

**MINUTES  
HISTORIC LANDMARK PRESERVATION BOARD  
REGULAR MEETING**

**December 21, 2009**

**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: John Adams, Ann Eifert, Geneva Jackson, Michael McQuarrie Sean O'Sullivan, Sue Parkerson and Dr. Philip Shapiro. Member excused was James Stowers; and absent was Carl Gerken.

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

**III. Approval of Minutes – November 16, 2009**

**Mr. Adams moved seconded by Ms. Parkerson to accept the minutes of the November 16, 2009, meeting. The motion passed unanimously.**

**IV. Public Hearing – Certificate of Appropriateness (Alterations) – 143 Oceanshore Boulevard, HTE File #10-26**

Dr. Shapiro opened the Public Hearing

Ms. Kornel stated this was a request by Robert Maust of Ford Metal Roofing, Inc., on behalf of property owner George Arnold, for a Certificate of Appropriateness to modify the exterior of 143 Oceanshore Boulevard. She noted the property was located ocean side, on the Local Landmark List and

therefore a Certificate of Appropriateness is required. The property is a two-story Mediterranean Revival building built in 1925. The request is to replace the existing tile (cap and pan) roof with like material. Staff recommends approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for alteration to replace the roof of the historic structure located at 143 Oceanshore Boulevard.

Dr. Shapiro asked whether it was the original roof.

**Mr. Adams moved, seconded by Mr. O'Sullivan that the Historic Landmark Preservation Board agrees with staff's recommendation to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for alteration to replace the roof of the historic structure located at 143 Oceanshore Boulevard. The motion passed unanimously. 6-0**

Dr. Shapiro closed the Public Hearing

## **V. Discussion Item**

### **A. Riverwalk Presentation – Planning Director Ric Goss**

Mr. Goss stated the Riverwalk Concept has been a topic of discussion since 2000, and an idea was adopted by the City Commission in 2005 through the Strategic Economic Development Plan and then in 2007 they discussed the restaurant Concept for one of the parks on the north side of the Granada Bridge. He noted \$75,000 was put aside in the CIP to conduct a feasibility study to figure out whether the Concept was a viable idea. Mr. Goss stated in March the City Commission requested staff to move forward with the Concept. Even though the funds were from the Tax Increment Financing (TIF) District, the City did not want to spend \$75,000 for the study, so they suggested doing a Conceptual plan for public education and input. Without the study, there are not many answers to the questions everyone might have. Staff consulted with Glatting Jackson from Orlando for the Concepts that are being presented.

Concept 1 was a low impact use of the existing property. The church would remain on the site, the docks, pier and lift station would remain, and there would be a mom and pop 10,000 square foot restaurant, with approximately 36 parking spaces. This was the least costly Concept. There would be a need for parking lot on New Britain.

Mr. O'Sullivan asked what the seating capacity was.

Mr. Goss stated it should seat about 150 and have a full bar, but without the study, it was not a definite answer.

Mr. O'Sullivan stated 18 parking spaces would not be enough for that seating capacity.

Mr. Goss stated there would be additional parking on New Britain for both concepts.

Concept 2 was more of a destination with more impact on the site, there would be a 30,000 square foot restaurant and meeting space, the docks and pier would remain the same, the church would be relocated, more parking would be necessary onsite and offsite, and the lift station would also have to be relocated. He noted this project was not something that would be planned and developed in a short time. It would take years for just the dock to be developed, so this would be a future plan, if it went forward.

Mr. Goss stated at the September City Commission meeting the Commission instructed staff to move forward with Concept 2. He stated they received a lot of emails and comments from the public on the issue, but since the feasibility study had not been done, there were not a lot of answers to the questions. He stated the Commission would benefit from the comments and concerns from the minutes of the various boards discussing the Concept.

Mr. Goss stated there was a City Commission meeting scheduled for January 5, 2010, to discuss these concepts, and the Commission wanted the communities' input.

Dr. Shapiro asked whether a developer has come to the City to ask about developing the site.

Mr. Goss stated he was unaware of any inquires made to the Planning Department about the property. He stated the idea was suggested by the City Commission at a focus meeting.

Mr. Adams asked about the marina in Daytona Beach and asked whether the Daytona owned that property. Mr. Goss stated the City probably owned the property and has some type of lease agreement.

Mr. O'Sullivan stated that was a prime example of why Ormond Beach should not go forward with this idea especially when a City close by couldn't keep tenants. He stated he was against the idea; it was not a good location regardless of the meeting space; it doesn't blend into downtown; the historic building would have to be relocated; there were already a lot of retail businesses in the area struggling financially without adding another one. Mr. O'Sullivan stated it was a waste of time and money. He stated it should stay a passive park.

Mr. Goss stated the planning for any project would take a lot of time to develop and a feasibility study would have to be done and updated to see whether the project is viable.

Dr. Shapiro stated it seemed the dock was only for small family boats and from Labor Day to the end of April there would not be a lot of activity, nor would the area be large enough for party boats. He also stated there were environmental and ecological issues.

Ms. Parkerson stated she was also against the idea. She didn't like the idea of the 3-story building or the future buildings that were being planned in Concept 2. She noted the Concept should have come before the Historic and Environmental Boards before being presented to the other Boards. The impact on the environment of that property would be major; there were drainage problems, swells; lift station issues; a retaining wall was costly; parking was an issue; the corners of the bridge represent historic significance and to add a new structure would not be in line with that. The proposed area was currently heavily used and a lot of people would be displaced. Ms. Parkerson also noted the water was not high and needed to be dredged for boat traffic. There were also memorials in the park that would have to be relocated as well as the church. She noted the only good thing she saw in the project of public benefit was the wooden walkway.

Mr. Adams noted the concept was ambitious but raises a lot of questions. He noted it was a manatee zone and could cause a problem with the boat traffic; the liquor license might pose a problem being close to a church. He noted it might not be a viable solution given the other struggling restaurants in the area. Mr. Adams stated at this time the City should not pursue the concept. He also didn't think a private developer would be willing to finance the concept.

Dr. Shapiro asked the Board if the concept was presented by a developer, would their concerns still be the same. The Board answered "yes" they would still have the same concerns.

Mr. O'Sullivan agreed that the concept was interesting and extremely ambitious, but wanted to keep the park as it is.

Mr. McQuarrie stated he was not in favor of Concept 2 and a lower impact concept might be ok. He noted there would be DOT issues, land trust issues and problems with the spoil isles as well as it having an impact on the environment. Mr. McQuarrie asked with all the developers in the area, why the City used a firm in Orlando for the Concept.

Mr. Goss stated Glatting Jackson has a continuing contract with the City.

Ms. Kornel stated the Bailey Riverbridge Meeting House was on the Local Landmark List and if it was moved, it would have to be removed from the List and then reapply to have it placed back on the List.

Mr. Goss stated the land use was Special Environmental and the uses were extremely limited. Meeting as a church was not conforming, commercial uses on the other side of the bridge was not conforming either, but it was not uncommon to have uses that were not stated in the SE Plan.

Mr. McQuarrie stated it would be an attraction for boaters and he would use it, even in the winter months.

Mr. O'Sullivan stated the concept was for the wrong place and at the wrong time.

Dr. Shapiro noted no motion was needed; but summarized the Board consensus was that they were not in favor of Concept 1 or Concept 2 or having anything developed at this time at that location.

Mr. Goss apologized from a staff perspective for not having answers to the questions being posed, since a feasibility study wasn't done. He thanked the Board for their comments and will make sure that the City Commission receives them.

## **B. HLPB 2010 Orientation Handbook**

Dr. Shapiro thanked Ms. Kornel for the handbook and noted that the Board's services were extended for another year so that their time runs concurrent with the election of the Commissioners.

Ms. Kornel reviewed the handout and asked the members to replace the old pages with the updated pages.

Ms. Kornel noted on the calendar January 18, 2010 was a holiday and the meeting would be rescheduled to February 8, 2010.

## **VI. Member Comments**

Dr. Shapiro thanked everyone for the time that they committed to serving the Board.

Mr. O'Sullivan noted he couldn't attend last month's meeting because he had jury duty.

**VII. Public Comments**

None

**VIII. Adjournment – Next Meeting**

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Shá Moss, Recording Secretary

ATTEST:

---

Dr. Philip J. Shapiro, Chairman