

PLANNING SERVICES

Architectural Review Board

MINUTES OF THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

August 15, 2019

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Carter Quina, Michael Crawford, Susan Campbell-Hatler, Derek Salter, George Mead, Anna Fogarty

MEMBERS ABSENT: Nina Campbell

STAFF PRESENT: Gregg Harding, Historic Preservation Planner, Leslie Statler, Planner, Michael Ziarnek, Transportation Planner-Complete Streets, Heather Lindsay, Assistant City Attorney, Ross Pristera, Advisor

OTHERS PRESENT: Lucy Lloyd, Dan Ahern, Jeffrey Shop, Christian Wagley, J. Veal, Jonathan Harrington, Joseph Dhaiti, Jerry Sparkman, Lois Benson,

CALL TO ORDER / QUORUM PRESENT

Chairman Quina called the Architectural Review Board (ARB) meeting to order at 2:01 p.m. with a quorum present. He explained because of the incident which took place at the last Board meeting, he sent a letter of apology to Ms. Courtney and asked everyone to please treat people with respect. He explained the ARB was an advisory board and trying to make things that are built in Pensacola as good as they can be by following the guidelines and doing its best to make everyone happy.

Mr. Harding indicated that the Planning Board had chosen Ms. Ryan Wiggins as its representative on the ARB, and she would likely be present at the October 2019 meeting.

Mr. Mead advised he appreciated that Chairman Quina apologized to Ms. Courtney, and while it was inexcusable behavior that occurred in the audience, he did not know if the Chairman in that position was really empowered to do much else other than to ask that people remain civil, and he felt the Chairman had done all he could do under those circumstances.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Salter made a motion to approve the July 18, 2019 minutes, seconded by Mr. Mead, and it carried unanimously.

OPEN FORUM – Christian Wagley appreciated the comments and the letter of apology and wanted to make it a teachable moment for the Board to consider what might could be done to keep the discourse of the meeting from getting so hostile that it led to something which happened in the audience, which was beyond the Board's control. He pointed out at the beginning of Council meetings where the rules of decorum which apply in that chamber are read to the audience, and perhaps something of that nature could be adapted to the ARB. The ability of citizens to come and speak and be part of this governmental process is absolutely sacred. He thanked Mr. Salter for making that statement that you don't have to be an architect to appreciate good design when their speaker was challenged by Mr. Daughtry, and she had no credentials in

architecture to comment on the item. He also felt bad for the way the Board was treated and wanted to make sure the Board and staff were treated well in the future.

Ms. Campbell-Hatler pointed out the Board does not face the audience and does not have the ability to know what is taking place behind them. Ms. Lindsay informed the Board that staff also did not hear the conversations going on in the audience. Ms. Statler indicated the room could be set up in a different format. Mr. Mead explained the current format allowed the Board members to speak to each other and view the screen the same way as the audience. Ms. Campbell-Hatler had no objection to Ms. Lindsay addressing an issue.

NEW BUSINESS

Item 1

SW Corner of E. Romana Street

PHD

New Construction

& S. Ninth Avenue

HC-1 / Brick Structures

Action taken: Approved with comments and abbreviated review.

Jerry Sparkman, Sweet Sparkman Architects, is requesting *FINAL* approval for the construction of a three-story residence with a detached garage. This item received conceptual approval in May 2019 with comments regarding the handling of the garage and a study of the eave height.

Mr. Sparkman presented to the Board and stated the furnished model intended to show the context with the height and how it related to the neighborhood. They also lowered the garage 4' and took a mid-century modern precedent with the attachment to the primary structure. They also designed a landscape plan which was equally provocative from the owner's use but also for neighbors walking around the property. They removed the "L" shaped water facility because of cost concerns and liability issues and replaced it with a Mexican pebble element.

Chairman Quina asked how the model was demonstrating the context, and Mr. Sparkman showed how the adjacent structure determined the height which was 44'. He also explained the whalebone elements would be cast in place, picking up on an historic arcade. The garage would be simple and unadorned. He indicated the majority of the glass was on the east and west sides of the living level. Mr. Crawford asked how it related to the fenestrations of adjacent buildings. Mr. Sparkman explained the windows had to be egress size, 38" width by full height at 12" and there were some mullions to allow for operable windows. He also pointed out that the generous roof created shading for the east and west sides. The north and south had eaves but less glazing. The lower exterior would be STO which was a more refined stucco; the materials were refined stucco, glass and concrete.

Chairman Quina pointed out the design was remarkable and would become a landmark during construction. Ms. Campbell-Hatler asked about the water element, and Mr. Sparkman explained the intent was to be able to look across, and they wanted to add a water element at the entry in the rectangles on each side. The concept was to present something that the City could enjoy. Chairman Quina asked about the HVAC, and Mr. Sparkman indicated it was geothermal with pumps in the garage and air handlers in the ceiling. He was not certain about the landscape elements since there was so much shading involved, but stated the edges could be natural material which needed sunlight. Mr. Crawford suggested the area on the west behind the garage could benefit from landscape treatment. Mr. Salter was concerned with the garage being the first structure on the street at this major location, and Mr. Crawford's comment might be a way to use landscaping to soften it up. He also brought up the fact that up lighting might not be appropriate in this district, and the addition of the light at night might make the structure stand out more than the neighborhood. Mr. Mead suggested down lighting in the canopy which would not cause it to dominate the presence at night. Mr. Salter referenced the Code in Section 12-2-12(B)(5)(j)(1) for lighting. Mr. Harding clarified that the Code did not allow up lighting; down lighting was allowed either with a pole or structure mounted.

Mr. Salter addressed the foyer doors since they faced a major street and was curious how the doors were attained; he felt there was a disconnect between the house and the doors. Mr. Sparkman

explained the idea was to have custom doors. Scale was also important, and texture was essential to add interest.

Mr. Crawford made a motion to approve the plans as submitted, with the provision that landscaping, final door selections, final window selections, and landscape lighting not to include up lighting per the LDC be resubmitted for Abbreviated Review. Mr. Salter amended the landscape plan to address the Romana Street elevation of the garage, and it was accepted. There were no speakers. Mr. Salter seconded the motion. Mr. Harding asked if the motion covered the water feature, and it did. Mr. Mead amended stating since they carried the fenestration around the corner of the garage, whatever they did on the Romana side, carry it to the back for similar integration, and Mr. Sparkman agreed. It was clarified the landscaping could also be in an abbreviated review. The motion then carried unanimously.

Item 2 **1122 N. Baylen Street** **NHPD**
Contributing Structure **PR-1AAA**

Action taken: Approved with abbreviated review on vertical screening.

Margaret and Lucy Lloyd are requesting approval for exterior modifications to a contributing structure to accommodate handicap access.

Ms. Lloyd presented to the Board and stated they would put a landscaping buffer between the neighbor's driveway on Bernard Street. Chairman Quina stated North Hill had requested the lift be screened from the street, and Ms. Lloyd advised they planned to do this and suggested the color would probably be white. She provided an illustration of the lift. **Mr. Mead made a motion to approve with an abbreviated review on vertical screening to help with the appearance of the lift in accordance with comments from North Hill. Ms. Campbell-Hatler seconded the motion.** Chairman Quina explained once the applicant decided on the landscaping, it could be submitted for an abbreviated review. **The motion then carried unanimously.**

Item 3 **316 N. Spring Street** **PHBD**
New Construction **R-NC**

Action taken: Approved with abbreviated review.

Joseph Dhaiti is requesting *FINAL* approval for a single family residence. The proposed dwelling will be a narrow two-story residence with a balcony on the front elevation. This project received approval for the demolition of the existing structure and conceptual approval for the new construction in January 2019. At that meeting, the motion included comments regarding a change in siding profiles for consistency, modifications for narrower porch columns, and a change in roof profile from hip to gable.

Mr. Dhaiti presented to the Board. Chairman Quina advised he preferred the four columns on the original drawing and had no problem with the siding pattern. Mr. Salter noticed the product package contained windows from three different manufacturers which would mean their mullions were different sizes and asked if the applicant could limit the number of manufacturers; he advised windows that face the street should be from the same manufacturer. Mr. Harding confirmed that the Board was fine with vinyl windows at the conceptual review. Mr. Crawford advised it would give a better look, except for the round windows, having all the details the same from the same manufacturer. He also pointed out the front door was more elaborate, and a simple cottage style was a more appropriate style for the rest of the building. Mr. Dhaiti stated that could be changed. Mr. Salter advised the verbal language was to cut off the tops of the fence. Mr. Crawford also noted they had a small lot, but a parking pad in the front was not appropriate. Mr. Dhaiti advised only 25% of the driveway was on his property. He intended to use 8"x 8" concrete pavers. Ms. Fogarty agreed with the comments to add in the column and revisit the spacing of the windows and doors. Mr. Salter addressed the right side of the

second elevation with the horizontal windows and advised in the past, the Board had recommended those be more square or vertical in proportion for historical structures. **Mead made a motion to approve with the following changes to be submitted for abbreviated review: (1) conforming the front façade to the 3-bay 4-column profile consistent with the conceptual approval, (2) rebalancing the window and door fenestration on the front facade consistent with the conceptual approval, (3) that the front door be consistent in style and form with the overall windows as opposed to what was indicated, (4) that the side windows be conformed to either square or vertical profile consistent with the overall fenestration or three square profile as shown on the reverse elevation, (5) and that the placement of the driveway be conformed to a single pad on the right side.** Chairman Quina clarified that the driveway would be slid to the south as a single pad and a walkway could still be considered in the abbreviated review.

Mr. Wagley pointed out that probably none of the historic structures had a parking pad in the front, but it was as far to the side or the rear as possible.

Mr. Salter amended the motion that the privacy fence be a flat top instead of dog eared and also that the windows be divided light. Mr. Crawford added the landscape plans for an abbreviated review. The amendments were accepted, and the motion was seconded by Mr. Salter and carried unanimously. Mr. Harding advised the applicant that all the recommendations would be reflected in his notes and the minutes.

Item 4 **309 N. 6th Avenue** **OEHPD**
Contributing Structure **OEHR-2**
Action taken: Approved.

Jonathan Harrington is requesting approval for exterior modifications to a contributing structure.

Mr. Harrington presented to the Board and explained the structural piers would be covered with nonstructural brick veneer. Regarding the lattice, Mr. Mead suggested since they were varying the width of the piers, to keep the existing profile, they could forget the brick and lay the lattice across the CMU and put the lattice into the application. Mr. Harrington stated the lattice was in consideration with the owners at this time. Chairman Quina advised East Hill was in support of the project. With no speakers, **Mr. Crawford made a motion to approve, seconded by Ms. Campbell-Hatler, and it carried unanimously.**

Item 5 **820 E. LaRua Street** **OEHPD**
Variance **OEHC-1**
Action taken: Approved.

Alicia and Daniel Ahern are seeking a Variance to increase the minimum required west side yard setback from 5 feet to 3.8 feet (1.4 feet in total) to accommodate a rear addition. This project was not able to be heard in June 2019 due to improper notification by staff and was returned in July of 2019, and the applicants withdrew to revise the application.

Mr. Veal presented to the Board and explained the old survey was not to scale, and he used the dimensions to create a new site plan. As the structure moves north, it moves away from the property line. Maintaining the line and plane of the structure was essential to preserving the integrity of the structure and historic character of the house. The plans were to demolish the added rear porch as well as the old porch and extend the high roof as part of the proposed addition. He added the applicants wanted this to be their principle residence, and the house would benefit from fulltime residents. Mr. Mead advised the drawing answered most of the Board's questions. He pointed out the entirety of the structure seemed to be non-conforming in regard to the western setback which raised the question did the Board need to grant a variance, because what was going to be done was consistent with the existing

non-conformity and was not going to increase it in any other way except for de minimis; he asked if the Board could rule on that ground, and Ms. Lindsay agreed with his interpretation. Mr. Salter stated the drawing shown actually widened that part of the house and was not keeping with the original footprint but extended farther over in the back portion. Mr. Mead's concern was that 2' was more than de minimis but was not sure 4" was. Mr. Salter explained that the Code stated to grant a variance, the terms have to be met that the addition cannot be made without the variance, or that the project cannot go forward without the variance. He did not believe this was the case here.

Mr. Mead explained what they had before was an indication that a portion of the structure was conforming to the setback, and that the non-conforming increased as they went to the rear. Now, we had the reverse where the entirety of the structure was non-conforming, and the extension of the addition would diminish that non-conforming, consistently going backward in a manner he viewed as de minimis because they were only talking about a few inches. Mr. Salter asked if the addition would then have to align with the existing step back in the rear of the house. Mr. Mead stated that had to be determined if the step back was maintained or whether the 4" was de minimis with regard to the existing non-conforming. He felt that was the situation since the intent was to carry the upper roofline all the way back. He agreed the porch would normally have been a step back, but the intent was to extend the fabric of the main body of the structure rather than extending the porch.

Ms. Lindsay explained by removing part of the structure and replacing it, they would lose their grandfathered status for purposes of that improvement, so it wasn't necessarily de minimis, and the Board would still have to vote on a variance. Ms. Campbell-Hatler thought the variance criteria had been laid out, and that a variance would be warranted, and they had not created the encroachment. Chairman Quina pointed out East Hill was comfortable with the variance.

Mr. Mead advised in Item 4 the nature of the actual encroachment, the setback, is radically different from the prior package, and that aspect was a de minimis change and should not bar a variance. Regarding Item 2, since the intent is to carry the body of the main house back and not the porch, that would not be allowed under the current setbacks and talking about a matter of inches instead of 2'. This would also be considered a de minimis in the way that the setback requirements were affecting the ability to make the use, and he would allow the use under the variance under that condition. He felt the other conditions had been met in the prior application and had also been met in this application. He made a motion to approve the variance under those terms, seconded by Ms. Campbell-Hatler. Mr. Salter explained that while he understood the statements made, he did not believe Item 5 regarding use of the land had been met. He saw nothing that proved this addition could not be made within the setbacks required for this zoning district. He understood it was a minimal encroachment but did not think it was necessary. With regard to maintaining the line of the house, in his opinion, this was less important because stepping back allows the contributing structure to be more distinguished. He did not believe a variance was warranted. Mr. Mead stated he believed the use of the word minimal in the Code allows precisely this question for this, how minimal the issue is in regard to the setback, and he felt that condition in Item 5 had been met. Mr. Veal informed they had a letter of non-objection from the neighbor. He also pointed out it was not merely to gain space but to gain the plane. **The motion then carried 5 to 1 with Mr. Salter dissenting.**

Item 6

118 S. Palafox Street

PHBD

Contributing Structure

C-2A

Action taken: Approved.

The Saenger Theater is seeking approval to install hardware to attach hurricane panels, as needed, during inclement weather over the west entry doors, the window above the west entry doors, the south entry doors and the box office window located outside of the south entrance.

Mr. Shop presented to the Board and provided samples of the hardware and stated they would be painted to match the surfaces to make them less noticeable. He also clarified that for their installation, the track at the top would be removed as well. He stated there would be no rails top, bottom or sides, and they would be held by these bolts only. **Ms. Campbell-Hatler made a motion to approve, seconded by Ms. Fogarty. The motion carried 5 to 1 with Chairman Quina abstaining.**

OPEN FORUM – None.

DISCUSSION – Ms. Campbell-Hatler asked about future Board procedures regarding noise from the audience. Ms. Lindsay stated sometimes staff could hear something but could not make out the words to know if there was a conflict. Ms. Fogarty stated going forward, the Board members would be more aware of what was going on in the audience. Chairman Quina confirmed he had the authority to tell someone to leave the chamber if necessary. Ms. Lindsay advised the Chairman could do that on his own authority without asking anyone, and the other Board members could also ask for a point of order if they heard anything. Ms. Statler advised there was some other language used in the past that could be presented. Chairman Quina suggested the language be on the screen for audience members, and he could refer to it at the beginning of the meeting.

ADJOURNMENT – With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,



Gregg Harding
Secretary to the Board