



MINUTES OF THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

August 20, 2020

MEMBERS PRESENT: Vice Chairperson Crawford

MEMBERS VIRTUAL: Board Member Fogarty, Board Member Mead, Board Member Salter, Board Member Villegas

MEMBERS ABSENT: Chairperson Quina, Board Member Campbell-Hatler

STAFF PRESENT: Historic Preservation Planner Harding, Board Advisor Pristera (virtual), Planning Services Director Morris (virtual), Senior Planner Statler, Assistant City Attorney Lindsay (virtual), Network Engineer Chris Johnston, Digital Media Coordinator Rose

OTHERS PRESENT VIRTUAL: Jim Veal, Morgan Spear, Brenda McCastle, Damian Schrey, George Williams, Kelly Wieczorek, Tom Akin

CALL TO ORDER / QUORUM PRESENT

Vice Chairperson Crawford called the Architectural Review Board (ARB) meeting to order at 2:09 p.m. with a quorum present and explained the procedures of the virtual Board meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Board Member Mead made a motion to approve the July 16, 2020 minutes, seconded by Board Member Fogarty, and it carried unanimously.

OPEN FORUM - None

NEW BUSINESS

Item 1

820 E. La Rua Street

OEHPD

New Accessory Structure

OEHC-1

Action taken: Approved with abbreviated review.

Jim Veal is requesting approval to construct a new accessory structure in place of a recently approved garage. The original design was finalized and approved by the Board in December 2019.

Mr. Veal presented to the Board and stated the previously approved garage included an automobile turntable for the convenience of the owners, but the owners decided the garage was too bulky and took up too much of the rear yard. Basically, this would now be a carport with storage, and the materials remained the same. Because of the proximity of the property line, the north wall would have 1 hr.-rated construction because of the difficulty in maintaining the north wall, and he wanted to use Hardi lapsiding for this wall. Vice Chairperson Crawford indicated this was an approved approach to the carport design and more in keeping with the scale of Old East Hill. Mr. Veal explained the larger than normal overhang was to allow the 3 point or 4 point turnaround. Board Member Mead did not have a problem with the scale of the columns, but asked if there was a way to reduce the façade of the gable and keep the overall configuration of the house. He asked if the column level could be raised and raise the height of the fascia while keeping the ridge height the same, it would effectively reduce the facade and accomplish the same purpose and visually be less out of scale with the columns. He provided a rudimentary sketch illustrating the changes. Board Member Fogarty agreed that it felt awkward, and asked if there was any way it could be extended to have three support columns. Mr. Veal suggested raising the ceiling of the carport and leaving the soffit and fascia which would accomplish what was suggested; he presented a drawing with his suggestions. Board Member Villegas added that the airflow vent on the primary structure was round at the front, and the gable vent should also be round to match.

Board Member Mead made a motion to approve as presented with modification of the front façade and treatment of the soffit, raising the roof as depicted, be submitted through an abbreviated review, with the addition of the round versus the rectangular gable vent; the motion was seconded by Board Member Villegas, and it carried unanimously.

Item 2

615 E. Belmont Street

OEHPD

Contributing Structure

OEHR-2

Action taken: Denied without prejudice.

Ms. Spear is requesting approval for modifications and additions to a contributing structure. Ms. Spear addressed the Board and stated the sidewalk to the home measured 28' and the proposed driveway would be 20' in depth, and they thought this was sufficient. She also stated they had issues with the on-street parking because of the commercial businesses on Wright Street. She indicated a 30" porch would be agreeable; she was open to suggestions for the columns.

Vice Chairperson Crawford stated at the 30" porch height, no railing was required; the style of the porch columns was common on beach houses and more modern structures. OEH illustrations show a top and bottom rail which are more parallel to the ground. Ms. Spear stated she was concerned for privacy on the porch as well as safety, but was open to anything to allow her to protect those issues. Board Member Mead addressed the brick steps and suggested if they were using brick, to extend the line of the stair to both columns and extend the walkway to the same width. Vice Chairperson Crawford suggested ripping the steps out and making it clean. Board Member Mead explained that new footers would be set for the railings without getting them involved with the brick. Board Member Villegas asked about the brick pavers, and the walkway was determined to be full brick. She agreed

with the 30" railing and spindle work.

Board Member Mead stated the outbuilding was keeping with the main structure, and it was determined to be in the actual yard. After the tree removal, the shed would be pulled forward and still retain a full 20' driveway. Board Member Mead was concerned with the amount of concrete for the driveway and echoed the OEH comments. Ms. Spear stated they originally planned to construct a ribbon drive. Board Member Mead indicated he would not have a problem with a dual ribbon drive. Vice Chairperson Crawford explained the prevalent character in OEH is a single ribbon drive, and permeable pavers are not historically appropriate, and the ribbon drive or brick pavers would be more suitable. Ms. Spear stated the ribbon driveway was her original idea, and they could push the shed back if needed. They liked the idea of enclosing the front yard with the picket fence; Vice Chairperson Crawford advised the fencing detail would need to be provided. Board Member Salter stated if the applicant placed the railing around the front porch, and that railing is painted white, the railing on the house should be painted to match. The materials for the shed would not be appropriate since it would be highly visible from the street; it should match the siding of the house. Ms. Spear confirmed the shed would match the materials of the house. Board Member Salter asked if there would be any brick around the porch area, and Ms. Spear indicated the concrete was cracked, but they did not intend to infill with brick.

Board Member Salter emphasized there were no specifics on the fencing, and there needed to be more conversation on the driveway. He asked if there was enough for submittal to be approved. Board Member Villegas agreed the proposal needed to return with the full explanation and illustration of what would be constructed. It was determined the shed was being built and not pre-fabricated; it was also noted that the gable vents needed to match the primary structure. Ms. Spear explained the fencing was flat-top wood, but the picket fence detail was not a part of this package.

Board Member Villegas made a motion to deny without prejudice, and the applicant could return and address the specifics of this project; Board Member Salter, seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously. Vice Chairperson Crawford indicated the major points had been resolved, but the Board needed visual material to memorialize this as a part of the record.

**Item 3
Contributing Structure**

412 W. Gonzales St

**NHPD
PR-1AAA**

Action taken: Approved with abbreviated review (Crawford).

Brenda McCastle is requesting approval to rebuild a front porch and carport. Exterior work to both began as minor repairs and unexpectedly resulted in the removal of the structures. An Abbreviated Review to rebuild the porch and carport was referred to the full board since the scope of work exceeded minor repairs, and structural plans for the reconstruction were requested.

Ms. McCastle presented to the Board. Vice Chairperson Crawford asked Advisor Pristera his opinion if the porch was an add-on or an original component. Advisor Pristera believed it was original, it fit the character of the house, and he would like to see it remain. Board Member Salter noted that in the original photographs, the porch had very little slope to it. Vice Chairperson Crawford noted the porch looked appropriate at the front, and they were

matching the original columns; the new slope might be correcting a problem. Board Member Villegas explained it seemed like the original roof was minimal, but the proposed roof was probably resolving an issue. If they could maintain the original visual, she would not have a problem with it. Advisor Pristera stated when it was originally built, the roof was shallow, they probably had water issues, and this would be a compromise in addressing the water issues as long as it looks fairly similar to the original house. The drawings did not show the double columns. Board Member Villegas thought the renderings needed to be accurate since the sketches do not have double columns. Vice Chairperson Crawford suggested the side elevation show more of the house to the right and show the columns accurately with the eave detail. Board Member Mead was disturbed to see the porch come down, but thought as long as the overall visual dominance of that strong line supported by the double columns is maintained, he was open to the general direction of the proposal. Staff advised that all original columns had been saved, and the intention was to put everything back as close as possible. Board Member Salter explained where the porch tied into the existing gable was really unknown; a specific drawing on how this porch tied into the front gable, showing the columns was necessary. Ms. McCastle explained the particular design was flat and allowed water damage. Staff advised an abbreviated review could be assigned to any member of the Board. Board Member Villegas agreed if the intent was to save the architectural presence in North Hill, and if someone from the Board was verifying that.

Board Member Mead made a motion to approve with the moving forward of the reconstruction with submitted details to show the points of concern regarding connection and how they treat the slope of the roof consistent with returning the visual façade to its original condition with the original materials which do not have to be replaced; that it be submitted for an abbreviated review performed by Vice Chairperson Crawford; if it varies significantly from that or otherwise affects its ability to return to its original condition, it be resubmitted for further review after the abbreviated review. Vice Chairperson Crawford amended the motion to include the detail on the porch ceiling and other materials. It was accepted. Board Member Salter amended the motion to ask that the revised drawings be true to scale. It was accepted. The motion was seconded by Board Member Villegas, and it carried unanimously.

**Item 4
New Construction**

407 E. Intendencia St

**PHD / HR-1
Wood Cottages**

Action taken: Approved with abbreviated review.

Damian Schrey, Highpointe DBR, LLC, is seeking final approval for the construction of a new single family residence and a detached garage with an accessory residential dwelling on the second level. This project received conceptual approval in August 2017 and a Variance to increase the maximum allowable height from 15 feet to 26 feet for an accessory residential dwelling located 3 feet from the property line was also granted.

Mr. Schrey addressed the Board. Staff advised the variance was approved with the understanding that the two heritage trees in the rear would be saved. Board Member Mead addressed middle banding; the cantilevered balcony on the rear and the dimension of the header beam on the porch on the front, and if something closer to that dimension was

incorporated underneath the water table, it would present a better definition to that line with a more consistent visual. Also, the roof for the cantilevered porch looked dangling; Mr. Schrey advised he could add brackets to the roof itself. Board Member Salter asked about the shutters, and they were determined to be operable and appropriately sized. He advised the fixture which makes this a modern style was the two or three horizontal windows in the bathroom spaces – was it possible to make them more square or reduce the one for the bathroom. Mr. Schrey advised they could enlarge those windows if necessary. Board Member Mead pointed out the other element that gives the appearance of a modern structure was where the window sits in terms of the wall – the windows are too far out and need to be recessed. Mr. Schrey stated the face of the sash is usually relatively near the face of the trim. The aluminum clad version of Jeld-Wen are more recessed. He advised they could look at methods of installation for recessed windows. Board Member Mead presented a visual example for consideration. Vice Chairperson Crawford indicated a wood fence would be more appropriate for this style; the metal fence would be appropriate for the pool. Board Member Villegas pointed out the fencing should not be staggered and should mimic the railing on the porch. Mr. Schrey suggested it could be a struck-through knuckled fence.

Board Member Mead made a motion to approve for submission of an abbreviated review with details to show a more dimension mid-body band consistent with the depth of the cantilevered beam and beam header on the front and rear porch balconies respectively; that the comments which were agreeable to the applicant regarding the proportion and shape of the windows be addressed in those details; that the roof projection over the cantilever be either supported by brackets or carry the columns on the cantilevered portion up to the roof at the applicant’s option; that the details on the fence be submitted in detail to show the knuckle pattern consistent with the reverse pattern on the balconies on the house with struck-through by pickets in a pattern to be approved in the abbreviated review. Board Member Salter amended the motion for the front elevation porch height at a minimum of 24” which was accepted. Board Member Villegas seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.

Item 5

33 W. Garden Street

PHBD / C-2A

Demolition

Action taken: Approved.

George Williams is requesting approval for the demolition of an existing bank drive-thru and associated structures. In its place, the applicant is proposing to construct a new two-story bank building.

Mr. Williams presented to the Board and stated Beach Bank is a tenant in this building. The tenant and the landlord have opted to have the bank relocate, and the bank has opted to eliminate the drive-thru teller service at the new location. It was a 3-lane drive-thru on the corner, which created a traffic problem; the plan was to remove the 3-lane drive-thru and the roof associated with it. (The Board then moved to Item 6.)

Board Member Mead made a motion to approve the demolition, seconded by Board Member Villegas, and the motion carried unanimously.

Item 6

33 W. Garden Street

PHBD / C-2A

New Construction

Action taken: Approved with abbreviated review.

George Williams is seeking final approval for a new two-story bank building which will replace the existing drive-thru. The proposed building will have a brick façade with a brick corbel accent along sections of the building. The windows and store fronts are proposed to be aluminum-clad and both brick arches and accents will be used for window headers. A canopy will also be installed on the building's rear along with improvements to the hardscape and landscape.

Ms. Wieczorek presented to the Board and stated that the Board had asked in the previous submittal that an entry be provided on Garden Street. With reduction to costs, the floorplan was reduced. The original building was a 3-story warehouse. They wanted to be consistent but added several changes to tie into the contemporary buildings to the west. They were proposing the more traditional red brick and the modern monolithic gray brick. They were using an aluminum storefront system and had incorporated an applied muntin product for the warehouse aesthetic. She pointed out this was the bookend to the block, and they were limited to two stories. The parapets conceal the roof-mounted equipment. They would use a gray-tint glass for the windows. Vice Chairperson Crawford asked if the 4' parapet would screen all the equipment, and Ms. Wieczorek advised they were looking at site plans for all the equipment, and it would be a package rooftop system.

Board Member Salter addressed the south elevation where it appeared historic, but the first floor entry door seemed to lack brick detail. Ms. Wieczorek agreed they could probably add the brick. Board Member Salter pointed out that smooth brick that is mortar matched actually de-emphasizes the brick and reads more as stucco. Vice Chairperson Crawford agreed in matching the color, you lose the human scale. Board Member Mead agreed matching the mortar reads as a stack of units as opposed to a surface. Board Member Villegas liked the contrast but was concerned with the trim on the windows of the red brick and thought it might be softened; Ms. Wieczorek stated it would be the same color as the mortar. Regarding the canopy, Ms. Kelley stated it would be covering the ATM only; Board Member Mead agreed that the projection should be brought back closer to the building. It was determined there was no landscaping on Baylen since the building is pulled up to the property line.

Ms. Wieczorek advised the signage would be on the west side and south side of the building. A plaque would be placed on the north side. Board Member Mead addressed the windows on the ground floor in the warehouse portion and suggested they carry down the metal treatment as though that's complete infill rather than have the masonry component.. Board Member Fogarty had no problem with the color of the brick and mortar on the modern portions, but thought it might be interesting to have the mortar a couple of shades darker.

Board Member Salter made a motion to approve, excluding signage and lighting; an abbreviated review on modifications to the south elevation which includes adjustments as discussed to the back awning as well as detailing around the door openings to include more historic type detailing; the final brick and mortar color; landscape plan and the infill detail below the ground floor windows of the historic section. Vice Chairperson Crawford amended the motion to include an abbreviated

review for the real size of rooftop mechanical equipment to be indicated on a drawing. It was accepted. It was determined the Board had enough information to move forward on the foundation. Board Member Villegas amended the motion to address the upper windows on the historic section, and it was accepted. The motion was seconded by Board Member Mead and carried unanimously.

Item 7

121 S. Palafox St

PHBD / C-2A

Contributing Structure

Action taken: Approved three signs.

Tom Akin is requesting approval for approximately 65.84 square feet of exterior vinyl widow signage. Based on the business' street frontage, the applicant is allowed a combination of wall signage of no more than 83 square feet (10% of the street front elevation). Although window stickers are considered a type of permanent accessory sign, the applicant was not aware that ARB review was required for this type of sign. Since the existing windows are heavily tinted, the applicant is also unable to relocate the signs to the interior of the windows which would not require ARB review. An abbreviated review for this item was referred to the full board in July 2020 for a discussion on the appropriateness of the proposed signage and for a general discussion on vinyl window signage along Palafox Street.

Board Member Mead informed the Board he had an appointment at 5:50 pm and stated he had no objection to the applications pending.

Mr. Akin addressed the Board and apologized for not obtaining a permit. Board Member Mead advised as far as the use of vinyl signs, he didn't have a problem with them especially in the Historical Business District because historically, painted and artistically appropriate signage on windows was historically known and had typically been done in a pleasing and representative fashion for the businesses and endured for periods of time before they were either refurbished, replaced or changed entirely. He understood not placing them inside because of the nature of reflective film and the temperature on the inside. He felt the purview of the Board should address the overall design of the signage in terms of its treatment with regard to the present façade and the surrounding businesses, and the arrangement and application of the proposed signage on the windows. He liked what was being done with the entry surround and the door appliques, which were in keeping with traditional uses of paint on glass commercial signage. Even though the façade was not back where we would want it, the other three applications were not in keeping with that since they were applied somewhat haphazardly. In the lower tier window, they needed to be higher and in the upper tiers and arranged in a more pleasing composition as the signs around the door; the three facing Palafox needed to be reviewed for right scale, composition and if the overall impact was correct for the district. He had no problem in approving the door; the lettering on the two sides should be brought to scale and adjusted. Vice Chairperson Crawford confirmed 10% of street frontage could be signage, but this was a very unusual building; the armed sign came through an abbreviated review and was accepted. He agreed there was a haphazard nature to the signage and did not know of any other location on Palafox which had the entire storefront system as its sign. Staff confirmed for attached wall signage, it could be a combination up to the 10% of the storefront.

Board Member Villegas liked the style of the entryway but had a problem with the hours of

operation being on the side and not on the front door which seemed to be an advertisement for Happy Hour; this was not appropriate for Palafox and took away from the business. Staff stated when these types of applications come through an abbreviated review for allowed types of signage for the building, they ask does it fit in with the size requirements, and does it fit in with the overall character of the district. The intent of the signage was not really addressed but addressed in the overall character of the surrounding area. The way the Ordinance is written, 10% of the street front façade up to 200 sq. ft. It is applied according to 10% of individual storefronts which does not push the overall signage of the building over 200 sq. ft. Board Member Mead explained the Board should be reviewing the color or configuration of the signage in relation to the overall façade. He felt it was appropriate to have a single white lettering and imagery on a building of such a plain façade; anything other than that would be fighting with the façade. Board Member Fogarty stated the entryway was too cluttered, and she was confused on the business name itself. She suggested simplifying the signage; the 5 Barrel signage could be scaled down, and she felt the overall signage should be simplified. Mr. Akin noted the points were valid and appreciated any input the Board could offer.

Board Member Salter advised he received the abbreviated review and walked down Palafox and noted quite a few businesses with vinyl signage on the windows. When they worked, it seemed they were focused on the name or the graphic image near the logo of the business – less wordage or function and more graphics. He pointed out the Taproom and hours of operation and happy hour were more function, and those hours could change. The more graphic oriented for the business logo would be more appropriate signage. Staff confirmed the majority of the vinyl window signage on Palafox had not been approved; they were easy to install and remove, and we don't have the staff to regulate all the signage on Palafox. When they did come for abbreviated review, it was because someone complained or called in a 311 issue on a specific area or specific building; the result of the investigation is usually to place the vinyl stickers on the inside; in this situation, the tinted windows prevented that. He did state that he appreciated the applicant's willingness to come before the Board, and he had been great to work with.

Board Member Salter made a motion to approve the signage of the barrel and the 5 above the door that is graphically or logo-oriented; the 5B design on the doors that is graphically-oriented in type, and approve the style of the 5 barrel brewery taproom logo on Palafox Street because of its graphic representation of the business name; not approve the brewery happy hour, the brewery hours or the large brewery or taproom signage located on either side of the door. The motion was seconded by Board Member Villegas and carried unanimously. Staff advised when these items come before the Board, they generally waive any type of Code Enforcement fees, but it was up to the Board on when the signage needed to be removed; it was decided that the Board would work with the applicant.

Item 8

205 E. Zaragoza St

PHD / HC-1

Non-Contributing Structure

Action taken: Approved with comments.

Ross Pristera, UWF Historic Trust, is requesting approval to repair the south porch on the Tivoli High House replica. The scope of work will include board-for-board replacement of

the wood railings, trim and second floor decking and the replacement of the ground floor wood decking with Aeratis. The south elevation will also be repainted with the existing paint palette.

Advisor Pristera addressed the Board and stated the Board had approved the Aeratis product for North Hill. He stated the tongue and groove matched other decks. Vice Chairperson Crawford explained the design expands and contracts, but this product might be better than similar products, but there had been problems with them wanting to pop up which was tied to the fact they were tongue and groove. Advisor Pristera noted the problems since it would be south facing. Board Member Salter explained this was a replica with the intent to represent what was there, not just in look but in construction. This building represented what it would have looked like historically in Pensacola. He didn't think it was right to change materials which defeated the intent of the building. Board Member Fogarty agreed because the purpose was to replicate, and this material did not do that as well as the real thing. Board Member Villegas agreed that precedence comes into play even though it was the south side of the building since those small allowances add up. Whereas the Historic Trust is as responsible as one can be, that was not the fight we normally have, and she could not agree with this. Advisor Pristera stated they would probably have to reconsider anyway since the budget for this project was cut and asked if they went back with wood, could a lighter natural wood color be approved. Board Member Villegas felt going back with a natural color was more in line with what was there. Advisor Pristera stated they used wood and allowed it to grey out naturally. Board Member Salter agreed and did not feel dark grey paint was a necessary aspect of the historic nature. Advisor Pristera stated they would lean toward the wood they have used and could submit the details for an abbreviated review. Staff advised this would be submitted for a full Board review or the Board could make a motion to send this to an abbreviated review. Vice Chairperson Crawford explained because it would be not be board-for-board, it would be replacing a non-tongue and groove system with a tongue and groove system, and the Board would want to see those details and should be presented to the full Board. Staff advised that full replacement would trigger a full Board review.

Board Member Salter made a motion to approve the wood railing trim and second floor replacement with board-for-board material as well as repaint of the existing paint palette, and non-approval of the Aeratis decking for the first floor. The motion was seconded by Board Member Villegas and carried unanimously.

DISCUSSION: Historic Preservation Planner Harding advised that in October, Chairperson Quina's appointment was up for nomination as well as Board Member Hatler-Campbell's. Vice Chairperson Crawford suggested names for nomination be submitted to staff for consideration. Applications would be submitted to Council; the chairperson must be a registered architect and be a resident of the city. Ms. Hatler-Campbell's position would be a property owner or business owner in the Palafox Historic Business District or the Governmental Center District. Staff explained there was a lot of opportunity to begin involving the DIB in this process. The deadline was noted as August 24, 2020.

ADJOURNMENT – With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:38 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "G. Harding". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a prominent initial "G" and a long, sweeping tail.

Historic Preservation Planner Harding
Secretary to the Board