

PLANNING SERVICES

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD

October 11, 2016

MEMBERS PRESENT: Paul Ritz-Chairman, Nina Campbell, Danny Grundhoefer, Kyle Owens, Kurt Larson

MEMBERS ABSENT: Nathan Monk

STAFF PRESENT: Brandi Deese, Leslie Statler

OTHERS PRESENT: Ross Pristera, Dave Hemphill, Pearce Barrett, Drew Holmer, Juan C. Lemos, Ann Hill, Elizabeth Benchley, Della Scott-Ireton, William Lees, Christian Wagley, Ramie Gougeon, Dottie Dubuisson

AGENDA:

- Quorum/Call to Order
- Approval of Meeting Minutes from September 13, 2016
- Review of Development Plan for 453 W. Main Street – Fish Hatchery
- LDC Amendment – Section 12-2-8 (Medical Marijuana Dispensary)
- Review of Historic Structures Prior to Issuance of Demolition Permit
- Draft Ordinance for Historic Structures
- Open Forum
- Adjournment

Call to Order / Quorum Present

Chairman Ritz called the meeting to order at 2:08 pm with a quorum present. He gave instructions to the audience on the rules and procedures of the Board.

Approval of Meeting Minutes

Mr. Grundhoefer made a motion to approve the September 13, 2016 minutes, seconded by Ms. Campbell, and it carried unanimously.

Review of Development Plan for 453 W. Main Street – Fish Hatchery

The Florida Department of Environmental Protection has submitted a request for Site Plan approval for the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission “Gulf Coast Marine Fisheries Hatchery & Enhancement Center.” This project is located on the southeast corner of the intersection of Clubbs and W. Main Streets and lies within the WRD, Waterfront Redevelopment District. Ms. Deese informed the Board the proposal was for preliminary and final site plan approval as well as aesthetic approval.

Chairman Ritz advised this Board has aesthetic jurisdiction for this district; the Board reviewed the project while Chairman Ritz described the project specifications and aesthetics. Ms. Deese clarified that the applicant wanted the Board to consider preliminary and final approval which was allowed by the Code.

Ms. Campbell asked if the Board typically reviews brick samples and final colors; Ms. Deese stated normally the boards other than ARB are not as specific in the material requirements but they could be required if the Board provided rationale for it.

Dave Hemphill, Project Manager, introduced Mike Marshall, Project Architect, Pearce Barrett, Project Representative for DEP, and Ross Pristera with the UWF Historic Trust.

Mr. Grundhoefer asked about the metal panels, and Mr. Marshall stated they were located above the roof except around the glass area where they are metal-panel fish scale pattern shingles, diamond-shaped in a scale pattern with greenish color. Mr. Grundhoefer suggested the fish scaling did not fit in the industrial/warehouse area of the city and asked if brick would be more appropriate. Mr. Marshall stated the entryway had originally been metal panels displaying an industrial aesthetic. Ms. Campbell appreciated the details, but had concerns with the north elevation. Mr. Marshall advised it was a two-story space with an elevator and designed for school groups and for those using the space for an educational opportunity. He explained the fish hatchery portion was not open to the public because of bio-security; however the second level allows them to view operations. He also stated there was a second floor science lab.

Mr. Grundhoefer questioned if the purpose of the clear story windows was to bring in natural light, and Mr. Marshall stated those windows were a part of the second floor observation platform which brings visitors down to the center of the building. Mr. Grundhoefer suggested using larger windows and spacing them differently. Understanding the hatchery was a large building, he suggested breaking up the expanse of the brick on the north elevation on Main Street.

Chairman Ritz questioned the windows looking in to the fish hatchery portion displaying a wave pattern, and Mr. Marshall stated it was designed to be appealing from the street and to grab attention. Chairman Ritz pointed out the industrial aesthetics within this area is transitional between the tanks and the stadium. Regarding the site plan, he did understand the bus access allowing for large turns.

Mr. Hemphill advised the finished floor would be 15 feet, with flood elevation at 7 plus 3, with the site as far as earthwork being very close to balance. On the east side is Washer Woman Creek, and their intent is not to touch that area except to cross with a pedestrian bridge which connects to Maritime Park. He advised the stormwater system was very shallow with a blue-green system, and they would save as many trees as possible. However, Clubb Street would have to be reworked to add a turnaround to accommodate the large trailers for fish transport.

Chairman Ritz asked about the hedge for screening around public parking spaces, and Mr. Hemphill stated due to the elevation, it might have to be relocated to the interior to allow parking to be seen.

He also stated the color of the brick on the building would match the color on the signage – light tan. The roof would be a galvalume, almost tin in color. Ms. Campbell appreciated the work going into the project, but was not sure of the fish scales and wave feature in the windows. It was determined the colors would be green, blue, and silver tiles with matte finish.

Ms. Deese advised there was a Code requirement to screen the parking spaces. Chairman Ritz addressed the second story classroom. Mr. Grundhoefer suggested there would be more continuity if the fish scales were wrapped around the west elevation.

Ms. Deese clarified that the site plan and aesthetic approval should be taken separately, and the Board should be specific in its suggestions or requirements.

After discussion, Mr. Larson made a motion to approve the site plan as presented for preliminary and final approval. Ms. Campbell seconded the motion.

Mr. Wagley addressed the Board. He offered that buildings provide a sense of enclosure and speak to the street; this building was more suburban and set back from the street, which is less desirable for the pedestrian. He felt the building should be brought forward and hide the parking. He also mentioned the Green Building Ordinance of 2012 requiring city-sponsored projects to follow the LEED or Florida Green Building Coalition standards. He stated that he has yet to see a city-sponsored project follow those guidelines. He also advised that the Pensacola Environmental Advisory Board reported there is little to no evidence of enhancement of fisheries from fish hatcheries.

Mr. Hemphill stated they did not want to place the parking on the water side of the building, and were giving the water side to the public; everything south of the building was meant to be public and viewed in

total from the Fish Hatchery to Maritime Park as one unit. Ms. Deese explained that the Code required the building to be set back 60 feet from the street.

Mr. Marshall stated they did not pursue LEED guidelines but used Energy Star Standards as the Green Building Standard which is acceptable in the state of Florida.

Ms. Campbell expressed the reason for not moving the primary structure closer to the street and moving the parking to the west was because of a grade issue. Mr. Barrett explained this project was a National Resource Development Project and was funded by funds received from British Petroleum; the building will belong to FWC with FDEP will handle the construction. The tank based hatchery portion of the building is stipulated to produce fingerling-size fish and would be the only hatchery of its type in the state. The left side is the administration portion, with the center portion open to the public. The aesthetic design has been reviewed by a citizen advisory committee with architects, city and county personnel, and stakeholders from the community; their meetings were open to the public as well.

Mr. Grundhoefer suggested the building be moved to the north, possibly 60 to 100 feet from the property line, and to bring a plan to the Board. **Ms. Campbell rescinded her motion, and it died for lack of a second.**

Ms. Campbell asked about the timeframe, and Mr. Hemphill stated plans were to be complete by the end of the year with permits in hand and ready for bids the first of the year.

Chairman Ritz was not offended by the location of the structure due to other buildings begin set far off Main Street, and as a pedestrian, there are areas where he walks which have a good distance between sidewalks and buildings.

Ms. Dubuisson felt the project was a wonderful plan and encouraged the Board unless they had a major issue, to allow the site plan as is. She believed they had very intricate pieces which had to be worked into this, including typography and the mitigation field; she approved the fact they had preserved the waterfront side for the public and asked the Board to move the project forward.

Mr. Grundhoefer then made a motion to not approve the site plan and have the developers bring the plan back to the Board pushing the building significantly closer to Main Street. The motion died for lack of a second. Ms. Campbell made a motion to accept the site plan and recommend comments taken accordingly: review building closer to Main Street, move parking to the west. Mr. Hemphill suggested making it more pedestrian/bike friendly by making a loop from Main Street into Maritime Park, out Whibbs Drive across the bridge, and coming around their building, making a two-mile loop. After discussion about stormwater, **the comments were revised to pedestrian loop around the building, investigate the opportunity to move the building closer to Main Street but not required.** It was asked if the Board considered increase in construction costs, and Chairman Ritz stated the Board was sensitive to that. **Ms. Campbell restated her motion to approve preliminary and final development plan review for the Gulf Coast Marine Fisheries Hatchery & Enhancement Center with a provision that they investigate the building coming closer to Main Street, also they agree to expand the pedestrian and bike friendly loop around the building. It was seconded by Mr. Owens.**

Chairman Ritz suggested an abbreviated review follow-up for final approval; **Ms. Campbell amended the motion to include an abbreviated review follow-up for final approval; the amendment was accepted and the motion carried 4 to 1 with Mr. Grundhoefer dissenting.**

Mr. Grundhoefer made a motion to approve the preliminary design with abbreviated review. Ms. Deese advised the Board that they could approve, approve with follow-up abbreviated review or deny the aesthetic approval but approving preliminary aesthetic review was not an option. **Mr. Grundhoefer amended his motion to include aesthetic approval with an abbreviated review follow-up required for three items: (1) break up of scale on the long north front face, (2) vertical panels be brick or other material compatible with the industrial site and not a metal panel, (3) windows on the clear story get larger and repeat the rhythm established on the structure. Ms. Campbell seconded the motion.**

Ms. Dubuisson commented she loved the building and the concept of the fish scales and waves and felt it was great that they separated the three uses. She felt whatever was placed out there would be successful. She pointed out that while the drive by does not look like old Pensacola, this is a whole new side of Pensacola. Ms. Deese restated the motion, and with no other discussion, **the motion carried unanimously.**

LDC Amendment – Section 12-2-8 (Medical Marijuana Dispensary)

During the September 15, 2016 City Council meeting, City Council approved a motion to refer to this Board for consideration a Land Development Code Amendment for Section 12-2-8 Commercial Land Use District. This proposed ordinance will add Medical Marijuana Dispensary to the list of permitted uses for the Commercial Land Use District.

Chairman Ritz explained this would be in a C-1 zone and asked if this would be affected by cumulative zoning. Ms. Deese clarified that this would open it up to C-2, C-3 and the industrial districts; staff has issued zoning verifications previously for two locations that are commercially zoned but considered them as pharmacies. However, there is concern that the November election could open it up to broader uses medically. Ms. Deese stated that staff has not received any calls from citizens on this issue. **Larson made a motion to approve the medical marijuana dispensary in C-1, and Mr. Grundhoefer seconded. With no input from the audience, the motion carried unanimously.**

Review of Historic Structures Prior to Issuance of Demolition Permit

During the September 13, 2016 Planning Board meeting, Planning Board discussed the current demolition process and lack of review and implementation of preservation standards and requirements. After reviewing several sample ordinances, gaining public input, and discussing the matter in detail, the Board directed staff to seek clarification from the original sponsor of this item (Councilmember Brian Spencer) in order to assist the Board with their deliberations. After speaking with Councilman Spencer, Ms. Deese stated his intent was not to create a new board; there was discussion that possibly the ARB could take the responsibility, but it did not seem like a good option because of the volume of work they receive. Councilman Spencer was comfortable with Planning Board taking on the responsibility. He requested Ms. Deese speak with Mr. Pristera to see how long and what it would cost to perform a citywide survey. An agenda item was added for consideration of the draft ordinance presented at a prior meeting as requested by the Board.

Chairman Ritz asked that the Board move to the Draft Ordinance agenda item and discuss that item first. The Board was in agreement.

Draft Ordinance for Historic Structures

Mr. Grundhoefer stated the draft document was a good document but was set up on the premise of establishing a Preservation Board; now that Councilman Spencer had indicated he did not intend to do that, it was not appropriate for the charge the Board was given.

Ms. Campbell asked when the Board has a topic having to do with historic demolition, that they have a format where Mr. Pristera would be available for that particular meeting to express his opinion. Chairman Ritz asked for a definition of a historic structure and asked for citizen input.

Elizabeth Benchley with UWF advised she keeps an eye out for archaeological resources when ordinances are being proposed and noted the end of the draft ordinance did address archaeology with no archaeologist to sit on the board. She offered archaeological sites evidence in downtown Pensacola lying under the city streets and buildings. She stated if the Board was to move forward with better historic preservation planning downtown, that they should incorporate archaeological resources as well. She encouraged the Board to include those involved in archaeology and history in its workshop discussion.

Mr. Grundhoefer clarified that since the Board was not developing a Preservation Board, some of the information that was developed by previous staff for the Board to review could be used to establish an

ordinance, however, the Board was not supporting this particular document and would be starting over with the help of UWF and the Historic Trust. Chairman Ritz offered the draft ordinance as it is written was inappropriate for Pensacola at this time.

Ms. Deese stated she would take a consensus that this was not the ordinance to consider. Chairman Ritz stated this ordinance was not what the Board wanted to see as a draft ordinance; consensus of the Board was unanimous.

Review of Historic Structures Prior to Issuance of Demolition Permit (continued)

Chairman Ritz explained he did not have a clear picture of what a historic structure was, and it was a topic the City of Pensacola needed to address. Mr. Grundhoefer pointed out in Councilman Spencer's request, the Board needed to develop an ordinance that addresses demolition permits and felt a workshop should be scheduled first to allow input from UWF and the Historic Trust; that language would be placed into the ordinance so that it is comprehensive, with the Board using their invaluable resources.

Chairman Ritz explained whoever comes before the City to request a demolition permit, if the Board should write an ordinance committing other resources, we need to make sure those resources are verified. He pointed out the consensus of the Board was to create an informational workshop, possibly followed by an additional workshop where more concrete language is placed in an ordinance, leading into an agenda item for demolition permits and historic structures. Ms. Campbell suggested that the Board encourage Councilman Spencer to participate in the second workshop.

Ms. Deese reminded the Board there was a workshop held in August on this topic and staff had requested input, and Mr. Larson was the only Board member to provide information. Mr. Grundhoefer offered to draft an ordinance with some of the language which the Board could address and revise. Ms. Deese advised that once there is an ordinance, you still need an inventory. Mr. Grundhoefer suggested that information could be provided by Mr. Pristera.

Mr. Pristera with the Historic Trust stated Councilman Spencer asked him to present a proposal in May for the current historic districts. He indicated there were roughly 1800 properties, and the request was not to perform an extensive survey but re-photograph, document what has been torn down, what was new, and any significant changes to buildings. He performed a survey on Intendencia Street from Tarragona three blocks going east which encompassed 70 properties and it took approximately one hour in the field and six hours in the office for processing and comparing to current records using the existing information. He suggested when going into a citywide survey, a consultant might be necessary, and the Historic Trust could manage the records afterwards.

Mr. Larson said after the process has begun, they could prioritize the properties for demolition versus the age of the structures. Mr. Pristera suggested the workshop would establish what makes a property historic – determining age, historical events and cultural relevance. Mr. Grundhoefer pointed out the age could place it into a category for review with Building Inspections.

Ms. Hill questioned the need for a citywide survey since the historic districts were already under the purview of the ARB and felt the real need was to review the areas outside those districts.

Ms. Benchley pointed out the State of Florida has a wonderful preservation program and a grants program for surveying. She suggested having the Historic Trust partner with the City to have the work performed. She indicated there was lots of money at the state level for historic preservation planning.

Ms. Dubuisson felt the Board needed to start from scratch on what is worth preserving in Pensacola - what does it look like, what process do we come to as a consensus of it being of value to the community, whether it be architectural, historical, site significant, individual related, etc. She suggested maybe a task force could come up with the criteria using standards from other communities. The sooner the criteria was identified, the sooner there could be consensus.

Chairman Ritz indicated the consensus of this meeting was the scheduling of two workshops, one informational and one directional, with Mr. Grundhoefer creating a draft ordinance. Ms. Deese offered to

gain input from the Board on a specific date for the first workshop which would include Ms. Benchley and Mr. Pristera. She indicated a 72-notice would be required for attendance and room availability. The Board preferred a date in October.

Open Forum – None.

Adjournment – With no further business, Chairman Ritz adjourned the meeting at 3:55 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Brandi C. Deese', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Brandi C. Deese
City Planner
Secretary to the Board