

MINUTES REPORT
BOCA GRANDE HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
ST. ANDREW'S CHAPTER HOUSE
380 GILCHRIST AVENUE, BOCA GRANDE, FL 33921
FEBRUARY 11, 2026
10:00 A.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Bill Caldwell III (Chair)
Paul Eddy
Jerry Edgerton
Dennis Maloomian

Rebecca Paterson
Peggy Stanley (Vice Chair)
Barbara Wickwire

STAFF PRESENT:

Peter Blackwell, Planner, Zoning
MarySue Groth, Principal Planner, Zoning

Janet Miller, Recording Clerk, DCD

OUTSIDE CONSULTANTS/APPLICANTS

Tom Hinkle, Hinkle Architecture, Inc.
Kyle Knight, PE, Morris-Depew-Associates (Engineer)
Neely Kountz, Treasurer, Boca Grande Preschool
Tim Krebs, T A Krebs Architect, Inc.
Robin Palmer, Environmental Planner, Weiler Engineering Corporation
Lindsay Rodriguez, MPA, AICP, Morris-Depew-Associates (Planner)
Gloria Sajgo, AICP, APLANADAY, LLC
Garland Sandel, Design Project Manager, Florida Department of Environmental Protection

Agenda Item 1 - Call to Order – 10:00 a.m./Review of Affidavit of Publication

Mr. Caldwell, Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

The following members were in attendance: Bill Caldwell, Dennis Maloomian, Jerry Edgerton, Paul Eddy, Peggy Stanley, and Barbara Wickwire.

Ms. Miller stated the Attorneys Office had reviewed the ad and Affidavit of Publication for today's meeting and determined it was legally sufficient.

NOTE: For the audio recordings for this meeting, go to:

<http://www.leegov.com/dcd/committees/committeesearch>. Once the page pulls up, click on the blue hyperlink that says, "Boca Grande Historic Preservation Board (BGHPB)." There will be an audio recording for each item to help keep the recordings from being too large for the public to open. Contact Janet Miller at 239-533-8583 or jmiller@leegov.com if you need assistance.

Agenda Item 2 – Election of Officers

Chair

Mr. Edgerton made a motion to nominate Mr. Maloomian as Chair. The motion was seconded by Ms. Stanley. The motion was called and passed 6-0.

Vice Chair

Ms. Stanley made a motion to nominate Mr. Edgerton as Vice Chair. The motion was seconded by Mr. Maloomian. The motion was called and passed 6-0.

Agenda Item 3 – Approval of Minutes – December 10, 2025

Mr. Edgerton made a motion to approve the December 10, 2025 meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Ms. Stanley. The Chair called the motion, and it passed 6-0.

Agenda Item 4 – Special Certificate of Appropriateness (SCA) Cases:

A. SCA2025-00030, 1911 Shore Lane, Boca Grande, FL 33921

Proposal to elevate existing residence, add new entry stair enclosure to east façade, and add new deck and staircase to west façade.

Mr. Blackwell reviewed the staff report and recommendations.

The Board had no questions, so Mr. Maloomian opened this item to the applicant or their representative.

Mr. Tom Hinkle, architect for the project, reviewed the plans with the Board and noted that a secondary benefit of raising the house is that the courtyard never had a view of the water. That will change with the new proposal being presented today.

Mr. Caldwell believed there was once another Sarasota school residence on Boca Grande Isles.

Mr. Maloomian opened this item for public comment. No members of the public wished to comment, so the public comment segment was closed.

Ms. Stanley thanked the owners for maintaining this structure.

Ms. Stanley made a motion to approve the Special Certificate of Appropriateness to permit the proposed alterations to the property, as depicted in the site plan, floor plans, and elevations stamped “Received” on December 10, 2025; and make a finding that the proposed elevation and alterations to the main residence are in compliance with the Design Guidelines for the Boca Grande Historic District and Chapter 22 of the Land Development Code. The motion was seconded by Mr. Caldwell. The Chair called the motion, and it passed 6-0.

B. SCA2025-00031, Gates Residence, 1821 18th Street W, Boca Grande, FL 33921

Proposal to elevate the existing residence, construct additions to the north and west side of the residence, add a golf cart garage to the west side of the property, and construct privacy walls on all sides of the property.

Ms. Paterson arrived at this juncture.

Mr. Blackwell reviewed the staff report and recommendations. He recommended approval with conditions and outlined them with the Board. He stated the Board has several options: 1) approve the project as presented by the applicant; 2) approve with the conditions staff recommended; 3) deny the proposal; or 4) continue the case to next month, which will allow the applicant to provide new plans that the board would be able to review.

Mr. Maloomian opened this item to the applicant or their representative.

Mr. Hinkle stated that this structure only had two small bedrooms. In order to be able to access the western space through the house, there was no way to get a proper bedroom; therefore, they expanded on that access on that room portion in order to have proper sized bedrooms. He gave an overview of the proposal and the reasons for this specific design. Mr. Hinkle stated he did not agree with staff's recommendations because he felt it was reasonable to want two decent sized bedrooms and they minimized what they were adding. He noted there are plenty of features that will be saved on the inside of the home, but it cannot be determined until they tear up the drywall.

Mr. Maloomian asked if they would prefer a month to make valid arguments to staff in an effort to modify those qualifications or if they preferred to be subject to the preference of this Board.

Mr. Hinkle stated he would make that decision after finishing with the question and answer segment.

Ms. Paterson stated that she was aware of Mr. Hinkle's abilities and knew he could do what staff is requesting. It may not be exactly what he and the owner wants, but she felt this Board had been overlooking a lot of historic things lately in order to take care of the owners, but that is not what this Board's task is.

Mr. Hinkle stated he tried to address it another way, but this was the best option.

Ms. Paterson stated there might be other things that could be changed that would not ruin the integrity of the historic property.

Mr. Caldwell stated that many years ago he had spent a lot of time at Journey's End and was familiar with the red roofed cottage. Although it was an old structure that has been there for many years, he did not consider it to be of historic value in that it did not add much to the whole area. The original owners used to rent the cottage out. She lived in the larger home and rented the cottage out. She also combined two cottages together. He felt that if the

original owners had the finances, they would have probably liked to do something similar to what is being proposed today. To him, historic preservation is for a substantial piece of property/structure that needs to be saved. To him, no one would want to pay a substantial amount for this home and have to keep a 6 foot 6 inch ceiling.

Ms. Paterson stated she disagreed with that sentiment. She referred to another cottage that the owners wanted to demolish that backed up to the alley on Gilchrist Avenue, but when Tim Seibert realized that the reason it did not have a kitchen was because staff lived there, which is very historic, and they were always in the kitchen in the main house, he felt the cottage should be saved. She noted you cannot rewrite history.

Mr. Caldwell felt you must take everything by its merits.

Ms. Paterson stated that does not always mean “*beautiful*.”

Mr. Caldwell stated that was her opinion but, to him, it means a structure that is worth saving.

Ms. Paterson felt that all historic structures were worth saving.

Mr. Caldwell stated that the two combined structures were not great historic buildings. He was in favor of what Mr. Hinkle proposed and stated it was a beautiful site plan and building.

Mr. Maloomian opened this item to the public.

Mr. Royce Gates stated he and his wife were the proud new owners of 1821 18th Street W. He noted that one of the reasons they purchased this property despite all of its issues was they liked the feel of Old Florida and in particular Boca Grande. It is he and his wife’s intent to make the house and property feel as much like Journey’s End as possible. At the same time, the building is small with small bedrooms, one of which was called a library and has no windows. He reviewed the proposed plans for the property.

Ms. Courtney McGovern, resident of Boca Grande, stated she was familiar with this property and saw what it looked like post hurricane. She felt it was a very inconsequential historic cottage, yet the new owners are at least maintaining it in a manner that is consistent with the style of Boca Grande.

Mr. Edgerton made a motion to approve the Special Certificate of Appropriateness to elevate the main residence, construct five additions, construct an accessory golf cart garage and outdoor kitchen, construct perimeter walls, modify the existing pool, expand the paved area of the front yard, relocate pool equipment, and modify the shell drive for the property at 1821 18th Street West, pursuant to LDC Chapter 22 as provided in the site plan, floor plans, and elevations plan stamped “Received 12/10/25, and make a finding that the proposed renovations to the residence, subject to conditions, comply with the criteria of the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and Chapter 22 of the Land Development Code. The motion was seconded by Mr. Caldwell. The Chair called the motion, and it passed 5-2. Ms. Paterson and Ms. Stanley were opposed.

C. SCA2025-00032, Boca Grande Preschool, Inc., 311 Palm Avenue, Boca Grande, FL 33921

Request approval for the proposed redevelopment of the site and the rehabilitation and addition to the existing building for the establishment of a day care known as the Boca Grande Preschool.

Mr. Maloomian announced that he had a conflict of interest with this project because he is a board member and Chair of the Building Committee for the Boca Grande Preschool and would be representing the applicant today. He previously completed the appropriate Voting Conflict form and submitted it to staff. Mr. Maloomian stated he would be recusing himself from the vote and asked that the Vice Chair take over for this item. Mr. Maloomian stated he would resume his Chair duties after this case.

Ms. Groth reviewed the staff report and recommendations.

Mr. Edgerton opened this item to the applicant or their representative.

Ms. Sajgo, representing the applicant, did not have anything further to add, but was available for questions.

Ms. Courtney McGovern, resident of Boca Grande, asked why the parking was not off the alley, which would be in compliance with Code 2.5.

Ms. Sajgo stated it made better sense to have parking off the street to accommodate the traffic better. She noted it is a 10 foot narrow alley so it would not be preferable to divert traffic there.

Ms. McGovern stated she was not referring to traffic and noted there were four parking spaces for employees. The Code says that when there is an adjacent alley, that all parking should be accessed through the alley. Instead, the proposal shows that the one side of the project that is adjacent to the historic homes in the area is being cleared and turned into parking. Currently, there is a full street of areca palms, which will be cleared to put in parking, so it has a very different appearance.

Ms. Sajgo reviewed the plans for that area with the presentation boards, and she also explained some of the constraints they have with this project.

Ms. Paterson noted that since the alley is only 10 feet wide, only one car can be on it going in one direction because you are unable to move over to let someone by. To her, it did not make sense to insist on having parking there.

Ms. Groth stated that the Code referenced by Ms. McGovern is in the Administrative Code (2.5). She noted that the criteria in the ordinance for Boca Grande applies to non-contributing structures. For contributing structures, the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation is used. She noted that the Land Development Code and the ordinances are different. This project is not breaking any codes for a contributing structure.

Ms. McGovern stated she still did not understand why there could not be some consideration for the adjacent homes on 3rd Street who currently have a much better view of areca palms.

Mr. Maloomian stated that they were put on notice by the county that the areca palms and the composts are in the right-of-way and must be removed. If the county enforces this, the areca palms will need to be removed anyway.

Ms. McGovern referred to the adjacent commercial building and noted they did a nice job by putting in shell parking and landscaping along the 3rd Street side. They also removed their entrances that faced 3rd Street and put them on Railroad Avenue instead.

Ms. Sajgo referred to the wall and noted they planned to elevate the building about 3 ½ feet to meet Code. She explained that when you have a children's playground, the playground needs to be at grade. This means they must bring in fill so that the children will not have to go down steps to the playground. It will be an 8 foot high wall on the street side, but on the playground side, it will only be 5 feet high. On the inside, there will be a 3 foot concrete wall with a 2 foot high trellis. On the street side, it will be a 6 foot high wall with a 2 foot high trellis.

Mr. Maloomian stated that the height of the wall was a recommendation of the Sheriff's Department for the security and privacy of the children.

Ms. Groth stated that the proposal for the wall is allowed by Code as well.

Ms. McGovern asked what would be done to mitigate runoff to the neighbors.

Mr. Maloomian stated that because it is a commercial property, they have an extensive storm water management requirement where the standards are not just to control the rate at which water leaves the property, but to also control the volume of water leaving the property. The water must stay onsite. To accomplish this, under the playground, they will have a series of chambers and perforated pipes that will hold the water and allow it to percolate back into the soil. In addition, the entire front of the property behind the picket fence has a large retention basin. They plan to incorporate a wading garden. Mr. Maloomian stated it would be a beautiful garden that will serve as a stormwater management feature in addition to an attractive amenity. All of this is being done to ensure that no water will be coming off the property.

Ms. Lindsay Rodriguez stated that this lot is what is known as a legal non-conforming lot. It was platted in the 1920s long before the Land Development Code and Comprehensive Plan were in existence. They are designing the project to allow for a preschool use, so every feature has been designed around safety for children and parents dropping off their children. She noted that the alleyway has dumpsters for loading and unloading all the commercial uses in this area. She noted that this parcel is zoned commercial, so the location of parking is very consistent. Ms. Rodriguez stated that when you drive down Palm Avenue, there is parking everywhere. She stated that as part of this project, they will also have shell parking. Ms. Rodriguez stated that a preschool is essential for Boca Grande to keep the island alive and

give people a place to bring their children. This site also meets the parking code; therefore, they are not seeking relief from parking. She noted they would be asking for some relief from setbacks due to the legal nonconforming nature of the lot.

Ms. Sajgo stated that this property was donated to the preschool. She noted that one of the constraints of Boca Grande is that you cannot rezone to commercial. This means there is no way to find an alternate large residential parcel and try to rezone it to have a school. The commercial the island has now is what they will have tomorrow. This is another reason why this parcel is so important. It was not only donated, but it was donated with the idea that it could be redeveloped as a preschool.

Ms. McGovern stated for the record that she was not disputing having a nursery school on Boca Grande. She is in support of early childhood care on the island. She explained that the emotional component of this discussion is not about the children or whether or not Boca Grande needs a nursery school. Her concern is that there continues to be exceptions that seem to be things that are not consistent with protecting the adjacent historic home neighborhood. She noted that the other three adjacent properties on the corner of 3rd and Palm Avenue are all residential so she felt it was not authentic to say that this is consistent with the whole block of commercial when the entire east side of Palm Avenue is historic residential, the south side of 3rd Street is historic residential, and the southwest side of 3rd Street and Palm Avenue are historic residential. Her concern is having an entire 24 foot side of hardscaped parking and cars adjacent to the homes.

Ms. Paterson stated that this proposal meets all the criteria regardless of whether someone likes it or not. The applicants have done everything that is required. She did not know what else they could do to meet the criteria.

Mr. Neely Kountze, Treasurer for the Boca Grande Preschool, stated that the alley is used by Waste Management to pick up trash every week. He also noted that there has always been parking on 3rd Street, but it has been parallel parking not face-in parking. The plan is to come right up against the wall to put in face-in parking.

Ms. McGovern stated she was not suggesting parking in the alley. She was suggesting using the alley as the egress for parking on the west side of the building.

Ms. Sajgo stated that has been done in the past, but this is a different project, so what worked for parking in the past does not work for this project.

Ms. Rodriguez stated that the parking on 3rd Street is going to be consistent with crushed shell. It will also be a beautifully landscaped area with only a couple of parking spaces. This is some of the relief they are asking for so that they can have crushed shell. She noted that the Land Development Code, Chapter 22, allows certain relief to be requested from a historic district, so they are following all proper procedures.

Ms. Paterson felt the proposal was perfect in every way, so she was in favor of it.

Mr. Eddy made a motion to approve the requested Special Certificate of Appropriateness for the redevelopment of the site and the rehabilitation and addition to the existing contributing building for a children’s daycare known as the Boca Grande Preschool; and make a finding that the proposed project is in compliance with the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and Chapter 22 of the Land Development Code. The motion was seconded by Ms. Wickwire. The Chair called the motion, and it passed 6-0. Mr. Maloomian abstained.

Agenda Item 5 – Item by the Public

A. Amory Memorial Chapel

Informal presentation/discussion regarding the Amory Memorial Chapel at the Gasparilla Island State Park.

Ms. Robin Palmer, Environmental Planner, with Weiler Engineering Corporation, stated she and Garland Sandel were representing the Florida Department of Protection. Ms. Palmer stated they were now looking into designs to repair the Amory Memorial Chapel under the Gasparilla Island State Park. She reviewed a PowerPoint presentation with two possible options for the rehabilitation. One was a closed option and the other an open pavilion option.

Ms. Paterson noted that the original owners donated the property to the Gasparilla Island State Park in 1982 or 1983.

Ms. Palmer reviewed the damages to the building and stated that she did not believe this structure would survive another storm. Ms. Palmer stated that because this is a property that has significant history, they were seeking the Historic Board’s opinion.

Mr. Eddy asked if they had considered raising the building.

Ms. Palmer stated this had been something they considered. Had this been an elevated structure, it would not have received this much damage. She reviewed Options 1 and 2 in the PowerPoint presentation.

Ms. Paterson referred to Option 2, which is an open pavilion. She asked if there could be some type of screening or a way for it to be enclosed with removable motorized shades so that it could be used in the rain and heat.

Mr. Caldwell stated that it says the FEMA elevation is AE6.

Ms. Palmer stated that is the flood elevation for the 100 year storm. Under current standards, AE6 is a flood elevation 6 with an additional 2 feet above that. It is a Special High Hazard flood zone.

Mr. Maloomian asked if there had been any thought to having Option 2 but keeping the windows.

Ms. Palmer stated they had considered this because the windows are a nice aspect of the Chapel, but they thought of having more of an artistic representation of them.

Mr. Caldwell discussed elevating the floor and roof and possibly slightly lifting the building.

Mr. Krebs felt they might be able to repair the wall with carbon fiber, which is used often. He reviewed other ways the wall could be repaired as well.

Mr. Caldwell noted that floodproofing is easier to accomplish as well.

Ms. Palmer stated they considered having flood doors and flood panels; however, the flood panels would be attached to the exterior of the structure.

Mr. Caldwell stated he would be more in favor of trying to build back something rather than spending the extra money for the flood panels for the entries.

Mr. Eddy stated there are inflatable flood panel options as well.

Mr. Maloomian asked if there was funding for this project.

Mr. Sandel stated that FEMA funding comes with certain guidelines that they will have to review thoroughly before beginning this project. This is why they were looking at an open air concept where they could use some of the windows on the side as part of an exhibit.

Mr. Eddy asked if there was a limitation to the amount of FEMA funding for the project. If they get through a portion of the rehabilitation and run out of FEMA funds, what would be their course of action?

Mr. Sandel stated they also had received a certain amount of money from Gasparilla.

Ms. Paterson stated she was certain they would be able to raise what they need from residents in Boca Grande.

Ms. Sharon McKenzie, Executive Director, for the Barrier Island Parks Society, stated they had managed and operated the Amory Memorial Chapel building for over 40 years, and it has always been their vision to turn it into an African American Museum. Unfortunately, the open air concept of Option 2 would not allow for that. She also felt that Option 2 takes away from the integrity of the history of the building, specifically the windows, which are the historic aspect of that building. She noted they were taken from the Shiloh Baptist Church and placed inside the Amory Chapel. She noted that originally the Shiloh Baptist Church was supposed to be moved to that site, but it was unable to be done. Ms. McKenzie stated that Roger and Louise Amory paid for that building to be built along with the historic windows, so she felt we should do whatever we could to restore the history of that structure.

Ms. Paterson asked under whose authority would they be able to put an African American Museum in there because that would limit the use for everyone else.

Ms. McKenzie stated it would remain a multi-purpose building. They used to rent out the east side of the building for weddings and other special events. As a museum, they will still be able to do that. The museum will be limited and not take up the entire building. Again, this could be compromised altogether depending on whether Option 2 will be selected with open doors and windows.

Ms. Paterson asked it if would be focused on the African Americans who lived in Boca Grande.

Ms. McKenzie stated that was correct. The Amory Memorial Chapel was the African American community's church and that is the history they would like to establish there, but it will depend on which option the State moves forward with. She noted that the Barrier Island Parks Society is in support of the State, but the open doors and windows will limit what they can use the building for.

Discussion took place on making the windows hurricane resistant, using hurricane shutters, or removable hurricane shutters, after which, discussion on this item concluded.

Agenda Item 6 - Items by Staff

A. Pending Historic Cases (where they are in the process)

Mr. Blackwell reviewed with the Board two pending cases. He noted that because they were recently submitted, it is unlikely they would be scheduled for the March agenda. He noted that staff will most likely cancel the March meeting because these two cases are the only pending cases.

Agenda Item 7 – Items by the Public; Board Members

Public – None

Board - None

Agenda Item 8 – Adjournment – Next Meeting Date

The next tentative Boca Grande Historic Preservation Board meeting will be held on Wednesday, April 8, 2026, at this same location (St. Andrew's Chapter House, 380 Gilchrist Avenue, Boca Grande, FL 33921). The meeting adjourned at 11:35 a.m.