



# Ocala

## Historic Preservation Advisory Board

### Minutes

---

Thursday, September 4, 2025

4:00 PM

---

1. Call To Order and Roll Call

a. Roll Call

**Present**

Carol Barber  
Jane Cosand  
Joshua DeMonte  
Noelle Smith  
Rick Hugli  
Chairperson Tom McCullough

**Absent**

Holland Drake

**Excused**

Vice Chair Melissa Townsend

2. Public Meeting Notice Acknowledgement

The public notice for the Ocala Historic Preservation Board was posted on August 21, 2025.

3. Approval of Minutes

a. August 7, 2025 Meeting Minutes

**Attachments:** [August 7, 2025 Meeting Minutes](#)

**RESULT:** APPROVED

**MOVER:** Rick Hugli

**SECONDER:** Jane Cosand

4. Certificates of Appropriateness

a. Case File # 256; COA25-0022; 1244 SE 7th Street - Garage.

**Attachments:** [COA25- 0022 Staff Report](#)  
[COA25- 0022 Application](#)

Planner II, Breah Miller, provided a brief overview of COA25-0022 a request to add a 1,344 square foot garage addition to the home with an associated recommendations for a variance request to reduce the rear setback from 25 feet to 3 feet and a variance request to reduce the street side yard from 25 feet to 18.5 feet.

Robert Briggs and Nadia Briggs, 1244 SE 7th Street, Ocala, FL shared that they have lived at their residence for the past ten years. They currently have three children enrolled at Forest High School. The Briggs family expressed that the project under discussion is very important to them. They emphasized that they have no plans to move and intend to remain in their home permanently. They noted a strong need for the proposed garage

space, specifically with a west view.

Ms. Barber asked if this was the property that had previously been delayed due to setback requirements. Breah confirmed that it was, and explained that one of the conditions for moving forward with a recommendation is that the applicants must first appear before the Ocala Historic Preservation Board prior to proceeding to the Board of Adjustment. Motion to approve COA25-0022 with conditions to apply for a variance.

**RESULT:** APPROVED

**MOVER:** Jane Cosand

**SECONDER:** Rick Hugli

- b. Case File # 328; COA25-0026; 1019 SE 3rd Street - Driveway.

**Attachments:** [COA25-0026 Staff Report](#)  
[COA25-0026 Application](#)  
[COA25-0026 Master Site File](#)

Planner II, Breah Miller, provided a brief overview of COA25-0026 a request to replace asphalt driveway with Tremron "Olde Towne" Glacier Grey pavers.

Ms. Cosand asked whether the concrete driveway was breaking up, and Breah responded that it is, noting that the surface is uneven.

Mr. McCullough asked if the area was already paved, noting that because the materials are not like-for-like, this is why the project must come before the board. Breah confirmed this and added that until a code update is in place, similar projects will continue to require board review.

Ms. Barber asked if the applicants had given a reason for wanting to install pavers. Breah responded that it was a matter of preference, as they wanted the alterations to match improvements already made to the home. Additionally, the existing concrete is broken up, and the applicants do not want to remove the trees in the area. Ms. Barber then inquired whether the pavers would be brick-sized. Breah explained that the pavers are closely set and not significantly gapped like typical pavers.

Motion to approve COA25-0026.

**RESULT:** APPROVED

**MOVER:** Rick Hugli

**SECONDER:** Noelle Smith

- c. Case File # 189; COA25-0028; 514 SE Sanchez Avenue - Gazebo and Pool with Deck.

**Attachments:** [COA25-0028 Staff Report](#)  
[COA25-0028 Application](#)  
[COA 25-0028 Master Site File](#)

Planner II, Breah Miller, provided a brief overview of COA25-0028 a request to receive after-the-fact approval for an above ground pool and wood decking with an associated recommendation for a variance request to reduce the interior side setback from 8 feet to 2 feet and a gazebo with an associated recommendation for a variance request to reduce the interior side setback from 8 feet to 5 feet.

Kim Gibas, 514 SE Sanchez Avenue, stated that she has lived at the property for 35 years. Her sister resides on one side of the property, and she owns the adjoining property on the other side, located at 520 SE Sanchez Avenue, for which she has a Power of Attorney. Ms. Gibas explained the gazebo in question is not new and has been on the property for several years. It has recently come to light that the structure does not meet current code requirements. She clarified that the gazebo is not a permanent fixture but a movable metal structure. The pool on the property is not deep enough to require a permit, and although it may appear that the deck surrounds the pool, it does not. The front area has no decking, and only about three-quarters of the deck is visible from the road. Ms. Gibas noted that she does not have a new site plan and instead used her own measurements from the property line to the items in question.

Breah clarified that the property adjacent to hers belongs to her father, for whom she has Power of Attorney. She explained that if she owned both properties and they were not combined, they would still be considered separate parcels and must meet the required setbacks based on the existing property line. There is no current survey available, so measurements from the structures to the property line cannot be verified. The gazebo was originally placed between 2018 and 2019 without proper approval. A storm occurred several years later, during which she replaced the cloth covering. The original application listed different dimensions, which would have required permits for the associated work. After a meeting with city staff, she remeasured the structure, and the new measurements indicated that a building permit was not needed. However, the gazebo's actual size meets the threshold requiring a building permit. If engineered plans for the alterations cannot be provided, the permit will be denied. This is the reason the application could not move forward for a determination of appropriateness.

Ms. Cosand asked whether the gazebo was anchored. Breah responded that it was not. She explained that the dimensions of her gazebo require a building permit, as it must be anchored and include engineered plans. She has never obtained a Certificate of Appropriateness or a building permit for the structure.

Ms. Barber stated we may need to table it until the specs are met.

Ms. Gibas stated that she agreed with Breah's comments and confirmed that everything Breah mentioned was correct. She explained that before meeting with building staff and receiving a code violation, she was informed that a building permit was required for the gazebo. She later met with another city department regarding the gazebo but was initially unable to get a clear answer. After a follow-up call, she was told that a building permit was not needed. She then met with Breah, who expressed concerns and explained that the requirement for a building permit depends on the size of the structure. Breah stated now that the exact dimensions are known, it has been determined that a building permit

is required.

Ms. Cosand asked why Ms. Gibas had not applied for approval prior to installing the gazebo. Ms. Gibas responded that she did not believe it was necessary because the structure is not permanent. She noted that she has applied for several Certificates of Appropriateness in the past and is aware of the process. Ms. Cosand then asked whether the structure could be dangerous if a storm were to come through. Ms. Gibas replied that it would not be dangerous, as she is able to take it down when needed. She explained that it functions more like an umbrella over the patio area. Ms. Gibas also stated that she has not received any email indicating a building permit is required and that, based on her previous meetings with the Planning and Building Departments, she was informed a permit was not necessary.

Breah wanted to clarify whether she needs a building permit or not it will come after the approval for this request. Also, she needs to get approval for a variance before a building permit.

Mr. DeMonte asked if the gazebo is visible from the road. Breah confirmed that it is, stating that it can be seen as one walks past the property.

Kelly Hamer, of 506 SE Sanchez Avenue, which is on the west side of the property, clarified information regarding the gazebo. She stated that the structure is commercially available from stores such as Lowe's, consisting of metal poles with a canvas top, and is not a built or permanent structure. She noted that since 2018, the only work done on the gazebo was replacing the canvas top, which is what drew attention to it.

Motion for denial was made for COA25-0028.

**RESULT:** DENIED

**MOVER:** Carol Barber

**SECONDER:** Joshua DeMonte

- d. Case File # 91; COA25-0030; 703 E. Fort King - Reroof.

**Attachments:** [COA25-0030 Staff Report](#)  
[COA25-0030 Application](#)  
[COA25-0030 Master Site File](#)

Planner II, Breah Miller, provided a brief overview of COA25-0030 a request to replace the shingle roof with a 26-gauge silver metal roof.

Ms. Smith asked if the structure next door had been approved. Breah responded that the board had approved a metal roof for the property. Ms. Smith then asked if the approval occurred after the initial request. Breah explained that the initial request for the neighboring property was submitted in 2008 and was denied because it did not fit the architecture of that home. The home on the west, which is a single-family residence, was later approved for the metal roof. She noted, however, that approvals are considered on an individual basis, so it is not entirely clear how that approval was granted.

Brian Kuhn, of 703 SE Fort King Avenue, stated that he has lived at the property for 30 years. He is seeking approval to install a silver roof, noting that he believes it would enhance the appearance of the home and that he plans to remain at the property for some time.

A motion for denial was made fro COA25-0030.

**RESULT:** DENIED

**MOVER:** Carol Barber

**SECONDER:** Joshua DeMonte

5. Affirmative Maintenance

None,

6. Old Business

None.

7. New Business

None.

8. Public Comments

None,

9. Staff Comments

None.

10. Board Comments

None.

11. Next Meeting Day: October 14, 2025

None.

8. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 4:48pm.