STAFF REPORT

Community Planning and Preservation Commission
Certificate of Appropriateness Request

For Public Hearing and Executive Action on April 9, 2019 beginning at 2:00 p.m. in Council Chambers, City Hall, 175 Fifth Street North, St. Petersburg, Florida

According to Planning and Development Services Department records, Commissioner Lisa Wannemacher resides or has a place of business within 2,000 feet of the subject property. All other possible conflicts should be declared upon the announcement of the item.

Case No.: 18-90200057
Address: 687 Central Avenue
Legal Description: ORANGE PARK ADD (HISTORIC LANDMARK) BLK A, LOT 5 & W 4 FT OF LOT 4 LESS S 26.3FT OF EACH FOR RD R/W
Parcel ID No.: 19-31-17-64530-001-0050
Date of Construction: 1924
Local Landmark: State Theatre (historic Alexander National Bank), HPC 91-02
Owner: Landmark Theatre Group, LLC
Agent: Jack Bodziak, AIA
Request: Request for the approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the alteration of a local historic landmark
Historic Context and Significance

Constructed in 1924 as the Alexander National Bank, the State Theatre at 687 Central Avenue (“the subject property”) was designated as a local historic landmark in 1991 as a rare local example of high-level Beaux Arts and Neoclassical architecture. The building was financed by North Carolinian transplant Jacob Alexander and designed by architect Neil Reid of Atlanta firm Hentz, Reid, and Alder, who had been commissioned by the same individual for the construction of the nearby Alexander Hotel (local historic landmark HPC 86-10) in 1919.¹ Its original appearance is depicted in Figure 1.

Figure 1: The subject property as shown in a 1929 advertisement for its new operation as the Fidelity Bank & Trust Company²

In 1949 the subject property was purchased for conversion to a new use as a movie theatre. The renovation, which lasted until early 1950, was designed by noteworthy St. Petersburg architect Archie G. Parish.³ Although the largest impacts of this renovation occurred inside, where the entire building was retrofitted with a lobby, concession stand, seats, and screen, the exterior was also altered somewhat to advertise the subject property’s new use:

“The theatre façade, which follows classical lines with six Ionic pillars and artistic embellishments, has been decorated further by a blue-ceilinged, neon lighted overhanging shelter above which is the large “State” sign. The foyer has terrazzo tile flooring and blue walls. Rest rooms tile and attractively decorated, are to the right and left; a carpeted staircase mounts to the left past a flower bin set inside a rough, yellow-brick low wall; in the rear center stand the candy and popcorn concessions.”⁴

¹ “Your Banking Home,” St. Petersburg Times, October 20, 1929.
² Ibid.
³ Ibid.
It should be noted that the interior renovations that took place as part of the bank-to-theatre conversion necessitated exterior change. The arched portions of the three bays that define the building’s façade were enclosed to conceal and house the structure of the new interior balcony. The undated photograph included as Figure 2 shows these blind upper arches, as well as the cantilevered awning sheltering the entrance, marquee, and blade sign.

Figure 2: Undated photograph of State Theatre after conversion to movie theatre. Note blind arches, signs, and awning. Photograph on file, City of St. Petersburg

The subject property was again altered circa 1990 for use as a jazz club, at which point it largely took on its present-day appearance through the introduction of glass block infill at its remaining original window openings (Figure 3) and a sign referencing the building’s predominant arcade design (Figure 4). Despite these alterations, the original window openings and even portions of the 1950 sign brackets have been retained, resulting in a remarkable degree of historic integrity for a property that has been employed for three distinct commercial uses.
When the subject property was designated as a local historic landmark in 1991, its 1949-1950 conversion to a movie theatre had occurred less than 50 years prior. As such, the designation’s period of significance was confined to the building’s initial design and use as a bank only. However, the 1950 alterations can be viewed as significant in their own right, since over 50 years have now passed since their design. Further, they are representative of an early-Postwar approach to theatre design and are associated with Archie Parish, a local architect who was involved in the construction of a number of significant local landmarks including the Mark Dixon Dodd homes in the Driftwood Local Historic District and historic portions of the St. Petersburg Shuffleboard Club. Staff, therefore, recommends that the Commission review the following project for its appropriateness to not only the 1924 design of the subject property, but to significant features of its 1950 conversion to a downtown movie theatre.

Project Description

The proposed project being considered in the evaluation of COA 18-90200057 is part of a rehabilitation that is intended to maintain the subject property’s most recent use as a live music venue. Although interior alterations are beyond the purview of COA review, the intended function and desired rehabilitation of interior features dating to the 1950 theatre conversion – specifically the balcony – will impact the building’s exterior in the case of the window restoration. Detailed plans are included in the application submissions in Appendix A. Briefly, the proposed project is to include:

- Front window openings:
  - Removal of circa 1990 glass block;
  - Installation of aluminum storefront windows and doors as shown in Figure 5.

- Sign:
  - New double-faced illuminated blade sign
  - Two electronic reader boards installed in a "V" over existing front entrance.
Figure 5: Proposed fenestration from application. New windows darkened.

Figure 6: Proposed signage from application
Staff Findings

The criteria used in COA evaluations are listed below. Because of the complexity and heightened significance of this particular property, a discussion of staff findings follows.

**General Criteria for Granting Certificates of Appropriateness and Staff Findings**

1. *The effect of the proposed work on the landmark or the property upon which such work is to be done.*

With recommendations noted below, the proposed project appears to meet this criterion.

2. *The relationship between such work and other structures on the landmark site or other property in the historic district.*

With a scope of work limited to the south elevation of the subject property’s façade, impact is confined. The project meets this criterion.

3. *The extent to which the historic, architectural, or archaeological significance, architectural style, design, arrangement, texture and materials of the local landmark or the property will be affected.*

The project does not appear to successfully meet this criterion as proposed. Recommended Conditions of Approval will address stylistic changes.

4. *Whether the plans may be reasonably carried out by the applicant.*

The applicant appears to be able to complete the project.

5. *A COA for a noncontributing structure in a historic district shall be reviewed to determine whether the proposed work would negatively impact a contributing structure or the historic integrity of the district. Approval of a COA shall include any conditions necessary to mitigate or eliminate negative impacts.*

This criterion is not relevant.

**Additional Guidelines for Alterations**

1. *A local landmark should be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.*

The proposed project will restore the building to use as a live music venue. Its original use as a bank has been abandoned for over 70 years, and its continued use as a venue will retain changes that were made in its conversion to a movie theatre – alterations which staff suggests have since gained historic significance in their own right. Therefore, staff finds that the proposed project, with recommended Conditions of Approval, will meet this criterion.

2. *The distinguishing historic qualities or character of a building, structure, or site and its environment shall be preserved. The removal or alteration of any historic material or distinctive architectural features shall be avoided when reasonable.*

The glass blocks and arched marquee proposed for removal were added circa 1990 and are not historically significant. The proposed project, therefore, meets this criterion.
3. Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings without sufficient documentary evidence, shall not be undertaken.

The project does not appear to successfully meet this criterion as proposed, primarily because of the stylistic incongruity of the proposed signage. As addressed in the Conditions of Approval, a more streamlined aesthetic is recommended for these elements to recreate the 1950 signage.

4. Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved, as appropriate.

Part of the propose project appears meet this criterion as proposed. As noted, the 1950 alterations are recommended for consideration by Commissioners as significant and character-defining elements of the subject property. With the recommended Conditions of Approval, the proposed windows will restore the 1950 configuration. Proposed ornamentation on the signage is out of context and a modified shape and style are proposed.

5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.

The applicant has shown a great deal of commitment to the restoration and long-term preservation of the subject property’s historic masonry. The proposed project appears to meet this criterion.

6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, texture, and other visual qualities and, where reasonable, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

With the recommended Conditions of Approval employed, the proposed project will meet this criterion.

7. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.

Detailed information has not been provided on this aspect of the project, but harsh cleaning is highly discouraged.

8. Significant archaeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved if designated pursuant to this section. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.

This criterion not relevant.

Additional Guidelines for Window Replacement

1. Impact resistance. The replacement window and glass shall be impact resistant;

Proposed windows appear to meet this criterion.

2. Energy performance. The replacement window shall be Energy Star qualified for southern climate zones;

The proposed windows do not appear to meet this criterion, though similar versions of the product line are available with insulating glass.
3. **Depth in wall.** The replacement window shall be setback into the wall the same distance as the historic window;

Although specific information on proposed window setback is not included in the application, the proposed windows do appear to follow the historic setback, running behind the façade’s columns. Replication of the historic window depth should be a Condition of Approval.

4. **Frame size, shape and exterior trim.** The replacement window shall be the same size and shape as the historic window and opening. Historic openings shall not be altered in size. Existing, exterior trim shall be retained, where practicable;

Historic window units have been removed and evidence as to the details of trim work are limited, but the proposed windows appear to reference those visible following the subject property’s 1950 renovation.

5. **Configuration.** The replacement window shall have the same light configuration as the historic window. If the historic window configuration cannot be determined, the replacement window configuration shall be appropriate to the architectural style of the subject building;

As discussed below, a full restoration of the 1924 window configuration does not appear to be feasible if the character-defining 1950 balcony is also preserved. As proposed, and with recommended Conditions of Approval, the windows will replicate the 1950 configuration.

6. **Proportions.** The replacement window shall have the same visual qualities of the historic window, where commercially reasonable:

   a. **Muntins and mullions.** Where provided, muntins and mullions shall have the same dimensions and profile of the historic muntins and mullions.

   b. **Stiles.** For hung windows, stiles shall align vertically and be the same width at the upper and lower sashes.

   c. **Top, meeting and bottom rails, and blind stop.** The top, meeting and bottom rails of a hung window, including the corresponding blind stop, shall have the same dimensions and profile of the historic window.

   d. **Finish.** The finished surface and appearance shall match the historic window, where practicable.

While not an exact replication, the proposed windows visually approximate the 1950 windows.

**Evaluation**

**Windows**

The subject property retains an impressive degree of integrity given the fact that its use has changed twice since its construction 94 years ago, including one drastic change in use from a bank to movie theatre in 1949-1950. The 1950 changes were not found to substantially decrease the subject property’s integrity in 1991, when it was designated as a local historic landmark despite both 1950 alterations such as the construction of the broad cantilevered awning above the entrance, and circa 1990 alterations including glass block windows and arched marquee being present and, at the time, considered to have occurred outside of the resource’s period of significance. The age of the 1950 alterations has now surpassed the requisite 50-year mark for consideration as significant and character-defining elements of the building’s past.

When considered in conjunction with the restoration of the Art Deco-influenced theatre interior, a restoration that reflects the building’s midcentury adaptive reuse not only preserves its architectural transformation but provides the opportunity for interpretation of an interesting note in the history of
downtown commercial buildings, especially banks, that occurred between the development booms of the 1920s and the post-World War II era. Beaux Arts banks like the subject property’s initial presentation, with their strong references to classicism and association with the establishment are noted to have lost favor in the wake of the Great Depression. As a rapid pace of construction resumed throughout the United States following World War II, bank buildings exhibiting sleek and modern aesthetics – and often ample parking or even drive-up windows – became the preferred visual representation of banking institutions. Meanwhile, remaining prewar commercial buildings along downtown Main Streets such as St. Petersburg’s Central Avenue vied to catch patrons’ attention with flashy additions such as the subject property’s large blade sign and marquee and grand, blue-ceilinged cantilevered awning.

The initial application for this COA initially included a full restoration of the façade windows to replicate their 1924 configuration. However, if a replication of the original “State” sign is approved, the retention of the stucco infill within the round arches is actually a more authentic configuration, as it reflects the postwar changes to the building. This infill appears to have been, and, indeed, remains necessary because of the construction of the interior balcony, which is being restored.

The 1950 windows can be seen in Figure 2 to have rested above low knee walls and feature primary entry doors at the center bay. There are secondary doorways at the first and third bays, where windows extend upward to end in alignment with the tops of the imposts from which the round arches begin their curvature. Staff recommendation is to replicate this historic upper terminus. The proposed doors appear to be taller than those seen in Figure 7, and there are slight changes to the proposed upper light configuration and knee wall heights, but these changes will not significantly impact the overall presentation of the building.

Because of the presence of the marquee in photographs following the 1950 theatre conversion, it is difficult to see whether the space behind the marquee was glazed or infilled with stucco, as proposed. This is a minimally visible location, due to the proposed replication of the “V” shaped marquee, so approval of the central bay as proposed is recommended.
Signage

The proposed signage is stated to be a reconstruction of the 1950 blade sign and marquee. According to City Code Section 16.40.120.3.6 – Signs of Historic Significance,

“A replica sign is permissible when based on sufficient historical documentation of the sign and its location. The sign to be replicated must have been originally installed at least 40 years prior to the date of application. In order to construct a replica sign, the sign being replicated must be a sign of historic significance. A replica sign shall meet the same criteria, reviews and processes as a sign of historic significance. A sign can be replicated only once. Replicas of replicas are not permitted. A replica sign must use historical materials and technologies, or use contemporary materials and technologies that visually match historical ones. Replica signs shall only be allowed on the property on which the sign of historic significance was originally erected and shall not be relocated. Variances to height and area shall not be required, however, the replica sign must meet setback requirements unless a variance is granted by the Commission.”

According to Zoning staff, the maximum allowable area of sign face for the 57’9” width of the façade would typically be approximately 102 square feet. The proposed signage will appear to total approximately 153 square feet, based on staff calculations from plans provided. The exact dimensions of the 1950 sign are unknown, but the replication of the sign shown in Figure 10 would allow additional square footage, since the “State” blade and marquee have been identified in St. Petersburg’s Inventory of Signs of Historic Significance. It is suspected that applying the following recommended stylistic changes will sufficiently decrease the sign face area, as well as create signage that more appropriately replicates the historic condition:
Use straight rectangular shapes at both blade sign and marquees, rather than curved signs;
Eliminate upper and lower “Sunburst” flourishes;
Eliminate “chaser bulb” borders of white lights surrounding each sign face;
Employ more streamlined sans-serif typeface at “State” blade;
Restrict overall footprint, as shown in Figure 12:
  o Blade shall extend no more than 12 inches above existing roofline;
  o Marquee shall not extend beyond edge of awning.

![Figure 12: Footprint of 1950 blade, marquee, and awning](image)

The proposed sign also features two faces of Electronic Message Centers (EMCs) at the marquee. Although the installation of EMCS within the boundaries of Local Historic Landmarks is generally not permissible, a COA may be granted for such by the CPPC in the case of performing arts venues such as the subject property. Due to the requirement that replications of signs of historic significance “must use historical materials and technologies, or use contemporary materials and technologies that visually match historical ones,” historic preservation staff does not support the approval of the introduction of EMC technology as part of the approval of the additional sign face square footage allowable for a replica sign.

**Staff Recommendation**

Based on a determination of general consistency with Chapter 16, City Code of Ordinances, staff recommends that the Community Planning and Preservation Commission **approve** the Certificate of Appropriateness request for the alteration of the State Theatre, 687 Central Avenue, with the following conditions:

1. Window openings at first and third bays be extended upward to align with round arches as shown in photographs taken following the subject property’s 1950 renovation;
2. Windows and doors are to be set back in wall plane and run behind columns, as shown historically;
3. Sign to be modified to more accurately reflect a replication of the historic 1950 “State” blade and marquee:
   a. Use straight rectangular shapes at both blade sign and marquees, rather than curved signs;
   b. Eliminate upper and lower “Sunburst” flourishes;
   c. Eliminate “chaser bulb” borders of white lights surrounding each sign face;
   d. Employ more streamlined sans-serif typeface at “State” blade;
   e. Restrict overall footprint, as seen historically:
      i. Blade shall extend no more than 12 inches above existing roofline and make use of existing historic frame where possible;
      ii. Marquee shall not extend beyond front or side edges of awning;
      iii. Marquee shall use interchangeable letters, rather than EMCs.

4. All work, especially masonry cleaning and repairs, undertaken in the course of this rehabilitation to employ the gentlest means possible;

5. Any additional work necessary, including the need for exterior work that results from continued interior rehabilitation, to be discussed with staff for possible COA or further Commission review.
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Appendix A:

Application No. 18-90200057
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Application No. 18-90200057.

List of Required Submittals

Only complete applications will be accepted:

☑ Completed COA application form

☑ Application fee payment
   (See fee schedule in General Information section)

☑ Site plan or survey of the subject property:
   • To scale on 8.5” x 11” paper
   • North arrow
   • Setbacks of structures to the property lines
   • Dimensions and exact locations of all property lines,
     structures, parking spaces and landscaping

☑ Elevation drawings:
   • On 8.5” x 11”, 8.5” x 14”, or 11” x 17” paper
   • Depicts all sides of existing & proposed structure(s)

☐ Samples or a detailed brochure for new materials to be used
  N/A

☑ Photographs of the subject property and structures in question

The following items are optional, but strongly suggested:

☑ Floor plans:
   • To scale: on 8.5” x 11”, 8.5” x 14”, or 11” x 17” paper
   • North arrow
   • Locations of all doorways, windows, and walls
     (interior & exterior)
   • Dimensions and area of each room

Note: A Historic Preservation Inspection is required as part of the
Building Permit process. A final building inspection will not
be conducted until the Historic Preservation Inspection is
approved or waived by Historic Preservation staff.

Completeness review by city staff: ____________
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Application No. ___________________________

All applications are to be filled out completely and correctly. The application shall be submitted to the City of St. Petersburg's Planning and Economic Development Department, located on the 8th floor of the Municipal Services Building, One Fourth Street North, St. Petersburg, Florida.

GENERAL INFORMATION

NAME of APPLICANT (Property Owner): LANDMARK THEATRE GROUP LLC
600 FIRST AVENUE N, SUITE 303E
ST. PETERSBURG FLORIDA 33701-3609

KEVIN CHADWICK 813-352-1260
KWCCHADWICK@GMAIL.COM

NAME of AGENT or REPRESENTATIVE: JACK BODZIAK ARCHITECT AIA
2325 ULMERTON ROAD SUITE 21
CLEARWATER FLORIDA 33762

CELL 727 543 3562 OFFICE 727 327 1961
JACK@JABODZIAK.COM

PROPERTY INFORMATION:

Street Address: 687 CENTRAL AVENUE
ST PETERSBURG @ 7TH & CENTRAL

PARCEL C.D. 19-31-17-64530-001-0050

AUTHORIZED

City staff and the designated Commission will visit the subject property during review of the requested COA. Any code violations on the property that are noted during the inspections will be referred to the city's Codes Compliance Assistance Department.

By signing this application, the applicant affirms that all information contained within this application packet has been read and that the information on this application represents an accurate description of the proposed work. The applicant certifies that the project described in this application, as detailed by the plans and specifications enclosed, will be constructed in exact accordance with aforesaid plans and specifications. Further, the applicant agrees to conform to all conditions of approval. It is understood that approval of this application by the Commission in no way constitutes approval of a building permit or other required City permit approvals. Filing an application does not guarantee approval.

NOTES: 1) It is incumbent upon the applicant to submit correct information. Any misleading, deceptive, incomplete or incorrect information may invalidate your approval.

2) To accept an agent's signature, a notarized letter of authorization from the property owner must accompany the application.

Signature of Owner / Agent: ___________________________ Date: 10/19/18

UPDATED 09-12-2012
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

NARRATIVE (PAGE 1 OF 2)

All applications must provide justification for the requested COA based on the criteria set forth in the Historic and Archaeological Preservation Overlay (City Code Section 16.30.070). These criteria are based upon the U.S. Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (available online at www.nps.gov/history/hps/tpe/standards_guidelines.htm). Please type or print clearly. Illegible responses will not be accepted. Please use additional sheets of paper if necessary.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Property Address: 687 CENTRAL AVENUE  COA Case No: 

Type of Request

☒ Alteration of building/structure  ☐ Single-family residence
☐ New Construction  ☐ Multi-family residence
☐ Relocation  ☐ Restaurant
☐ Demolition  ☐ Hotel/Motel
☐ Alteration of archaeological site  ☐ Office
☐ Site Work  ☐ Commercial
☒ Other

Estimated Cost of Work: $250,000

WRITTEN DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED WORK

Explain what changes will be made to the following architectural elements and how the changes will be accomplished. Please provide a detailed brochure or samples of new materials.

1. Structural System

   NO STRUCTURAL MODIFICATION

2. Roof and Roofing System

   NONE
3. Windows
   RESTORE CENTRAL AVENUE ARCHED STOREFRONT TO ORIGINAL STYLE AND MATERIAL.

4. Doors
   DOORS AT MAIN ENTRY TO MATCH STOREFRONT RESTORATION AND WITH ENTRY DOORS AT EAST AND WEST ARCHWAYS ALL TO MATCH AS CLOSE AS POSSIBLE TO ORIGINAL.

5. Exterior siding
   NONE

6. Decorative elements
   REMOVE KNEE WALLS AT ARCHED STOREFRONT AND CLEAN UP ALL DECORATIVE ELEMENTS ON FACADE.

7. Porches, Carriage Porch, Patio, Carport, and Steps
   NONE

8. Painting and/or Finishes
   RE-PAINT FACADE TO REFLECT EXISTING GRAY AND WHITE FINISHES

9. Outbuildings
   NONE

10. Landscaping, Parking, Sidewalk, Garden features
    NONE

11. Other
    RECONSTRUCT SIGN ABOVE MAIN ENTRY TO REFLECT ORIGINAL SIGN.
LEGAL DESCRIPTION:
Lot 5, LESS the South 26.3 feet thereof, and the West 4 feet of Lot 4, LESS the South 56.3 feet thereof, Block A, ORANGE PARK ADDITION TO THE TOWN OF SAINT PETERSBURG, FLORIDA, a sub-division according to the plat thereof recorded in Plat Book 2, Page 1, of the Public Records of Hillsborough County, Florida of which Pinellas County was formerly a part.

Properly Address:
867 Central Avenue
ST. Petersburg, Florida 33701

GENERAL NOTES:
[Other notes may follow here]

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:
[Legal description details for the property]

LEGAL & SURVEYOR’S CERTIFICATION:

CERTIFIED TO: Kevin I. Chadwick as Trustee of Kevin L. Chadwick Family Trust; Tampa Bay Title; Old Republic National Title Insurance Company.

SURVEYOR’S CERTIFICATION:

[Surveyor’s certification details]

Prepared by:
LakeRidge Surveying & Mapping, LLC
1320 LEGENDARY BLVD
CLEMONT, FL 34711
PHONE 407-385-3101
407-385-3102
CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORIZATION LETTERED
FAX 1-866-541-6709

[Surveyor’s signature and date]

[Notary seal and signature]
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Renovations to historically significant State Theatre, located at 687 Central Avenue, are expansion of the first floor seating area, alterations to interior fan, expansion of existing restroom capacities. Renovations to Existing Bath or those Green Rooms, relocation of the sound and light booth and expansion of balcony area, will meet site requirements.
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SCOPE OF WORK:
Renovations to Historically significant State Theatre, located at 687 Central Avenue, are
expansion of the first floor viewing area, upgrades to interior Box, expansion of Existing Platforms
capacity. Renovation of Existing Back of House Green Rooms, relocation of the sound and light
booth and upgrade of Existing Flat floor relay and front entry upgrade.
We are also upgrading the green rooms and providing compliant express.
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Laura,

As the Architect-of-Record on the State Theatre, I have worked with the Owner and Contractor in an effort to restore the Glass Store Front to as close to its original configuration, as is practically possible. In an effort to make it as Historically Correct as possible, Kevin Chadwick, Boyd Construction and my Staff have put in considerable time attempting to recreate the original Glass Front Façade. Unfortunately we now realize the arched tops of the window Store Fronts are no longer Glass and are replaced with Stucco Panels for a reason.

As you know, the Building was originally a Bank. In the early 60’s it was converted to a Movie Theatre and a Mezzanine/Balcony was installed, the elements of which, were and are, an 18” thick Concrete Stepped Seating Area that is supported by a very heavy Steel Post & Beam Framework. That Structural Framework runs from the First Floor/Ground Floor to the underside of the Mezzanine and terminates only 2-4 inches from the back surface of the arched Stucco Panel. The Steel Concrete Structure would prohibit the Store Front to be continuous from the Sidewalk Entries to the Crown of the Arch.

Also, if we were to work out a way to install Glass in that Archway, it would present a very unattractive view of the underside of the Concrete and Steel Structure as well as, other Framework Supporting Members.

In order to simply install the new Store Front up to the bottom of the Arch or make any Store Front Installation, we would be required to place an additional Steel Horizontal Support Beam creating an Anchor for the Store Front below that will provide sufficient Wind Load Resistance and conform to the current Florida Building Code.

Also, when we bring the Side Panels behind the Existing Exterior Concrete Columns, it would be wise to leave the Knee Wall, avoiding the creation of a Trash Receptacle that can be seen from behind.

I believe the Store Front Restoration in the attached Drawing is the smartest and soundest Solution that will bring us as close as possible to the Original Façade. If you wish to visit the Site and climb into the area at the top of the Arch, I will arrange it, however, I have attached photographs that fairly clearly represent the current conditions with the Concrete and the Red Iron.

We would appreciate you consideration of this request at your earliest convenience, as we are attempting to diligently maintain a reasonable Time Table.

Please feel free to contact me or Kevin Chadwick to set up a meeting or a visit to the Site.
Thank you,
Jack A. Bodziak, AIA, PA

JOHN A. BODZIAK, ARCHITECT, AIA, PA
2325 Ulmerton Road Suite #21
Clearwater, Florida 33762
O: 727.327.1966
C: 727.543.3568

From: Kevin Chadwick <kwchadwick@icloud.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 14, 2019 2:36 PM
To: John Bodziak <jack@jabodziak.com>
Subject: State Theatre Balcony Iron
Appendix B:
Maps of Subject Property