

PLANNING SERVICES

***Architectural Review Board***

**MINUTES OF THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**

September 15, 2016

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chairman Ben Townes, Michael Crawford, Susan Campbell Hatler, Carter Quina, George Mead, Ray Jones

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Nina Campbell

**STAFF PRESENT:** Brandi Deese, Leslie Statler, Karen Lefebvre, Ross Pristera, Advisor

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Phillip Turner, Julie Sheppard, Matt Lopez, Stanley McGill, Nora Bailey, Melissa Reid, David Ebbert, Michelle MacNeil, Nick Ortiz, Dean Dalrymple, Bill Holman, Tom Bailey

**CALL TO ORDER / QUORUM PRESENT**

Chairman Ben Townes called the Architectural Review Board meeting to order at 2:03 p.m. with a quorum present. He instructed the audience on the functions of the Board, and that all decisions made by the Board are subject to review by the City Council.

There were no add-on items.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Mr. Jones made a motion to approve the August 18, 2016 minutes, seconded by Mr. Crawford, and the motion carried unanimously.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**Item 1**

**420 E. Romana St.**

**Pensacola Historic District**

**Non-Contributing Structure**

**HC-1/Brick District**

**Action Taken: Approved.**

Ms. Julie Sheppard, on behalf of IHMC, is requesting a variance of 90 square feet of additional sign area for the new facility recently constructed on Romana Street. The Pensacola Historic District limits the square footage for signage to 12 square feet, which is somewhat of a hindrance for a building of this scale. This signage was recently approved through an abbreviated review for aesthetics, but does require the approval of this Board for the additional square footage requested.

Julie Sheppard stated they were successful in working with the county to obtain a grant for a new building, with a million dollar gift to continue the project. She advised all personnel would be consolidated on this property. She stated at completion, the building would be 33,000 sq. ft., and the view of the sign would be the Garden and Alcaniz Street corridor. She advised the signage would only total three percent of the face of the building. Ms. Deese stated the sign had already received aesthetic approval. Tom Paux with Brix Design indicated the sign would have polyurethane high density letters, painted with exterior latex enamel; he offered that polyurethane materials were stronger and lasted longer. Ms. Sheppard stated they spoke to neighbors with the most impacted view to make sure there were no objections. Mr. Quina pointed out the most impacted view would be from within the campus. Ms. Deese clarified that

the sign materials had been approved through an abbreviated review.

**Ms. Hatler made a motion to approve, seconded by Mr. Mead, and it carried unanimously with Mr. Quina abstaining.**

**To accommodate the client and with no objections, 571 E. Romana Street was moved forward.**

**Old Business, Item 1**

**571 E. Romana St.**

**Pensacola Historic District**

**New Construction**

**HR-2/Aragon**

**Action Taken: Approved as submitted.**

Mr. Carter Quina is requesting the Board consider an amendment to the recently approved project at 571 E. Romana Street to include a change of materials for the windows. This project received approval during the August meeting with the exception of the windows. This amendment was submitted as an abbreviated review on August 31, 2016 and was referred to the full Board for review. The applicant is requesting Jeld-Wen Premium Atlantic Vinyl Windows on non-primary facades and in the Guest House. The front facing façade on Romana Street is proposed to be Jeld-Wen Clad Wood Windows.

Bill Holman represented Tom and Nora Bailey. Mr. Crawford pointed out that vinyl windows were not permitted in this part of Aragon, with the southern portion following the historic guidelines. This application presented the opportunity for the Board to consider using vinyl windows in some limited way in HR-2, approving the solid vinyl windows on the sides and rear of the structure. Chairman Townes asked if a motion could be made that this approval only applies to houses in Aragon. Ms. Deese clarified that the Code does not specify you cannot have vinyl windows but leaves the decision to interpretation; the Board must consider if the new construction is historic design, then consider materials. Ms. Hatler suggested the Craftsman style allowed for more affordability. Mr. Holman indicated there was a \$20,000 difference between the wood and vinyl material costs. Ms. Bailey advised that wood windows were a serious upkeep with time and expense.

**Mr. Mead made a motion to find a hardship for variance approval to be found based upon the potential impact of the excess cost of the wood window alternative, and approve vinyl on the sides and back with the conforming wood clad on the front. Specifically, that the hardship has to do with the impact of that cost in regard to the finance terms and your personal contribution to those finances in terms of the down payment. Ms. Hatler seconded the motion. Mr. Mead amended his motion stating that it meets the requirement given the current state of design, maintaining the ancient appearance since the sides and backs will not be prominent, and they are consistent with the overall profile of historic windows.** Ms. Deese clarified that this was not a variance request but a variation in the Code. Chairman Townes pointed out at the last ARB meeting that the AARB would weigh in on this decision. Mr. Crawford indicated he had discussed this with Ms. MacNeil, and it was not that Aragon's rules were more strict, but only that the historic district wanted to have the ruling for wood windows in this portion of Aragon. **Ms. Hatler withdrew her second and the motion failed. Mr. Crawford made a motion to approve as submitted with solid vinyl windows on the sides and rear and vinyl or other clad on the front. Ms. Hatler seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously with Mr. Quina abstaining.**

**Item 2**

**100 Blk S. 9<sup>th</sup> Ave.**

**Pensacola Historic District**

**New Construction**

**HC-1/Brick District**

**Action Taken: Denied.**

Mr. Paul Ritz, Bullock Tice Associates, is requesting approval for the development of a two-story complex in Privateer's Alley that will include retail use, restaurant and condominium units. This development will wrap the corner of East Romana and South 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue with a primary façade that includes a synthetic stucco system. The proposed windows and doors are Jeld-Wen Custom Clad Wood and the roofing system is proposed as standing seam metal. This development includes a breezeway with a translucent roof system, overhead door at the craft bar, decorative railing and woodland concrete pavers with defined wood grain finish. Ms. Deese furnished information regarding the conceptual approval granted in August 2015.

Mr. Ritz stated the structure would be 6' above the sidewalk, with first floor retail and likely an alcohol sale establishment on the north side. South of this would be Craft Beer Bar, with the southern portion being the wine bar. Condominium units would comprise the second floor. The units would have covered parking in the rear, with storage

lockers. He indicated they were trying to keep to the intent of the original architects. He stated the major aesthetic change from the conceptual approval was the roof over the alleyway between the two building components which created the most optimum conditions for outdoor customers.

Mr. Quina questioned the 6' rise needing a ramp. Mr. Ritz stated the ramp would be located on Romana Street which was in the original design. Mr. Quina also asked about the horizontal windows not being store front style. Mr. Ritz stated the tenant for that location wanted store shelving along the wall, so the windows were located higher. Mr. Crawford addressed brackets on the second floor; Mr. Ritz stated they were column caps, and the columns were not illustrated in the drawings. He explained the utilities would be under the building.

Chairman Townes asked if the Board was considering conceptual or final approval, and Mr. Ritz stated it was final approval. Chairman Townes explained on new construction, the Board needed to see door and window details, wall sections, and surface materials on the underside of balconies. He suggested the package was incomplete for final approval. Mrs. Hatler wanted to see stucco and roof samples and colors. Mr. Jones questioned the signage, and Mr. Ritz explained the tenants would return to the Board at a later date with a signage request.

Mr. Quina asked about dumpsters, and it was explained their location would be under the building.

After further discussion on parking lights, light pollution, windows and roof elevation details, **Mr. Mead made a motion to table for a presentation with more details.** It was determined the timeframe would support tabling, but if there was no quorum, the project would be approved. It was explained if the proposal was denied, the applicant would submit a new application with no additional fees. Mr. Crawford felt the project was too big to table, and **Mr. Mead withdrew his motion.** He stated with concurrence of the City Attorney, whatever the applicant applies for is what the Board considers; he pointed out the applicant applied for final approval. **Mr. Crawford then made a motion to deny the application, seconded by Mr. Mead.**

Mrs. Michelle MacNeil appeared before the Board and explained this was the first building in Aragon which has not gone through the ARB. Her firm furnished the genetic design but was not part of the project at the present time. She agreed the project needed more details on the columns, the façade, the ramp, placement of horizontal windows and colors. In the original concept, the three buildings would have different types and styles of guardrails and columns. Having heard the comments, Mr. Ritz indicated they had a checklist for specific items to be addressed and looked forward to revising the presentation to the Board. With no other speakers, **the motion then carried unanimously.**

### Item 3

823 E. Jackson St.

Old East Hill Preservation District  
OEHC-1

#### Non-contributing Structure

**Action Taken: Denied. Paint and one for one wood repair approved.**

Mr. Nick Ortiz is requesting approval to construct a modular accessible handicap ramp, add porch railing and paint at his Law Office at 823 E. Jackson Street. The 58 foot ramp will be constructed of wood with railing to match the proposed porch railing and will have a 5 x 5 platform. The ramp and porch railings will be painted white. The existing trim on the structure is a reddish color, and the applicant would like to repaint the trim with Sherwin Williams "Jay Blue."

Mr. Pristera pointed out the structure was built in 1903 and should be contributing. Mr. Quina stated the package did not have a site plan, and the more recent ramps which were approved used more resistant materials which are stronger and disappear within the landscaping. He pointed out the Code did not require this house to have railing, and it could remain without the rails.

Mr. Mead asked if they had looked into a lift which might be more convenient. Mr. Ortiz stated the clients would park in the rear and access the ramp up to the stoop. Chairman Townes asked about a Code compliant handicap parking space, and it was determined there was none since they have no designated parking. He offered the Board was there to help and recommended that he get a design professional to make sure he is in compliance with the Building Code.

**Mr. Crawford made a motion to deny, seconded by Mr. Mead.** Chairman Townes emphasized the Board needed a site plan with details. **The motion then carried unanimously.** Mr. Ortiz asked about the paint, and **Mr. Quina made a motion to approve the "Jay Blue" paint for sashes and door frames, with one for one board repair, seconded by Mr. Mead, and it carried unanimously.**

**Item 4** **150 W. DeSoto St.** **North Hill Preservation District**  
**Non-Contributing Structure** **PR-1AAA**  
**Action Taken: Approved.**

Mr. Stanley McGill is requesting approval to replace existing windows on the residence and construct an 8 x 14 accessory structure in the rear yard at 150 W. DeSoto Street. The proposed accessory structure is in compliance with the Land Development Code in regard to setbacks, height and square footage requirements. The applicant is proposing to replace the existing windows with custom aluminum clad windows to match the existing openings.

Mr. McGill advised there was no problem with his neighbors, and the shed would be constructed on site by the American Shed Company. He indicated the siding would be hardie board concrete siding and would not be visible from any direction. He provided a sample window which was double-hung aluminum, clad with vinyl, and outside screening. The mullion pattern would remain two over two. It was determined that North Hill had no issues with the selected vinyl window.

**Mr. Quina made a motion to approve as submitted, seconded by Mr. Mead, and it carried unanimously.**

**Item 5** **800 Blk E. Belmont St.** **Old East Hill Preservation District**  
**New Construction** **OEHC-1**  
**Action Taken: Approved.**

Dalrymple Sallis Architecture is requesting approval for a new slab on grade single-story wood-framed residence with lap pool. This proposed residence is functionally a guest home and pool that joins the neighboring property at 816 E. Belmont. However, due to regulations in the Land Development Code, staff is treating this as a stand-alone structure. Window selection for the structure is proposed to be Anderson E Series Double Hung Clad Window. The structure will also include painted composite panels as the primary façade and a standing seam metal roof.

Mr. Dalrymple stated the exterior composite panels have battens applied to them which are of the same material as the adjacent structure. He indicated the window selection matched the existing structure.

**Mr. Quina made a motion to approve as submitted, seconded by Ms. Hatler.** Mr. Mead asked if the stand-alone met the codes and setbacks, and Ms. Deese stated it did. It was also noted that Old East Hill supported the project. **The motion then carried unanimously.**

**Item 6** **300 S. Palafox St.** **Palafox Historic Business District**  
**Contributing Structure** **Pensacola Historic District/HC-2**  
**Action Taken: Approved.**

Mr. Pristera, on behalf of the UWF Historic Trust, is requesting approval to update and reinterpret the Colonial Archaeological Trail stop in Plaza Ferdinand VII. Currently, there is a platform with a wood railing which is rotting; they want to replace it with a railing system which would match the Commanding Officer's Compound Exhibit. The British brick wall in the grass will have a border to highlight that feature with signage telling the story of that element. He clarified that the railing would only be along the sidewalk, and the site would be regraded. He pointed out the railing was the standard 4" spacing.

**Mr. Jones made a motion to approve, seconded by Ms. Hatler, and it carried unanimously.**

**Item 7** **330 S. Jefferson St.** **Palafox Historic Business District**  
**Contributing Structure** **Pensacola Historic District/HC-2**  
**Action Taken: Approved.**

Mr. Pristera, on behalf of the UWF Historic Trust, is requesting approval for upgrades to the lighting at the T.T. Wentworth Museum. The new LED fixtures will have the ability to change colors and will be placed in locations that highlight key architectural features. New reproduction globe lamps will be placed on either side of the front stairs and new reproduction pendant fixtures will be installed in the alcoves. Ms. Deese provided an email from Mr. Kyle Owens for the Board's consideration.

Melissa Reid with Premier Engineering Group advised they could accommodate the time delays through their programming. They also have plans for the north and south elevations. They will replace the custom pedestals on the outside to match the original. Acrylic globe fixture samples were provided to the Board. David Ebbert explained the

event programming aspects which can be controlled by the owner. After further discussion, **Ms. Hatler made a motion to approve, seconded by Mr. Jones.** Mr. Jones mentioned other businesses using this same concept, and Ms. Deese stated that if the project was within the historic district, the Board would review it as it is an exterior modification. **The motion then carried unanimously with Mr. Quina abstaining.**

**DISCUSSION:**

**LDC Section 12-13-3/12-2-10/12-2-22 –**

During the August 18, 2016 meeting, staff presented draft language for potential amendments to the Land Development Code as directed by the Board. The Board at that time decided to spend the next month reviewing the draft language options. Staff added this item to the agenda for discussion with the possibility of a recommendation to City Council.

**Sec. 12-13-3. – Architectural review board.**

The Board approved **Option 1 (Timeframe for Decision) – (G) Review and decision.** The Board shall promptly review such plans and shall render its decision ~~on or before thirty one (31) days from the date that plans are submitted, to the board for review~~ **in a reasonable time.** **Any agenda item may be continued at the discretion of the Board.**

Under **Conceptual Approval (Code Language)** the Board approved **Sec. 12-13-3. Architectural Review Board, E. Duties., e. Governmental Center District. Refer to section 12-2-22.**

It shall be the duty of the board to approve or disapprove plans for buildings to be erected, renovated or razed which are located, or are to be located, within the historical district or districts and to preserve the historical integrity and ancient appearance within any and all historical districts established by the governing body of the city, including the authority to grant variances, under the conditions and safeguards provided in subsection 12-12-2(A)(2), from the zoning ordinances of the city applicable in the Pensacola Historic District, the North Hill Preservation District, the Old East Hill Preservation District, the Palafox Historic Business District, **and the Governmental Center District.** **The Board must approve or disapprove plans based on the applicant's request listed on their application, be it conceptual approval or final approval.**

Under **12-2-10 – Historic & Preservation Land Use District. (A),(4) Procedure for review,** the Board approved the addition of

**(f) Conceptual approval is permitted by the Board only when the applicant specifies on their application that is the approval they are seeking. Conceptual approval applications shall be complete with the exception of final details such as material and color selections. Conceptual approval by the Board does not permit the issuance of a building permit.**

After discussion regarding proper notification, staff's ability to review materials before the Board meeting, and the purpose of add-on items, the Board decided not to permit add on agenda items.

Under **Governmental Center District** the Board approved **Option 1** with the most stringent requirements.  
Sec. 12-2-22. - Governmental center district.

**(B) Procedure for review of plans.**

- (1) Submission of plans. Every application for a building permit to erect, **raze**, construct, renovate and/or alter an exterior of a building, or sign, located or to be located in the district shall be accompanied by plans for the proposed work. As used herein, "plans" shall mean drawings or sketches with sufficient detail to show, as far as they relate to exterior appearance, the architectural design of the building or sign, (both before and after the proposed work is done in the cases of altering, renovating, demolishing or razing a building or structure) including proposed materials, textures and colors, and the plat plan or site layout, including all site improvements or features such as walls, fences, walks, terraces, plantings, accessory buildings, paved areas,

signs, lights, awnings, canopies, screening and other appurtenances. Such plans shall be promptly forwarded by the building official to the Architectural Review Board. The building official or his designee shall serve as secretary to the board.

- (2) Review and approval by the architectural review board. All such plans shall be subject to review and approval by the Architectural Review Board as established in section 12-13-3 and in accordance with the provisions of section 12-2-10(A)(4)(a) through (c), applicable to the historic zoning districts. **In addition, to section 12-2-10 (A) (9) demolition of contributing structures applies when the request involves a contributing structure.** The board shall adopt written rules and procedures for abbreviated review for paint colors, minor repairs, emergency repairs and minor deviations in projects already approved by the board. This process may authorize the board to designate one of its members to undertake such abbreviated review without the necessity for review by the entire board, provided, however such abbreviated review process shall require review by the director of the downtown improvement board and the staff of the Historic Pensacola Preservation Board. If agreement cannot be reached as it pertains to an abbreviated review by the board designee, director of the downtown improvement board, Historic Pensacola Preservation Board staff and secretary to the architectural review board then the matter will be referred to the full board for a decision.

It was explained that demolition for a non-contributing structure would come to the ARB without the application of the standards in Section (9); the structure would be demolished yes or no, but staff would clarify "contributing structures." Ms. Deese advised the Board's decisions would be moved forward to the Council Executive for consideration.

**ADJOURNMENT** – With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:07 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,



Brandi C. Deese  
Secretary to the Board