



The CITY OF DAYTONA BEACH

Historic Preservation Board Agenda

November 19, 2019

City Hall
Regular Meeting
Commission Chambers

301 South Ridgewood Avenue
Tuesday, November 19, 2019
6:00 P.M.

NOTICE – Pursuant to Section 286.0105, Florida Statutes, if any person decides to appeal any decision made by this Board at this public meeting, such person will need a record of the proceedings and, for that purpose, such person may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based. The City does not prepare or provide such a record.

	For special accommodations, please notify the City Clerk's Office at least 72 hours in advance. (386) 671-8023		Help for the hearing impaired is available through the Assistive Listening System. Receivers can be obtained from the City Clerk's Office.
---	---	---	---

In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), persons with a disability needing a special accommodation to participate in the Board meeting should contact the City Clerk's Office, 301 S. Ridgewood Ave, Room 210, Daytona Beach, FL 32114, Ph: (386) 671-8023, Email: clerk@codb.us not later than 72 hours prior to the proceedings. If you are hearing or voice impaired contact the relay operator at 1-800-955-9771.

- 1) **Call to Order**
- 2) **Roll Call**
- 3) **Approval of Minutes:** September 17, 2019 Meeting
- 4) **Action Item:** Approval of 2020 HPB Calendar
- 5) **Discussion Item:** *Student Scholarship*
- 6) **Discussion Item:** *Historic Sites drone fly over*
- 7) **Discussion Item:** *Mount Bethel*
- 8) **Discussion Item:** *Annual Christmas Dinner*
- 9) **Other Business:**
 - (a) Heritage Preservation Trust Report: Mr. Trager, Liaison
- 10) **Staff Update**
- 11) **Public Comments**
- 12) **Board Comments**
- 13) **Adjourn**

Next Meeting – December 17, 2019, 6:00 p.m. in the City Commission Chamber

DRAFT

REGULAR MEETING – HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD

Tuesday, September 17, 2019

Minutes for the Regular Historic Preservation Board meeting for the City of Daytona Beach, Florida, held on Tuesday, September 17, 2019, at 6:00 p.m. in Commission Chambers of City Hall, 301 S. Ridgewood Avenue, Daytona Beach, Florida

Board Members present were as follows:

Mr. Robert Fort, Chair
Mr. James Daniels
Mr. Dallas Peacock
Mr. Brian Fredley (arrived at 6:05 p.m.)
Dr. Andrei Ludu
Mr. Warren Trager

Board Members absent were as follows:

Dr. Daniel Stotland
Mr. Roman Yurkiewicz, Vice Chair

Staff members present:

Mr. Doug Gutierrez, Principal Planner
Ms. Kira Honse, Assistant City Attorney
Ms. Becky Groom, Board Secretary

1. **Call to Order**

Mr. Fort called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

2. **Roll Call**

Roll was called with members present as listed above.

3. **Approval of Minutes:** August 20, 2019

Board Action:

A motion was made by Dr. Ludu, seconded by Mr. Fort, to approve the minutes of the August 20, 2019 Historic Preservation Board meeting, as presented. The motion carried (5-0).

Mr. Fredley arrived for the meeting at 6:05 p.m.

DRAFT

4. **DEV2019-129: A request by Jose R. Alvarez, Facilities Project Manager, County of Volusia, representing the property owners, Volusia Board of County Commissioners (VBOCC) for a Certificate of Appropriateness for 440 South Beach Street, a contributing structure in the South Beach Street Local Historic District, to allow a change of roofing materials**

Staff Presentation:

Mr. Gutierrez presented the staff report which was included as part of the packet. Mr. Gutierrez stated the architectural style of the structure is Queen Anne and the typical roof material is slate. Mr. Gutierrez stated the style evolved and local materials were incorporated. Mr. Gutierrez stated the structure was donated in 1949 by the Rawlings family to be used as a courthouse annex and is still used as a Volusia County judicial facility. Mr. Gutierrez stated the proposed material to be used is Brava Spanish Tile. Mr. Gutierrez stated other than the roof, no other replacements will be made to the structure.

Applicant Presentation:

Jose Alvarez, Volusia County, was in attendance representing the applicant. Mr. Peacock asked if the entire building is occupied and Mr. Alvarez stated yes. Mr. Alvarez stated the building houses State Attorney staff and all three stories are used.

Mr. Peacock asked what the life expectancy of the proposed material will be.

Mr. Alvarez stated 50 years.

Board Comments:

There were no additional Board comments.

Public Comments:

There were no public comments.

Board Action:

A motion was made by Mr. Trager, seconded by Mr. Fredley, to approve DEV2019-129: A request by Jose R. Alvarez, Facilities Project Manager, County of Volusia, representing the property owners, Volusia Board of County Commissioners (VBOCC) for a Certificate of Appropriateness for

DRAFT

440 South Beach Street, a contributing structure in the South Beach Street Local Historic District, to allow a change of roofing materials, in accordance with the staff report as presented. The motion carried (6-0).

5. **Discussion Item:** Scholarship draft application

Mr. Gutierrez presented the draft application and scoring rubric for the scholarship program. Mr. Gutierrez stated the application will be directed to the school, not the students; and funds will be paid in September 2020 for the first semester and January 2021 for the second semester, directly to the college and not the student.

Dr. Ludu stated he liked the application that is proposed and provided Mr. Gutierrez with some personal notes and comments. Mr. Gutierrez stated he will make the recommended changes and provide the final application to the Board at the next meeting.

6. **Discussion Item:** Mount Bethel

Mr. Gutierrez stated he met with members of Mount Bethel Institutional Baptist Church. Mr. Gutierrez stated a resolution will be prepared identifying Mount Bethel as a local landmark and a plaque will be prepared. Mr. Gutierrez stated the items will be presented to the Historic Preservation Board for review and he will meet with the Church historians for the information to be included in the resolution and plaque. Mr. Gutierrez stated the second step will be to designate the area as a local historic district and that process will be lengthy and costly.

Eartha Sims-Watson, 173 Aleatha, Daytona Beach, Florida spoke and stated she represented other Church members in attendance. Ms. Sims-Watson stated the members are requesting an administrative application for a historic district that would include Mt. Bethel and the Campbell Hotel. Ms. Sims-Watson stated the church was founded on June 22, 1885 and was the first church of any denomination. Ms. Sims-Watson stated the architectural style of the church is early 20th century Gothic Revival style and is unlike any church in the Daytona Beach area. Ms. Sims-Watson stated the building itself will be 100 years old on November 1, 2021 and the church just celebrated its 135th anniversary. Ms. Sims-Watson stated Mount Bethel is also the home church of Dr. Howard Thurman, whose home is already on the National Registry of Historic Places.

Mr. Peacock asked about the main entrance to the church and stated the church's website indicates the church is closed for renovations.

Ms. Sims-Watson stated there are three entrances: one is the main entrance at the top of the church and there are two doors on the side for

DRAFT

entrances from the parking lot. Ms. Sims-Watson stated the services are at 10:30 a.m. on Sunday but the downstairs is still closed due to damages from Hurricane Matthew. Ms. Sims-Watson stated the exterior of the church has not been changed.

7. **Other Business:** Heritage Preservation Trust Report – Mr. Trager, Liaison

Mr. Trager asked about the historic overlay for Hotchkiss House and asked why the house has not received a plaque.

Mr. Gutierrez stated he believes that Hotchkiss House already has the overlay done, he will verify at the next meeting. Mr. Gutierrez stated there is a delay for the special use permit and there are things that are required from the Hotchkiss House staff, such as the parking lot, a fence, and drainage and there is also an easement issue. Mr. Gutierrez stated the designation does not come with a plaque. Mr. Gutierrez stated the historic designation has nothing to do with the special use permit.

8. **Staff Update**

There were no additional staff updates.

9. **Public Comments**

Harriet Edwards, 924 School Street, Daytona Beach, Florida spoke regarding the parking lot at the corner of Martin Luther King and School Street. Ms. Edwards stated the structure of the parking lot is well accepted and does not interfere with traffic flow. Ms. Edwards stated the 800 block of School Street has become a dumping ground and asked what can be done to discourage dumping in the area.

Mr. Gutierrez stated he will report Ms. Edwards' concerns to Code Enforcement.

Gregory Wilford, 947 School Street, Daytona Beach, Florida stated he has spoken to Code Enforcement about dumping along Shady Place and School Street at the north side of the golf course. Mr. Wilford asked if some large rocks could be placed at the entrance to discourage people from dumping on the empty lot.

Mr. Peacock stated that is something that should be addressed by the City Commission since he has already spoken with Code Enforcement.

DRAFT

10. **Board Comments**

Mr. Fredley stated he will not be in attendance if there is a meeting in October.

Dr. Ludu stated he will not be in attendance if there is a meeting in October.

Mr. Fort noted there is a vacancy on the Board and asked if there is a residency requirement for service on the Board.

Ms. Honse stated the code reads that the majority of the members must be residents of the City.

11. **Adjourn**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Robert Fort, Chair

Becky Groom, Board Secretary

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD - 2020 CALENDAR

Submittal	Notice	Meeting
November 18, 2019	December 7, 2019	December 17, 2019
December 16, 2019	January 11, 2020	January 21, 2020
January 20, 2020	February 8, 2020	February 18, 2020
February 17, 2020	March 7, 2020	March 17, 2020
March 16, 2020	April 11, 2020	April 21, 2020
April 20, 2020	May 9, 2020	May 19, 2020
May 18, 2020	June 6, 2020	June 16, 2020
June 15, 2020	July 10, 2020	July 21, 2020
July 20, 2020	August 8, 2020	August 18, 2020
August 17, 2020	September 5, 2020	September 15, 2020
September 19, 2020	October 10, 2020	October 20, 2020
October 19, 2020	November 7, 2020	November 17, 2020
November 16, 2020	December 5, 2020	December 15, 2020

Application
Submittal Deadline

1st Class Mail
Notification (150) at
least 10 days

Historic Board
Preservation Meeting*

*Third Tuesday of the Month

ESSAY RUBRIC SCORING

Criteria	Max Score	TARGET	ACCEPTABLE		UNACCEPTABLE
		9-10	HIGH 7-8	LOW 5-6	0-4
Grammar, spelling, punctuation, and appearance.	10 Write your score here below...	Appropriate level of complexity in syntax with no or very few errors, correct spelling, correct punctuation, neat format and appearance, distinctive sections, paragraph, references, structure.	Confined to simpler sentences or structures with few errors that do not affect comprehensibility. Correct spelling, punctuation. Readable format, neat appearance.	Errors frequently affect comprehensibility or very basic types of errors. Negligent aspect, frequent repeated errors in spelling or punctuation, no references section. Bad formatting.	Contains multiple errors in grammar, spelling, punctuation. The page layout is cluttered. Navigation between paragraphs is unclear, or no paragraphs at all. Bad formatting. No bibliography.
Clarity of presentation and style. Organization, structure, logic and transitions.	10	Clear and organized presentation. Ideas well-conceived and developed. Contains examples. Logical flow of ideas, critical thinking. Educated style. Very well executed transitions. Details where needed, and synthesis where needed.	Organized, logical progression of ideas, but some lacks in transitions. Enough clear presented, but not an appropriate style. Mixture between synthetic and analytic arguments or logic.	Barely organized, gaps in logic, no transitions. No examples. Not intuitive content. Difficult to understand the main goal or ideas.	Disorganized, no logics, random, gaps, incoherent. Message incomprehensible. No goal, main line, direction. Little supporting details included.
Use of resources, references, literature, historical data.	10	Contains multiple sources of different types (articles, books, video, historic documents, conference, etc.) Includes qualitative and quantitative data. Makes references to models of appropriate practice, theory, historical or economic data. The overall project is well supported by references. References prove the need and justification of this project.	Not too many references, or references from one type of resources only. The references do not actually support the goal and point of the project. The references are not really adequate or related. Only qualitative data from references.	Very few references or only from one type of source. Some wrong cited sources. References do not support the goal and main idea, and data from references are not actually used.	No references, or just 1-2 references from popular culture, movies, gossip, private discussions or false references, wrong cited sources.
Demonstration of background knowledge	10	Author demonstrates knowledge of the question, problem, situation, necessity	Author knows vaguely and/or generally about the problem, questions and situation that	Author knows a little about the chosen topic, not quite in detail, but still in some	Author has not specific knowledge of the topic chosen. Didn't studied it enough to have a

		or missing data, that triggered the occurrence of this project. Author know the local, historic and economic situation of the system investigated or described.	triggered the writing of this project. Doesn't know actual or exact economic or historic data in detail about the project.	particular sense. Author may have interest and curiosity in the topic and didn't have access to original sources.	deeper knowledge justifying the writing of this essay or project.
Creativity, novelty, originality.	10	Interesting content, novel ideas, new ideas, very original project, or known ideas or elements but combined into a very novel original way. Using conventional ideas or methods in a new light.	Some originality but not enough arguments, or clearly demonstrated. Somehow new, but unfinished ideas or logic procedures. Creativity present.	Conventional ideas, clichés. Trivial, known conclusions. Functional, feasible, but nothing original. No creativity involved.	No novelty, known used ideas or procedures. No new connections, no original conclusions, results, or at least supporting arguments. No conclusions at all.
Relevance and importance of the topic in connection to economic development.	10	The project is directly connected to and inspired by economic development factors and needs. The project can really bring a solution or a clarification of a situation concerning economic development.	The project is not quite connected to, or not really inspired by economic development factors or needs. The project can bring a hypothetical solution or a vague clarification of a situation concerning economic development.	The project is not connected to, or not inspired by economic development factors and needs. The project is justifiable for clarifying a situation concerning economic development.	The project is neither connected nor inspired by economic development factors or needs. The project doesn't bring any economic development idea, solution or clarification.
Relevance and importance of the topic in connection historic preservation.	10	The project is directly connected to and inspired by historic preservation issues and needs. The project can really bring a solution or a clarification of a problem concerning historic preservation.	The project is not quite connected to, or not really inspired by historic preservation issues or needs. The project could bring a hypothetical solution or some clarification of a situation historic preservation.	The project is not connected to or not inspired by historic preservation issues or needs. The project is not justifiable for clarifying a situation concerning historic preservation.	The project is neither connected nor inspired by historic preservation problems, issues, needs or conflicts.
Justification of the project, contextualization, feasibility	10	Project addresses an existing present problem, and it may be able to explain the situation or bring a solution or a feasible plan.	Project addresses in general to a vague problem and is not really convincing in bringing a novel explanation, solution, plan or methodology	Project doesn't address to a present need or problem. Project doesn't present an explanation, connection of factors, solution or plan, except in a general form	There is not quite a justification for this project and the project doesn't clarify a topic, answer a question and doesn't provide a plan or even an idea or sketch of plan.

Educational value and broadcasting merit	10	Project has educational value, brings knowledge and connections, is valuable, original and deserve broadcasting on-line or publication, may be useful for students and interested citizen to read	Project is interesting enough to be read and broadcasted, even if it is not a completely new solution or explanation. Not really for publication.	Project is readable and onto the problem but doesn't really have educational value. Or the project has educational component but is poorly presented, organized, documented or defended.	Project has not a valuable educational content and is not recommended for broadcasting, publication or posting.
Potential impact	10	Project has potential impact to be executed in real life, as a model, as a publication, conference or solution. It has a budget and an efficiency evaluation.	Possible impact but not enough justified, or not very well correlated to the topic or local needs.	Possible impact but not cross-correlated to historic preservation and economic development.	The project is not relevant or not recommended to be implemented.
TOTAL	100				