



**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD**  
**February 8, 2022**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chairperson Paul Ritz, Vice Chairperson Larson, Board Member Grundhoefer, Board Member Powell, Board Member Sampson, Board Member Van Hoose, Board Member Villegas

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** None.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Assistant Planning & Zoning Manager Cannon, Historic Preservation Planner Harding, Urban Design Specialist Parker, Assistant City Attorney Lindsay, City Engineer Hinote, City Arborist Stultz, Help Desk Technician Russo

**STAFF VIRTUAL:** Development Services Director Morris, Senior Planner Statler

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Barbara Henriques, Christy Cabassa, Scott Sallis

**AGENDA:**

- Quorum/Call to Order
- Approval of Meeting Minutes from January 11, 2022

**New Business:**

- Aesthetic Review – 556 E. Romana Street
- Aesthetic Review – 16 N. Florida Blanca
- Proposed Amendments to the Tree Ordinance
- Open Forum
- Discussion
- Adjournment

**Call to Order / Quorum Present**

Chairperson Ritz called the meeting to order at 2:00 pm with a quorum present and explained the procedures of the Board meeting including requirements for audience participation.

**Approval of Meeting Minutes** - Board Member Larson made a motion to approve the January 11, 2022 minutes, seconded by Board Member Villegas, and it carried unanimously.

**New Business** –

### **Aesthetic Review – 556 E. Romana Street – GRD-1**

Scott Sallis, Dalrymple Sallis Architecture, is requesting approval for a new 2-story single-family residence with a detached garage and accessory dwelling unit located at 556 E. Romana Street. The structure provides a front and rear balcony as well as a connecting roof between the residence and the two-story garage. Comments from staff had been addressed by the applicant. Review comments and/or approval from the Aragon Architectural Review Board (AARB) were not included.

Mr. Sallis addressed the Board and stated written approval from the AARB was expected in a matter of days. Senior Planner Statler had performed a careful review of the pool; this design had them going to the zero-lot line, but she advised regulations did not require that, and the plans were corrected. Chairperson Ritz pointed out comments from staff had been addressed, and any motion to approve would be pending the AARB approval. Mr. Sallis stated the Code allowed them to extend past setbacks with the chimney and rails; the second-floor porch was taking advantage of that resulting in an architectural stoop, but technically, you could not stand on a chimney (sheet A101).

**Board Member Grundhoefer made a motion to approve contingent on Aragon Architectural Review Board approval, seconded by Board Member Powell, and it carried unanimously.**

### **Aesthetic Review – 16 N. Florida Blanca – GRD-1**

Christy Cabassa, Architect, is requesting approval for a new 2-story single-family residence and a storage building located at 16 N. Florida Blanca Street. The property is across from St. Michaels Cemetery and abuts the access road for the Tech Park to the north. Comments from staff had been addressed. Review comments and/or approval from the Aragon Architectural Review Board (AARB) were not included.

Ms. Cabassa addressed the Board and stated they had received a conceptual review from the AARB and had addressed all the comments; they were awaiting that approval. Chairperson Ritz had no issues with the request. Ms. Cabassa clarified this was a Type 4B Side Yard built to the property line; the lot was 30' wide, 20' for the structure and 10' from the house to the other property line for the driveway since vehicles had to be onsite. There was a 3' easement on the other property granted to this property for the foundation, overhangs, gutters, etc. Board Member Grundhoefer questioned no windows on the south side, and Ms. Cabassa stated they were not allowed. Historic Preservation Planner Harding explained every lot in Aragon was different with house types having very specific designs and setbacks; they were built-to lines rather than zero-lot lines. Ms. Cabassa also pointed out they were fire rated and treated as a townhome. Board Member Villegas stated it would be more balanced even with faux windows.

**Board Member Grundhoefer made a motion to approve pending Aragon Architectural Review Board approval, seconded by Board Member Villegas, and it carried unanimously.**

### **Proposed Amendments to the Tree Ordinance**

On January 11, 2022, the Planning Board considered proposed amendments to the Tree Ordinance 12-6-6 (e) as a discussion item. The proposed changes are to allow staff to authorize deviations to setbacks in order to further the protection of heritage trees. During the January 11, 2022 meeting, Planning Board members requested staff to consider adding a notification process to the proposed amendments. The attached amendment incorporates a modified version of the existing notification process currently in place for

“removal” of heritage trees in Sec 12-6-4 (4) and applies it to a request for a “reduction in setbacks” to preserve heritage trees in 12-6-6 (e).

e. *Setback Reductions.* Deviations to setbacks may be authorized by the mayor, or their designee for preservation of heritage trees. Such deviation shall be the minimum amount necessary for the preservation of the tree(s). Notice. If a setback reduction request is sought for one or more heritage trees within any property in any zoning district identified in section 12-6-2, a sign shall be posted no further back than four feet from the property line nearest each respective roadway adjacent to the property. One sign shall be posted for every 100 feet of roadway frontage. Each sign shall contain two horizontal lines of legible and easily discernible type. The top line shall state: "Heritage Tree Setback Reduction Request Applied For."

The bottom line shall state: "For Further Information Contact the City of Pensacola at 311" (or other number as designated by the Mayor). The top line shall be in legible type no smaller than six inches in height. The bottom line shall be in legible type no smaller than three inches in height. There shall be a margin of at least three inches between all lettering and the edge of the sign. The signs shall be posted by the applicant at their expense, and shall remain continuously posted for two weeks prior to the requisite building, site work, or tree removal permit is issued. The city's designated arborist will notify the councilperson representing the district in which the permit has been requested upon receipt of the request.

Assistant Planning and Zoning Manager Cannon introduced City Arborist Khristopher Stultz, who has been a professional arborist for 40 years. Mr. Stultz stated he was happy to be in the city of Pensacola and working on the sustainability of its urban forest.

Chairperson Ritz explained the Board was considering the notice requirements in 12-6-6 (e). Board Member Grundhoefer explained the language seemed arbitrary and asked if the adjacent neighbors would be able to contact someone. Staff advised the City used the 311 system which was also used in removal of a heritage tree and was consistent with information provided in the Code. Chairperson Ritz advised it gave the adjacent neighbors the avenue to address the situation. Board Member Grundhoefer pointed out hopefully the deviation would be the minimum amount necessary for the preservation of the tree as stated. Chairperson Ritz indicated should someone apply for this, it would be a staff decision to grant, and the arborist would be consulted. Staff advised the intent was for the preservation of the heritage tree.

Board Member Grundhoefer pointed to 12-6-6 Protected Trees (1) Preservation incentives which states, “Such reduction shall be required when the reduction would preserve a heritage tree” – the parking spaces are allowed to be reduced, but “required when the reduction would preserve a heritage tree.” He felt such reduction should be “allowed” which would be a better wording in lieu of “required.” Staff advised the document could be returned to Legal for review. Chairperson Ritz stated if it was the desire of the Board, it could address the business here, and under New Business come up with an idea and make a request from there. He asked if there were any edits to the language, and there were none.

**Board Member Villegas made a motion to approve the amendment, seconded by Board Member Sampson, and it carried unanimously.**

**Open Forum** – Staff advised the intent was to preserve heritage trees with the incentive of a parking reduction. Board Member Van Hoose pointed out the word “required” was to preserve the tree. Board Member Grundhoefer proposed changing the language from “Such reduction shall be ~~required~~ to allowed when the reduction would preserve a heritage tree.” Assistant City Attorney Lindsay advised the request to Council could be submitted with the additional changes, and staff could be consulted to make sure the intent was

understood and there were no issues. If the Board recommended it in a certain way to proceed to Council and staff did not agree, staff would inform Council they did not agree with this part. Board Member Powell asked if the language change would change the reduction schedule, and it was determined the reduction schedule would remain the same. Chairperson Ritz advised the Board could forward this to Council, but they preferred a motion that fairly well explains what is trying to be accomplished. **Board Member Larson pointed out “allowed” gave some options versus “required” left no options.** By changing the language, we soften it by allowing them to have input and work with the City to save the heritage tree which was the reason he was going with “allowed” versus “required.” **Chairperson Ritz clarified the motion was to change the word “required” to “allowed” to offer some leeway to a person bringing a project to the city to save a heritage tree.** Board Member Grundhoefer explained the change in the wording does not require reducing the parking, and he did not want to be required to reduce the parking if he saved the tree. Assistant City Attorney Lindsay asked that they specify the specific part of the Code for the record. She also indicated it could be assumed the only way to save the tree would be to reduce the parking because of the space needed, so if the parking was not reduced, there must be some other way where the site plan allows for the saving of the tree. If they could not save the tree without giving up the parking space, then there was no way to save the tree unless revising the design of the improvement. Staff advised the applicant would be required to meet the Code requirement for parking with the exception of the heritage tree which would cause it to be less, but the requirement was to save the heritage tree. **Board Member Larson withdrew his motion (comments), and there was no second.** Chairperson Ritz suggested the item return as a discussion item, with staff reflecting on it and possibly furnishing some history on how the language was crafted. Staff agreed it would be beneficial since we now have an arborist onboard. It was agreed the item would return as a discussion at the next Board meeting. **It was also clarified that the language the Board voted on would move forward to Council for two readings.**

**Discussion – None.**

**Adjournment** – With no further business, the Board adjourned at 2:44 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Cynthia Cannon, AICP  
Assistant Planning & Zoning Manager  
Secretary to the Board