



MINUTES OF THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

August 17, 2023

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairperson Salter, Board Member Mead, Board Member Ramos, Board Member Yee, Board Member Fogarty, Board Member Courtney, Advisor Pristera

MEMBERS ABSENT: Board Member McCorvey

STAFF PRESENT: Assistant Planning & Zoning Division Manager Harding, Digital Media Specialist Russo, Cultural Resources Coordinator Walker

STAFF VIRTUAL: Development Services Director Morris, Assistant City Attorney Lindsay, Development Services Coordinator Statler

OTHERS PRESENT: Shawn Kessler, Elizabeth Bush, Wally Nowicki, Anne Bollinger, Rob Hogan, Nico Camero, Mimi Moncier, Eric MacInerney, Dan Fitzpatrick, Tosh Belsinger

CALL TO ORDER / QUORUM PRESENT

Chairperson Salter called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. with a quorum present.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Board Member Ramos made a motion to approve the July 20, 2023, minutes, seconded by Board Member Mead, and it carried 6-0.

OPEN FORUM

NEW BUSINESS

Item 2 506 E. Gadsden Street OEHPD / Zone OEHC-2, City Council District 6
Exterior Improvements to a Contributing Structure
Action Taken: Approved.

Wally Nowicki is seeking approval for exterior improvements to a contributing structure that was relocated from 710 N. Davis Highway to the current location at 506 E. Gadsden Street. The applicant is proposing to add a brick element to the existing concrete staircase, removing aluminum siding to

reveal original wood lap siding that will be repaired in-kind as needed, and relocating an original wood window from the interior of the house to the front exterior.

Anne Bollinger and Wally Nowicki presented to the board. Chairperson Salter noted the Old East Hill Association supported the improvements. Board Member Mead asked for clarification on how far out the stairway will go. Ms. Bollinger answered that brick will be added to the sides of the stairs and the existing steps will be preserved. Board Member Courtney asked if the applicant had thought about adding handrails. Ms. Bollinger answered that the code requires handrails at 30 inches, and these are not quite that high. Ms. Bollinger asked if the addition of handrails would have to come back to the board. Cultural Resources Coordinator Walker answered that the addition of handrails could be handled through an abbreviated review that is all electronic. Board Member Courtney asked about the existing stairs and how the brick will accommodate the curve at the bottom. Ms. Bollinger answered that there will not be any gaps and the brick will angle out like the stairs. Advisor Pristera added clarification that the bricks will be used to make the radius, partly on the steps to hide the gap.

Board Member Mead made the motion to approve. Board Member Courtney seconded the motion and it carried 6-0.

Item 3 516 N. Alcaniz Street OEHPD / Zone OEHC-1, City Council District 6
Renovation of a Contributing Structure
Action Taken: Approved with conditions.

Shawn Kessler is seeking approval for exterior alterations at a contributing structure. This project received a stop work order in October 2022 for unpermitted exterior alterations that also did not receive ARB approval. The proposal includes a replacement rear addition, new Ply Gem single hung vinyl windows throughout, changing the front window composition from one picture window to two smaller openings, replacement wood siding on the front and smooth cement board siding on the sides and rear, lattice covering the foundation to match existing, tongue and groove pine boards for the porch and gable end soffits, and wood replacement porch pillars to match the existing. The roof replacement was previously approved through a board-for-board application, the door selection will require a full board application, and the paint selection will be submitted for an abbreviated review.

Shawn Kessler presented to the board. Chairperson Salter shared the Old East Hill Neighborhood Association's comments that they are happy to see the restoration but question the use of synthetic materials for siding, the lattice finish, and use of vinyl windows. Chairperson Salter asked for clarification on which line of Ply Gem windows are being proposed. Mr. Kessler answered he did not know the specific line. Chairperson Salter noted that Ply Gem makes high quality and low quality and the board tries to monitor the window profile and style and make sure appropriate windows are being used in the historic districts. Chairperson Salter said clarification on the line of window is needed for a full approval. Chairperson Salter asked where the lattice would be installed. Mr. Kessler answered the lattice will be placed along the foundation on the sides and rear, fully covering the piers. Board Member Ramos asked about the brick veneer depicted in the plans. Mr. Kessler answered that the brick veneer was changed to lattice due to cost. Chairperson Salter noted that the lattice overlaps the siding in the existing photograph and asked if the new lattice will be tucked underneath and will it occur only between the openings between piers. Mr. Kessler answered that lattice will be tucked under the siding. Chairperson Salter asked about the orientation of the piers and if the applicant was proposing to completely skirt the house with lattice. Mr. Kessler answered yes. Advisor Pristera noted there is not an example of the board approving latticework to fully skirt over piers. Mr. Kessler

described the pier orientation and that additional piers were poured to stabilize the structure, so the pier pattern is not uniform. Mr. Kessler noted that the lattice skirting is a way to make everything uniform and if the lattice is placed only between piers, it will not be uniform and the spacing will be uneven. The board discussed options such as stucco on the piers, setting the lattice further inside, or painting the piers as alternatives. Advisor Pristera asked if all the piers are at the same plane. Mr. Kessler answered yes, but they are not uniform since the newer piers were poured while the house was in place. Board Member Yee clarified the discussion and asked the applicant about the concern of putting lattice between piers rather than full skirting. Mr. Kessler answered due to the pier configuration, lattice between piers will look choppy.

Board Member Yee asked about the plan for the front porch foundation. Mr. Kessler answered that the siding comes down to meet the concrete porch. Board Member Courtney asked about the existing novelty siding and if the cement board will fit into the novelty profile. Mr. Kessler answered no, flat Hardie siding will be used on the sides and rear and in-kind wood siding will be used on the front. Board Member Ramos asked if the existing siding would be salvaged to use on the front. Mr. Kessler answered the boards are in bad shape and have been painted multiple times. The corbels and porch pillars will be replaced with in-kind new material to match the existing. The new elements will be tongue and groove boards on the soffits on the front.

Board Member Yee clarified that Old East Hill's biggest concern is maintaining original façade and details and clarified Board Member Ramos' question about using materials from the sides to maintain the front. The porch column detail and subtle taper needs to be maintained. Mr. Kessler answered that everything will be replaced the same with just new material from a mill in Milton. Board Member Courtney asked if Board Member Yee was requesting that original materials be reused, and the paint could be stripped to reuse original material. Board Member Yee answered yes. Board Member Yee noted that setting the lattice between piers is ideal, but also the sides and rear are not really visible from the street.

Board Member Courtney asked about proposed doors. Mr. Kessler answered that doors had not been identified yet, but the hope is a shaker-look with three windows at the top and a T-shape panel. Mr. Kessler provided a representative photograph that was shown on the screen. Board Member Ramos noted that the intent is evident, but there are discrepancies in what has been said versus what is in the application. More information is needed for the line of windows and ideally the existing siding material should be salvaged to use on the front. The fiber cement siding on the sides and rear is appropriate and the reveal should be similar to the existing reveal on the front to be consistent. In regard to the lattice, Board Member Ramos noted it would be nice to have a better idea of what the piers look like and perhaps put brick veneer just on the existing piers and then framed wood lattice in between. The goal is to maintain the historic methods of construction and framed wood lattice would be ideal. Mr. Kessler noted that there was no lattice historically, the foundation was open. Board Member Ramos clarified to say that in a situation where there may have been lattice, it would have been framed around the piers, and that is regardless of whether this structure had lattice. Mr. Kessler stated confusion about the irregular pattern of piers and how the varying sections of lattice will appear if placed in between the piers. The lattice is being proposed to keep animals out.

Board Member Mead suggested that lattice could be mock framed to match the color and texture of the existing piers, to even out the pattern. It can be applied to the lattice, which would be recessed and that would provide a rhythm and visual harmony with a faux treatment. Mr. Kessler asked for clarification on Board Member Mead's suggestion. Board Member Mead answered that using a faux

treatment could even out the irregular pier pattern. Board Member Ramos noted that he agrees with Advisor Pristera that continual lattice would not be appropriate. Advisor Pristera noted the foundation plan indicates that there is not much irregularity except on the rear, but it is hard to determine a solution without seeing the existing piers. Board Member Courtney emphasized what Board Member Ramos said about the existing siding reveal being matched for a continuous band around the structure.

Board Member Ramos made the motion to approve with the condition that the siding on the sides of the house be salvaged if possible for use at the front of the house, the front siding that is existing to be preserved and repaired as needed, that window information is submitted for an abbreviated review, and that more information on the final lattice detailing be submitted for an abbreviated review.

Chairperson Salter asked for clarification if the intent of the motion was that the front of the house must remain as wood siding and that as much of that as possible be the salvaged material but if there is not enough, it can be substituted as needed with new wood. Board Member Ramos answered yes. Advisor Pristera recommended that product information on the doors must be provided. Board Member Ramos accepted the amendments. Board Member Courtney seconded the motion as presented with the amendments. The motion carried 6-0.

Item 4 49 W. Intendencia Street PHBD / Zone C-2A, City Council District 6
Exterior Improvements to Parking Garage Facades
Action Taken: Denied.

Escambia County Facilities Department is seeking approval to remove stucco and non-structural metal studs from the north and west sides of the Escambia County Government Complex Parking Garage that were damaged during Hurricane Sally. The applicant is proposing to paint the north and west sides with Sherwin Williams Practical Beige to match the existing concrete.

Elizabeth Bush presented to the board. Board Member Mead asked staff when the structure was built and when did it come before the board. Ms. Bush answered the mid-to-late 1990s or early 2000s. The parking garage was built when the addition to the board chambers was constructed. Cultural Resources Coordinator Walker noted that the project files are probably hard copy and were not available at the time of the meeting. Board Member Ramos asked for clarification on what is being removed. Ms. Bush stated that everything is to be removed down to the original concrete structural items. The metal studs were added to support the stucco. Repairs after Hurricane Sally indicated the depth of damage to the structure. Board Member Mead said the property appraiser website says the effective year is 2005. Ms. Bush said that the county database has information on when the structure was built. Board Member Mead asked if there is a replacement façade plan. Ms. Bush said replacement is not the goal at this time. Board Member Mead noted the stair tower and pilasters at the bottom would be the only architectural features that relate at all to the county complex on that block. Ms. Bush noted that the south side is solid concrete with no stucco. Ms. Bush noted that all the awnings and brick veneer would remain in place. Ms. Bush made the point that the parking garage associated with the M.C. Blanchard Building has no façade and is a concrete structure.

Board Member Mead asked if the south side is the only currently exposed portion of the structure that represents what is being proposed. Ms. Bush answered yes. Ms. Bush noted on the Baylen Street entrance, a faux beam was removed that used to go across that matched on the second floor. That

area is what the façade will look like. The beam was removed because it started falling off and was falling on vehicles coming in and out of the garage. Advisor Pristera asked if the applicant had looked behind the brick to make sure there is no damage. Ms. Bush answered there is concrete behind the brick. Ms. Bush noted that Mott MacDonald did an analysis and came up with a plan to remove the stucco and they would be the structural architect on the project. Board Member Yee asked if the applicant had explored other options for repairing or improving the façade beyond just removing what is there. Ms. Bush answered not at this time. When this came up, a preliminary analysis of the building was done and that is when it was realized that it is not just one area or the top. Anywhere there are metal studs, there is deterioration. The plan was not to replace the stucco because twenty years later there may be the same issue. The applicant would rather match other structures in the area and paint the parking garage.

Board Member Yee appreciated the significant cost savings of not replacing the stucco and framing that is currently there, but it was without a doubt designed in such a way that it is meant to present like a building and less like a parking garage. If all is being seen is bones of a garage with steel cables, this structure will have a completely different presence and impact in the area. If the proposed configuration were new construction, it would have very little chance of being approved in this district. Board Member Ramos asked if the recommendation of the structural engineer that the stucco and substructure be removed is because it will continue to fall. Ms. Bush answered yes and most recently maintenance employees have been sent because the outer coating of stucco and paint is chipping off and falling on the opening on Intendencia Street. County employees are constantly having to pick up debris because it is degrading everywhere. Board Member Ramos noted the replacement proposal is what is contentious, can it be left bare and just paint it or does another treatment or design option need to be presented to the board so it fits within the district. Board Member Ramos agreed with Board Member Yee that there are wall systems that would be able to get rid of moisture and not corrode as this assembly has.

Board Member Ramos asked staff if the board could approve demolition today of existing features that are falling apart and ask the applicant to come back with a solution or a replacement for a full board or does the application have to be rejected and the applicant returns with the demo and proposed design. Cultural Resources Coordinator Walker stated yes, the board can approve demolition of what is there and ask that the applicant come back with a plan for replacement. Board Member Mead noted that he is uncomfortable with approving demolition of the only significant architectural tying feature to the other elements in that block and the district, on the promise that a government entity is going to find the money and eventually get around to putting a permit together to do something. Board Member Mead felt that a project needs to be presented that is going to demolish this and put something suitable back in its place. Board Member Mead agreed with Board Member Yee that a naked parking structure is not appropriate in this area especially with other developments that have been approved and are pending, approved projects that may get built across the street and in the area. The design of the parking garage was intended to complement the county office structure at the corner of Baylen and Government, there is enough architectural detail to carry its impression as a building and not a functional parking structure and that is an important part. Other things can intrude on public policy making and budgets and money availability and if something does not get done when it is presented, it may not get done. Board Member Mead felt that some plan must be presented that brings back something approaching a moderately consistent architectural appreciation of the other structures on that block to make it consistent, it does not have to be the same approach but something that will tie it. Clearly the brick at the bottom ties directly, it is the same pattern as the other building on Baylen and there needs to be something on the upper floors that complements. The side

wall has some landscaping to screen it from street. Assistant Planning & Zoning Division Manager Harding noted that the permit would come from the city since the county is not a self-permitting agency for this case. Ms. Bush confirmed not within city limits. Assistant Planning & Zoning Division Manager Harding noted that the City cannot hold up a permit if another jurisdiction is involved, but the City can hold up a certificate of occupancy. Ms. Bush stated that there is concern with holding up the application because if demolition does not continue and someone gets hurt, someone could come back to the county or another agency for not having taken it down. It is a safety concern whether it is someone walking on the street, whether it is something falling on a car when they are in a vehicle. It is a major safety concern for the county.

Cultural Resources Coordinator Walker asked Assistant Planning & Zoning Division Manager Harding for clarification on how the permit longevity would function if demolition approval were granted with the requirement to return to the board. Assistant Planning & Zoning Division Manager Harding answered that so long as the applicant is working toward correcting the issue and the permit is open, Jonathan Bilby would probably be ok with keeping the permit open. Board Member Mead asked if a certificate of occupancy would affect the façade work since the structure would continue to function as a parking garage. Assistant Planning & Zoning Division Manager Harding answered that it would stop the permit from being closed out. Board Member Ramos asked staff if an applicant came with a proposal to demolish a certain aspect of a non-contributing structure, would it have to come through ARB, even if it is in a historic district. Assistant Planning & Zoning Division Manager Harding answered yes, it would be considered under the “other structures” and since this is Palafox Historic Business District, all demolitions get routed through the language of the Pensacola Historic District. Contributing structures require replacement plans, non-contributing structures are considered “other structures” and typically replacement plans are not required.

Board Member Ramos asked if there was funding for replacement or a plan for replacement. Ms. Bush answered no, there is not funding for the demolition and the applicant was waiting on the current proposal to get approved and then go back to the finance department to have money moved around to fund the demolition. Board Member Mead asked staff if the standard the board would be looking at is the consistency with the surrounding district and structures, since this was designed to match the other county administrative structure on the other corner. Chairperson Salter noted that notion is debatable. Chairperson Salter stated that when the parking garage was built, it was obviously a new structure, and the guidelines stated that in the case of a new building, that such building will not be injurious to the general visual character of the district in which it is to be located considering visual compatibility standards such as height, proportion, shape, and scale (Sec. 12-3-27(f)(2)c.). When this was built, the original architect chose for the parking garage to mimic a building. There is nothing that says that must be the case. There is no argument that the framing and hazards need to come down, but what goes back does not necessarily have to be exactly what the original architect chose to blend in or it does not have to resemble a building or resemble the rest of the governmental center complex. In Chairperson Salter’s opinion, it just has to be something that is appropriate for the structure that blends in with the area. That could be any number of things. There are many downtown parking garages that do not have faux facades on them, but have some type of applied or fabricated screening of some sort that is designed and designed to fit into the surroundings. Something like that would be perfectly appropriate here and would be more economical and would last longer. The design would be something that would need to be considered. Board Member Mead noted that is fair and is amenable to an alternate approach.

Ms. Bush asked the board if they would be amenable to paint temporarily until the county can get it

budgeted in the future to take that approach since once the hazardous material comes down, it will be straight concrete. Board Member Fogarty's preference is a painted concrete structure over a dangerous safety hazard and is not sure how the motion would work to require a design return to the board, but from an aesthetic standpoint, the painted concrete structural elements would look better than they look now. Board Member Fogarty agreed that a more permanent design solution needs to be presented, but temporarily the hazardous material could come down and the concrete be painted with a future design plan.

Chairperson Salter noted that the owner of the property has the right and arguably the responsibility to make the building safe. If there are pieces and parts that are falling off, they should have a legal responsibility to remove the parts that are falling. Not necessarily every bit and piece, but for the parts that are an imminent hazard there is nothing the board or the outcome of the meeting could prevent them from doing that. There is nothing that should or can prevent them from doing that. Removing the entirety of it is a gray area, if a case can be made that the entire structure could fall over then they might have the ability to remove everything. Chairperson Salter tends to agree that if the board approves the proposal then the likely outcome is a painted concrete parking deck. Chairperson Salter thinks the board does not have to approve the modification in order for the applicant to take corrective action, which can be the removal of the pieces that are likely to fall. Assistant Planning & Zoning Division Manager Harding noted there is a section of code that provides the building official the discretion of not needing board approval in the case of unsafe situations. Typically, when that has been brought up, the applicant is required to show there is an unsafe situation and Assistant Planning & Zoning Division Manager Harding is unsure if there has been a case where the building official has applied that and not gone to the board. One example is the Dollarhide building on Palafox and the exterior wall requiring corrective action, but they were required to come to ARB before that occurred. The ARB can provide a motion where the applicant would not be in any conflict with the code, remove unsafe portions. Chairperson Salter's impression was that the Dollarhide example came before the board for approval because their corrective action was demolition where in this case the applicant is requesting to remove decorative, loose elements that may fall on people. Assistant Planning & Zoning Division Manager Harding noted that the Dollarhide applicants were provided several options for corrective action and demolition is what the applicant chose.

Board Member Mead stated that he agreed with Chairperson Salter and this is not theoretical because the applicant has already removed portions over the entrance on Baylen Street and on the parapet level per the photographs. Board Member Mead feels the ARB should not be controlled by safety concerns and the ARB does not rule on safety questions. Assistant Planning & Zoning Division Manager Harding noted that there is no scenario where someone would correct an unsafe issue and the city would question it, especially when the county is involved and they are doing their due diligence. Board Member Mead stated it is not under the purview of the ARB to deem it unsafe. Chairperson Salter asked Assistant Planning & Zoning Division Manager Harding if it would be beneficial for the board to make a motion to encourage the building official to allow partial demolition or that the ARB supports it. Assistant Planning & Zoning Division Manager Harding answered it would not hurt especially if there is possibility of a gray area and legal interpretation would be relied on for the land development code. Ms. Bush asked if it would help if they provided the report from Mott MacDonald because most of the building is like what is depicted in the photographs, being held together by the pieces of stucco that have not fallen yet. May 2022 is when the first piece came off and the metal supports looked like what was on the top floor. The damage is likely throughout the entire building. Assistant Planning & Zoning Division Manager Harding stated that in the past when there has been an unsafe issue with proof, the applicant was allowed to go through the abbreviated

review process and this was allowed under the last ARB Chair, knowing that unsafe issues cannot wait for 21 days for an application to be submitted and be heard by the board. It would still require action from the board, through the abbreviated review process. Board Member Ramos noted that the ARB members are not experts in structural deterioration and the board does not have a valid opinion on that and the applicant's word is trusted. Board Member Ramos asked if the building official can approve the demolition without the ARB stating any opinion and the project comes to the ARB for replacement plans. Board Member Mead stated that it is not the ARB's job to decide if unsafe material can be taken down, it is the ARB's job to decide if what is proposed as a permanent solution is suitable architecturally and the sense appears to be no. Board Member Mead encouraged the county to return with something that looks like the previous and will fit the standards of the code.

Ms. Bush stated that the goal was to get approval from the ARB, though they wanted to start demoing whenever the deterioration first started happening, but wanted to do the right thing by coming before the board and get approval. The goal was to get approval to remove the façade and not put back stucco. The county would be willing to diligently pursue funding to put something back, but today's goal was to get approval from the board to get the stucco off and not put that particular product back. Assistant Planning & Zoning Division Manager Harding noted that the Assistant City Attorney communicated that based on her understanding of the standards of the board, the application either needs to be for denial or approval.

Board Member Mead moved to deny on the grounds that the code for this particular portion of the Palafox Historic Business District requires consistency with the surrounding structures and that while the County is not required to go back with something exactly like what is there, what they have proposed is not consistent with the code provision regarding its consistency with other elements of the City's landscape in that area and that it would be inappropriate (Sec. 12-3-27(b) and (c), and Sec. 12-3-27(f)(4)). Sec. 12-3-27(f)(2)a. was included in reference to the motion - *In the case of a proposed alteration or addition to an existing building, that such alteration or addition will not impair the architectural or historic value of the building or if due to a new use for the building the impairment is minor considering visual compatibility standards such as height, proportion, shape, and scale.* **Board Member Yee seconded the motion and it carried 5-1, with Board Member Fogarty dissenting.**

Board Member Ramos recused himself from Item 5 since STOA Architects is participating in the project.

**Item 5 330 S. Jefferson Street PHD / Zone HC-2, City Council District 6
Dumpster Enclosure at a Contributing Structure**

Action Taken: Approved with abbreviated review required.

The UWF Historic Trust is seeking approval for a new brick enclosure located in a small parking lot behind the Museum of History. The dumpster enclosure will be constructed of matching yellow brick walls capped with cast stone with metal privacy gates. The proposed site work will include removing a section of the curb along Church Street and the removal of one Drake Elm.

Ross Pristera and Nico Camero presented to the board. Chairperson Salter noted that the gates are not full resolved, but the intent is to place a graphic on the gates. Mr. Pristera noted that an abbreviated review could be submitted for those details. Chairperson Salter noted that this project meets the general criteria and spirit of the ordinance, and the only concern is the gates since they are not resolved. A mural would be appropriate for the district and for promoting the history of the area.

Board Member Fogarty made a motion to approve the application with the request that the door panel be submitted for abbreviated review prior to installation. Chairperson Salter clarified the final design of the gates should come back for abbreviated review and Board Member Fogarty agreed. Board Member Courtney seconded the motion and the motion carried 6-0.

Item 6 1501 E. Lakeview Avenue East Hill/ Zone R-1AA/ City Council District 6
Historic Structure Demolition Review

Action Taken: Denied

Per the City of Pensacola's Historic Building Demolition Review Ordinance, the referenced structure has been found to be potentially significant in regard to its architecture as well as its association with the lives of persons potentially significant in our local past. Per the ordinance, the Board is tasked with determining whether or not this structure meets the criteria for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. If eligible and deemed historically significant by those criteria, the Board must also determine if the building is subject to a demolition delay of no more than 60 days. To determine that a historically significant building is subject a demolition delay, the Board must find that in the interest of the public it is preferable that the building be preserved or rehabilitated rather than demolished.

Cultural Resources Coordinator Walker noted that no applicant was present, which is not required by the demolition ordinance. Advisor Pristera presented about the property. This is a larger property on Lakeview Avenue that has been modified over the years with additions and porch enclosures, but the core of the house still remains. There is a Florida Master Site File form available, which is rare for that part of town. James McCaskill appeared to be the first owner who worked at L&N Railroad, eventually being the Assistant Superintendent. When this property was purchased, this part of East Hill was growing rapidly. The property encompasses three lots, each roughly could have cost \$300 or up to \$800 in 1925, which was a significant amount of money during that time period. This was not an insignificant piece of property. The house and neighborhood play into the development of Pensacola and the 1920s land development boom of suburbs with paved streets and street cars. Even though the house is not a pure example of a specific style or type, it meets enough of the criteria that in the past, demolitions were delayed. Advisor Pristera was not comfortable signing off without further board review.

Board Member Mead asked when the street grid and park system in East Hill was established. Cultural Resources Coordinator answered that maps indicate that the area was platted out in 1835 by George Chase and the land history is complex. Board Member Mead asked about when the City laid out parks. Cultural Resources Coordinator answered that the parks in East Hill were established through time as property was developed to the north and west. Advisor Pristera noted that records are available for big real estate companies that were buying land and developing the area. The McCaskill Realty Company was associated with the 1500 block of Lakeview Avenue and that may be related to the first owner of the property.

Board Member Mead stated that it does meet the requirements and it is significant for the person who lived there and the subsequent development of East Hill. This is a good example of something architecturally midwestern. Board Member Courtney asked if there was a footprint available for the original version of the structure. Advisor Pristera answered that no confirmed historic photographs were found during background research. Board Member Fogarty asked the age of the photograph from the Florida Master Site File. Advisor Pristera answered likely 1970s or 1980s.

Board Member Courtney made the motion to deny the demolition for a maximum of 60 days. Board Member Mead seconded the motion and asked staff if the board needed to make findings to support the motion. Assistant Planning & Zoning Division Manager Harding stated no, it is implied. The motion carried 6-0.

Item 7 110 E. Garden Street PHBD / Zone C-2A, City Council District 6
Conceptual Review for a New Mixed-Used Development
Action Taken: Approved.

STOA Group is seeking conceptual approval for a new six-story mixed-use building with parking, retail, and amenities. This project was reviewed at the November 2022 ARB meeting where demolition of the existing structures was approved and the conceptual approval for the new development was denied without prejudice. The proposed development includes parking on two levels, approximately 12,000 sf. of retail space at street level, amenities at levels one and two, and approximately 242 residential units on the upper four levels that surround two internal courtyards with amenities and pool access at level three.

Eric MacInerney and Dan Fritts presented to the board. Chairperson Salter noted a previous concern was how Tarragona Street was being treated with a fake front that masked the parking garage. The new proposal encourages pedestrian activity along Tarragona and is appreciated as well as the efforts to address the massing of the building. The parking garage entrance was a big concern. It is the first element that people see when walking from the heart of downtown, but it must be located where it is. Chairperson Salter asked for clarification on the updates that were made. Mr. MacInerney answered that the parking location needs to be known but there is also concern for pedestrians and the applicant is still exploring it. Chairperson Salter noted that the first application indicated red brick for the parking garage entrance but the current proposal indicates dark black brick that may be bringing more prominence to the parking entrance. Chairperson Salter questioned if something other than black banding and the two corner anchors may make the parking garage less of a visual element as it still reads as a dominant element. Mr. Fritts noted that avoiding vertical striping is important and the corner element is a unique visual impact and the base being consistent between the corner anchors is important. The applicants are willing to study this further. Chairperson Salter stated that the bottom black brick adds weight and breaking up the façade could create the appearance of multiple buildings like what was there previously; the Chase Street elevation design works really well.

Advisor Pristera agreed that Chase is a great façade with the end building with the planes depicted, which looks like a regular urban building. An issue is the vertical window elements, those could be cleaned up and would be more fitting especially on the larger facades like Garden Street. The lap siding is not appropriate for large, urban buildings since it is a residential material. A large masonry building could be broken up with other materials that would be more appropriate. Mr. Fritts answered the concept is worth exploring and creating balance for the multifamily structure. Lap siding was chosen among a significant amount of masonry materials because it has texture, fiber cement panels can look flat and not well executed, it is more cost effective, and lap can be increased in size to look more like a metal panel. Since this is a wood frame building, the applicants would prefer to avoid stucco, but other options for materials can be explored.

Board Member Ramos complimented the applicants on the previous and new design. Board Member Ramos noted that more activation might be better for the Tarragona Street side, such as a side entrance to the coworking space. Mr. MacInerney answered that designs are being explored for allowing the coworking space to extend out to the south. A number of things are being coordinated

with Florida Power and Light. In addition, making leasing and the main entry on the north side of the retail space will also bring people to that area. There will be a conference room to the north of the leasing area that will place people inside looking out. The planting and landscaping will be interesting to draw people out. Mr. Fritts added there will be seat walls and encouragement for people to rest, eat lunch, and use the space. The applicants are working on how to get an outdoor component for the coworking space while also working with FP&L. Board Member Ramos noted a pedestrian entrance would help and give the space a purpose. Mr. MacInerney noted there are challenges to that such as the four foot-drop in grade from Chase to Garden Streets.

Board Member Mead echoed concerns of other board members such as the parking entrance on Garden Street that needs to fit overall with the project and adjoining areas and the fiber cement siding elements. Changing plane helps to establish a rhythm and there is nice symmetry on the Chase side. Board Member Mead asked about the plan with FP&L. Mr. MacInerney answered that the power along Chase and Garden goes underground as part of other projects. For this project, the power will come across to a pole at the corner of Garden and Tarragona, go underground along Tarragona, come up to a pole at Chase and Tarragona, and continues north beyond the property. On Tarragona there are not balconies along some of the third floor due to transformer clearance and the garden area that takes pedestrians off Tarragona is one other place to set transformers. Board Member Mead asked how they will be screened. Mr. MacInerney answered through landscaping elements, it is not a large area so screens take up too much space. Board Member Mead stated underground utilities are great, but the poles will be in front of the corner feature elements. Mr. MacInerney noted the poles are not as obtrusive as one may think, but much progress has been made in working with FP&L.

Board Member Ramos made a motion to approve this conceptual application with the understanding that once this comes for final review, some of the comments made by the board will have been studied and considered and solutions would be brought forth. Board Member Mead seconded the motion and the motion carried 6-0.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:24 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



Cultural Resources Coordinator Walker
Secretary to the Board

Adrianne Walker

From: Christian Wagley <christianwagley@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 17, 2023 1:39 PM
To: Adrianne Walker
Subject: [EXTERNAL] comments from Old East Hill POA on ARB items

THIS EMAIL IS FROM AN EXTERNAL EMAIL ACCOUNT

Hello Adrianne:

Sorry for our late response--can you share these comments with ARB members?:

Dear ARB members:

Our Old East Hill Property Owners Association Architectural Committee has reviewed the one proposed project on the April ARB agenda, and we offer the following comments:

Item 2. 506 E. GADSDEN STREET

We support the proposed improvements and thank the applicant for making improvements that are complementary to the District.

Item 3. 516 N. ALCANIZ STREET

We are happy to see the restoration of this lovely home. But we do question the use of synthetic materials as a replacement for real wood, as proposed for siding. The ARB has typically not allowed such on contributing structures, and we do not find the use of synthetic materials on contributing structures to be complementary to the District. Should the Board find the use of synthetic materials appropriate, we ask for careful monitoring to ensure that they are only used on the sides and rear of the structure and not the front.

As for lattice, we suggest that lattice be framed with wood for a more finished look, as opposed to just being nailed across the entire opening between footers.

We know that vinyl windows have been approved for use on contributing structures, and ask that these windows be carefully reviewed by the Board for their appropriateness. It also appears that the proposed windows for the front elevation represent a return to the original vertical rather than horizontal orientation of those windows, but we ask the Board to confirm that this would indeed return the front facade to its original as-built condition.

Thank you for considering our comments, and for your service.

Christian Wagley

Chair

On behalf of the Old East Hill Property Owners Association Architectural Committee

Diane Dixie

Michael Courtney

Cassandra Manis

Susan Ford Buck

Christian Wagley

--

FORM 8B MEMORANDUM OF VOTING CONFLICT FOR COUNTY, MUNICIPAL, AND OTHER LOCAL PUBLIC OFFICERS

LAST NAME—FIRST NAME—MIDDLE NAME Ramos, Yuri		NAME OF BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY, OR COMMITTEE Architectural Review Board	
MAILING ADDRESS 121 E. Government Street		THE BOARD, COUNCIL, COMMISSION, AUTHORITY OR COMMITTEE ON WHICH I SERVE IS A UNIT OF:	
CITY Pensacola	COUNTY Escambia	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CITY <input type="checkbox"/> COUNTY <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER LOCAL AGENCY	
DATE ON WHICH VOTE OCCURRED August 17, 2023		NAME OF POLITICAL SUBDIVISION: NA MY POSITION IS: <input type="checkbox"/> ELECTIVE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> APPOINTIVE	

WHO MUST FILE FORM 8B

This form is for use by any person serving at the county, city, or other local level of government on an appointed or elected board, council, commission, authority, or committee. It applies to members of advisory and non-advisory bodies who are presented with a voting conflict of interest under Section 112.3143, Florida Statutes.

Your responsibilities under the law when faced with voting on a measure in which you have a conflict of interest will vary greatly depending on whether you hold an elective or appointive position. For this reason, please pay close attention to the instructions on this form before completing and filing the form.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 112.3143, FLORIDA STATUTES

A person holding elective or appointive county, municipal, or other local public office **MUST ABSTAIN** from voting on a measure which would inure to his or her special private gain or loss. Each elected or appointed local officer also **MUST ABSTAIN** from knowingly voting on a measure which would inure to the special gain or loss of a principal (other than a government agency) by whom he or she is retained (including the parent, subsidiary, or sibling organization of a principal by which he or she is retained); to the special private gain or loss of a relative; or to the special private gain or loss of a business associate. Commissioners of community redevelopment agencies (CRAs) under Sec. 163.356 or 163.357, F.S., and officers of independent special tax districts elected on a one-acre, one-vote basis are not prohibited from voting in that capacity.

For purposes of this law, a "relative" includes only the officer's father, mother, son, daughter, husband, wife, brother, sister, father-in-law, mother-in-law, son-in-law, and daughter-in-law. A "business associate" means any person or entity engaged in or carrying on a business enterprise with the officer as a partner, joint venturer, coowner of property, or corporate shareholder (where the shares of the corporation are not listed on any national or regional stock exchange).

ELECTED OFFICERS:

In addition to abstaining from voting in the situations described above, you must disclose the conflict:

PRIOR TO THE VOTE BEING TAKEN by publicly stating to the assembly the nature of your interest in the measure on which you are abstaining from voting; *and*

WITHIN 15 DAYS AFTER THE VOTE OCCURS by completing and filing this form with the person responsible for recording the minutes of the meeting, who should incorporate the form in the minutes.

APPOINTED OFFICERS:

Although you must abstain from voting in the situations described above, you are not prohibited by Section 112.3143 from otherwise participating in these matters. However, you must disclose the nature of the conflict before making any attempt to influence the decision, whether orally or in writing and whether made by you or at your direction.

IF YOU INTEND TO MAKE ANY ATTEMPT TO INFLUENCE THE DECISION PRIOR TO THE MEETING AT WHICH THE VOTE WILL BE TAKEN:

- You must complete and file this form (before making any attempt to influence the decision) with the person responsible for recording the minutes of the meeting, who will incorporate the form in the minutes. (Continued on page 2)

APPOINTED OFFICERS (continued)

- A copy of the form must be provided immediately to the other members of the agency.
- The form must be read publicly at the next meeting after the form is filed.

IF YOU MAKE NO ATTEMPT TO INFLUENCE THE DECISION EXCEPT BY DISCUSSION AT THE MEETING:

- You must disclose orally the nature of your conflict in the measure before participating.
- You must complete the form and file it within 15 days after the vote occurs with the person responsible for recording the minutes of the meeting, who must incorporate the form in the minutes. A copy of the form must be provided immediately to the other members of the agency, and the form must be read publicly at the next meeting after the form is filed.

DISCLOSURE OF LOCAL OFFICER'S INTEREST

I, Yuri Ramos, hereby disclose that on August 17, 20 23 :

(a) A measure came or will come before my agency which (check one or more)

- ☐ inured to my special private gain or loss;
- ☒ inured to the special gain or loss of my business associate, STOA Architects ;
- ☐ inured to the special gain or loss of my relative, _____ ;
- ☐ inured to the special gain or loss of _____, by
whom I am retained; or
- ☐ inured to the special gain or loss of _____, which
is the parent subsidiary, or sibling organization or subsidiary of a principal which has retained me.

(b) The measure before my agency and the nature of my conflicting interest in the measure is as follows:

Agenda Item 5- 330 S. Jefferson Street

If disclosure of specific information would violate confidentiality or privilege pursuant to law or rules governing attorneys, a public officer, who is also an attorney, may comply with the disclosure requirements of this section by disclosing the nature of the interest in such a way as to provide the public with notice of the conflict.

Date Filed

8/17/23

Signature

[Signature]

NOTICE: UNDER PROVISIONS OF FLORIDA STATUTES §112.317, A FAILURE TO MAKE ANY REQUIRED DISCLOSURE CONSTITUTES GROUNDS FOR AND MAY BE PUNISHED BY ONE OR MORE OF THE FOLLOWING: IMPEACHMENT, REMOVAL OR SUSPENSION FROM OFFICE OR EMPLOYMENT, DEMOTION, REDUCTION IN SALARY, REPRIMAND, OR A CIVIL PENALTY NOT TO EXCEED \$10,000.