



PLANNING SERVICES

THE UPSIDE of FLORIDA

## ***Architectural Review Board***

### **MINUTES OF THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**

**November 17, 2016**

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

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Michael Crawford

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

**OTHERS PRESENT:** David W. Jacobi, Brittany Sherwood, J.J. Zielinski, Steve Jernigan, Bo Carter, Brian Lumbatis, Tom Renshaw, Ed Carson, Michelle MacNeil, Rex McKinney, Carl & Annette Valletto, John Ellis, Diane Davis

### **CALL TO ORDER / QUORUM PRESENT**

Chairman Ben Townes called the Architectural Review Board (ARB) meeting to order at 2:01 p.m. with a quorum present. He then 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.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Mr. Jones made a motion to approve the October 20, 2016 minutes with a revision to Item 4 indicating 1 dissention. Ms. Deese indicated the correction had been made. Mr. Mead seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

#### **Item 1**

**321 S. Palafox St.**

**Palafox Historic Business District  
C-2A**

#### **Contributing Structure**

#### **Action taken: Approved**

Mr. JJ Zielinski was requesting approval to extend the street front canopy of a contributing structure. The proposed canopy would extend along the front of the building to the north and south of the existing canopy. It would also match the existing canopy in design and color. Mr. Zielinski addressed the Board, and Mr. Jones asked if it would match exactly. Mr. Zielinski provided materials and stated they intended to match all details exactly. Mr. Mead asked if the canopy would cover the tables under an existing License to Use, and Mr. Zielinski said it would. Ms. Deese agreed there were no further approvals needed. **Ms. Hatler made a motion to approve, seconded by Mr. Mead.** Mr. Quina wanted to make sure they poured new footing for the columns, and Mr. Zielinski stated the concrete was being replaced, and it would not appear patched. **The motion then carried unanimously.**

EVERYTHING THAT'S GREAT ABOUT FLORIDA IS BETTER IN PENSACOLA.

222 West Main Street Pensacola, FL 32502 / **T:** 850.435.1670 / **F:** 850.595.1143/[www.cityofpensacola.com](http://www.cityofpensacola.com)

**Item 2**  
**Non-Contributing Structure**  
**Action taken: Approved**

**221 S. Baylen St.**

**Palafox Historic Business District**  
**C-2A**

Mr. David Jacobi was requesting approval for the demolition of a non-contributing structure. Per the Escambia County Property Appraiser, the structure proposed for demolition was constructed in 1957. The demolition of the existing building would allow for the redevelopment of the property as presented in Item 3 of this agenda. Because of the age of the property, Mr. Pristera stated he checked the records, but the structure did not appear to be significant, but he did not like removing it for a parking lot. Mr. Jacobi stated the intention was to remove all the brick and replace it with asphalt. Mr. Pristera asked about the drainage, and Mr. Jacobi stated his engineer indicated all those concerns would be addressed. Regarding a retention pond, Ms. Deese stated the City Engineering Department would have to approve per the Code before granting a permit. Mr. Jones inquired about retaining the brick, but Mr. Jacobi stated grass growing between the bricks made it difficult to maintain. Ms. Campbell wanted to see more landscaping on the Government Street portion, and Ms. Hatler agreed. Mr. Jacobi pointed out that landscaping would cost parking places.

Mr. Quina asked if a new survey was performed, it would have to be reevaluated regarding age, architectural style, etc. Mr. Pristera stated the district has a particular narrative that buildings are to fit in, but this structure was not conducive to it. He pointed out the site placement was odd to the area, and no significant events or persons were tied to it. He did check with the archaeological institute who stated there probably were ruins which had already been disturbed when the building was constructed.

Chairman Townes questioned the intentions for the white areas along the perimeter. Mr. Jacobi stated he had no specific plan at this point, but they might be landscaping. He did state the intention was not to enter on Government Street, but entering only on Baylen and then looping through the parking lot. For now, the parking would not be gated, and they would use vehicle identification stickers.

Ms. Campbell wanted to see some changes, and Mr. Jacobi advised he was open to suggestions for a design professional. He indicated the parking was specifically for employees. Ms. Hatler asked if it would help if the employees were shuttled in from another parking lot. Mr. Jacobi pointed out the Levin Law Firm currently leases 45 spaces at the Judicial Center, and there could be another space problem in the future. He also indicated they were the owners of the property, and the parking was more valuable to them than the existing structure. Mr. Quina suggested keeping some of the brick for a brick wall along the street to hide the parking spaces on the Government and Baylen Street sides. Mr. Jacobi stated they had an easement along the north side to provide access to the Lundy Building.

Chairman Townes stated the building itself eventually will be torn down, and if it could serve as a parking lot for Mr. Jacobi, he had no objection, since downtown is growing and this is a vibrant corner for future buildings. He suggested that Mr. Jacobi bring landscaping forward along with suggestions from the Board. He stated the Board would ask that he have a plan before applying. Mr. Jones asked about current parking spaces, and Mr. Jacobi stated there were 31 spaces, and they wanted a total of 46. Mr. Quina pointed out brick pavers were what others want to emulate. Mr. Mead asked if the Board approved the demolition, would the landscaping return. Ms. Deese advised the landscaping was tied to Item 3. **Mr. Mead then made a motion to approve, seconded by Ms. Hatler. Mr. Quina stated the basis of approval for the demolition was that the building was considered a non-contributing, poorly sited, under-utilized structure on a midblock location. Mr. Mead added the proposed reuse will not prevent future appropriate development. Mr. Mead and Ms. Hatler accepted the language amendment, and it carried unanimously.**

**Item 3**  
**New Construction**

**221 S. Baylen St.**

**Palafox Historic Business District**  
**C-2A**

**Action taken: Denied without prejudice.**

Mr. David Jacobi was requesting approval for the expansion of a parking lot. Mr. Jacobi wanted suggestions for landscaping companies the Board would recommend in order to return with a proposal in the future. Mr. Quina suggested the curb cut at the street did not need to be 26' wide, and he suggested using curbs. He explained the Code required site lighting and irrigated landscaping, and he wanted Mr. Jacobi to consider the use of brick on the perimeter to create a separation from the public sidewalk and the parking lot. It was clarified that Item 2 covered the demolition

only, but the brick could not be removed before submitting a landscape plan. Mr. Jones suggested taking another look at using other materials for the parking lot. Chairman Townes offered to provide names of landscape professionals after the meeting.

Mr. Mead reminded the Board that tabling was not possible, but the applicant could withdraw in writing; Mr. Jacobi agreed with denial. **Mr. Mead then made a motion to deny without prejudice, seconded by Ms. Hatler, and it carried unanimously.**

**Item 4  
Signage**

**165 E. Intendencia St.**

**Palafox Historic Business District  
C-2**

**Action taken: Approved with comments.**

Mr. Tom Renshaw, Complete Signs, was requesting approval for attached wall signage on the YMCA building. This application is for the "YMCA" signage currently on the building as well as the proposed additional "Baptist" signage. Initially, the signage for the YMCA was presented as an abbreviated review. After being denied for internal illumination, the signage was modified to non-illuminated letters. However, the signage which was installed does not comply with the approval and is internally illuminated. The proposed "Baptist" signage was also presented as an abbreviated review; however, the reviewer determined full Board approval was warranted and should include the previous submittal. Also, Caldwell and Associates was requesting approval for a minor exhibit area to be located within the entry plaza of the YMCA on the northwest corner of the site. **This exhibit focuses on the "First Early Learning City" concept and promotes the use of visual aids within the community to teach children. However, at this time, Caldwell and Associates wanted to withdraw this request.**

Brian Lumbatis with Complete Signs stated the client (YMCA) did prefer internally luminated signage, and they were instructed to build them as such, but the client would not turn them on. He stated they submitted the same drawings with non-illuminated language until they could get approval for internal illumination. The signage was approved, built and installed. He stated the materials and construction were according to the approved drawings. Ms. Deese informed that Mr. Quina had approved the proposal in an abbreviated review. However, Mr. Quina explained the package he approved did not allow for internally luminated signage. He approved the "Y" and the "Bear-Levin-Studer Family YMCA." When the additional abbreviated review package for "Baptist Health Care" was submitted, he sent it to the full Board to make sure of the full intention, not knowing they were already internally illuminated. The new proposal is to place "Baptist Health Care" below the "Y". Mr. Lumbatis advised this signage would be backlit for a halo effect. Mr. Mead clarified that you cannot substitute an operational restriction for an architectural requirement. Mr. Lumbatis stated it was the client's intent to seek approval for the illuminated signage.

For further clarification, Mr. Ed Carson stated there was some miscommunication. The external signage was pulled out and left to the executive director of the YMCA and staff to work out; there wasn't a lot of communication between the construction team and staff. It was his recollection that they had depicted the signs the way they are with illumination. Mr. Jones recalled that conversation came up, and the illumination was not allowed. Mr. Carson advised they showed illumination from the beginning. Mr. Mead explained that backlit is allowed. Ms. Campbell lives in the area, and had several comments from the historic village about the bright lights. Mr. Mead pointed out in the original application signage was indicated, and if there was conduit in the plans, it did not show the manner of illumination.

Mr. Carson wanted a solution to the problem and asked for the language in the Code. Chairman Townes stated Section 12-13-3 charges the Board with maintaining the historic integrity of the Pensacola historic districts, and the Board makes its rulings based upon what they have done for precedence in the past. The Board has determined that it is architecturally acceptable to backlight signs in the historic districts, and they have never in the ten plus years he has been on the Board allowed internally illuminated signs. Ms. Deese indicated in Section 12-2-10 the language spelled out signs which are prohibited which includes internally illuminated signage. She advised the illuminated signage had been denied two times.

Mr. Quina then suggested the bulbs be removed from the signage. Mr. Mead was concerned with stacking up signage on the building because everyone wants to be associated with the YMCA. Mr. Carson stated they had taken time to consider the square footage allowed for building signage and tried to stay within that limit. The Board discussed having the Baptist signage below the "Y" in both locations, and Mr. Pristera agreed there should be consistency on the location. Mr. Mead suggested if the client is within the area limits, there is only so much the Board could do, and if



Baptist Health Care is a legitimate tenant, it would be appropriate. Ms. Campbell suggested the "Baptist Health Care" signage be located under the "Y" on the east side, same as the north side; the Baptist signage was indicated as backlit. Chairman Townes had no problem with multiple-tenant buildings with multiple signage for advertising purposes. Ms. Hatler asked about the square footage, and Ms. Deese explained the clients were under their 200 sq. ft. limitation, with possibly 2 or 3 sq. ft. left.

**Mr. Quina made a motion to approve the Baptist sign as submitted to the north elevation, with the east elevation in the same proximity as the "Y" on the north elevation; regarding the two signs presently lit, the internal illumination needed to be removed in some manner immediately. Mr. Mead seconded the motion and encouraged illumination, but it would have to be brought into compliance with the Code; it was not appropriate to be internally illuminated.** Ms. Campbell stated it was regrettable that the sign was built with components which were not allowed in this section of Pensacola. The applicant would have to provide some type of hardship for the requested lighting, and more importantly, the Board would be setting a precedent for what is allowed. Ms. Hatler pointed out as a leading architectural piece in downtown, the applicant needed to consider what they have presently is not up to Code. She inquired about the "First Early Learning City" signage which was withdrawn, and Ms. Deese explained this signage was considered an exhibit and not a tenant, and the permitted 200 square footage would not come into play. **The motion then carried unanimously.**

**Item 5  
New Construction**

**200 Blk Garden St**

**Palafox Historic Business District  
Pensacola Historic District**

**Action taken: Approved with comments.**

Mr. Steve Jernigan, Bay Design Architecture, was requesting final approval for a 5-story bank and office building with a drive-thru extension. This project was presented to the Board on June 16, 2016, as a 4-story bank and office building with a drive-thru beneath the first floor; the Board approved the conceptual design with comments. The applicant has taken the Board's comments under advisement and has provided a submittal with the building anchoring the corner and the parking lot to the rear of the site as directed. Additionally, the aesthetic of the building has been modified.

Mr. Jernigan advised the building had been reoriented to address the corner and they worked out the accessibility issues to the building. He furnished brick samples and stated the building would be all brick floors 1 through 4 (matching the brick on the Beck Building), with a buff brick at the 5<sup>th</sup> floor. He advised the signage would not be internally illuminated.

Mr. Jones asked about the dumpster enclosure, and Mr. Jernigan stated it would probably be brick to match the building. He also indicated there would be an ATM in the drive-thru.

Mr. Quina suggested having brick with more consistency. He asked if the horizontal band at the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor could be removed. He also appreciated moving the building to the corner and asked about landscaping. Mr. Jernigan stated he could bring the dumpster enclosure and landscaping back to the Board.

Chairman Townes asked about signage. Mr. Jernigan stated there was one prime tenant in the building with a building mounted sign, and they were considering a small ground-mounted monument sign near the corner for any additional tenants. He explained they wanted to begin construction in January. Mr. Mead asked how consciously they were mimicking the proportions of the Blount Building; Mr. Jernigan stated it was not intentional. He advised the site lighting would be brought to the Board at a later date.

**Mr. Quina made a motion for approval based on the Board's conversation about the entrance, brick selections, landscape plan, site lighting and signage for final approval, seconded by Ms. Campbell.** Ms. Deese asked if landscaping, site lighting and dumpster enclosures would be an abbreviated review or full Board; it was determined to be the full Board. Mr. Jernigan stated they would probably present again at the Board's January meeting. **The motion then carried unanimously.**

**Item 6  
Contributing Structure**

**418 E. Intendencia St.**

**Pensacola Historic District  
HR-1 / Wood Cottages**

**Action taken: Approved**

Mr. Marcus Gross was requesting approval for the removal of the roof on the side porch on the principle (contributing) structure and the demolition of a non-contributing accessory structure. Mr. Gross provided pictures to the Board

illustrating the conditions. He planned to keep the base and have no covering on the side porch; the decking would remain.

**Mr. Quina made a motion to approve demolition of the rear structure and the roof on the side porch, seconded by Ms. Campbell, and the motion carried unanimously.**

**Item 7**

**100 Blk S. 9th Ave.**

**Pensacola Historic District  
HC-1 / Brick Structures**

**New Construction**

**Action taken: Approved with comments.**

Mr. Paul Ritz, Bullock Tice Associates, was requesting approval for a new 2-story mixed-use development. This item was previously reviewed and denied by the Board at their September 15, 2016, and October 20, 2016, meetings. The applicant has taken the Board's findings under advisement and has provided a submittal with more details and modifications as directed. Mr. Ritz stated a major change was to lower the building by 2 feet on the first floor only – from 1<sup>st</sup> floor to 2<sup>nd</sup> floor is now 16 feet. The podium material was changed to split-face block. The vents now occur every fourth concrete block with a painted cast iron look. On the 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue elevation the railings were simplified. The more flamboyant railings are on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor over the wine bar area. (This selection could come back to the ARB for final selection approval.)

On the Romana Street elevation, they constructed a parapet style roof for the bump out portion. The railings match the 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue railings. The landscaping between the podium and sidewalk would be ornamental grass similar to that at the park across the street. Colors of the stucco and metal remained the same. Chairman Townes noted the increase in porch columns. Mr. Ritz advised the maximum span is 16 feet. On the west wall off the parking lot, they added brackets to the standing seam roof. The mechanical room has arch relief. All of the mechanical fans for intake and exhaust for the kitchen are on the roof; 8" of the equipment might be visible above the parapet wall. The wall height of the bridge was reduced almost 2 feet. There is additional signage on the north elevation after the creation of the parapet wall.

Mr. Quina questioned the letter size for Aragon Lot versus Privateers Alley, and Mr. Ritz stated Aragon Loft is not a complex but a permanent condominium. Mr. Ritz also provided details on the dumpster enclosure for the restaurant, with the wall mimicking the wall along the western edge of the site as well as the wall which is between this building and property to the south along 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The electrical transformer is in the general neighborhood of the back stair ramp area with shrubbery and ornamental grasses. He stated the Bevolo lights are now on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor balconies and 1<sup>st</sup> floor walls with all the fixtures being electrically illuminated. There is a 4" recess for the windows and doors providing some shadow. The signage for the soffit on the 1<sup>st</sup> floor will be brought back to the Board based on the tenants' desire.

Mr. Jones asked about the parking area materials, and Mr. Ritz indicated they would be asphalt. Mr. Mead asked about the setback from the adjoining property on the south elevation. Mr. Ritz stated it was continuous with the property line, similar to that north of Romana Street. Mr. Mead asked about the north and west elevations façade wall elements. Mr. Ritz stated they could consider some louvered element. Mr. Mead advised the parapet element was thin and could they give it more dimension. Mr. Ritz stated they went with the minimum height to accomplish the task. Mr. Mead also asked about the metal standing seam on the western element rather than continuing the parapet on the shed roof – the projection of the parapet is very different with the gable element. Mr. Ritz stated at the conceptual approval, it was shown as a standing seam metal roof. Mr. Quina addressed the muntin patterns. He pointed out no mullions on the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> floor doors. He noted they had eliminated any arched transoms at this point, and Mr. Ritz agreed. He advised they could return to a transom over the doorways.

**Mr. Jones made a motion to approve, seconded by Mr. Quina.**

Ms. MacNeil pointed out the newels didn't align and recommended they be centered between the two columns on each side (sheet 1 and sheet 6). On sheet 8, the reflective ceiling plan also shows the newel not centered. Looking across at the Craft Bar, the column is not shown spaced between the two columns. She also observed the door and window mullions were not consistent, and the arch transom on the major corner should be put back. She addressed the Privateers Alley signage and preferred the previous detailing on the connecting bridge.

Chairman Townes advised a motion had been made and seconded for final approval, but the comments could be kept in mind but were not included in the motion. Mr. Ritz stated the bulk of the comments could be addressed. He clarified

the light between the alleyway was intended to mimic the light at Romana Street. Chairman Townes addressed the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor lettering might need to be reconsidered. **Mr. Quina clarified the Board had discussed the transoms over the entrance doors, the alignment of the newels, the column on the west elevation and mullions. Mr. Jones agreed to the accept amendments to the motion, and Mr. Quina agreed. The motion carried unanimously.**

**Item 8** **125 S. Alcaniz St.** **Pensacola Historic District**  
**New Construction** **HC-1 / Wood Cottages**

**Action taken: Approved as submitted-abbreviated review on landscaping, fencing and signage.**

Mr. Dean Dalrymple, Dalrymple Sallis Architecture, was requesting approval for a 3-story mixed-use building with a pool. This project was presented to the Board at their October 20, 2016, meeting; it was withdrawn by the applicant during the discussion. The applicant has taken the Board's comments into consideration and has provided a submittal with open stairwells on the west side of the building and visual interest on the elevator shaft. The proposed resident storage facilities have been combined into one building on the north side of the pool amenity. Mr. Sallis addressed the Board and stated they were happy to provide the adjustments, but it was quite expensive. Mr. Quina pointed out it was a good balance of a fairly large project on this corner and is more delicate in nature and also appreciated the use of the brick to pull from the Warfield Grocery.

**Ms. Campbell made a motion to approve the project as submitted, seconded by Ms. Hatler.** Mr. Jones asked about the parking spaces, and Mr. Sallis stated they would be asphalt, and that landscaping was in the original package. He advised the fencing on the street side would be brick and a powder coated fence at the property line. Chairman Townes asked about the underside of the balconies on the east side facing Alcaniz. Mr. Sallis stated they were hoping for a tongue and groove nearly clear stained pine wood soffit. He advised they had removed the can lights and were using wall sconces for the balconies at Alcaniz. He also stated they would return to the Board for signage. **Ms. Campbell amended her motion for an abbreviated review for landscaping, fencing and signage accepted by Ms. Hatler.** Mr. Mead addressed the lighting configuration being the same. Chairman Townes asked about the ground floor doors and windows, and Mr. Sallis explained they would be aluminum clad wood, but would appreciate some flexibility possibly in the abbreviated review. **The motion then carried unanimously.**

**Item 9** **600 S. Barracks St.** **Pensacola Historic District**  
**Non-Contributing Structure** **SSD**

**Action taken: Approved**

Mr. Dean Dalrymple, Dalrymple Sallis Architecture, was requesting approval for an elevator addition. This request was previously reviewed and denied by the Board at their October 20, 2016, meeting. The applicant took the Board's findings under advisement and modified the façade and roof to create interest. Mr. Sallis presented to the Board and explained Mr. Quina had suggested the elevator tower could be better; they accepted the Board's input and modifications were incorporated for a better product. Ms. Deese advised that the signage would be evaluated through an abbreviated review. Mr. Sallis explained that this signage would possibly address the services and not the business. **Mr. Quina made a motion to approve, seconded by Ms. Campbell, and it carried 5 to 1 with Mr. Mead recusing.**

**Item 10** **1109 N. Reus St.** **North Hill Preservation District**  
**Contributing Structure** **PR-1AAA**

**Action taken: Approved**

Mr. Carter Quina, Quina Grundhoefer Architects, was requesting approval for exterior repairs due to a fire as well as a new 354 sq. ft. master bathroom addition on a contributing structure. The repairs include the removal of the brick chimney on the rear of the dwelling. The proposed addition is an expansion of a previous addition and will incorporate the existing wood windows. The Board was provided positive comments from North Hill. Mr. Valetto and Mr. Quina addressed the Board and advised that the house probably should be demolished, but they were restoring it, adding a master bathroom and closet on the south side of the structure. Mr. Quina advised the initial inspections revealed they could restore the back side of the roof, and they would be working with the Inspections Department to make sure the new construction would meet the codes.

Mr. Jones asked about the chimney and if it could be saved since it would change the character of the house. Mr. Quina

stated the rear chimney would have to be removed and reconstructed because of the extensive fire and water damage. The front main chimney was in good shape and would remain a defining point. Mr. Valletto explained they would remove the aluminum siding and replace it with Hardi Board; the side addition materials would also be Hardi Board. Mr. Jones suggested using the Sherwin Williams SF-1 product to conceal fire damage odors.

**Ms. Campbell made a motion to approve, seconded by Mr. Jones, and it carried 5 to 1 with Mr. Quina recusing.**

**Item 11**

**16 W. Main St.**

**Palafox Historic Business District  
C-2A**

**New Construction**

**Action taken: Approved**

Mr. Phillip Partington, SMP Architects, was requesting approval for the addition of a parking lot and a children's play area. \*\* This item was referred to the full ARB during the Abbreviated Review process. \*\* Ms. Deese explained that abbreviated reviews could be considered as long as there was adequate time for the Board to review the materials before the meeting.

Mr. Partington explained the project added 20 spaces for a total of 35 parking spaces. Mr. Caldwell explained he and Mr. Studer teamed up together to build the first Early American Learning Center. They researched several countries as well as other states to see how this would operate, since children learn by engaging all their senses. He also advised the play area would be constructed from recycled materials from the site.

Mr. Pristera asked about the poured in place colors, and Mr. Caldwell advised they had not decided on the colors. Mr. Quina asked about the tree cookie, and Mr. Caldwell explained in this learning element they took the trees and cut them into 1 inch thick plates for building and writing on; there are also alphabet letters on some of the trees at different heights to engage the children. Mr. Mead asked about the fencing, and it was determined the fence was originally at the PNJ parking lot and would be reused. The Board was provided with handouts. Mr. Mead suggested a more visual enclosure from the drive-thru, looking at it from the children's perspective, and Mr. Caldwell agreed that was a fair point. Ms. Hatler suggested fencing might help with safety. Mr. Partington explained the fencing was along the drive-thru and on Main Street to the first sidewalk connecting to the plaza.

Mr. Quina asked about lighting, and Mr. Partington provided a handout. Ms. Hatler asked the location of the entrance to the playground, and Mr. Campbell it was from the outdoor seating area south of the entrance. Mr. Quina and Ms. Hatler agreed the project was a much needed element downtown. **Ms. Campbell made a motion to approve as presented.** Mr. Mead asked about the associated parking. Ms. Deese explained the clients submitted them together but they could be separated out. Mr. Partington explained they were adding much needed parking spaces for customers and visitors.

Mr. Mead pointed out the fencing along Main Street provides the street edge and was it possible to provide that at Baylen to integrate the corner. It was also clarified that the parking lot was for the coffee shop patrons and employees of other businesses, and there was an existing crosswalk. Chairman Townes advised they do not ask children to cross active lanes of traffic; Mr. Mead was concerned people would be parking in the parking lot and coming across the drive lane, and they might want to rethink about more control. Chairman Townes explained drivers might be distracted going through those lanes. Mr. Mead asked if the menu board could be moved closer to the crosswalk to stop the vehicles. It was explained the placement of signage had to do with order time. The Board then discussed safety issues and possibly using a speedbump with the crosswalk.

**Mr. Jones asked about the luminaries before he seconded the motion,** and they were determined to be Acorn. Chairman Townes suggested the safety concerns be brought back to the Studers, but Ms. Deese advised the safety issues were out of the purview if this Board. Mr. Mead pointed out a traffic concern is part of approving the parking, and there needed to be some control, however, he felt the speed bump addressed his concern. Ms. Hatler's concern was walking west on Main Street and entering the drive-thru. **The motion then carried 5 to 1 with Chairman Townes dissenting.**

**ELECTION OF NEW CHAIR (effective December 2016)**

Mr. Jones nominated Ms. Campbell for Chairman, and she declined. Ms. Hatler asked for clarification regarding the Chair, and Mr. Mead stated that the Chair cannot rule on motions made but can discuss and vote. Chairman Townes

declined to be nominated and nominated Mr. Quina. Ms. Hatler nominated Mr. Crawford. The Board voted 5 to 1 for Mr. Quina as Chairman. Ms. Hatler then nominated Mr. Crawford for Vice Chairman, and it carried unanimously.

**ADJOURNMENT** – With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:17 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Brandi C. Deese". The signature is stylized and cursive.

Brandi C. Deese  
Secretary to the Board