



## **MINUTES OF THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**

**January 16, 2020**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chairperson Quina, Vice Chairperson Crawford, Board Member Fogarty, Board Member Campbell-Hatler, Board Member Mead, Board Member Salter, Board Member Villegas

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** None

**STAFF PRESENT:** Historic Preservation Planner Harding, Senior Planner Statler, Board Advisor Pristera, Assistant City Attorney Lindsay, Intern Mendillo, Assistant Planning Director Cannon, Digital Media Coordinator Siedah Rosa

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Elsie Zhang, Lissa Dees

### **CALL TO ORDER / QUORUM PRESENT**

Chairperson Quina called the Architectural Review Board (ARB) meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. with a quorum present and explained the Board procedures to the audience.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**Board Member Crawford made a motion to approve the December 19, 2019 minutes, seconded by Board Member Villegas, and it carried unanimously. Board Member Fogarty made a motion to approve the minutes of the special meeting tour on January 10, 2020, seconded by Board Member Campbell-Hatler, and it carried unanimously.**

**OPEN FORUM** - None

### **NEW BUSINESS**

**Item 1**

**1304 N. Barcelona Street**

**NHPD**

**Contributing Structure**

**PR-1AAA**

**Action taken: Approved.**

Scott Sallis, Dalrymple Sallis Architecture, is requesting modifications to a recently approved project.

Mr. Sallis presented to the Board and explained the proposed changes were simplified due to construction costs but felt it warranted returning to the Board for approval. Chairperson

Quina noted that North Hill had no objections to the request. He asked about the materials for the pergola, and Mr. Sallis advised they were most likely wood. Board Member Mead addressed the tree cutting, and Mr. Sallis stated the neighborhood association had met and had given their concerns. It was determined the tree cutting involved Laurel oaks, and everyone was on board. He further explained the trees coming out were near the pool, and they were planting far more trees than they were removing. It was determined the pergola was open to the sky with aluminum slats. Chairperson Quina asked about the security from the house to the pool. Mr. Sallis stated the pool contractor would be addressing this. He also advised there was a new connection from the porch to the master suite since the windows leaked horribly. **Board Member Crawford made a motion to approve, seconded by Board Member Mead, and it carried unanimously.**

<b>Item 2</b>	<b>1 S. Jefferson Street</b>	<b>PHBD</b>
<b>Non-Contributing Structure</b>		<b>C-2A</b>
<b>Action taken: Approved (awning not included).</b>		

Lissa Dees, Downtown Improvement Board (DIB), is requesting approval for a "Puppy Pit Stop" along the south side of the Jefferson Street parking garage.

Ms. Zhang and Ms. Dees presented to the Board and stated the dog area would be open with the dogs on leashes. The no parking zone would be painted to expand the sidewalk area with planters to protect pedestrians from the vehicles. Some of the furniture and amenities would be offered in the second phase.

Chairman Quina pointed out it was an interesting way to enliven that corner, and it was a shame they couldn't raise the curb to make it all level. It was determined the funding came from the DIB. Board Member Mead asked if there was some manner where they could attach leashes, possibly installing rails to give for more freedom for the animals and the owners; it might also be a good architectural addition. Board Member Campbell-Hatler asked about the cleanup plan, and Ms. Dees stated the DIB had hired a company for street cleaning who would add this to their regular routine. Ms. Zhang advised there would be a waste station, and the turf was designed to keep the solid waste on top of the turf for easier cleaning.

Board Member Villegas was concerned about safety and asked about the shrubs which were determined to be in the first phase. She was concerned with the presence of the dogs and how people deal with them and how this would all play out. She liked the idea of attaching the leash to something and asked if there could be a gate on the entrance if needed; she wanted to know the quick fix for any potential problems. Ms. Dees advised when Southtowne was proposed, there was a dog park, but that had been mitigated. There were now areas to avoid, and they were trying to provide an area for the downtown pets. She also explained they were working within the budget they currently have, and a gate might be affordable at a later date. She indicated the traffic flow was a part of Public Works, and they had not commented on the need for a change.

Ms. Zhang stated they would use the same screening as the rear of Jefferson garage, and the awning cover was within Phase 2. They considered the retractable awning for the tight space and hurricane conditions. Advisor Pristera asked about the lighting, and Ms. Dees advised the lighting on the inside had been converted to LEDs, and the domes would be replaced to make it brighter. She also explained there were lots of security cameras around

the parking garage. Board Member Salter asked about the size of the in-ground waste disposal, and it was determined to be around 24" to 36" but it would be a regular size container buried in the ground. Board Member Campbell-Hatler was concerned about the shade and suggested "lollipop" trees, and Ms. Dees stated she would be asking Council about the Tree Fund monies. **Board Member Campbell-Hatler made a motion to approve, seconded by Board Member Crawford. Board Member Salter made an amendment to state the awning was not included, and it was accepted and seconded. With no speakers, the motion carried unanimously.**

**Item 3**

**412 E. Belmont Street**

**OEHPD**

**Contributing Structure**

**OEHC-1**

**Action taken: Approved with abbreviated reviews.**

Jesse LaCoste, LaCoste Construction Group, is seeking *final* approval for a rear addition and exterior modifications to a contributing structure.

Mr. LaCoste addressed the Board and stated the siding color was aqua, windows and doors would be a deep espresso stain, the iron fixtures would be black, and trim color would be white. Chairperson Quina advised from the onsite visit, the actual ceiling height upstairs seemed adequate, but the problem was the ceiling height over the stairwell. Mr. LaCoste stated raising one roof line above the other created the need to raise the whole roof for the best visual.

Advisor Pristera stated it seemed to be a lot of expense to raise the roof for two rooms and a bathroom, and with a deep lot it might be better to construct an addition on the rear and not deal with the stairs and raising the roof; he explained this was not a preservation project. Mr. LaCoste stated the deep structural work was caused by the Code, and once they did the structural alterations, it became a Level 3 alteration. Advisor Pristera felt the lot was wide enough for other things. Mr. LaCoste stated the house was actually twisted, and according to the boundary, the rear of the left elevation was actually diving into the property line; he did not have as much room to build in the rear as it seemed. The Board then discussed other methods to obtain the needed height. Mr. Scapechi, the engineer, explained that Mr. Weekley pointed to a structural beam which holds up the second floor which is below the head height, and it could not be raised. Chairperson Quina asked how significant this house was, and Advisor Pristera stated it was unique to Old East Hill and significant to them. Staff stated Old East Hill had provided comments when the project was presented for conceptual review. Mr. LaCoste indicated they wanted to keep the structure the same, but it would be taller. Staff handed out the prior Old East Hill comments to the Board for consideration. It was determined the age for construction of the house was the 1890s, and Old East Hill wanted to maintain the gothic influence and details with a single front door and sidelights; Mr. LaCoste was agreeable to these suggestions.

Chairperson Quina appreciated the fact they were trying to preserve the structure, and adding 2' was minimal in saving the house. Mr. Weekley then explained to the Board that the foundation was a must, the head level at the stairs would have to come to Code, it was a Level 3 alteration, and he would need reports for historical repairs. He pointed out the foundation would not be done from the crawl space, and all flooring would be removed even to level the foundation. In just walking across the flooring, he could see there were some serious issues. He advised the east side appeared to be an add-on with multiple

piers at one location which was the point where it was beginning to sag. He explained they were basically building a new house from inside out. Advisor Pristera agreed this structure needed work. Board Member Campbell-Hatler asked what aesthetic quality would the structure have in the end with all the required changes and would it be better to take it down. Mr. LaCoste explained they had factored in enough to build what they proposed, and since his name would be attached to this home, it would be built with certain standards. Board Member Mead addressed the lack of fenestration on the rear, and Board Member Crawford suggested a window on the new rear elevation.

**Item 4**  
**Contributing Structure**  
**Action taken: Approved.**

**NHPD  
PR-2**

Mr. English presented to the Board, and Chairperson Quina stated he appreciated the applicant returning to the Board and addressing its concerns. Board Member Mead pointed out the house originally comprised a parcel which included the lot behind it, so with respect to the current Code, the existing house is built well into the rear setback line which is part of the percentage problem. Historic Preservation Planner Harding advised the Board had approved the removal of the existing stairs but 175 sq. ft. of the house still encroached into the rear; he explained they were able to occupy 625 sq. ft. and they were asking for 684 sq. ft. If the building had been built within its own setbacks, a variance would not be necessary. **Board Member Mead considered this a hardship, and the applicant should get credit for that detail and receive the balance for that on the additional coverage for what they were requesting and moved for an approval. Board Member Crawford seconded the motion, and with no audience speakers, the motion carried unanimously.**

**Item 5**

**200 W. Jackson Street**

**NHPD  
PR-2**

**Contributing Structure**

**Action taken: Approved with abbreviated review.**

James and Michelle English are requesting approval for exterior modifications to a contributing structure and to add a detached two-car garage with second-story living quarters.

Mr. English addressed the Board and stated the windows were changed to wood since they wanted to emulate each elevation. The steel carriage doors would be trimmed to match the house. Board Member Crawford was concerned with the steel because of extruding methods which might not have sharp edges. Mr. English advised their goal was consistency which would be addressed by the painter. He also explained the balcony was now at 4' and they wanted it to aesthetically match the house. Chairperson Quina suggested lowering the balcony windows for access. Mr. English advised they proposed to position the A/C units under the stairs. Board Member Mead addressed the awning roof over the door and suggested duplicating the bracket detail on the front porch.

**Board Member Crawford made a motion to approve with the following modifications:**

**1) that the windows on the front and right include a 4" center trim piece which matches the main house; 2) that brackets be added to the rear elevation canopy similar to the front elevation; 3) recommended the carriage door in the plans and suggested considering fiberglass doors with a cement board overlay for sharper details. Board Member Salter amended the motion to include that the second floor windows be lowered. Board Member Mead suggested an abbreviated review for the 4" center window trim since the trim was probably a 6" trim. The amendments were accepted. Board Member Mead seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.**

(The Board then proceeded to Item 7.)

**Item 6**

**2 N. Palafox Street**

**PHBD  
C-2A**

**Contributing Structure**

**Action taken: Approved as art.**

The UWF Historic Trust is requesting modifications to a previously approved mural. This project was denied during an Abbreviated Review due to the inclusion of the UWF Historic Trust's name and logo causing the mural to be classified as signage.

Advisor Pristera presented to the Board and explained the mural had been installed. He explained as people come into the mural program, they were trying to deal with how to place the signature on it to designate it as part of a walking trail. They will eventually have an application which visitors can follow to an information hub. He explained the key was a citation or artist's signature, and they did not intend it to be offsite advertising.

Board Member Salter explained the definition of a sign by the City of Pensacola does not distinguish or exclude not-for-profits but states any entity, and the Trust is an entity. Assistant City Attorney Lindsay stated Board Member Salter was correct. Whether this Board would want to recommend that the City look at whether the ordinance could be amended at how we define signs, the Board could recommend that review. But as the Code is currently written, the opinion by Board Member Salter was correct. Staff referred to Sec. 12-14-1 *Definitions enumerated, Sign* - Sign means any device, display or structure, or part thereof, which advertises, identifies, displays, directs or attracts attention to an



object, person, institution, organization, business, product, service, event or location by the use of words, letters, figures, designs, symbols, fixtures, colors, illumination or projected images.

Board Member Mead suggested the Trust was the custodian of the art and what it had been approved under previously. Board Member Salter advised every image he had seen in the past did not have the logo/key. Staff advised they had looked at it as off-premise signage which was also prohibited in this district. Assistant City Attorney Lindsay explained it was public art but might not be under the City's definition because there is a designation referencing back to the Historic Trust; the logo and the wording created the sign. Board Member Campbell-Hatler explained it was more an installation piece since one would have to know what they were looking at in order to participate in the viewing and consumption of it. Board Member Mead pointed out the Gulf Coast Arts Festival had lots of signs and depictions which direct the person to the artist. Advisor Pristera stated the parking garage also had the signature of the artists. Board Member Mead felt the categories were different. Board Member Campbell-Hatler explained if it was really signage, it would be very legible and very obvious for what it was trying to advertise; she did not believe this mural was focused on selling. She pointed out if walking through a museum with earphones on, you would have to have a designation to know which pieces were in that collection. Advisor Pristera indicated the key was lending to interactive wayfinding. Board Member Mead explained the value was given by the designation, and Board Member Campbell-Hatler suggested it was out of the perimeters of advertising and believed all of the murals should have it. Board Member Salter believed the issue at hand was using the key/logo as the symbol for the wayfinding paths, but the murals being mounted to the sides of the building represented the emblem of the Historic Trust Trail and did not need the mark of the Historic Trust placed on them to mark them as a part of the historic trail. The way the Code is written does not mean it has to be a business but states "which identifies an entity" which it does. He felt there needed to be an alteration to the Code.

Board Member Mead did not feel in this context an alteration was needed because he thought a categorical distinction could be made between art and signage and that the customary nature of the identification that is spoken to in the signage is different than the customary nature of the identification that is typically the signature of the artist, or in this case, the custodian of art. Proportionally speaking, this was consistent for the signature on art where we have a matter which is in the public domain and has to be maintained by a public custodian; he suggested this was within the bounds for custom of art and did not become signage. Board Member Salter asked the difference between this mural and the mural with the logo for the East Garden District development. Advisor Pristera felt the development was using the mural to benefit them for their development, and the logo placement was also in a more prominent location. Board Member Salter stated it was still a logo of an entity and did not see a distinction between this logo and the Historic Trust logo. Board Member Mead explained they were trying to use a public domain image as signage in the same manner as the Historic Trust, but here you have the public custodian of the art and of the location putting up the historic image of the place and also indicating the custodian. Board Member Salter pointed out the image could change and at that point, anyone who wanted to become the custodian could place their image on it. Board Member Mead clarified that the Historical Trust was the real custodian of the images, and if that

custodian did not exist, those historical resources would go away. Advisor Pristera advised there was a committee to oversee donors, and it was a program for public benefit, and if they wanted their sponsorship noted, it could be placed on a website. He felt giving the key gave it legitimacy in that a larger group had reviewed this, and it was appropriate and serving a public good.

Board Member Villegas agreed with both Board members but felt some type of amendment needed to be in place to acknowledge the historical value of it and how these things are approached. Verbiage of custodianship could get the Board in trouble down the line, and she felt amending it with some acknowledgment to a historical acknowledgement within the community would be the value of the community and allowed in that context. But outside of that, signage was signage; she felt it would be changed out and could be a problem down the line. Board Member Mead explained that within an art placement, you would sign the iteration of the art, and this mural was consistent with that. Attempts to prescribe too much winnows out all the creative efforts that you could get in the play of the joints that are needed in order to be successful. Board Member Villegas pointed out there were a lot of images not owned by UWF which the Historical Trust had not handed over, and a private company could purchase them, and an amendment protected the Board in the long term.

**Board Member Mead made a motion to approve as these are public art in placements which are being signed effectively by the custodian of the art in placement responsible for its erection, these should be considered as art, and insofar as they are in proportion to the typical customary signature on a piece of art, they should be approved and not considered signage. Board Member Campbell-Hatler seconded the motion. The motion carried 5 to 2 with Board Member Salter and Villegas dissenting.**

**Item 7**

**423 E. Government Street**

**PHD**

**Contributing Structure**

**HC-1 / Wood Cottages**

**Action taken: Approved.**

Robin Hoban is requesting approval to remove a chimney.

Ms. Hoban presented to the Board and thanked Historic Preservation Planner Harding for his assistance in preparing the application. She advised they did a preliminary assessment of the chimney initially, and based on the Board's discussion, they decided to try and keep the chimney; the entire floorplan had been designed around the chimney. At this time, they have begun to fully assess the brick on the chimney and the house, and the sun dried brick had not held up over time, and the prior owners had not done anything to mitigate the damage. After getting onto the roof with the structural engineer, the degradation was alarming; it was a concern at this point, it would cost more to remove it than to keep it, and they wanted the Board to consider her request to remove the chimney. Advisor Pristera explained he had met the contractor at the house and also felt the house was very unstable, and only a small portion was supporting the chimney structure; to repair the house would be a total rebuild. He pointed out the homeowner was doing a great job in restoring the house the correct way, but the chimney would be a total rebuild. **Board Member Mead made a motion to approve the chimney removal, seconded by Board Member Salter, and it carried unanimously.**

Architectural Review Board Meeting  
January 16, 2020  
8

**ADJOURNMENT** – With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:22 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Historic Preservation Planner Harding  
Secretary to the Board