

Florida National Register Review Board
R. A. Gray Building, Auditorium
Tallahassee, Florida
November 10, 2022 (Postponed to January 19, 2023)
Meeting Minutes

Commission Members Present via Webinar:

Mr. Rick Gonzalez, Dr. Clifford Smith, Dr. J. Michael Francis, Ms. Kathleen Kauffman (joined the meeting at 3:18 p.m.).

Commission Members Not Present: none.

Commission Members Present In-Person: Dr. Judy Bense.

Florida Department of State Officials and Staff Present In-Person: Mr. Ruben A. Acosta, Bureau Chief, Historic Preservation; Mr. Andrew Waber, Historic Preservationist; Ms. Alissa Lotane, Director, Division of Historical Resources; Ms. Annie Delaroderie, Historic Preservationist; Ms. Gina Lane, Historic Preservationist; Ms. Jennifer Tobias, Historic Sites Specialist; Mr. Eric Case, Grants Supervisor; Ms. Harley Burgis, Grants Specialist.

Florida Department of State Officials and Staff Present via Webinar: Mr. Ethan Putman, Historic Sites Specialist; Mr. Daniel Vasquez, Historic Sites Specialist; Ms. Marcia Welch, Historic Preservation Specialist; Ms. Alayna Gould, Historic Preservationist II; Mr. Chip Birdsong, Site File Supervisor; Mr. Johnathan Grandage, Division of Historical Resources Program Administrator; Mr. Michael DuBose, Historic Sites Specialist; Ms. Kelly Chase, Compliance Supervisor; Dr. Kyra Lucas, Historic Preservationist; Dr. Angela Tomlinson, Assistant Director, Division of Historical Resources.

Guests Present In-Person: (in order of signing in) The Honorable Keith Truenow, Representative, District 31; Ms. Shann Purinton, Chair of the Water Works Environmental Center; Ms. Jane West, 1000 Friends of Florida & Policy and Planning Director for Royal; Ms. Beverly Steele, resident of Royal; Mr. Samuel Albritton, resident of Royal; Mr. Sam Love; Mr. Scott Sigler; Ms. Jamie Sanders; Mr. David Clapp, Water Works Environmental Center volunteer; Mr. Ken Carman, Water Works Environmental Center volunteer; Mr. Robert Nelson, Water Works Environmental Center volunteer; Mr. Danilo Sosa, Water Works Environmental Center volunteer; Mr. Joe Jacquot, representing 8G Farms in Royal; Mr. Shawn Riordan, representing 8G Farms in Royal; Ms. Tara Tedrow representing the Farkus properties in Royal; Ms. Suncara Jackson, resident of Royal; Ms. Carmelita Leon, resident of Royal; Mr. Cliff Hughes, resident of Royal; Ms. Etta Huff, resident of Royal; Ms. Ann Timoner, resident of the Villages in support of Royal.

Guests Present via Webinar: (in order of registration) Ms. Althea Wunderler-Selby, PaleoWest; Ms. Christine Rupp, Dade Heritage Trust; Ms. Megan McLaughlin, Plusurbia; Mr. Derek Kilborn, Manager of Historic Preservation, St. Petersburg; Mr. William Burke; Ms. Lisa Walsh, Palatka CLG Coordinator; Mr. Brad Cornelius; Mr. Don Buckner; Ms. Tracy de Lemos; Ms. Malinda Creager; Mr. Jonathon Drucker; Mr. Bernardo Mascioli; Mr. C.J. Williams; Mr. Lee Rambeau Kemp; Ms. Kristen Congdon; Ms. Deborah White-Labora; Mr. Will Brown; Mr. Tom Hammer; Ms. Dallas Evans; Ms. Adrienne Schmitz; Ms. Mary McIntyre; Mr. Bruce Duncan; Mr. Dan Tatro; Ms. Louise Laprade; Ms. Irene Morris; Mr. Pat Beerhalter; Mr. William Farkus; Ms. Jill Moss-Greenberg; Mr. Thomas Conrad; Ms. Angela Madathil; Mr. Jerry Driggers, Ms. Janice Warnock; Mr. Bill Luttrell; Ms. Debbie Casanzio;

Ms. Debbie Gray; Mr. Joserah Johnson; Ms. Laura Lee Corbett; Ms. Carrie Hurst; Ms. Vera Johnson; Mr. Maxwell Johnson; Ms. Deidra Russell; Mr. Randall Alvord; Ms. Deanna Jenkins; Ms. Lillie Shells; Ms. Joyce Cotton; Ms. Rosalyn Lewis; Ms. Jacquie Latzer; Ms. Tammy Teolis; Mr. Alexander Labora; Mr. David Caruthers; Ms. Kathy Smiley; Mr. Steve Schnell; Mr. James Greenberg; Mr. Marchahal Jenkins; Ms. Diana Gonzalez-Tenant; Ms. Shannon Bruffett; Ms. LaFreda Gavin; Ms. Ines Cortes; Ms. Cheryl Gibson; Ms. Maureen Calvesio; Mr. Alex Horner; Mr. Frank Calascione; Ms. Cozette Sesler; Mr. Eric Rose; Mr. Harry Coverston; Ms. Brenda Alston; Ms. Janet Mott; Ms. Penelope Walker; Mr. Jim Shields; Mr. Lous Black; Mr. John Kiser; Mr. James Schear; Ms. Mercedes Dickinson; Ms. Kelly Perkins; Mr. Burnadine Rich; Ms. Irene Matthews; Ms. Jessica Kowal; Ms. Cat Mont; Ms. Penelope Zwicker; Ms. Patricia LaSane; Mr. Hugh Perry; Mr. Arimus Wells; Mr. Ernie Massey; Ms. Rae Alfassa-White; Ms. Barbara Singleton; Mr. Samuel W. Crosby Jr.; Mr. Levi Solomon; Mr. Howard Carter; Ms. Dallas Fowler; Ms. Carol Gariano; Ms. Brenda Boyd; Mr. Ronald Parris; Ms. Genniver Bell; Ms. Kate Connell; Ms. Lindsay Rose Gruesu, Florida Department of Transportation; Mr. Jim Fenton; Ms. Lindsay Rothrock, Florida Department of Transportation; Mr. Clifford Bell; Mr. Robert Givens; Mr. Ralf Brookes; Ms. Ella Woods; Mr. Lee Rambeau; Ms. Whitany Lewis; Ms. Carolyn Collins; Ms. Linda Winchester; Mr. Mark Palmer.

I. **Call to Order and Roll Call**

Mr. Acosta read the housekeeping notes addressing the webinar. Mr. Rick Gonzalez called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m. Mr. Gonzalez asked Mr. Acosta to call the roll.

II. **Introduction of Commission, Staff, and Guests**

Mr. Gonzalez introduced the Commission. Mr. Acosta introduced the staff.

Dr. Bense made a motion to allow Representative Truenow to speak. Dr. Smith seconded. The motion passed unanimously. Representative Truenow thanked the board and asked for the Board to have a fair and transparent process regarding the Sumter County nomination, and that owner objections be considered by the board.

III. **Adoption of Agenda**

Mr. Gonzalez asked for a motion to adopt the agenda. **Dr. Smith moved to adopt the agenda. Dr. Francis seconded the motion. The agenda was approved unanimously.**

IV. **Remarks by Chairperson on Purpose of Meeting**

Mr. Gonzalez explained the purpose of the National Register meeting.

Mr. Acosta asked to establish a time limit for public comment. Mr. Gonzalez asked that public comment and anyone from public be allowed up to three minutes for speaking regarding a nomination. **Dr. Francis made the motion for this change. Dr. Bense seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.**

V. **Approval of Minutes from the August 4, 2022, Meeting**

Mr. Gonzalez asked for approval of the Meeting Minutes. **Dr. Francis made a motion to approve the Minutes from the August National Register Review Board meeting. Dr. Smith seconded the motion. The minutes were approved unanimously.**

VI. Director's Comments

Ms. Lotane thanked guests and staff for their time and efforts toward the National Register program. Ms. Lotane explained that she will need to leave at 2:35 p.m. for a meeting but will return for the end of the board meeting at 4:00 p.m.

VII. Review of Nomination Proposals

A. Eastside Historic District, Jacksonville, Duval Co., was presented by Mr. Acosta.

The Eastside Historic District is a historic African American neighborhood located within downtown Jacksonville. The district is locally significant under Criterion A for Community Planning and Development, Ethnic Heritage: Gullah Geechee, and Social History; and Criterion C for Architecture. It comprises 678 contributing resources and 326 non-contributing resources spread out over an area of roughly 392 acres. The period of significance extends from circa 1884 to 1970. The district is primarily composed of single-story frame vernacular residences from the early to mid-20th century, with a significant representation of Masonry Vernacular, Commercial Vernacular, Industrial Vernacular, Craftsman, Ranch, and Midcentury Modern architecture. There is also one contributing site, Oakland Park, which was the first playground established in Jacksonville for African American children. The Eastside Historic District contributes to the African American Architects in Segregated Jacksonville, 1865-1965, Multiple Properties Submission.

Historically, the Eastside neighborhood was a densely packed urban community for working class African Americans. It is one of the most intact of the remaining downtown African American districts in Jacksonville. It developed primarily as a residential area, with a commercial and entertainment core along Florida Avenue. The district also contains several religious institutions, including Mother Midway AME, which is the first officially sanctioned African Methodist Episcopal Church in Florida. Comprised of Campbell's Addition and Oakland, the Eastside African American community dates to before the Civil War. The formerly enslaved community here was joined by an influx of freedmen from outside of the area, who were drawn here by the proximity to the ports and the sawmills. The district, which is within the National Park Service Gullah Geechee Heritage Corridor, contains one of the largest and most important populations of Gullah people in Jacksonville. The district was also the location of two significant race riots that occurred late in the Civil Rights Era, the first in 1969 and the second in 1971, events which sparked the city to undertake an assessment of the underlying causes. This led to the identification of significant problems such as inadequate housing, lack of jobs, lack of political power, and police brutality, bringing political pressure on the city to rectify a long overdue problem with race relations in Jacksonville and the impacts of segregation.

Staff would like to draw your attention to some significant changes that have taken place in the district since the end of its period of significance. There are a total of 467 buildings identified in an earlier survey in 1993 that are no longer extant. Many of those demolished buildings have been replaced by non-historic infill. There has also been development pressure brought onto the district by the nearby Springfield and Stadium districts. However, due to the densely packed nature of the original neighborhood and the small size of most of the buildings within, the demolitions have not been significant enough to cause the district to lose its cohesiveness as a historic neighborhood. Special consideration must also be paid to the impact of urban renewal and the general scarcity of intact downtown African American districts in Jacksonville, especially east of Interstate 95. Compared to other downtown African American districts such as LaVilla

and Brooklyn, which have seen wholesale destruction of nearly entire swaths of the communities, the Eastside is considerably more intact.

Staff provided a copy of the nomination for the Eastside Historic District to the City of Jacksonville CLG. The Jacksonville Historic Preservation Commission reviewed over the nomination at their October 26, 2022, meeting.

Staff finds that the Eastside Historic District is eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion A: Community Planning and Development, Criterion A: Ethnic History-Gullah Geechee, Criterion A: Social History, and Criterion C: Architecture, for the period 1884-1970, at the local level of significance.

Mr. Gonzalez solicited public comments. Ms. Althea Wunderler-Selby, the nomination author, spoke in support of the nomination.

Mr. Gonzalez solicited board comments. Dr. Smith spoke in favor of the nomination. He was impressed with the number of intact resources. Mr. Gonzalez spoke in favor of the nomination. Dr. Francis thanked staff for the detail involved in all the nominations.

Mr. Gonzalez called for a motion. **Dr. Smith made a motion to forward the nomination of Eastside Historic District under Criteria A and C. Dr. Francis seconded the motion. The nomination passed unanimously.**

B. Garden Club of Jacksonville, Jacksonville, Duval Co., was presented by Mr. Acosta.

The Garden Club of Jacksonville consists of a complex of two buildings and landscaping located within the historic Riverside area. The club is locally significant under Criterion A: Social History and Conservation, and under Criterion C: Architecture. The Period of Significance extends from 1947 to 1972. There are two principal buildings onsite: a smaller rectangular Garden Club Room Building constructed in 1947 and the larger L-shaped Auditorium Building constructed in 1958. The Auditorium Building is an excellent locally significant example of a midcentury adaptation of Neoclassical Revival. The building features a prominent inset multi-column portico along its west façade and a temple front porte-cochere on its north façade that are supported by large near full-height columns with Ionic capitals. The interior consists principally of a single large open ballroom space with a kitchen and garage located along the south side. The Garden Club Room Building is a Masonry Vernacular building with Neoclassical elements such as cornice lines and dentils near the roofline. The interior of the building consists primarily of a large single open meeting room space with a food preparation room.

The Garden Club of Jacksonville, which was originally founded in the 1920s, has long been associated with larger civic improvement, beautification, city planning, and conservation movements within the city. The club itself was one of the founding members of the Florida Federation of Garden Clubs and was a major advocate of public horticultural education. As part of its larger beautification and conservation advocacy, the club was a major proponent for the planting and preservation of trees and natural scenery throughout the city, including the Treaty Oak. The group also played a key role in the development of several parks in Jacksonville and played a key part in the hiring of its first professional city planner. At its height, the Garden Club of Jacksonville had over 2,300 members in 100 circles, making it one of the largest such clubs in the world.

Staff has no concerns about this nomination. The principal buildings onsite retain excellent integrity and have seen few changes of note that would affect National Register eligibility.

The City of Jacksonville Historic Preservation office prepared the nomination and submitted it to our office for listing in the National Register.

Staff finds that the Jacksonville Garden Club is eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion A: Social History, Criterion A: Conservation, and Criterion C: Architecture, for the period 1947-1972, at the local level of significance.

Mr. Gonzalez solicited public comment. No members from the public spoke on this nomination.

Mr. Gonzalez solicited board comments. Mr. Gonzalez spoke in support of the nomination. Dr. Smith, Dr. Francis and Dr. Benz spoke in support of the nomination.

Mr. Gonzalez called for a motion. **Dr. Francis made a motion to forward the nomination of the Garden Club of Jacksonville under Criteria A and C. Dr. Smith seconded the motion. The nomination passed unanimously.**

C. Flori-Coral Apartments, Miami, Miami-Dade Co., was presented by Mr. Acosta.

The Flori-Coral Apartments is a large, three-story, Mediterranean Revival apartment building constructed in 1926 on 6th Street in the Little Havana/Shenandoah neighborhood of Miami. We propose nomination of the property under Criterion C: Architecture for its 1920s architectural design and for its significance as the largest extant example of 1920s multi-family housing in the Shenandoah neighborhood. The period of significance is 1926, which corresponds to the property's construction date.

The building consists of two, three-story blocks with a narrow central courtyard, which are linked at the ground floor by the property's laundry room, which replaced the original entrance to the courtyard. The property retains significant exterior character defining features, primarily on the main façade facing 6th Street. These include arched doorways, arched window openings, balconets, and a pair of towers with barrel tile roofs flanking the interior courtyard. The remaining facades feature minimal decoration and are characterized by the fenestration pattern that mirrors the interior organization of the building. The interior retains most of its historic floorplan, which consists of double loaded corridors of small apartments with staircases at either end.

Modifications to the building include the replacement of all the historic windows sometime in the mid-century period, along with a renovation of interior finishes in 1983. The building has been re-stuccoed and non-historic tile applied along the base of the façade. The historic lobby spaces are no longer present and the main entrance to the courtyard was infilled to accommodate a laundry room. However, the building retains most of its exterior design, and the fenestration pattern is still visible, with surviving concrete window sills showing the location and size of the historic openings. Comparison between the current façade and historic images of the property from newspapers and postcards shows that a majority of the significant 1920s design elements survive.

We consider the building to be a very good representative example of 1920s Mediterranean Revival apartment architecture. The nomination author provides an extensive context for the

building and compares it to other surviving buildings along 6th Street, which was historically a significant transportation corridor with a streetcar line and multiple apartment buildings. The nominated property is the largest and most elaborate of the surviving examples of such buildings in the neighborhood.

A copy of the nomination was provided to the City of Miami CLG and the Miami-Dade County CLG. Miami-Dade County supports the designation. Both local historic preservation boards replied in support of the nomination.

This property is a current federal historic preservation tax credit project, and a Part 1 application was recently reviewed and forwarded to the National Park Service for approval.

Staff finds that the Flori-Coral Apartments are eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion C: Architecture, for the period 1926, at the local level of significance.

Mr. Gonzalez solicited board comments. Mr. Gonzalez spoke on how the area to the west of this building is currently changing rapidly. He supported the nomination.

Dr. Francis asked about the original paint color. Mr. Acosta said it is difficult to tell, since we only have black and white postcards. Dr. Bense asked about the central courtyard.

Mr. Gonzalez explained the central area is for lighting. Dr. Lucas spoke and said she worked closely with the owner on the Part 1 Tax Credit application. Through research they believe the building was originally light pink or white. The owner intends to restore all of the windows and historic features.

Mr. Gonzalez solicited public comments. No members from the public spoke on this nomination.

Mr. Gonzalez called for a motion. **Dr. Smith made a motion to forward the nomination of the Flori-Coral Apartments under Criterion C. Dr. Bense seconded the motion. The nomination passed unanimously.**

Ms. Lotane spoke and informed the board that she had to attend another meeting and would return at 4:00 p.m.

D. Grove Park, Miami, Miami-Dade Co., was presented by Mr. Acosta.

Grove Park is a residential historic district consisting of 1920s-1960s residences, located between Dolphin Expressway on the north, and NW 7th St on the south, NW 14th Court on the east, and NW 17th Avenue on the west. We propose nominating this district to the National Register under Criterion A: Community Planning and Development at the local level, for its significance as one of Miami's first boom-period suburban residential subdivisions. We are also proposing listing under Criterion C: Architecture at the local level, for its significant collection of 1920s-1960s single family homes in a variety of architectural styles. The Period of Significance spans from 1921-1961, which corresponds to the initial platting of the neighborhood and the construction of the first homes, to when the neighborhood was essentially built out.

The neighborhood consists of two developments, Grove Park and Oak Terrace, both of which were platted in 1921. The district contains 92 resources, one of which is a contributing park, and the remainder consisting of 69 contributing residences and 22 non-contributing properties. Character defining features of the district include large, single-family houses, one or two stories

in height with a variety of massing, centrally placed on large lots with open lawns, and tree-lined streets. Many of the homes have historic ancillary buildings, including original garages. A small park bisected Grove Park. Architectural styles present in the district include Mediterranean Revival, Mission Revival, Colonial Revival, Italian Renaissance, Minimal Traditional, and Ranch. Many of the buildings retain their original design and materials, although some alterations include replacement windows, doors, and roofing materials. Some have enclosed porches or garages. The district retains integrity of location, design, materials, workmanship, association and feeling. Integrity of setting is present within the district, although the neighborhood's setting within greater Miami has changed, with the construction of the Marlins Stadium to the south, Robert King High Towers to the east, Dolphin Expressway to the north, and the widening of NW 17th Avenue. Roadway widening and the construction of the expressway has impacted resources on the west and north sides of the district, resulting in the loss of some historic properties.

The district is locally significant under Criterion A: Community Planning and Development for the period 1921-1925 as one of the last surviving intact examples of suburban development from 1920s Miami. The neighborhood was developed by the Tatum Brothers (one of whom lived in the district) as an upper middle-class neighborhood located along one of their streetcar lines. The size, use, and type of buildings within the district were controlled via deed restrictions established by the Tatum's development company, the Lawrence Estate Land Company. The planning and development of Grove Park is directly tied to the Florida Land Boom and is significant for the investment in the neighborhood's infrastructure, the quality of its properties, and its more suburban character that contrasts from higher-density contemporary developments.

The district is also locally significant for its significant collection of boom-period, depression-era, and post-war residential architecture, with the Period of Significance spanning 1921-1961. The district retains its suburban style streets, open yards, and large single-family homes. The most common examples of architecture in the district are 1920s Mission and Mediterranean Revival homes, followed by 1950s era Ranches. These correspond to the two primary boom periods of the city's development within the Period of Significance. Other styles speak to development in the 1920s and 1930s, including the Minimal Traditional style, which derives from standards promoted by the Federal Housing Agency during the Great Depression.

A copy of the nomination was provided to the City of Miami CLG and the Miami-Dade County CLG. Miami-Dade County supports the designation. Both local historic preservation boards responded with support for the nomination.

Staff finds that the Grove Park Historic District is eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion A: Community Planning and Development and Criterion C: Architecture, for the period 1921-1961, at the local level of significance.

Mr. Gonzalez solicited public comments. Ms. McLaughlin, nomination author, spoke in support of the nomination. Ms. Rupp spoke in support of the nomination and said there has been a large amount of public support for the district.

Mr. Gonzalez solicited board comments. Dr. Smith, Dr. Francis and Dr. Benz spoke in favor of the nomination. Mr. Gonzalez thanked Dade Heritage Trust for their interest and time in this district.

Mr. Gonzalez called for a motion. **Dr. Francis made a motion to forward the nomination of Grove Park under Criteria A and C. Dr. Bense seconded the motion. The nomination passed unanimously.**

- E. Peninsular Fruit Company Building, St. Petersburg, Pinellas Co.,** was presented by Mr. Acosta.

The Peninsular Fruit Company is a two-story, Mediterranean Revival commercial building constructed in 1926. The building is located along the original alignment of Gandy Boulevard, which linked the first bridge across Tampa Bay to St. Petersburg. The building is locally significant under National Register Criterion C: Architecture, as a significant example of 1920s boom-period commercial architecture. Character defining features include its symmetrical façade, arcaded ground floor windows with Solomonic columns, recessed central entryway, and decorative pilasters topped with terra cotta finials flanking a stepped parapet. The arcaded windows return along both side facades. The windows are original wood. The interior retains its original structural system, wood floors, and plaster on tile block walls. A rear, one story addition housed the citrus packing house operation until 1929.

The property is significant as a rare, surviving example of 1920s boom-era architecture. The Peninsular Fruit Company built the property in 1926 as an expansion of its operations from their downtown St. Petersburg location. The property's construction along Gandy Boulevard was speculative, as much of the surrounding area was platted but completely undeveloped. Its location was ideal for attracting customers travelling via automobile between Tampa and St. Petersburg, which was made possible by the opening of the Gandy Bridge in 1926. The Mediterranean Revival design tapped into Florida's romanticized Spanish roots and adaptation to the hot and humid climate. The building retains many original details and materials and is one of the best examples of its style and type in St. Petersburg.

The city of St. Petersburg has designated the property a local historic landmark. The local historic preservation board reviewed the National Register nomination and supports listing. The property has applied for federal historic preservation tax credits to facilitate rehabilitation.

Staff finds that the Peninsular Fruit Company is eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion C: Architecture, for the period 1926, at the local level of significance.

Mr. Gonzalez solicited public comments. No members of the public spoke on this nomination.

Mr. Gonzalez solicited board comments. Dr. Smith asked about the future plans for the building. Mr. Acosta said our office has reviewed the Part 1 Tax Credit application for this project, and we are waiting for the Part 2 plans. Dr. Lucas explained that the applicant plans to restore all windows. Potentially part of the building will be a museum, but the plans are unknown.

Mr. Gonzalez called for a motion. **Dr. Bense made a motion to forward the nomination of the Peninsular Fruit Company Building under Criterion C. Dr. Francis seconded the motion. The nomination passed unanimously.**

F. Interlachen Academy, Interlachen, Putnam Co., was presented by Mr. Acosta.

The Interlachen Academy, now known as the Sid Martin Building, is a one-story wood frame Neoclassical Revival schoolhouse. It is locally significant under Criterion A in the area of Education and Criterion C in the area of Architecture. The period of significance extends from circa 1890 to 1971. The T-shaped building features a prominent full-height entry porch supported by four square columns. The interior of the building consists primarily of two large open classroom spaces, with office spaces, utility rooms, and bathrooms on the rear.

The Interlachen Academy is one of the oldest extant schoolhouses in Florida and is perhaps the oldest wooden schoolhouse still functioning as a school in the state. The school was conceived and constructed by the founders of Interlachen at the height of the citrus boom in the county, which ended with the Great Freeze of 1895. Its construction was a key element of the attempts of town founders to promote what they deemed to be a “better class” of citizens in the community. Except for a brief period in the late 1930s and early 1940s, this building served as the principal public elementary and junior high school for the white children of Interlachen and western Putnam County until 1955. Afterward, it remained as a support building for the expanded elementary school campus until 1989.

The building is a locally significant example of a vernacular interpretation of Neoclassical Revival architecture. When constructed, the level of architectural sophistication of this building far exceeded what would have been the average public schoolhouse in western Putnam County. Like the rest of Putnam County, Interlachen remained segregated until the late 1960s. The adjacent Interlachen Junior-Senior High School, which this building is currently part of, was one of the first purpose-built integrated schools constructed in Putnam County when it was built in the late 1960s.

Staff would like to draw your attention to several changes that have taken place since the building’s original construction. Many of these changes were the result of the varied uses of the building over its long history while part of the Putnam County school system. When originally built, the school was a two-room schoolhouse that was converted to a cafeteria in 1936 following the construction of the Annie C. Jones School. The main façade was also originally symmetrical. In 1941, after the Jones school burned, the Interlachen Academy once again reverted to use as a principal schoolhouse. By this time, the county converted it into a three-room schoolhouse and added onto the south façade, giving the building its currently T-shaped footprint. This is considered an historic alteration, however, and the extent of the original south wall of the building is still visible on the main façade. In 1955, after the construction of a four-room masonry school building, the Interlachen Academy reverted to use as a cafeteria, and the interior was opened. In the 1980s, after it became part of the junior-senior high school for use as a JROTC classroom, it took on its current two-classroom configuration. The interior materials have also been impacted, with vinyl flooring, dropped ceilings, and non-historic walls added into the space. Despite these changes, the most important aspects of its architecture, which are tied to its form and exterior design, have been retained. The other aspects of its integrity it retains, including location, setting, and association, are of importance to its historical significance. Special consideration must also be paid to the scarcity of the resource; it is the oldest school building in Putnam County and one of the oldest in the state of Florida. Staff believes the building possesses requisite integrity for listing in the National Register.

Staff finds that the Interlachen Academy is eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion A: Education and Criterion C: Architecture, for the period 1890-1971, at the local level of significance.

Mr. Gonzalez solicited public comments. No members of the public had comments on the nomination.

Mr. Gonzalez solicited board comments. Mr. Gonzalez asked who initiated the application for the building. Mr. Waber replied that the Interlachen Historical Society initiated the project. Mr. Gonzalez asked about the addition of the building. He said the addition was done very well. Mr. Gonzalez recommended removing the covered walkways, away from the historic façade. Dr. Lucas commented on ADA access.

Mr. Acosta said staff would pass on the recommendations to the Interlachen Historical Society.

Mr. Gonzalez called for a motion. **Dr. Smith made a motion to forward the nomination for the Interlachen Academy under Criteria A and C. Dr. Francis seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

G. Lincoln Lane School, Interlachen, Putnam Co., was presented by Mr. Acosta.

The Lincoln Lane School is a one-story wood frame vernacular historic schoolhouse located within the African American section of Interlachen. The school is locally significant under Criterion: A in the areas of Education and Ethnic Heritage: Black and Criterion C for Architecture. The period of significance extends from circa 1937 to circa 1954. The Lincoln Lane School contributes to the *Florida's Historic Black Public Schools MPS*. The schoolhouse itself is a simple one-story wood frame building with a gabled roof, corbeled brick chimney, and concrete block foundations. It consists of a row of five nine-over-nine sash windows along the main façade, which are boarded up. The entry has a simple glazed paneled wood door, which is also boarded up. The interior consists of a single open space with wood floors, wood walls, and wood beadboard ceiling.

This school historically served as the only public elementary and junior high school for the Black children of Interlachen. The school would have played a vital role in the education of African American children in the community, providing a level of schooling virtually unavailable just a few years prior. The dichotomy of the educational system between Black and White children at this time is perhaps best illustrated in the differences in size and complexity of the Lincoln Lane and Interlachen Academy buildings. Even though the Black community of Interlachen was adjacent to the rear of the White school, after the Lincoln Lane school closed in the mid-1950s, Black students had to be transported to Palatka on a bus purchased and driven by members of the community. The school building is an excellent locally significant example of a mid-20th century African American one-room schoolhouse.

Staff would like to draw your attention to several issues with this building's condition caused in part by its long period of vacancy. There are portions of the interior and exterior siding that are either missing or lifting off. Nearly every window found in the building has some missing or shattered glass and has been boarded up. The chimney also has some condition issues, with the brick towards the top of the chimney leaning. The condition issues have not progressed to the point that it has impacted the school's integrity. The building possesses a significant degree of

integrity, with its character-defining form, design, materials, and workmanship all retained. Staff believes that this building possesses integrity for listing in the National Register.

Staff finds that the Lincoln Lane School is eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion A: Education, Criterion A: Ethnic Heritage-Black, and Criterion C: Architecture, for the period 1937-1954, at the local level of significance.

Mr. Gonzalez solicited public comments. No members of the public commented on this nomination.

Mr. Gonzalez solicited board comments. Mr. Gonzalez commented on the quality of the materials. Dr. Francis commented on the survival of the school. Dr. Smith expressed his support for the historical society's effort to preserve the school.

Mr. Gonzalez called for a motion. **Dr. Smith made a motion to forward the nomination of the Lincoln Lane School under Criteria A and C. Dr. Francis seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously, of the four board members who were present during the initial presentation.**

Ms. Kauffman joined the meeting at 3:18 p.m. She had to attend a local commission meeting.

H. Palatka Water Works, Palatka, Putnam Co., was presented by Mr. Acosta.

The Palatka Water Works is being proposed for listing at the local level under Criterion A: Community Planning and Development and Criterion C: Engineering. The period of significance for Criterion A is 1886 to 1887. This period corresponds to the year of a large fire in Palatka, which spurred plans for the Water Works, to the completion of the first phase of the property's construction. The period of significance for Criterion C extends from 1886 to 1963, which includes the construction of each of the historic resources. The Water Works operated until 1986. Changes to the property reflect the growth in Palatka and advancements in water works technology. The construction of the Palatka Water Works included a network of pipes and fire hydrants throughout the city, enabling residents to have clean drinking water and a method for putting out fires.

The Palatka Water Works is a 9.5-acre property, which was constructed in 1886. Palatka is located in northeast Florida, about 29 miles southwest of St. Augustine. Railroad tracks are east of the Water Works, while Ravine Gardens State Park borders the southwest, west, and northwest border of the property. The Palatka Water Works was built by the Boston firm, Wheeler & Parks. Prior to designing the Palatka Water Works, Wheeler & Parks had constructed two water works in Connecticut and one water works system in Massachusetts. The original pump house, west reservoir, and brick canal date to 1886. Additional historic resources were developed for the Water Works from the 1920s through the early 1960s. The Palatka Water Works property is in fair condition. The Pump House was restored in 2000, while all of the other structures are in varying levels of disrepair.

Although the Water Works has not been used in several decades, its form and historic resources remain intact. The Palatka Water Works retains integrity of location, setting, design, materials, workmanship, feeling and association. The setting around the Water Works has changed very little and the area is sparsely populated. The design of the Water Works is intact, with the most

recent historic resources built in the 1950s and 1960s. Although the Water Works have not been used since 1986, the different historic resources retain their original materials, design, and workmanship. While the reservoirs, brick canal and settlement pond are overgrown with vegetation, the form and structure of these resources remain. At some point, most of the historic pumps were removed from the pump house. Other pumps have been kept in place in the east control room, new pump house, and west control room. Although these pumps are no longer active, the pumps and different resources retain the feeling and association for the property.

Staff finds the Palatka Water Works eligible for listing in the National Register under Criterion A: Community Planning and Development, and Criterion C: Engineering, for the period 1886-1963, at the local level of significance.

Mr. Gonzalez positively commented on the architecture of the Pump House.

Mr. Gonzalez solicited public comments. Ms. Purinton spoke about weekly activities at the Water Works Environmental Center. She said the city owns the building but does not have the money for staff. Mr. Gonzalez thanked Ms. Purinton for her comments.

Ms. Kauffman congratulated staff for their thorough analysis.

Mr. Gonzalez solicited board comments. Dr. Smith said this was an interesting nomination conveying local infrastructure change. Dr. Bense positively commented on the nomination. Dr. Bense asked how people receive water today. Ms. Purinton said that everyone receives water from wells. Dr. Francis questioned the wording of best-preserved water works in North Florida, and it was perhaps the best preserved in the state of Florida.

Mr. Gonzalez called for a motion. **Dr. Bense made a motion to forward the nomination of the Palatka Water Works under Criteria A and C. Dr. Francis seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

The Board adjourned for a 15-minute break at 3:45 p.m. Ms. Lotane rejoined the meeting during the break period. The Board reconvened at 4:00 p.m.

I. Royal Rural Historic District, Wildwood vicinity, Sumter Co., was presented by Mr. Acosta.

The Community of Royal Rural Historic District encompasses a historic African American community that was established as early as the 1870s, when freed slaves used the Homestead Act to acquire plots of land in Sumter County. We are proposing listing the district under Criterion A: Exploration/Settlement, Ethnic History-Black, Agriculture, and Community Planning and Development. The Period of Significance for this rural historic district is 1870-1972, at the local level of significance.

The large district encompasses 3,582 acres and is composed of a rural landscape of fields, homes, barns, churches, social buildings, and a historic cemetery. The historic African American village of Royal is located at the center of the district, with the site of the former school, two churches, a masonic lodge, and cemetery. The surrounding landscape is agricultural with fields, pastures, barns, and farmhouses. Several of the historic properties are archaeological sites, which potentially contain evidence of the earliest period of habitation in Royal. However,

additional investigation is necessary to evaluate these sites under Criterion D: Archaeology. The western third of the district is separated from the eastern two-thirds by Interstate 75, which runs in a southeastern direction through the district. The Royal Rural Historic district has 61 contributing buildings, structures, objects, and sites within its boundaries. It also contains many non-contributing buildings, most of which were built after the end of the period of significance, but which are associated with the continuing occupation of properties by descendants of the original homesteading families. The boundaries of the district were based upon historic land ownership determined from Government Land Office maps and patents, along with oral history and historic maps.

The Royal Rural Historic District is significant for its direct association with the establishment and development of the African American community known as Royal. The community is a rare example of a Black homesteader community, established by freed slaves who acquired their land directly from the federal government under the Homestead Act of 1862. These families practiced agriculture in plots ranging from 40 to 120 acres in size, growing a variety of crops including tobacco and sugarcane, along with livestock. A community developed, supporting several churches, a school, and a masonic hall. A cemetery was established at the south end of the district. Most of the surviving historic structures date to the early to mid-twentieth century, when residents were able to upgrade their homes and agricultural outbuildings during periods of strong agricultural growth and production associated with the world wars.

Staff would like to bring the board's attention to several items:

- This nomination is for a rural historic district, where the landscape itself is an essential component of the district. According to National Register Bulletin 30: Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Rural Historic Landscapes, a rural district or a rural historic landscape is defined as "a geographical area that historically has been used by people, or shaped or modified by human activity, occupancy, or intervention, and that possess a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of areas of land use, vegetation, building and structures, roads and waterways, and natural features." You may access the bulletin via this link: <https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nationalregister/upload/NRB30-Complete.pdf>
- Rural historic districts possess eleven characteristics, which are classified as either pertaining to processes that shape the land (first four elements) or to physical components that are evident within a district (seven elements). These elements include:
 - Land use and activities
 - Patterns of Spatial Organization
 - Response to the Natural Environment
 - Cultural Traditions
 - Circulation Networks
 - Boundary Demarcations
 - Vegetation related to land use
 - Buildings, structures, and objects
 - Clusters
 - Archaeological Sites
 - Small-scale elements

Section 7 of the National Register nomination proposal addresses these elements separately as part of the description of the district and its evaluation for possessing historic integrity.

- This district has a very high number of non-contributing resources. Staff would like to note that there is no written National Park Service requirement that contributing resources must either outnumber or be equal to non-contributing resources for a historic district to be eligible for listing. In this case, the large number of non-contributing resources reflects ongoing land use activities, cultural traditions, and clusters which are part of the historic landscape. Most of the properties are noncontributing solely due to age and reflect the pattern of families continuing to live on their historic homesteads and subdividing the property amongst the heirs. In addition, while there are many non-contributing resources, they are compatible with the rural landscape, which preserves its historic clusters of buildings, historic road network, open fields and pastures, and land divisions.
- Nine archaeological sites were identified within the district and included as contributing. These were identified primarily via LiDAR. Additional investigation is necessary to determine if the properties would contribute significance under Criterion D: Archaeology. However, they were included in the contributing list as they correspond to historic homesteading sites and reinforce other elements of a rural historic district. Note that one of these archaeological sites spanned multiple parcels within the district and thus the resource count, which was based upon parcel lines, has eleven sites counted instead of the nine addressed in the Section 7 narrative.
- The boundary encompasses the majority of the area associated with Royal and its families, except in the south, where development along Hwy 44 and its interchange with I-75 has transformed the landscape and rendered ineligible several plots of land that were historically owned and farmed by Royal residents. The boundary is based upon historic ownership and land use, as supported by oral history and land records.
- As of January 18, 2023, we have received twenty-one objections to listing, out of 629 identified property owners. The objections have been provided to the board, along with a map showing the locations of the properties covered by the objections.

Overall, staff finds that the district is eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. The Royal Rural Historic District possesses all eleven characteristics identified in the *Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Rural Historic Landscapes*. While there are more non-contributing than contributing resources, they are the result of ongoing historic processes and are compatible with the overall landscape. Comparison of historic aerial photos and current images show that the district retains much of its historic land divisions, road network, clusters, and agricultural character. The residents are primarily descendants of the original homesteaders and continue to live on their properties.

Staff recommends forwarding the Community of Royal Rural Historic District to the National Park Service for listing under Criterion A: Exploration/Settlement, Ethnic History-Black, Agriculture, and Community Planning and Development, for the period 1870-1972, at the local level of significance.

Mr. Gonzalez asked for comments from the board. Mr. Gonzalez asked for clarification on the number of objections compared to total owners. He also asked for a comparable rural historic district. Mr. Acosta said the only comparable property we have listed is Livingston Place in Jefferson County. Staff have not listed any similar rural historic districts in Florida.

Dr. Smith had questions about the boundary. He questioned the archaeological remains versus buildings. He questioned what an early survey map defined. Mr. Acosta said the map was an early land survey from territorial period Public Land Survey. Dr. Smith still questioned the district boundary. Mr. Acosta explained the consultants that wrote the nomination defined the boundary based upon research and historic resource surveys conducted since 2016. Mr. Acosta said the boundary could be amended based upon additional research and documentation.

Mr. Gonzalez asked about the boundary on an early map compared to the 1961 map. He questioned if there would have been any historic survey or Section 106 review before highway construction. Mr. Acosta explained that the National Historic Preservation Act was passed in 1966, after the construction of the highway.

Mr. Gonzalez solicited comments from the applicant. Ms. Beverly Steele spoke positively on behalf of the nomination and is the applicant. Ms. Steele shared how the families descended from the original settlers remain within the district, and how the significance of the community was passed down through oral tradition. She elaborated upon the origin of Royal and history of the name of the community.

Mr. Gonzalez asked about the 40-acre farm amount. Mr. Acosta stated that in western states, people were given 160 acres under the Homestead Act. He has not seen enough land patents to speak confidently on the average Florida acreage. Dr. Bense spoke about history of land patents in Georgia following the Civil War.

Mr. Gonzalez solicited comments from people who opposed the nomination.

Mr. Samuel Albritton spoke on the nomination. He is representing Gadison Incorporated. He filed two letters objecting to the nomination. While his personal property is now out of the boundary, he maintains an interest in part of his family's land that is within the district along the southern boundary. His family settled the land in 1842. His family has always been ranchers. He recognized the picture of the watermelon field and said the picture was on his family's land. He believes his family's land does not have anything to do with the community of Royal. He believes the potential district is an undue burden on large landowners. Mr. Joe Jacquot, of Gunster Law Firm, represented his client for 8G Farms, and his client opposed the nomination. He pointed out that there are no homes or known archaeological sites on 8G Farms. He explained the only thing on the property are utility lines and a dilapidated pole barn. He believes that his client's property has zero connection to the community of Royal. He asked for his client's property to be cut out of the southwest portion of the district boundary. Mr. Shawn Riordan, manager of 8G Farms, stated that his operation has ranched cattle on land encompassing 360 acres west of Interstate 75 since 2014, and they opposed the nomination. Mr. Bill Perry, of Gunster Law Firm, also spoke in opposition to 8G farms in the district. Mr. Gonzalez informed the board that he spoke with Mr. Perry and another lawyer, Mr. Crowley, the previous afternoon.

Ms. Tara Tedrow of Lawrence Law spoke on behalf of her client, the Farkus properties, who own over 370 acres. She requested that these properties be excluded from the district. She referenced a letter in opposition signed by 20 landowners who collectively owned over 1,000 acres. Ms. Tedrow believes the nomination is thorough but is not relevant to her client's property.

Mr. Gonzalez asked about the County's position. Mr. Acosta responded that Ms. Steele forwarded to DHR staff a letter of support from Sumter County dated 2015. In October 2022,

DHR Staff received a letter from Sumter County that said they would support the changes to the nomination with changes to the boundary, to exclude objecting property owners. Ms. Kauffman said the previous speaker noted that a property needs to qualify under all four criteria. This is inaccurate and Ms. Kauffman clarified that this district is being nominated only under Criterion A.

Mr. Dan Tatro spoke on behalf of the Farkus property and stated he believed that there are no relevant buildings on the property. Ms. Debbie Gray spoke in opposition to the nomination for the Buckner family. Mr. Randall Alvord represented 4C Family Trust and spoke in support of recognizing the area. He stated that the district, at 3,000 acres, was too large. His client has 140 acres in the northern portion, which are not represented in the original land patent map. Mr. Bernardo Manoli represented Champagne Farm and they oppose the inclusion of their property in the district. He believes the inclusion of this property in the district creates an undue burden.

Mr. Gonzalez solicited comments from people who supported the nomination. Mr. Cliff Hughes, resident of Royal, spoke positively in support of the nomination. He expressed concern about potential development around and in the proposed district. The main road through Royal is named for his great grandfather. Ms. West of 1000 Friends of Florida spoke positively in support of the nomination. She advocated for the district as a historic landscape. Ms. Zelma Jenkins is a 6th generation resident and supports the nomination. Ms. Ann Tomoner lives in the Villages and works with Ms. Steele on young performing arts events. She supports the nomination. Ms. Suncara Jackson is a descendent of Jim Patterson, an original resident. She supports the nomination. Mr. C.J. Williams spoke positively on the nomination and wished the area had been designated twenty years ago. He believes Royal conveys Florida and national history. Ms. Dallas Fowler spoke positively about the district. Mr. Edward Gonzalez Tenant said he was one of the original consultants for the district and supports the nomination. He believes there should be consensus for the boundary and the 'heart of Royal' should be preserved. Mr. Howard Carter spoke positively in favor of the district.

Ms. Moss-Greenberg positively spoke on the richness of the community of Royal. Jim and Marilyn Shields strongly support the district. Ms. Carolyn Collins positively supports the nomination. Ms. Whitney Lewis grew up in Royal and supports the nomination. Mr. Scott Sigler is a Tallahassee resident and supports the nomination. Ms. Kristen Condon supports the nomination. Mr. Harry Coverston supports the nomination. Ms. Penny Walker supports the nomination. Mr. Marshal Jenkins supports the nomination. Dr. Deidra Russell is also a direct descendant of original residents. She supports the nomination.

Mr. Gonzalez asked about other business on the agenda. Mr. Acosta said this is the last item of business for decision.

Mr. Gonzalez solicited additional board comments. Mr. Gonzalez said he did not previously know the turnpike was proposed for this area. Mr. Gonzalez suggests postponing this nomination for staff to adjust the boundary. Dr. Francis was confused by the boundary but agrees there should be more information on it. Ms. Kauffman thanked the staff and public for participating in the nomination. She clarified the definition of the National Register versus a local designation. Dr. Bense asked about editing the boundary. Mr. Acosta explains that the boundary could be amended. Dr. Bense restated the definition of the National Register. She sees the importance in the property and making a decision.

Dr. Smith is still concerned with the boundary. Dr. Smith stated that there needs to be a boundary justification. Dr. Smith asks for additional time to justify the boundary. Mr. Gonzalez agrees about additional time for clarifying the boundary. Mr. Gonzalez asked Mr. Acosta about postponing the nomination to the next meeting in two weeks. Mr. Acosta said we are required to provide legal notice of at least thirty days for board meetings to all of the associated property owners. Mr. Gonzalez asked about further justifying the boundary. Mr. Acosta explained that a boundary justification is stated in Section 10 of the nomination.

Mr. Gonzalez questioned two possible options of making adjustments and sending the nomination to the National Park Service or tabling the nomination. He asked Mr. Acosta if staff would have time to make adjustments to the boundary for the May meeting. Mr. Acosta said that there are three historians on staff, and we could make the changes. Dr. Bense asked to see the historic maps again. She believed the consultants did a thorough job and the boundary is alright to move forward.

Mr. Sigler from the public pointed out a section of the north part of the boundary.

Mr. Gonzalez called for a motion from the board. **Dr. Smith made a motion to table this National Register Nomination to the May 4, 2023, Review Board Meeting. Ms. Kauffman seconded the motion. The vote was 4 to 1 in favor, with Dr. Bense opposed.**

VIII. **Other Business**

The next National Register Board Meeting is Thursday February 2, 2023. The other meetings will be the first Thursdays in May, August, and November. Mr. Acosta requested board members inform him promptly of any scheduling conflicts. He also informed the board that the National Park Service assigned the state to a new reviewer, Ms. Michelle Dietrich. He also informed the board that staff are still seeking to hire a CLG Coordinator, and then following on a new Section Supervisor.

Mr. Gonzalez asked about a staff architect. Ms. Lotane responded the

Ms. Kauffman clarified the dates for the upcoming Historic Commission meeting.

IX. **Public Comment**

No Public Comment.

X. **Motion To Adjourn**

Dr. Smith made the motion to adjourn. Dr. Francis seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 6:35 p.m.

Chair, National Register Review Board

Date

State Historic Preservation Officer

Date