge

(Bridge No. 154000) – Engineering Consulting Services
PROJECT NO.: 145-0317-NC (SS)
Aesthetics Committee Meeting #3

Pinellas County
Color Comparison
OVERALL CONCEPT DISCUSSION
BARRIER DISCUSSION
BARRIER DISCUSSION

Combination Rail

Texas Classic Rail

Beckett Bridge
Enclosure Material
NEXT STEPS
Historic Preservation Board Agenda Item IV.

FY17 Work Plan Discussion

Staff will lead a discussion pertaining to updates on progress made on the FY17 work plan, including:

- Small Matching Grant application submittal
- Palm Harbor Master Plan update
- State Historical Marker Program updates
- October Historic Preservation Summit
- Speaker’s Bureau presentations

Attachment(s):

- Table of prioritized, approved and installed historical marker applications

Action Required:

- Discuss and provide feedback on the FY2017 Work Plan items referenced above
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prioritized for Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pass-a-Grille Historic District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarpon Springs Historic District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved by State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Pinellas County Courthouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Ward School Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. De Soto Military Batteries and Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal Beach Historic Path/Parkway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozona Village Hall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>