



MINUTES OF THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

January 21, 2021

MEMBERS PRESENT: Vice Chairperson Mead, Board Member Fogarty, Board Member Ramos, Board Member Spencer, Board Member Villegas, Board Member Yee

MEMBERS ABSENT: Chairperson Salter

STAFF PRESENT: Historic Preservation Planner Harding, Senior Planner Statler, Board Advisor Pristera, Network Engineer Johnston

STAFF VIRTUAL: Planning Director Morris, Assistant City Attorney Lindsay

OTHERS VIRTUAL: Blair LeJeune, Gregory Pierce, Greyson Roberts, Jase Graves, Michael Crawford, Scott Holland, William Brantley, Philip Partington, Richard Sherrill, Dan Girardin, Kevin and Lina Stephens, Lisee Sherrill, John Tucker, Michelle Burch, Dieter Borrell, Chris Sheppard

CALL TO ORDER / QUORUM PRESENT

Vice Chairperson Mead called the meeting to order at 2:01 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Board Member Fogarty made a motion to approve the December 17, 2020 minutes, seconded by Board Member Yee, and it carried unanimously.

OPEN FORUM - None

NEW BUSINESS

Item 1

585 E. Romana

PHD

Noncontributing Structure

Street

HR-2

Action taken: Approved.

Construction of New In-Ground Pool at Non-Contributing Structure

Chris Sheppard (Cox Pools of the Southeast) is requesting approval for a new in-ground swimming pool and Travertine at a noncontributing property. The proposed 20'x10' pool will be located in an existing paved area between the primary structure and accessory garage. Approval was given by the Aragon Architectural Review Board. Mr. Sheppard presented to

the Board and stated the pool was approximately 1.5' out of the ground, and they were following all the rules of the HOA. Board Member Ramos asked about the pool equipment, and Mr. Sheppard explained it would not be visible.

Board Member Fogarty made a motion to approve as submitted, seconded by Board Member Yee, and it carried unanimously.

Item 2

400 Bayfront Parkway

**PHD
HC-1**

**Noncontributing Structure-
New Construction**

Action taken: Approved with abbreviated review.

Mallory Studer is requesting approval for exterior renovations and the additions of accessory structures. The scope of work includes landscape and hardscape changes, the addition of event spaces in the front and rear, as well as associated accessory structures such as a bathroom facility and pavilion.

Mr. LeJuene presented to the Board and stated they were being mindful of what the house was originally and were building on the present foundation, tying two parcels into one. He advised the existing accessory structure was rotting, and they were working that into an ADA functional bathroom. He also explained they would be removing some ancillary trees but would follow the appropriate guidelines. He stated they would create a more formalized entrance along Alcaniz using permeable pavers and an underground storage tank for stormwater mitigation. He provided illustrations of the event/performance pavilion and the reimaging entrance for the hotel. Mr. Pierce advised steps to the entrance would be curved out, and the railing would match the existing railing, with a newel post at the end. They were within the allowed square footage for signage. In keeping with the neighborhood aesthetic, the open-air event pavilion would have storage for tables and chairs, with details which were derivative of the street frontage on Zarragossa.

Board Member Spencer needed clarification on Alcaniz, and it was noted the steps were existing. He also explained in Florida, the ADA bathrooms require lavatories in the ADA stalls, which would require the bathroom configuration to be larger. Staff clarified the applicants had been advised of a footprint redesign which might return through an abbreviated review. Board Member Ramos asked about the pavilion street frontage on Zarragossa, and it was determined the knee wall was just on the Zarragossa side, and the building itself was not raised; a planted hedge would screen the bottom portion. Mr. LeJuene explained they were trying to respect what exists on Zarragossa. Advisor Pristera asked about the brackets and turned elements on the porch. Mr. Pierce advised the intent was to make it look like the houses on Zarragossa with a raised porch and a brick foundation making the columns on that side shorter. At the Garden entrance, the columns were substantially longer, and they added the spandrel and brackets so it would not appear spindly.

Board Member Spencer asked about the brick base on Zarragossa which looked more like a raised slab as opposed to a pier foundation. He explained there was a way to create the look of piers with brick veneer under the columns. Vice Chairperson Mead pointed out the enclosed portion adjoining the pavilion on the west side looked out of joint since it was not following the sketch of the proposed pier footings, and there was a disconnect with the rooflines. This could be revised to raise the level of the enclosed structure to that of the roofline, bringing up the base consistent with the pavilion. Board Member Yee stated regarding the brick base it might not be required given the 4' hedge. Chairperson Mead advised he was always concerned with

substituting landscaping for arched features since landscaping would not be permanent. Board Member Villegas asked about emergency vehicles, and Mr. LeJuene advised the driveway had been relocated to the east side adjacent to an existing drive. It was determined they were not adding any corbels or other elements to the main structure, but they would need to infill two additional panels from the current railing configuration since the stairs were 16' at the top and 8' at the bottom.

With no other comments, Board Member Spencer made a motion to approve with modifications as suggested by the Board in an abbreviated review. Board Member Villegas seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.

Item 3

314 S. Alcaniz Street

PHD

New Construction

HC-1 / Wood Cottages

Action taken: Approved.

Scott Holland is seeking *final* approval for a new two-story, single-family residence. The demolition of the existing noncontributing structure was approved in December 2019, and a conceptual review for the new construction was approved by the Board in May 2020.

Mr. Holland presented to the Board and stated it would be a single-family residence of 2,000 sq. ft. for him and his wife. The upstairs would be the main living space. Since the Board had new members, staff provided the previous minutes for the conceptual review. Vice Chairperson Mead addressed the corrugated roof panel, and Mr. Holland stated those were aluminum brackets which were powder coated, and he was proposing heavy-timber wood brackets, but the panels would not be visible from below. He also stated he intended to use sod for the driveway but had not discussed this with the landscaper. Board Member Spencer felt this would be a great addition to help frame the historic Seville Square.

Board Member Spencer made a motion for final approval, seconded by Board Member Fogarty, and it carried unanimously.

Item 4

1380 N. Spring Street

NHPD

Demolition

PR-1AAA

Action taken: Approved.

Philip Partington is requesting approval to demolish a noncontributing accessory structure located in the northeast corner of their lot. In its place, the applicants are proposing to construct an accessory dwelling unit (ADU) with a garage on the ground floor and living space on the second. Staff advised that typically when the Board approved a demolition, it requested to see what would be constructed in its place. Once the demolition was approved, the Board could consider the design aspects. It was clarified that the house itself was a contributing structure. Staff then read the applicable demolition requirements for structures in Sec. 12-2-10(A)(10). Advisor Pristera stated he did not find anything significant about the structure.

Mr. Partington presented to the Board and explained the Sherrills had done a fantastic job in renovating the cottage in the Dutch Colonial style. He informed the Board that the existing shed had wood rot, and Hurricane Sally had not done it any favors, and they wanted to build a new accessory building with a residential unit above it in its place. Vice Chairperson Mead stated final plans must be approved prior to demolition of a contributing structure. Staff advised the demolition could be approved, but no permit could be obtained until the applicant got at the very minimum a conceptual approval with firm foundations approved by the Board. Mr. Partington shared the site plan and pointed out the beautiful garden at the south end of

the property, but the clients needed a small garage with a residential unit above it. They tried to be sensitive to the existing structure and adapted the architectural language to this addition with features matching the house. Vice Chairperson Mead stated North Hill's comments addressed the placement and turning radius for the garage entrance. It seemed convoluted to get in and out of the garage especially when backing out of the driveway which might risk impact to the contributing structure. Mr. Partington stated it was not a suburban-type garage and would take a couple of turns to access the garage, which was not uncommon in an historical or urban setting. North Hill suggested shifting the garage to the south, placing the entrance on the north side to make that turn. Mr. Partington stated that was an option, but it would encroach on the historic garden. Vice Chairperson Mead asked if they could flip the entrance to the garage to shorten up that area which could give more space for a turning radius and still place the entrance on the north side, keeping the porch on the south side.

Board Member Yee asked for the required setbacks for the garage and the accessory unit. Staff determined in North Hill you could not have a two-story residential structure unless that residential space is situated above a garage. When you get to the height level which would require two floors, the ADU would then have to meet the side yard setback of the primary structure. In this case, the side yard setback was 9' and typically in this district, it was 5' or 7.5'. On the rear, it could be situated 5' off the property line of the dwelling. Senior Planner Statler explained if you have a detached garage with an ADU above it, then the maximum height is 30' and you are subject to the rear yard at 5' and a side yard setback the same as the primary. Staff advised that accessory structures were different in nature from an ADU and specifically different in the Code.

Chairperson Mead did not have a problem with considering the demolition permit. It was determined the applicant could ask for conceptual approval while seeking a variance. Board Member Villegas stated style wise, the structure was complementary to the house, but size wise it was important to understand visually from the street how it was affecting the contributing structure. Advisor Pristera cautioned against the variance since this lot was large and had a lot of buildable area; we would be looking at a self-imposed hardship in this case, and you would have to make a strong case of why the structure would have to be placed in that location.

Board Member Ramos made a motion to approve the demolition of the noncontributing accessory structure, seconded by Board Member Villegas, and it carried 5 to 1 with Board Member Spencer recusing himself from the item.

Item 5

1380 N. Spring Street

NHPD

New Construction

PR-1AAA

Action taken: Denied.

Mr. Partington wanted to give as much flexibility to move forward with the final approval.

Board Member Ramos made a motion to deny the application based on the comments provided by the North Hill Preservation Association with which the Board agreed pursuant to Section 12-3-10(2)(D)(2)(ii)(b) which states in the case of a proposed new building, that such building will not in itself or by reason of its location on the site impair the architectural or historic value of the buildings on adjacent sides or in the immediate vicinity. No plans for a new building will be approved if that building will be injurious to the general or visual character of the district in which it is to be located considering visual compatibility standards such as height, proportion, shape, scale, style, materials, and colors. Vice Chairperson Mead seconded the motion with the amendment that the objections from

North Hill are specifically that the proximity and location of the entrance to the garage do not provide for adequate turning radius or backup area and place the contributing structure at risk. It was accepted by Board Member Ramos and he added that if the application did return to the Board, the Board would need to see the relationship of the proposed accessory structure to the existing structure, mass, and height to help with a better decision. The motion was seconded as amended and carried 5 to 1 with Board Member Spencer recusing.

Item 6

10 and 14 S. Palafox PI

PHBD

Contributing Buildings

C-2A

Action taken: Conceptual Approval Denied.

George Biggs is requesting approval to add an access stairway to connect two contributing buildings. Staff advised the Inspections Department had reviewed the plans and were satisfied, and this item was for *conceptual review* in order to give the contractor confidence to obtain engineering drawings for final review.

George Biggs presented to the Board and stated Mr. Sharruf owned both buildings but had recently purchased 10 S. Palafox and wanted to use his elevator between the office and the future residence. The connection would be approximately 5' long and 6' wide and would match the existing balcony and rails in materials and color.

Board Member Spencer advised he had been in contact with someone involved in the application prior to the meeting. He explained the Board was being asked to give conceptual approval for more of a convenient transportation link, but he felt he could support it conceptually, but the Board would be looking at the detail in the final review. Board Member Villegas explained she would not approve it conceptually as presented and felt it was correct to return with the correct drawings which would indicate the technical aspects, safety measures with the materials more clearly described. Staff advised the Board as a reviewing body was reviewing the design and not the use which should be defined in the motion. Board Member Villegas indicated proper drawings from an architect would be necessary to approve conceptually, and there was not enough information to make that determination. Board Member Ramos explained these were two contributing structures, but the application was only showing use with no design to conceptually approve; the cut sheet for the door was not architecturally congruent with the style of the contributing structure. Vice Chairperson Mead asked should two contributing structures of different character be connected. Advisor Pristera indicated if this were on the front of the building, he would be opposed to it, however, the rear of the buildings has changed over time; the portion the elevator was connecting to was not there before, the balcony portion had been redone a number of times, and this would be a utility feature in the rear. He pointed out none of this was meant to be seen, and he saw the applicant asking for permission to bridge the gap between the two structures and then go forward with the design. Vice Chairperson Mead asked if there was some guidance from the Secretary of Interior, and Advisor Pristera stated that might be better considered when the item returned. Board Member Spencer indicated he was supportive of the concept and appreciated staff consulting the building officials to ensure this discussion was valid. He also felt it was relevant to recite that the back area of those buildings has been a service alley and has become more of a service alley as the buildings have adapted to new occupancies, many of them restaurants requiring exhaust fans; he had been impressed by the owner's renovation and adaptive reuse of a historic building which was crumbling. He supported the effort but

needed more details to make an informed decision.

If the buildings came under different ownership, Vice Chairperson Mead felt the Board needed to look at the design elements with that in mind. Staff clarified that if this Board approved the conceptual review, that would tell the applicant the basics of the design were enough for him to provide additional detail; the applicant was feeling the waters to see if it was worth his time to compile those details for a final review.

Vice Chairperson Meade made a motion to deny the conceptual approval as not having adequate descriptions for understanding of the design and approach with regard to these questions based on the comments made. Board Member Villegas seconded the motion. Advisor Pristera saw it as the applicant asking permission to bridge the gap; could the applicant resubmit with another plan or the Board was not good with them bridging that gap. Mr. Biggs explained they were feeling the waters to see if this concept or bringing these two balconies together was plausible with the ARB. Vice Chairperson Mead stressed the sense of the permanence of the connection between the two structures which were structurally and historically independent was of concern; he asked if it could be done in a way that would not create the permanence while providing the utilitarian requirements of use which could be modified to give them this distinction and separation; he felt there were methods to accomplish this.

Board Member Ramos agreed and felt the applicant was asking for conceptual review but felt the goal of the Board was to review what was presented and provide an opinion of whether or not it was a benefit to the historical property or would take away from it. He felt comfortable with approving conceptually and giving the applicant the homework to bring back much more detail that was architecturally appropriate for the properties modified. Board Member Villegas offered it was really in the details, and there could have been more suggestions to show the project path. Board Member Spencer indicated the applicant had spent \$250.00 to test the waters, and if he were the applicant, he would feel the Board generally could be supportive with more information, and he advised them to submit for final approval regardless of the vote. He also felt the Board deserved more finite information with a conceptual submittal. **The vote to deny then carried 5 to 1 with Board Member Fogarty dissenting (Section 12-3-27)(E)(1) Submission of Plans).**

Item 7

617 Crown Cove

PHD / SSD

Variance

WOOD COTTAGES

Action taken: Approved.

Dan Girardin is seeking a Variance to reduce the maximum west side yard setback from three (3) feet to one (1) foot, nine (9) inches to accommodate a new three-story single-family residence. Staff explained the variance would be considered first and then the conceptual design would follow. The Board would be acting in a quasi-judicial manner. It was determined this was a variance to the west side yard setback only; the design materials could not be considered in the variance review. Assistant City Attorney Lindsay explained the Board was only to make a decision on what was presented at this hearing; information received before this hearing should be disclosed so the applicant could give a rebuttal. The Board should focus on being fair to the applicant so there was transparency on why the Board made their decision. Once all the evidence was presented, the Board members could debate among themselves on whether the evidence supported the variance being granted. The Board should state what criteria was either met or not met when giving its decision; this decision could be

challenged and presented to Council within 15 days for consideration.

Vice Chairperson Mead indicated quasi-judicial proceedings had been overturned when there was a lack of sworn testimony on points which controlled the outcome and preferred swearing in for the quasi-judicial process but left it up to the applicant in how to proceed. Assistant City Attorney Lindsay advised if it were not feasible for someone to be sworn in, concerns could be placed in the record, i.e., questions concerning the documents, taking testimony on someone's word.

Brian Spencer presented to the Board and stating the applicant was also participating. Staff advised there were no public comments concerning this item. It was also noted that the next step for an appeal would be through Council. Historic Preservation Planner Harding explained a Site Specific Development (SSD) is a development that was created and approved by Council prior to 1990; SSDs house developments that were not conforming to the surrounding districts. This application would be a specific development with specific land design standards not compatible and not contiguous with the surrounding district. This specific SSD is Crown Cove and with SSDs, the requirements are more restrictive than the surround district, but this was not the case with Crown Cove which was created in the 1980s. In the materials provided, there were suggestions to what the development might be – not requirements. He pointed out with SSDs within the ARB district, staff did not want to overrule the Board. For transparency, if ARB denied this request, the applicant could apply for an amendment to the SSD itself or appeal to Council. If the ARB was uncomfortable in approving this variance but was comfortable with senior staff making that decision, the variance could be approved subject to senior staff approval.

Mr. Spencer thanked the staff for its investigative efforts and clarified that the requested variance of 15" was the length of the stairwell element of the project 13' 6" in length. He pointed out prior to Hurricane Sally, this structure was underway, and the owners made a decision to change construction type to ICF which created a much thicker wall assembly. The variance requested was consistent with the existing structures or residences in the subdivision that protrude into the setback. They felt the variances requested were enjoyed by other property owners in the same subdivision with similar protrusions into the setback area. In this particular case, the applicant had chosen to fund a more expensive construction type to withstand increased storm activity.

Board Member Mead asked what in the design was driving the need for a variance. It was determined there were maximum dimensions for tread/risers which were suitable and safe for ascending from floor to floor, and they were at the tip of what was acceptable for tread and riser dimension. Carrying it up the second and third floors created pinch points as far as clearance for circulation. He explained this home was designed for long-term and potential ADA compliance for wheelchairs.

Board Member Ramos addressed the basement plan and a reduction on the east side. Staff explained the way the Code classified yards was unobstructed space from the ground up, and the subsurface basement area was not included as part of the measurement. (Board Member Mead left the meeting at this time and Board Member Fogarty assume the Vice Chair function.) Staff furnished letters of support from the Crown Cove HOA for the project. Staff also offered this SSD was meant to be flexible in its design.

Mr. Stephens, the homeowner, explained they were subjected to Hurricane Sally similar to their other neighbors. They then considered other alternatives to construction more resistant to those weather conditions. He also indicated his mother was in a wheelchair, and the ADA

accommodations were for her. Advisor Pristera advised he had read the variance criteria concerning No.5 and stated they were not asking for an entire wall, but only a small portion; looking at the first floor and basement it seemed to be a major pinch point, and 15" would be a lot to make up; he felt they had minimized the request.

Board Member Villegas made a motion to approve the variance, seconded by Board Member Ramos. He added it was important to have the HOA support and pointing out the encroaching piers on the east side of the property; he further asked that the approval be signed off by senior staff. The amendment was accepted. Staff explained this was an SSD, and it would be different if it were in North Hill or in any other district with specific codes for development. **The motion then carried 4 to 1 with Board Member Spencer recusing.**

Item 8

617 Crown Cove

PHD / SSD

New Construction

WOOD COTTAGES

Action taken: Conceptual Approval.

Dan Girardin is requesting *conceptual* approval for a new three-story single-family residence. The new construction will feature entertaining areas and a pool on the ground floor and living space on the second and third. Additionally, there will be a basement accessed by a car elevator and a rooftop terrace. Revisions to the rooftop floorplans and an alternate east and south elevation were distributed to the Board.

Mr. Spencer stated after listening to guidance from staff, they thought it prudent to seek conceptual approval for any design modifications thought necessary by the Board. Staff advised modern designs were allowed in the historic district as long as they compliment the district. The Board has the power to deviate from the standard, however, with the materials given for Crown Cove, the architecture would reflect a more British style of Gulf-Coast Caribbean with Spanish-American and Victorian elements that blend the project in with the 1890s atmosphere of the Seville Historic District; this allows this architect to borrow elements from these particular styles and incorporate them into their modern designs.

Board Member Villegas thought the layout was wonderful but was not sold on the appearance next to the other structures which took into account the surrounding area. Mr. Spencer noted the whalebone house had generated a lot of dialogue, but he felt there were some things in Crown Cove which had similar proportions, and there was an intentional interpretation and adaptation as opposed to replication. Board Member Villegas pointed out the whalebone house on 9th and that section of Aragon had its own entity, but she felt this structure was different for where it was located. Board Member Ramos appreciated the tropical modern style and did not feel it was inappropriate for the area. He pointed out from the drawings the height appeared to be 47' at the middle of the roof; staff indicated the height of the structures will vary according to each specific building, but it was believed 40' would be the maximum height; in reality, there was no height maximum for this SSD. The surrounding districts had a maximum height of 35' but close to Privateers Alley, adjacent buildings were 55'. Heights in Crown Cove vary from 35' to 42'. Board Member Villegas stated her concern was the surrounding properties were historically relevant, and this was a show piece in the middle. Historic Preservation Planner Harding advised they had previous conversations about this and although it was an SSD, it was still in the Wood Cottages District. The Board has the power to deviate from materials and designs, however, in the Wood Cottages District, structures are required to be more than half wood or a wood-like product. In Crown Cove, the structures are

partially Hardie board and stucco.

Advisor Pristera stated when he first saw the structure, he felt it was too modern for the historic district but adding historic features would look like a mish-match of styles. He explained they did not want to add other styles to the whalebone house either; as a preservationist, he loves pure styles no matter what they are. He felt if they were going modern, it should be pure modern as shown, and its location does not distract from the historic district. Board Member Villegas agreed siding would not look appropriate on this house. Mr. Stephens advised the HOA liked the design. Board Member Fogarty liked the tapered column and other details and thought it was very special. Board Member Yee appreciated the design and felt Hardie did not belong on the structure. He was surprised the Board had approved the "Top of Ninth" or whalebone structure. He did realize that the nature of Bayfront was different, and the type of development that would be going in that area adjacent to 9th Avenue was probably more fitting with this project. He reluctantly supported the project in this location and stated the design was great.

Board Member Ramos made a motion for conceptual approval and felt the Board wanted to keep it pure without the siding, and let it be the jewel it plans to be. The motion was seconded by Board Member Yee. The motion carried 4 to 1 with Board Member Spencer recusing.

Item 9

100 W. Garden Street

PHBD

Contributing Structure

C-2A

Action taken: Discussion only.

Michael Crawford (Caldwell Associates Architects) is presenting the following project for *conceptual review and discussion*. No action from the Board is being requested. The applicant is considering a makeover of the exterior building and the feasibility of applying a masonry stain (not paint) to the existing red brick.

Mr. Crawford thanked Advisor Pristera for the historical information. Mr. Pristera stated there was a three or four-page newspaper ad touting how modern the bank building was and all the special features it had. That stretch of Garden Street had those bank buildings which were the first in the modernization of downtown in the 1960s. Mr. Crawford indicated Adams Homes occupies the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th floors; they are looking to turning the building into 100 W. Garden Street. They plan to leave the 1st floor as future retail mixed use. He asked if the Board would entertain the use of a stain to recolor the brick on the building. This was unpainted original brick and they reached out to a manufacturer, but they wanted the Board's feedback before proceeding to the next level. They were currently looking at Nawkaw stain to change and update the overall street presence of this building; they felt the darker greys would probably be more successful over the red base.

Staff advised that the building was a contributing structure in City records, however, there were several structures listed as contributing that were not and vice versa. Advisor Pristera explained in looking at the 2011 form, it was probably a clerical error; this was a modernistic building which represented this period of style but was not the purest example, and the other bank buildings had a more cohesive look to them. Staff agreed if this were in the GCD, we would have a different conversation since the building treatments were different. Board Member Villegas liked the idea of staining and showing the brick, the treatment of the panel as well as the checkerboard element. Board Member Spencer explained the south facing panelization with the windows was a right opportunity to do something that was disciplined

and would be disappointed if he saw whimsy. This building was ordinary, serious, and utilitarian, and he felt it was great they were not trying to over complicate this and add icing on the cake. He suggested spending time standing in the tarmac parking lot which has no trees; the black surface is facing south and west. He also offered the west-facing giant murals have a short shelf life. Advisor Pristera stated their committee would review the murals to make sure they were not saturating the downtown; they learned using black and white for the west facing murals was better and they were getting better longevity than first imagined. Board Member Yee indicated that stain was a good solution and would be a huge improvement. The south panels gave an opportunity to have some type of treatment of the façade, but he was not sold on the checkerboard. Any way they could open up the ground level to activate retail would be a good thing.

The Board went on record to support the noncontributing structure classification. Mr. Crawford advised he would return for a final approval. Board Member Spencer suggested looking at the DeeZn website. Board Member Villegas suggested giving some nods to the 50s and 60s. Board Member Spencer suggested doing a shading device that would be more thoughtful but not canvas; Mr. Crawford indicated this would be some sort of horizontal element and not canvas.

DISCUSSION: None.

ADJOURNMENT – With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:03 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

 1-27-2021

Historic Preservation Planner Harding
Secretary to the Board