



PLANNING SERVICES

Planning Board

CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE CITY PLANNING BOARD

The regular meeting of the **City Planning Board** will be held on **Monday, November 18, 2019 at 2:00 P.M.** in the Hagler-Mason Conference Room, Mezzanine Level, City Hall, 222 West Main Street.

AGENDA

- Quorum/Call to Order
- Approval of Meeting Minutes from October 8, 2019.
- Approval of Tree Ordinance Workshop Minutes from October 24, 2019
- **New Business:**
 1. **Consider Amendment to LDC Section 12-6-4 (D) Tree Ordinance**
** This item pertains to the addition of a phone number on the notification signage **
 2. **Request for Aesthetic Review – 997 South Palafox Street “Jaco’s”**
 3. **Consider Preliminary/Final Site Plan Approval – 700-800 BLK South Palafox Street “Admiral’s Row”**
 4. **Request for License to Use Right-of-Way – 700-800 BLK South Palafox Street “Admiral’s Row”**
 5. **Discussion on the Proposed Amendment to the Tree Ordinance**
- Open Forum
- Adjournment

ADA Statement: The City of Pensacola adheres to the Americans with Disabilities Act and will make reasonable accommodations for access to City services, programs and activities. Please call 850-435-1670 (or TDD 435-1666) for further information. Request must be made at least 48 hours in advance of the event in order to allow the City time to provide the requested services.

Please advise Planning staff at your earliest convenience if you are unable to attend. As always, your presence is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Cynthia R. Cannon".

Cynthia R. Cannon, AICP

Assistant Planning Services Administrator

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



PLANNING SERVICES

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD

October 8, 2019

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Paul Ritz, Danny Grundhoefer, Ryan Wiggins, Charletha Powell, Eladies Sampson

MEMBERS ABSENT: Kurt Larson, Laurie Murphy

STAFF PRESENT: Cynthia Cannon, Assistant Planning Services Administrator, Sherry Morris, Planning Services Administrator, Heather Lindsay, Assistant City Attorney, Leslie Statler, Senior Planner, Michael Ziarnek, Transportation Planner-Complete Streets, Gregg Harding, Historic Preservation Planner, Brad Hinote, Engineering, Lawrence Powell, Neighborhoods Administrator, Councilwoman Myers, Councilwoman Hill, Mayor Robinson

OTHERS PRESENT: Andrew Rothfeder, P. Cantavespre, April Skipper, William J. Dunaway, Buddy Page, George Williams, George Biggs, Amir Fooladi, Fred Gunther

AGENDA:

- Quorum/Call to Order
- Approval of Meeting Minutes from September 10, 2019.
- **New Business:**
 1. Consider Amendment to LDC Section 12-2-12 Creating WRD-1
 2. Consider Rezoning and Future Land Use Map Amendment for 14 W. Jordan Street
 3. Consider *Preliminary* Approval for 500 E. Gregory Street
- Open Forum
- Adjournment

Call to Order / Quorum Present

Chairman Ritz called the meeting to order at 2:00pm with a quorum present and explained the procedures of the Board meeting.

Approval of Meeting Minutes

Ms. Sampson made a motion to approve the September 10, 2019 minutes, seconded by Ms. Powell, and it carried unanimously.

New Business

Consider Amendment to LDC Section 12-2-12 Creating WRD-1

Staff received a request to modify the Redevelopment Land Use District WRD by establishing a subcategory which would become the WRD-1. The proposed WRD-1 would be a standalone section with the intent of optimizing the future development of the City's Community Maritime Park (CMP) parcels. The overall park parcel was master planned for stormwater and open space during the final plat approval process in April

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

2013. Subsequently, lots 1 and 2 received Planning Board approval for development in 2013. Ms. Cannon advised future development on the CMP parcels within the proposed WRD-1 district would continue to be submitted to the Planning Board for aesthetic review. She advised the applicant and their consultant were available online to give a presentation to the Board.

Mr. Rothfeder, President of Studer Properties, presented to the Board and stated his firm had been asked to submit a master plan for the remaining parcels at the Maritime Park that was cohesive and worked with the 19 acre site across the street. He stated one of the first steps was to hire a market research firm which could confirm the demand for commercial and retail space in the downtown area; they subsequently hired Jeff Speck and Associates along with DPZ CoDESIGN. This process began nine months ago culminating with a week-long charrette involving public input. DPZ then presented the master plan, with the question being whether or not it would fit into the current zoning on the Maritime Park site. He represented to the Board that Ms. Khoury along with DPZ had worked with City staff to address an appropriate solution. He indicated the Studers had invested approximately one half million dollars into this project. He also stated there was a question being asked by a third party law firm about this rezoning, specifically about the purpose of the rezoning which would be addressed later by Mr. Dunaway.

Ms. Khoury then addressed the Board and asserted she had worked with the Planning staff. Her presentation consisted of 20 slides which focused on the Maritime Park parcel, and Mr. Speck was online to answer any questions. They were not aware of the rich history on this site and as such studied previous plans to evaluate lessons learned. The market study was completed before they conducted the charrette. The study demonstrated that there was an opportunity to extend the downtown to the waterfront. Ms. Khoury pointed out that Southtowne was an example of the desire for downtown living and that their study looked at the program for the market over a 15 year timeframe. The 19 acre site could accommodate 1,825 residential units, with the majority designated for rental units and approximately thirty percent designated as condos. She stated that the encouraging fact was that waterfront units could be affordable to people making \$30,000 and up and commercial and retail ranging anywhere from 80,000 to 200,000 sq. ft. and up. She pointed out the charrette was very positive, and residents were excited about what was being proposed. They proposed recreating the blocks with three linear greenways, the Maritime parcel with the parking completely lined, connections to Bruce Beach, and a boardwalk over the stormwater pond creating more of an environment.

WRD zoning permits 60 dwelling units per acre, and the proposed WRD-1 did not change this; the change was from height measured in feet to stories, to have generous floor to ceiling heights and certain commercial uses (still 60 units per acres – 60 sq. ft. to 6 stories). One of the biggest purposes was to change the intent or purpose of the district. They agreed WRD was archaic in the way it was written, and they tried to encourage waterfront activities. They learned the WRD was created as an antidote to the Port Royal gated development. The change does not affect the metrics but encourages development in a better way. They decided not to change things everyone was objecting to; the uses, density and parking remained the same. The height was changed from feet to stories.

The changes included permitting A-frame signage, festival signage and to prohibit illuminated signage. The landscaping would be appropriate for downtown with shrubs and trees. The lot coverage was changed from 75 (seventy-five) percent to 95 (ninety-five) percent on a parcel. The height would be measured in stories, and held to the height criteria outlined in the CRA Urban Overlay design standards.

Previous developers found that the current CMP plan did not ensure that a future developer would adhere to the same development standards. This needed to be addressed in order to develop a stable environment.

Ms. Wiggins addressed item (5) Regulations and why there was a strikethrough on (a) 1. from “maximum” and replaced with “enhance.” Ms. Khoury explained maximum was too subjective of an opinion and that the bay walk had been enhanced since there were buildings up against it. She continued to state that as you

move toward the beach, it was a more active waterfront and that "maximizing" intends to imply a final condition which is hard to judge and that "enhancement" is easier in considering enhancement or optimizing; it is an attempt to provide a more objective way to judge if a building is behaving with the waterfront.

Chairman Ritz pointed out there were several areas dedicated to openness where buildings will not be constructed. Ms. Powell had a problem with blocking the view and felt both "maximum" and "enhance" were both subjective. Chairman Ritz stated even if the document was not changed, projects taking place here come before the Board where there would be a judgment call on what was being presented. It relies on the Board as a body listening to constituents or the developer themselves for process to determine the final consensus. Ms. Wiggins did not feel the WRD needed the change. She also asked why (5) (b) 4. and 5. were a strikethrough. Ms. Khoury stated there was no historic parcel connected to this district. Ms. Powell asked if whatever language the Board agreed to would apply to anyone who wanted to rezone, using this same language and would not just be for Maritime Park. Ms. Khoury stated it might be easier to unstrike this portion. Ms. Lindsay explained when modifying language to a code, the issue is you are setting a precedent for future use and contemplation, so any change you make, you should always be contemplating the long term impact and what incentives are you providing to future changes to the Code. Chairman Ritz explained if someone asked to be included in WRD-1, they would come before the Board to make the decision to incorporate them. Ms. Cannon confirmed they would go through the rezoning process which would be reviewed through the Planning Board. Ms. Powell asked if it was in the Code and the Board had agreed to it, and they are complying with everything in WRD-1, what would be the way the Board could say they could not be allowed in the district when they were complying. Ms. Lindsay advised that was actually what the outside legal opinion was concerned with - if you set the precedent, then you have to anticipate it will be used to expand in the future. The Board would have to decide the legitimate goals so there would be an argument against expansion if that was truly what they wanted to do. Chairman Ritz explained there was some latitude for the Board to determine if the applications were appropriate or not. There is an ebb and flow to a city, and we are not trying to be static but are trying to move forward with the appropriate ideas. Ms. Wiggins asked if there was a need for WRD-1 and could exceptions be made as they applied to these parcels as opposed to changing Code. Ms. Lindsay advised there were other options which Ms. Morris had discussed with DPZ. Ms. Wiggins clarified she was referring to a variance instead of a Code change. Mr. Grundhoefer asked why the changes could not be included the WRD, and Ms. Cannon stated that if that was the proposed amendment then all parcels in the WRD district would be subject to the increased lot coverage and change in height requirements as opposed to just the CMP parcels. She explained the applicants were proposing to raise the design standards and encourage future developments to go through the new CRA Urban Overlay District for consistency and cohesiveness in development with the former ECUA parcel and that the WRD-1 was proposed as an effort to create a strategic development approach to the CMP parcels. Mayor Robinson explained they started looking at how to create something based on what we see new happening in models that would allow us to have these features we would see in our normal historic waterfront. If we had been thinking that way today, we probably would not have built the governmental buildings the way we did. Things changed dramatically in 50 years, and the overall intent was simply if we can create what we want to create, why not create a district which would allow that. The choice was to amend WRD and start over.

Ms. Cannon clarified that the Gregory Stewart memo was emailed to the Board and uploaded to the online agenda center upon receipt. Ms. Lindsay stated the memo addressed some things which the Board might consider so the correct articulations could be made. Mr. Dunaway of Clark Partington was asked to address the memo which was provided as comments to Mr. Wells, Deputy City Attorney. The scope of the review was quite broad, and Mr. Stewart concluded that he was unable to determine whether there was a public purpose and a deliberative process for this planning, and he raised the question of what is the purpose of

this. The Board had heard that this project came because the group came to the City asking how they should best implement this plan – how should they best put it into action. The idea was to follow the pattern they did in the Gateway Redevelopment District with the creation of earlier sections in the Aragon area. He emphasized that Mr. Stewart's memo was absolutely correct to note that all the changes to the LDC must be legally consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. He advised the fundamental land development document for these parcels and others was the Community redevelopment Plan of 2010, which directly addresses this issue on page 33 where the Plan identifies a number of areas within the Urban Core Redevelopment area that should be considered for policy amendments to the City of Pensacola Comprehensive Plan and Land Development Code. It further states the CRA should investigate the existing land use categories and zoning districts to determine if the creation of new policies and new zoning districts should be considered to support the recommendations of and to carry out the redevelopment plan. Mr. Stewart concluded in his memo that he "was unable to identify whether such a public purpose is served and therefore, it appears that there is a potential legal issue that the new WRD-1 classification is arbitrary and capricious and constitutes spot zoning from this rezoning."

Mr. Dunaway advised that staff, Mr. Rothfeder and Ms. Khoury, along with actions from this Board and the City Council, can supply that information which he believed Mr. Stewart did not have. He further advised that the 2010 CRA plan on page 3 "establishes the framework for transformative policies and investments in the CRA." Within that context, the plan provides policy, programmatic and fiscal direction for the CRA as Pensacola reshapes its urban landscape and waterfront. The purpose of the plan is to define the strategic framework, concepts, themes, goals and objectives for the future of Pensacola's urban core. He explained that because a zoning section exists in the Code, does not necessarily mean that other parcels get to take advantage of that. All parcels within the City are zoned with their own zoning, and there is a process where zoning can be changed, only if it is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and other comprehensive documents. The reason for not using a variance was because they require statutory criteria, specifically that the problem was not self-created. Changing the zoning was the appropriate process for this development and was a step forward in the ultimate goal of fulfilling the public purpose and vision by the decades of public planning for this CMP site.

Ms. Wiggins asked who had hired the outside attorney for this legal opinion, and Ms. Lindsay advised that Legal had asked for that opinion to do their due diligence for the sake of transparency because they anticipated the public could have questions, and they wanted to make sure the Board had answers.

Mr. Gunther stated that he was under the impression that DPZ was hired by the developer, and Chairman Ritz confirmed that. Mr. Gunther explained if the CRA had hired DPZ to make changes in zoning, that would make sense, but this was not the case here. He was opposed to a higher lot coverage ratio and more height along the water. He did not blame the developer for asking, but it did allow for taller and wider buildings. The citizens had spent millions on site development to maximize the connection to the water, but when you build a wider building, it creates a wall effect along the water. He explained that when planning is done right, the shorter buildings are along the water.

Ms. Wiggins stated this was also her concern with removing the term "maximize" from the document. Chairman Ritz advised he appreciated the work by DPZ and as a designer, he preferred the 6 stories language to 60 feet. Open spaces are not a reason for people to go there, but if you place something there, it connects people to the water. To correct some statements, Ms. Khoury explained they were not adding additional height, and most of the buildings would be 4 and 5 stories. Also, the reason for writing the WRD-1 was that the WRD was archaic, and they wanted it to reflect what the CRA encouraged, and they also heard from the community that they wanted to see more redevelopment.

Mr. Speck added it was important to make a distinction between rural beach development, as in Santa Rosa Beach, and urban beach developments like Portofino and Venice. Those are examples of other urban

waterfronts as they are models where spaces are well shaped by buildings, and he further explained that too many spaces between buildings actually cause you to not feel comfortable in public places.

Ms. Powell asked if the WRD was archaic, why not just modify the WRD. Chairman Ritz explained the applicant did not want to speak for the other WRD property owners; they were just considering the properties they control. Ms. Powell pointed out (c) of the landscaping guidelines that the "shoreline vistas" were more than just a view. The ability to see would be constricted by the buildings. Chairman Ritz advised the building code would regulate the height of the buildings. Ms. Cannon explained per the CRA overlay district, the heights for the ground story floor were beginning at 16', 20' and 24' and the maximum aboveground story heights were 14' so with the highest at 24' ground floor and 14' for the other stories, the potential would be a 94' building height. Ms. Khoury added that 24' on the ground floor was for retail only.

Ms. Wiggins was concerned with parking becoming unaffordable, citing Southtowne as the most expensive parking lot and believed parking would also become restricted and expensive. Ms. Morris advised that parking requirements in the CRA were greatly reduced based on land use in 2013 by Council and the Planning Board, and any future development would have to address the off-street parking, but there were other methods in the Code which allow for off-site parking through shared use agreements to provide flexibility. These future developments would be required to handle and address the required off-street parking to support the developments, and that would come before this Board when the developments apply for permitting. She also stated they had changed how we measure building height as the first habitable floor and tried to incentivize parking underneath instead of surface parking.

Mr. Grundhoefer addressed 5. (b) regarding CRA Overlay standards being "encouraged." Ms. Morris further explained the CRA Overlay is applicable to any district within the three CRAs in the downtown area not within a review district, anything not subjected to additional review beyond standard permitting. While this property is within the CRA Overlay boundary, it does not fall under the Overlay since it is protected by the WRD. They referred to the CRA Overlay guidelines and encouraged them, and the Board could recommend as part of their oversight some components of the CRA Overlay for the applicants to consider.

Regarding parking, Mr. Rothfeder stated currently as it is developed, it could be arranged with parking garages, and the market would determine what gets developed there. He stated the goals of this development were to connect the commercial core with the west side, to take this underutilized land and develop it in a way that accomplishes the goals of attracting and retaining our talent, and produces a wide array of housing that meets the market's demand and allows units which permit people to live in the project earning \$30,000 a year. He asked Ms. Khoury if there was anything that would be different if they had asked this development be done for them, the CRA, or a public entity, and Ms. Khoury indicated there would not. They were opening views to the waterfront and keeping with the character of the area, and for anyone else, it would still be very similar to this. She advised Mr. Studer did not direct any of this, but that the market study and prior plans, along with Civicon speakers, all supported the ideas presented.

Ms. Cannon explained the motion of the Board would be to "recommend" to the City Council. Ms. Morris advised this item would be presented at the Council's November 14th meeting. Mr. Grundhoefer suggested not striking the historic language, and he had no problem with the 60 feet versus the six (6) story language and was also not concerned with the 95 (ninety-five) percent lot coverage because of who the developer is.

Mr. Grundhoefer made a motion to approve a recommendation to the Council. Chairman Ritz clarified the historic language of (5) (b) 4. and 5. was to remain.

Ms. Powell was not confident if they kept the 95% going forward that it would not impact other things. **Ms. Wiggins wanted to remove "enhance" retain "maximum" and "maximize" in (5) (a) 1. and Mr. Grundhoefer accepted. Ms. Wiggins seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.**

Consider Rezoning and Future Land Use Map Amendment for 14 W. Jordan Street

Millwood Terrace, Inc. is requesting a Zoning Map and Future Land Use Map (FLUM) Amendment for the property located at 14 W. Jordan Street and identified by parcel number 00-0S-00-9010-001-124. The property currently has split zoning with C-2 on the southeastern portion and R-2 on the western portion; the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) is consistent with Commercial and Office designations. The applicants are proposing to amend the zoning district to C-1 Commercial zoning district and the FLUM to Commercial.

Mr. Page presented to the Board and stated the purpose was to have all the buildings zoned consistently. He said they originally thought to pursue R-2 to be consistent along Palafox Street, but staff recommended the C-1 category because it was less intense than C-2. Currently, the line separating the C-2 from R-2 runs through several of the buildings by several feet. He explained they had met with Councilwoman Cannada-Wynn onsite since she represents that district. Chairman Ritz was favorable with the C-1 classification transitioning into the neighborhood, noting his home is also in a C-1 designation. Mr. Page explained the existing uses were physicians' offices with the right corner being a pharmacy.

Mr. Gunther advised he owned the building to the north of the property and was concerned with street parking and any plans to reduce the existing parking. Chairman Ritz pointed out the Board could not make decisions on what might be. Mr. Page explained there were no plans to make any adjustments in development but more an opportunity to make sure the financing entities were satisfied that all of the buildings could be used under one category. **Ms. Wiggins made a motion for approval, seconded by Ms. Sampson.** Mr. Grundhoefer asked about the parcels, and Mr. Page further explained the survey showed the zoning line currently splits the pharmacy space. **The motion then carried unanimously.**

Consider Preliminary Approval for 500 E. Gregory Street

George Williams, AIA, Goodwyn Mills Cawood, is requesting *preliminary* approval for site improvements for a new (replacement) building for the adult entertainment business "Sammy's" located in the Gateway Review District (GRD). The new building will substantially increase the conformity of the project to the Land Development Code by improving parking, open space, landscaping and overall site design. Chairman Ritz noted this was the first consideration which was formerly within the Gateway Review Board purview.

Mr. Williams, a representative of Goodwyn Mills Cawood, presented to the Board and stated this project had been ongoing for well over a year. After evaluating the existing building and what was necessary to bring it up to Code, it became clear that would be quite expensive. They stepped back to consider a new building in lieu of the existing building, since there were certain criteria financial and otherwise that prohibited them from closing the existing building, demolishing it, and building a new one. They tried to be creative in locating a new building onsite, realizing there were certain criteria to be met in the Gateway District, and the new building could not be larger than the existing building. The basic request involved the location of the new building, and aesthetics would return to the Board. He pointed out the parking spaces to the west were leased from the City and were included in the car count. The variance for the rear of the building would go away. He pointed out the GRD district requires 25% pervious land area, and currently they have 24.5% of pervious surface in the redevelopment plan which was still a tremendous enhancement. Additionally, the parking requires one space for each 75 sq. ft. with a total parking requirement of 74 spaces; the plan presents 70 parking spaces, and they are 3 spaces deficient based on the City's criteria. He explained this plan would require an FDOT review since they were relocating a driveway on Gregory Street which was less than the standard.

Regarding the Gateway guidelines, Ms. Cannon referred the Board to Sec. 12-2-81 (C) for the contents of the preliminary plan which asks for general information at this point. She explained when the applicant returned, the Board would be looking at another list of requirements for the final phase. Chairman Ritz noted the layout reminded him of Publix with parking on the less intent street, and the building closer to the busier street giving it more edge. He pointed out the applicant had met the preliminary requirements, and he could support the project. **Ms. Wiggins made a motion to approve, seconded by Ms. Sampson.** Mr.

Grundhoefer questioned stormwater, and Mr. Williams stated they had engaged Rebol Battle since the site has 4,300 sq. ft. of pervious surface, and they were doubling that number. He indicated they would comply with whatever the stormwater requirements of the City might be and would return with the aesthetics. **The motion then carried unanimously.**

Open Forum – Chairman Ritz explained there had been a request to change the time of the October 24th Tree Ordinance workshop to 3pm-5pm to accommodate Council members who wanted to participate. Ms. Wiggins was concerned with the changed time that the public would not have a chance to weigh in after working hours. Ms. Cannon suggested there could be a second workshop not scheduled on a Council meeting night, and Ms. Wiggins appreciated that the public would then have a chance to participate. Chairman Ritz pointed out that it will likely take more than one workshop since this was very far reaching for many constituents. Ms. Cannon advised she would look for future dates on non-Council nights going forward to January and would present those at the November meeting of the Board and notify by email as well.

Adjournment – With no further business, Chairman Ritz adjourned the meeting at 3:48 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Cynthia Cannon", written in dark ink.

Cynthia Cannon
Secretary to the Board



PLANNING SERVICES

THE UPSIDE of FLORIDA

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD WORKSHOP

October 24, 2019

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Paul Ritz, Eladies Sampson, Ryan Wiggins, Danny Grundhoefer

MEMBERS ABSENT: Kurt Larson, Charletha Powell

STAFF PRESENT: Cynthia Cannon, Assistant Planning Services Administrator, Leslie Statler, Senior Planner, Michael Ziarnek, Transportation Planner-Complete Streets, Gregg Harding, Historic Preservation Planner, Heather Lindsay, Assistant City Attorney, Chris Mauldin, Derrik Owens, Brad Hinote, Kerrith Fiddler, Keith Wilkins, Lawrence Powell, Brian Cooper, Councilwoman Ann Hill, Councilwoman Sherry Myers,

OTHERS PRESENT: Diane Mack, Christian Wagley, Will Dunaway, Amir Fooladi, Sam Mathews, Horace Jones, Margaret Guiter, Margaret Hostetter, Barbara Albrecht, Sarah O'Neill, Drew Holmes, Olivia Atkins, Kia Johnson, John O'Neill, Sara Lefevers, Chris Bosso, Horace Jones, Teresa Hill, Mary Gutierrez, Elsie Zharng, Steve Dracos, Scott Singletary, Sean O-Toole, Pat Imhof, Blaime Flynn, Steve Corbae, Eve Herron, John Herron, Rand Hicks, Tony Terharr, Kreg King, Michael Wolf, Griffin Vickery, David Peaden, Steve Geci, David Hines, Chris Palmer, William Dunnaway, Elizabeth Major, Sam Mathews, Sarah Carruth, Sean O'Toole, Glen Miley

AGENDA:

- Call to Order
- **Introduction: Proposed LDC Amendment – Section 12-6, Tree/Landscape Regulations**
 - 1. **Presentation by Emerald Coastkeeper Inc**
- Open Forum
- Adjournment

Call to Order

Board Member Grundhoefer called the workshop to order at 3:06 pm with three board members present.

Discussion of Proposed LDC Amendment – Section 12-6, Tree/Landscape Regulations

Ms. Cannon introduced the agenda item, and Mr. Grundhoefer invited Ms. Murphy to the podium to present her proposal. Chairman Ritz arrived after Ms. Murphy began her presentation.

Chairman Ritz explained the workshop process and stated the Board was an advisory board, and all options were available through discussion; this was a gathering of the Board with no vote being taken. He then asked for speakers from the audience.

Ms. Hostetter came forward and recommended that we have better communication about what the rules are among the tree services and that there be signs placed on the property a few days before any tree work is to be done so as to notify neighbors and others of what is being planned with the

appropriate permit. Even if a tree did not need a permit in order to be cut down, it would be wise to have a statement from the City that the specific tree did not require a permit.

Mr. Flynn came forward and spoke about affordable housing for young professionals. He advised housing that did not cost more than 30% of the family income was considered affordable, with the median household income for a Pensacola resident being \$46,000 per year. The price point for a home with this income would be \$165,000 to \$190,000. His real estate team determined the median house cost for Pensacola was at \$254,000. In planting trees at those sizes in the proposal, he inquired what it would do to the construction costs per lot.

Mr. Herron then addressed the problem with leaf blowers, citing a specific portion in the proposed ordinance pertaining to maintenance. He had heard from the commercial landscapers that there was no noise ordinance to stop them. After a year, the East Hill Neighborhood Association sent a letter to the commercial landscapers recommending that they limit their use of leaf blowers. The North Hill Preservation Association also weighed in, and everything they recommended was exactly what the machine manuals stated addressing days, duration and the device itself. He recommended looking at Palm Beach or Key Biscayne for their policies. A great model to consider was Encinitas, California, who placed this issue into their environmental plan.

Ms. Herron addressed the commercial landscaping problems within their neighborhood and noted the gas operated leaf blowers were operating 7 days a week with maintenance activities after 7:30 pm. She had observed TruGreen landscapers spraying the yards and school children being dropped off in that same grass; the landscapers mowed that same grass later, spraying the wet pesticide into the air. She felt the landscapers were not being educated about the harmful effects of leaf blowers, and there should be an ordinance for residential neighborhoods to protect the workers, the environment, and the homeowners.

As a point of order Ms. Wiggins asked since there was limited time for the workshop, if the topic could remain with the ordinance at hand, and Chairman Ritz explained the speakers believed this issue should be in the landscape ordinance.

Mr. Fooladi explained he liked the benefit of trees and the ideas of incentivizing developers by reducing stormwater requirements. He felt there were some changes that could be made to the existing tree ordinance, but asked how the City Tree Fund was being utilized. He had proposed some tree planting projects to the CRA years ago, but nothing ever happened. In prioritizing saving trees, he believed the City would have to review variances. He indicated maybe this might need to be a collaborative effort with Escambia County. He pointed out that an urban tree canopy was a reason for the growth of Pensacola, however, he felt the proposed changes to the regulations would hamper economic growth, and the compliance cost would drive up the cost of housing. He believed there should be a fair and balanced approach to determine any changes to the tree ordinance. He asked that the Board ask City staff to take over this process and begin with the current tree ordinance. Changes proposed by Ms. Murphy could be discussed, and everyone could begin with the current ordinance which needed to be worked on as a group.

Chairman Ritz explained the ordinance was heavily edited and being brought forward in a democratic process allowing people to come forward and be heard.

Mr. Wolf referenced Ms. Murphy's presentation addressing the right tree in the right place and explained the wrong tree was being placed in the wrong place, then it died and became a nuisance. He explained civil engineers were allowed to stamp landscape plans, and he proposed the site plan should have a requirement for a licensed landscape architect. He offered this requirement existed in Destin, Ft. Walton, south Florida areas, as well as Louisville and Cincinnati.

Mr. Imhof, an environmental scientist, thanked Ms. Murphy for her presentation and advised he loved trees but was frustrated when he could not cut down a tree without obtaining permission, especially if it was a danger to his children, traffic or whatever. He advised Pensacola planted thousands of oaks in

the right-of-ways, and those trees grew rapidly. Although we have very poor soils with low quality in nutrients, the Red Oaks did grow in those conditions, but they were fast growing and short lived with shallow roots which buckled the roads. They provide shade as well as plenty of allergens and leaf matter which clogs our drains. He favored property rights and wondered why we were pushing the tree ordinance this far. He suggested that retrofitting parking lots with trees would kill Cordova Mall, and with the internet, businesses were already suffering. He proposed letting people plant what they want since it was their property right and their decision. He emphasized that no matter what happens in Seattle or Portland, Pensacola was totally different and would never be a forest, and he preferred looking at the current tree ordinance for evaluation.

Mr. Peaden thanked Ms. Murphy for her presentation but did not think her document was the way to go, and felt all stakeholders needed to be involved with the process. He explained he had been with the Home Builders for 22 years, and if he was a Planning Board member, there would heartburn over that; if he was a Planning Board member who revised the ordinance with the Home Builders and brought it forward, there would also be real heartburn; if he was lobbying for changes as a Planning Board member, it would be in the newspaper, media or whatever, and that put it into perspective how he felt about Coastkeepers having this opportunity to bring changes forward, and he did not think it was the way to go to get all the necessary input and to make the ordinance better. He had worked with Coastkeepers earlier to come up with the current document, and felt it had been workable up to this time. He also questioned the status of the Tree Fund and what were we doing with the current canopy to protect it, or new places in the right-of-ways or with retention ponds. He pointed out Hurricane Michael destroyed 500 million trees with 72 million tons of debris; he advised Mother Nature will do far more damage than man ever will to the landscape. He stated we need to figure out what the problem is and then try to solve it, and at the next Board meeting he hoped the City would open the discussion up to all stakeholders for input and move forward from there.

Ms. O'Neill thanked the Board for dealing with this issue. She was concerned with a Live Oak heritage her neighbors were attempting to cut down in order to facilitate a house on their property. She was for property rights, but when you buy a property, you buy into whatever requirements there are, and she hoped her neighbors were doing the same. She cited 12-6-6 (G (3) "The architect, civil engineer, or planner shall make every reasonable effort to locate such improvements so as to preserve any existing tree." She felt this was ambiguous depending on what was "every reasonable effort." In their case, the City stepped in to protect the heritage tree since the builder would be able to build around the tree. She stated the added expense of having to add a little more to the architectural plan saves the homeowners money by preserving the shade of the tree and adds character and value to the property. She also indicated she felt the burden for permitting should be placed on the persons cutting the trees and not on the homeowners.

Mr. O'Toole addressed invasive eradication and pointed out this was a complex issue and asked how the compliance was going to be handled. He advised this was not as simple as it might seem and needed to be done by licensed professionals. He also indicated careful consideration needed to be given to the cost of some of the processes. With the designs for commercial-residential developments, you also have to consider what would be the appropriateness of forest ecology versus farm ecology; maybe you shouldn't have to mitigate for all those trees - maybe DBH to DBH and diversity in age and species and appropriate cover for appropriate topography. He encouraged the Board to think about all these issues, the costs, the implementation and be prepared to have administrative appeals with qualified personnel implementing the programs initiated.

Ms. Mack addressed the Board and indicated her house was not visible from Google Earth since an urban forest covers her house. Her suggestions were for the next steps. (1) She suggested the Board formally invite anyone who has alternatives to what has been proposed and to put it in writing. She pointed out the Board was an advisory board, and this effort should not be left to them. She

suggested seeing what the Home Builders Association as well as the landscapers and architects could propose. She emphasized that it would ultimately be a compromise, and it was time to do better again. (2) She was aware there were members of Pensacola Young Professionals in the meeting, and she challenged them to perform a survey of the community to see how much of the population loves the trees – a quality of life survey. (3) Civicon has gone a long way toward educating us, and she was intending to get out-of-town speakers to address this issue.

Mr. Wagley advised he had worked with Mr. Wilkins in administering the tree ordinance in Escambia County. He wanted to address the larger context that Florida was growing at 900 people per day, and they have to go somewhere, and the environmental groups recommend that this growth should be accommodated in the urban areas where we already have the infrastructure, as opposed to spreading out, and to preserve our open forested areas. He indicated the healthcare facilities should not be exempt. Requirements for parking lot landscaping was excellent as well as trees around stormwater facilities. He felt people remove trees when necessary and 14" was very restrictive for a heritage tree. He also felt permitting decisions were best left with staff and not with citizen staffed boards under Parks and Recreation. Also, in considering hurricanes, there might be some opportunity to replace those species which are most wind resistant. He also felt we needed more trees in the public right-of-way with trees calming the traffic. He also experienced that more trees being transferred from private property to public property where they are protected by the City needed funding, and he proposed a dedicated source of funding for tree planting and tree maintenance. One possible way would be to increase the stormwater utility fees dedicated to this process.

Mr. Miley, a restoration ecologist, stated it was frustrating to see laudable objectives not achieved because of poor regulations. Rather than take a citizen-proposed ordinance, he favored paying professionals. He indicated the proposal was ripe with technical errors. He pointed out of the 41 species of Oak in Escambia County, there were only three on the list; why were the others omitted. The tree protection list has a tree not even present in Pensacola, and he advised there was a long list of technical issues with this ordinance and recommended using professionals in this process.

Mr. Corbae, a licensed arborist, stated just like in the ordinance, we have to find a balance. Sometimes the location of a building can be moved by three feet to save two Live Oak trees. He also felt there should be something in the ordinance for tree companies or builders to be responsible and not just the property owner; there is no ramification if a tree company cuts down a tree, and that is not fair to the home owner. He pointed out the species on the list that might not need to be there, but there are others not listed which should be. He explained that sometimes the canopies are overcrowded, and the trees struggle; sometimes thinning out and removing can help the other trees. He also advised if there was supposed to be a barrier zone around the roots, and a barrier zone is not present, Code Enforcement can place a stop work order in an effort to protect the roots.

Councilwoman Meyers pointed out that this what was not Ms. Murphy's agenda item that got us to this point today, but it was her agenda item as a public official. She stated the tree ordinance had been amended in the last four years, and one of the amendments was that the money from cutting trees had to be used if at all possible in the area from which those trees came. She stated she was not anti-commercial development, and she represented the largest commercial core in District 2. She disagreed that Cordova Mall would not exist in 10 years, since it was the town square for a lot of Pensacola. When she ran for City Council in 2010, she ran on the issue of trees. She represents a district with not many green spaces. In the last 15 years, there had been a lot of clear cutting around Carpenters Creek to the point that there is not much left now to cut. In 2011, there was almost \$900,000 in the Tree Trust Fund which came from the clear cutting in her district. Her concern was that we were not preserving trees, and we were not incentivizing businesses. She wanted the City to incentivize businesses to green up parking lots. When meeting Ms. Murphy three years ago, it was her first opportunity to address this issue in District 2 and Carpenters Creek.

Ms. Albrecht stated regarding the loss of trees due to storms, Mother Nature has great plans in that we now have a seed bank that is now being hit by sunlight, and that seed bank will regenerate. She indicated we had an opportunity in our small community to replant native and wind resistant trees. She advised that after a war and the devastation of bombing and infrastructure loss, one of the first things to happen was the replanting of trees. She stated we had the opportunity to determine what is worth keeping and what could be removed. She pointed out that we are a biological hotspot in northwest Florida and south Alabama with more species diversity, many of which have not been identified. She encouraged consulting the professionals to address this special area.

With no other speakers, Chairman Ritz explained this meeting was fact finding and gave the Board the pulse of the community, because he did not know what everyone felt until today's discussions. He pointed out the neither Board members or Planning Board staff were professionals in the way of trees or plants. He indicated there might be other workshops possible, and since there was much information to cover, it would take a while to get through it. He did hope for input from different professionals such as home developers as well as the Emerald Coastkeeper types. Because this is a monumental piece of work, it will take a lot of time to get through it; this is the start of the process with hearing the questions, with the answers to come later. He did want input from the professionals such as arborists, ecologists, etc., in writing.

Mr. Grundhoefer asked if when the Board reconvened, could staff provide the amount in the Tree Fund, who controls it and how it is spent. Chairman Ritz emphasized he wanted to see the professional input from the species side, and the Board did not want to put something forward that had not been vetted. He asked that comments be provided in writing to staff which would make its way to the Board and then be made available for public review at the City's website.

Adjournment – With no further business, Chairman Ritz adjourned the workshop meeting at 5:03 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Cynthia R. Cannon', written in a cursive style.

Cynthia R. Cannon, AICP
Secretary to the Board



PLANNING SERVICES

MEMORANDUM

TO: Planning Board Members

FROM: Cynthia Cannon, AICP, Assistant Planning Services Administrator

DATE: November 4, 2019

SUBJECT: Amendment to the Landscape and Tree Protection Plan
LDC Amendment – Sec. 12-6-4 (D)

On October 10, 2019 the City Council referred a proposed amendment to Section 12-6-4 (D) of the City's Land Development Code, Landscape and Tree Protection Plan, to the Planning Board for an amendment to the sign posting requirements of the landscape and tree protection plan, specifically that such signs include a contact number. The proposed change would require future notices to state: "For Further Information Contact the City of Pensacola at 850-***.****."

Attached you will find a modified version of Sec. 12-6-4 (D) with the proposed changes.

Department:	Comments:
FIRE	No concerns.
PW/E	No comments.
InspSvcs	A phone number should not be codified as the number could change and would have to be addressed whenever it changes. If the planning board wants to change this, it should be addressed through the 311 system if anything. It should not be a departmental number.
ESP	No comments.
ECUA	No comments.
GPW	No comments.
ATT	No comments.

Sec. 12-6-4 (D). - Landscape and tree protection plan.

A landscape and tree protection plan shall be required as a condition of obtaining any building permit or site work permit for townhouse residential, multi-family residential, commercial and industrial development as specified in [section 12-6-3](#). The plan shall be submitted to the community development department inspection services division. A fee shall be charged for services rendered in the review of the required plan (see chapter 7-14 of this Code).

No building permit or site work permit shall be issued until a landscape and tree protection plan has been submitted and approved. Clearing and grubbing is only permitted after a site has received development plan approval and appropriate permits have been issued. The building official may authorize minimal clearing to facilitate surveying and similar site preparation work prior to the issuance of permits. No certificate of occupancy shall be issued until the building official has determined after final inspection that required site improvements have been installed according to the approved landscape and tree protection plan. In lieu of the immediate installation of the landscaping material and trees, the city may require a performance bond or other security in an amount equal to the cost of the required improvements in lieu of withholding a certificate of occupancy, and may further require that improvements be satisfactorily installed within a specified length of time.

(D)

Notice. If removal is sought for two (2) or more heritage trees or for more than ten (10) protected trees (including heritage trees sought to be removed) and/or if removal of more than fifty (50) of existing protected trees is sought within any property in any zoning district identified in [section 12-6-2](#), a sign shall be posted no further back than four (4) feet from the property line nearest each respective roadway adjacent to the property. One (1) sign shall be posted for every one hundred (100) feet of roadway frontage. Each sign shall contain two (2) horizontal lines of legible and easily discernable type. The top line shall state: "Tree Removal Permit Applied For." The bottom line shall state: "For Further Information Contact the City of Pensacola at 850-***-****." The top line shall be in legible type no smaller than six (6) inches in height. The bottom line shall be in legible type no smaller than three (3) inches in height. There shall be a margin of at least three (3) inches between all lettering and the edge of the sign. The signs shall be posted at by the applicant at their expense, and shall remain continuously posted until the requisite building, site work, or tree removal permit has issued.

Cynthia Cannon

From: Jonathan Bilby
Sent: Thursday, October 24, 2019 12:07 PM
To: Cynthia Cannon
Subject: RE: Amendment to Sec. 12-6-4 (D) Landscape and tree protection plan

A phone number should not be codified as the number could change and would have to be addressed whenever it changes. If the planning board wants to change this, it should be addressed through the 311 system if anything. It should not be a departmental number.

My thoughts.

Jonathan Bilby

Inspection Services Administrator

Floodplain Administrator

Visit us at <http://cityofpensacola.com>

222 W Main St.

Pensacola, FL 32502

Office: 850.435-1748

PENSACOLA

Florida has a very broad public records law. As a result, any written communication created or received by City of Pensacola officials and employees will be made available to the public and media, upon request, unless otherwise exempt. Under Florida law, email addresses are public records. If you do not want your email address released in response to a public records request, do not send electronic mail to this office. Instead, contact our office by phone or in writing.

From: Cynthia Cannon <CCannon@cityofpensacola.com>

Sent: Thursday, October 24, 2019 11:32 AM

To: Amy Hargett <ahargett@cityofpensacola.com>; Andre Calaminus (ECUA) <andre.calaminus@ecua.fl.gov>; Annie Bloxson <ABloxson@cityofpensacola.com>; Bill Kimball <bkimball@cityofpensacola.com>; Brad Hinote <bradhinote@cityofpensacola.com>; Brian Cooper <bcooper@cityofpensacola.com>; Chris Mauldin <CMauldin@cityofpensacola.com>; Cynthia Cannon <CCannon@cityofpensacola.com>; Derrik Owens <DOwens@cityofpensacola.com>; Diane Moore <DMoore@cityofpensacola.com>; Jonathan Bilby <JBilby@cityofpensacola.com>; Karl Fenner (AT&T) <KF5345@att.com>; Kellie L. Simmons (Gulf Power) <kellie.simmons@nexteraenergy.com>; Leslie Statler <LStatler@cityofpensacola.com>; Miriam Woods <MWoods@cityofpensacola.com>; Paul A Kelly(GIS) <PAKelly@cityofpensacola.com>; Robbie Weekley <rweekley@cityofpensacola.com>; Ryan J. Novota <RNovota@cityofpensacola.com>; Sherry Morris <SMorris@cityofpensacola.com>; Stephen Kennington (AT&T) <sk1674@att.com>

Subject: Amendment to Sec. 12-6-4 (D) Landscape and tree protection plan

All,

Please remember to provide comments on the request before Planning Board to consider an amendment to the sign posting requirements of the landscaping and tree protection plan, specifically to add a phone number to the sign. The

Cynthia Cannon

From: Annie Bloxson
Sent: Wednesday, October 16, 2019 1:35 PM
To: Cynthia Cannon
Subject: RE: Amendment to Sec. 12-6-4 (D) Landscape and tree protection plan

Good Afternoon,

I do not oppose adding a contact number to the sign.

Respectfully,

Annie Bloxson

Fire Marshal

Visit us at PensacolaFire.com

475 E. Strong St.

Pensacola, FL 32501

Office: 850.436.5200

abloxson@cityofpensacola.com



Florida has a very broad public records law. As a result, any written communication created or received by City of Pensacola officials and employees will be made available to the public and media, upon request, unless otherwise exempt. Under Florida law, email addresses are public records. If you do not want your email address released in response to a public records request, do not send electronic mail to this office. Instead, contact our office by phone or in writing.

From: Cynthia Cannon <CCannon@cityofpensacola.com>

Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2019 4:39 PM

To: Amy Hargett <ahargett@cityofpensacola.com>; Andre Calaminus (ECUA) <andre.calaminus@ecua.fl.gov>; Annie Bloxson <ABloxson@cityofpensacola.com>; Bill Kimball <bkimball@cityofpensacola.com>; Brad Hinote <bradhinote@cityofpensacola.com>; Brian Cooper <bcooper@cityofpensacola.com>; Chris Mauldin <CMauldin@cityofpensacola.com>; Cynthia Cannon <CCannon@cityofpensacola.com>; Derrik Owens <DOWens@cityofpensacola.com>; Diane Moore <DMoore@cityofpensacola.com>; Jonathan Bilby <JBilby@cityofpensacola.com>; Karl Fenner (AT&T) <KF5345@att.com>; Kellie L. Simmons (Gulf Power) <kellie.simmons@nexteraenergy.com>; Leslie Statler <LStatler@cityofpensacola.com>; Miriam Woods <MWoods@cityofpensacola.com>; Paul A Kelly (GIS) <PAKelly@cityofpensacola.com>; Robbie Weekley <rweekley@cityofpensacola.com>; Ryan J. Novota <RNovota@cityofpensacola.com>; Sherry Morris

Cynthia Cannon

From: Andre Calaminus <andre.calaminus@ecua.fl.gov>
Sent: Thursday, October 17, 2019 9:58 AM
To: Cynthia Cannon
Subject: RE: Amendment to Sec. 12-6-4 (D) Landscape and tree protection plan

Hi Cynthia,

ECUA Engineering has no comment on the proposed changes to the language of the landscape plan.

Thanks,

Andre Calaminus | Right of Way Agent | Emerald Coast Utilities Authority |

P.O. Box 17089 | Pensacola, FL 32522-7089 | Web: www.ecua.fl.gov |

Phone: (850) 969-5822 | Fax: (850) 969-6511 |

From: Cynthia Cannon [mailto:CCannon@cityofpensacola.com]

Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2019 4:39 PM

To: Amy Hargett <ahargett@cityofpensacola.com>; Andre Calaminus <andre.calaminus@ecua.fl.gov>; Annie Bloxson <ABloxson@cityofpensacola.com>; Bill Kimball <bkimball@cityofpensacola.com>; Brad Hinote <bradhinote@cityofpensacola.com>; Brian Cooper <bcooper@cityofpensacola.com>; Chris Mauldin <CMauldin@cityofpensacola.com>; Cynthia Cannon <CCannon@cityofpensacola.com>; Derrik Owens <DOwens@cityofpensacola.com>; Diane Moore <DMoore@cityofpensacola.com>; Jonathan Bilby <JBilby@cityofpensacola.com>; Karl Fenner (AT&T) <KF5345@att.com>; Kellie L. Simmons (Gulf Power) <kellie.simmons@nexteraenergy.com>; Leslie Statler <LStatler@cityofpensacola.com>; Miriam Woods <MWoods@cityofpensacola.com>; Paul A Kelly(GIS) <PAKelly@cityofpensacola.com>; Robbie Weekley <rweekley@cityofpensacola.com>; Ryan J. Novota <RNovota@cityofpensacola.com>; Sherry Morris <SMorris@cityofpensacola.com>; Stephen Kennington (AT&T) <sk1674@att.com>

Subject: Amendment to Sec. 12-6-4 (D) Landscape and tree protection plan

****WARNING: This is an external email --- DO NOT CLICK links or attachments from unknown senders!****

Good Afternoon All,

Please review and comment on the request before Planning Board to consider an amendment to the sign posting requirements of the landscaping and tree protection plan, specifically to add a phone number to the sign. The proposed change would require future notices to state: "For Further Information Contact the City of Pensacola at 850-***_****".

All comments must be received by close of business on **Tuesday, October 29, 2019.**

Please call with any questions.

Thank you,

Cynthia Cannon, AICP



PLANNING SERVICES

MEMORANDUM

TO: Planning Board Members

FROM: Cynthia Cannon, AICP, Assistant Planning Services Administrator

DATE: November 4, 2019

SUBJECT: Request for Aesthetic Review – 997 South Palafox Street “Jaco’s”

Guy Brothers Roofing Company is requesting approval to replace the existing roof at “Jaco’s” which is located in the WRD, Waterfront Redevelopment District. The Land Development Code requires an aesthetic review in accordance with the design guidelines set forth in Section 12-2-82 (D), specifically architectural style such as exterior colors and materials. Please note that the abbreviated review process in WRD is only applicable to sign requests, paint colors and emergency repairs, therefore the applicant was referred to the full board for approval.

This request has been routed through the various City departments and utility providers. Those comments are attached for your review.

Review Routing
Project: 997 S. Palafox St

Meeting: November 18, 2019
Comments Due: October 29, 2019

Department:	Comments:
FIRE	No comments.
PW/E	No comments.
InspSvcs	No comments.
ESP	No comments.
ECUA	No comments.
GPW	No comments.
ATT	No concerns.

**Planning Board Application
Request for Aesthetic Review**

Application Date: 10/24/19

Applicant: Guy Brothers Roofing Co. Inc.

Applicant's Address: 997 S. Palafox St. Soyco Rest.

Email: Michael@GuyBrothersRoofing.com Phone: 850-434-1785

Review District: _____

* An application for aesthetic review shall be reviewed by a representative of the Planning Board once all materials have been submitted and it is deemed complete by the Secretary to the Board.

Project specifics/description:

Remove existing Roof
and install new .032 Alum. Standing Seam Roof
Color is Patina Green. Designed to Look Like
aged Copper.

I, the undersigned applicant, understand that payment of these fees does not entitle me to approval and that no refund of these fees will be made.


Applicant Signature

10/25/19
Date



Guy Brothers Roofing PENSACOLA
PO Box 17839 Pensacola, FL 32522 LIC# CCC058150
Phone: 850-434-1785
Fax: 850-438-0510

997 South Palafox
08/28/2019

Company Representative
Brent Langham
Phone: (850) 698-0120
Brent@guybrothersroofing.com

Chris Thompson
Downtown Property Group USA
997 South Palafox Street Pensacola, FL 32502
(850) 777-3100

Job: Chris Thompson

Roofing Section

1. Remove 1 Layer of SLATE SHINGLES, Renail to Current Code
2. Underlayment Type: High Temp Ice & Water Shield
3. Install New Valleys: Aluminum Valley Metal
4. Roof Type: Standing Seam Metal Roof System
5. Metal Eave Color: TBD Size:
6. Install New Plumbing Vents
7. Seal around all vents, pipes, flashing, chimney, and paint stacks
8. Clean up, haul away trash, and run magnet
9. Warranty Material Warranty: 25 year / 40 year Workmanship Warranty: 5 Year
10. Roof Material Brand: Image II Standing Seam Aluminum Color: TBD
11. Wood replacement: 20 SHEETS INCLUDED. Additional is extra above contract at: \$65 per sheet
12. Are not responsible for cracked driveway or damage to cloth awnings
13. Will Re-install bird spikes after replacement of roof.

DUE TO THE SCOPE OF THIS PROJECT WE DO REQUEST A PAYMENT OF HALF AT TIME OF MATERIAL DELIVERY AND THE REMAINING HALF UPON COMPLETION

TOTAL

PVDF Cool Colors


COLOR GUIDE



Linen White (81)



Sandstone (W51)



Parchment (W74)




Khaki (88)



Patriot Red (73)



Terra Cotta (W72)




Medium Bronze (H4)



Matte Black (106)




Ocean Blue (35)



Metallic Silver (K7)



Mistique Plus (W31)




Copper Penny (W92)



Aged Copper (65)



Patina Green (W58)



Aluminum (01) *Non-Painted Finish*

Aluminum Panel Advantages

- ▶ Panels are corrosion resistant even in coastal environments
- ▶ All Aluminum Cool Colors meet or exceed steep slope ENERGY STAR® requirements
- ▶ Panels have excellent uplift capacity as demonstrated by test results
- ▶ Aluminum Cool Colors may be eligible for tax credits (painted panels)
- ▶ Panels are light weight for easy installation







Leslie Statler

From: ST PIERRE, ROB A <RS634Y@att.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 30, 2019 2:06 PM
To: Cynthia Cannon
Subject: FW: Request for Aesthetic Review - 997 S. Palafox St., Jaco's
Attachments: 997 S. Palafox St. Aesthetic Rvw Application_11.18.2019.pdf

Cynthia,

AT&T has no objection/conflict to the roof replacement at Jaco's.

Thanks,

Rob St. Pierre
Manager - OSP Plng & Eng
Technology Operations

AT&T
605 W Garden St. Pensacola, FL 32502
o 850.436.1701 | rs634y@att.com
MOBILIZING YOUR WORLD

This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are AT&T property, are confidential, and are intended solely for use by the individual or entity to whom this email is addressed. If you are not one of the named recipient(s) or otherwise have reason to believe that you have received this message in error, please notify the sender and delete this message immediately from your computer. Any other use, retention, dissemination, forwarding, printing, or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited.

From: FENNER, KARL L
Sent: Tuesday, October 29, 2019 3:58 PM
To: ST PIERRE, ROB A <RS634Y@att.com>
Subject: FW: Request for Aesthetic Review - 997 S. Palafox St., Jaco's

Karl Fenner
Area Manager – OSP Plng and Eng
Technology Operations

AT&T
605 W Garden St, Pensacola, FL 32502
o 850.436.1485 | kf5345@att.com

MOBILIZING YOUR WORLD

This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are AT&T property, are confidential, and are intended solely for use by the individual or entity to whom this email is addressed. If you are not one of the named recipient(s) or otherwise have reason to believe that you have received this message in error, please notify the sender and

Cynthia Cannon

From: Annie Bloxson
Sent: Thursday, October 31, 2019 8:10 AM
To: Cynthia Cannon
Subject: RE: Request for Aesthetic Review - 997 S. Palafox St., Jaco's

Good Morning,

I do not have an issue with the color choice for the new roof.

Respectfully,

Annie Bloxson

Fire Marshal


Visit us at PensacolaFire.com

475 E. Strong St.

Pensacola, FL 32501

Office: 850.436.5200

abloxson@cityofpensacola.com



Florida has a very broad public records law. As a result, any written communication created or received by City of Pensacola officials and employees will be made available to the public and media, upon request, unless otherwise exempt. Under Florida law, email addresses are public records. If you do not want your email address released in response to a public records request, do not send electronic mail to this office. Instead, contact our office by phone or in writing.

From: Cynthia Cannon <CCannon@cityofpensacola.com>

Sent: Tuesday, October 29, 2019 3:57 PM

To: Amy Hargett <ahargett@cityofpensacola.com>; Andre Calaminus (ECUA) <andre.calaminus@ecua.fl.gov>; Annie Bloxson <ABloxson@cityofpensacola.com>; Bill Kimball <bkimball@cityofpensacola.com>; Brad Hinote <bradhinote@cityofpensacola.com>; Brian Cooper <bcooper@cityofpensacola.com>; Chris Mauldin <CMauldin@cityofpensacola.com>; Cynthia Cannon <CCannon@cityofpensacola.com>; Derrik Owens <DOWens@cityofpensacola.com>; Diane Moore <DMoore@cityofpensacola.com>; Jonathan Bilby <JBilby@cityofpensacola.com>; Karl Fenner (AT&T) <KF5345@att.com>; Kellie L. Simmons (Gulf Power) <kellie.simmons@nexteraenergy.com>; Leslie Statler <LStatler@cityofpensacola.com>; Miriam Woods <MWoods@cityofpensacola.com>; Paul A Kelly (GIS) <PAKelly@cityofpensacola.com>; Robbie Weekley <rweekley@cityofpensacola.com>; Ryan J. Novota <RNovota@cityofpensacola.com>; Sherry Morris

PLANNING SERVICES

MEMORANDUM

TO: Planning Board Members

FROM: Cynthia Cannon, AICP, Assistant Planning Services Administrator

DATE: November 4, 2019

SUBJECT: Consider *Preliminary/Final* Site Plan Approval – 700-800 BLK South Palafox Street
“Admiral’s Row”

Admirals Row, LLC, is requesting a combined *preliminary/final* approval for site improvements for a new multi-family development, “Admiral’s Row”, located in the SPBD, South Palafox Business District. New developments in the SPBD are subject to Sections 12-2-81 (C), approval procedure, and 12-2-82 (D), design standards and guidelines, aesthetic review provisions, as well as the additional provisions in Section 12-2-13 (E).

General Project Description:

- Multi-family residential - 1.47 Acres
- Building “A” 7 Condominiums Residences
- Building “B” 9 Condominiums Residences
- Building “C” 2 condominiums Residences

This request has been routed through the various City departments and utility providers. Those comments are attached for your review.

Department:

Comments:

FIRE

In the 3-D photos, a marina is shown. Please review NFPA 1: Fire Code, 2015 Edition Chapter 28 – Marinas, Boatyards, Marine Terminals, Piers and Wharves for code requirements. Please review NFPA 14, 2013 Edition Chapter 6 section 6.4.5 in regards to the location and identification of the FDC.

PW/E

Applicant is still required to pull permits for the project in addition to PB review and approval.

Insp Svcs

No comments.

ESP

Pensacola Energy has natural gas main under the sidewalk where they propose to saw cut. I would like to get gas shown on the plans.

ECUA

This project will need to submit to ECUA Engineering for review and permitting of water and/or sewer. Please have the applicant see the ECUA Engineering Manual - Procedures 2 and 3 for information regarding submittal and review processes (<https://ecua.fl.gov/work-with-us/engineering-manuals-contacts>).

GPW

No comments.

ATT

No comments.

Leslie Statler

From: Andre Calaminus <andre.calaminus@ecua.fl.gov>
Sent: Thursday, October 17, 2019 7:40 AM
To: Cynthia Cannon
Subject: RE: SPBD Preliminary/Final Site Plan Application - Admiral's Row

Good morning Cynthia,

This project will need to submit to ECUA Engineering for review and permitting of water and/or sewer. Please have the applicant see the ECUA Engineering Manual - Procedures 2 and 3 for information regarding submittal and review processes (<https://ecua.fl.gov/work-with-us/engineering-manuals-contacts>).

Thank you,

Andre Calaminus | Right of Way Agent | Emerald Coast Utilities Authority |

P.O. Box 17089 | Pensacola, FL 32522-7089 | Web: www.ecua.fl.gov |

Phone: (850) 969-5822 | Fax: (850) 969-6511 |

From: Cynthia Cannon [mailto:CCannon@cityofpensacola.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 16, 2019 10:56 AM
To: Amy Hargett <ahargett@cityofpensacola.com>; Andre Calaminus <andre.calaminus@ecua.fl.gov>; Annie Bloxson <ABloxson@cityofpensacola.com>; Bill Kimball <bkimball@cityofpensacola.com>; Brad Hinote <bradhinote@cityofpensacola.com>; Brian Cooper <bcooper@cityofpensacola.com>; Chris Mauldin <CMauldin@cityofpensacola.com>; Cynthia Cannon <CCannon@cityofpensacola.com>; Derrik Owens <DOwens@cityofpensacola.com>; Diane Moore <DMoore@cityofpensacola.com>; Jonathan Bilby <JBilby@cityofpensacola.com>; Karl Fenner (AT&T) <KF5345@att.com>; Kellie L. Simmons (Gulf Power) <kellie.simmons@nexteraenergy.com>; Leslie Statler <LStatler@cityofpensacola.com>; Miriam Woods <MWoods@cityofpensacola.com>; Paul A Kelly(GIS) <PAKelly@cityofpensacola.com>; Robbie Weekley <rweekley@cityofpensacola.com>; Ryan J. Novota <RNovota@cityofpensacola.com>; Sherry Morris <SMorris@cityofpensacola.com>; Stephen Kennington (AT&T) <sk1674@att.com>
Subject: SPBD Preliminary/Final Site Plan Application - Admiral's Row

****WARNING: This is an external email --- DO NOT CLICK links or attachments from unknown senders ****

Good Morning All,

Please review and comment on the attached combined Preliminary/Final Approval for the property located on South Palafox Street (address pending approval) which is in the South Palafox Business District (SPBD). All comments must be received by close of business on **Tuesday, October 29, 2019.**

Please call with any questions.

Thank you,

Cynthia Cannon, AICP

Assistant Planning Services Administrator

Visit us at <http://cityofpensacola.com>

222 W Main St.

Leslie Statler

From: Diane Moore
Sent: Monday, October 28, 2019 1:16 PM
To: Cynthia Cannon
Subject: RE: SPBD Preliminary/Final Site Plan Application - Admiral's Row

Cynthia,

My only comment is that Pensacola Energy has natural gas main under the sidewalk where they propose to saw cut. I would like to get gas shown on the plans.

Also, Pensacola Energy has no comment on the License to Use Application.

Thanks,
Diane

Diane Moore | Gas Distribution Engineer
Pensacola Energy | 1625 Atwood Drive, Pensacola, FL 32514
Desk: 850-474-5319 | Cell: 850-324-8004 | Fax: 850-474-5331
Email: dmoore@cityofpensacola.com

***Please consider the environment before printing this email.



For Non-Emergency Citizen Requests, Dial 311 or visit Pensacola311.com

Notice: Florida has a very broad public records law. As a result, any written communication created or received by City of Pensacola officials and employees will be made available to the public and media, upon request, unless otherwise exempt. Under Florida law, email addresses are public records. If you do not want your email address released in response to a public records request, do not send electronic mail to this office. Instead, contact our office by phone or in writing.

From: Cynthia Cannon <CCannon@cityofpensacola.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 24, 2019 11:27 AM
To: Amy Hargett <ahargett@cityofpensacola.com>; Andre Calaminus (ECUA) <andre.calaminus@ecua.fl.gov>; Annie Bloxson <ABloxson@cityofpensacola.com>; Bill Kimball <bkimball@cityofpensacola.com>; Brad Hinote <bradhinote@cityofpensacola.com>; Brian Cooper <bcooper@cityofpensacola.com>; Chris Mauldin <CMauldin@cityofpensacola.com>; Cynthia Cannon <CCannon@cityofpensacola.com>; Derrik Owens <DOwens@cityofpensacola.com>; Diane Moore <DMoore@cityofpensacola.com>; Jonathan Bilby <JBilby@cityofpensacola.com>; Karl Fenner (AT&T) <KF5345@att.com>; Kellie L. Simmons (Gulf Power) <kellie.simmons@nexteraenergy.com>; Leslie Statler <LStatler@cityofpensacola.com>; Miriam Woods <MWoods@cityofpensacola.com>; Paul A Kelly (GIS) <PAKelly@cityofpensacola.com>; Robbie Weekley <rweekley@cityofpensacola.com>; Ryan J. Novota <RNovota@cityofpensacola.com>; Sherry Morris <SMorris@cityofpensacola.com>; Stephen Kennington (AT&T) <sk1674@att.com>
Subject: FW: SPBD Preliminary/Final Site Plan Application - Admiral's Row

Leslie Statler

From: Annie Bloxson
Sent: Monday, October 28, 2019 11:40 AM
To: Cynthia Cannon
Subject: RE: SPBD Preliminary/Final Site Plan Application - Admiral's Row

Good Morning,

In the 3-D photos, a marina is shown. Please review NFPA 1: Fire Code, 2015 Edition Chapter 28 – Marinas, Boatyards, Marine Terminals, Piers and Wharves for code requirements.

Please review NFPA 14, 2013 Edition Chapter 6 section 6.4.5 in regards to the location and identification of the FDC. Thank you.

Respectfully,

Annie Bloxson

Fire Marshal

Visit us at PensacolaFire.com

475 E. Strong St.

Pensacola, FL 32501

Office: 850.436.5200

abloxson@cityofpensacola.com



Florida has a very broad public records law. As a result, any written communication created or received by City of Pensacola officials and employees will be made available to the public and media, upon request, unless otherwise exempt. Under Florida law, email addresses are public records. If you do not want your email address released in response to a public records request, do not send electronic mail to this office. Instead, contact our office by phone or in writing.

From: Cynthia Cannon <CCannon@cityofpensacola.com>

Sent: Wednesday, October 16, 2019 10:56 AM

To: Amy Hargett <ahargett@cityofpensacola.com>; Andre Calaminus (ECUA) <andre.calaminus@ecua.fl.gov>; Annie Bloxson <ABloxson@cityofpensacola.com>; Bill Kimball <bkimball@cityofpensacola.com>; Brad Hinote <bradhinote@cityofpensacola.com>; Brian Cooper <bcooper@cityofpensacola.com>; Chris Mauldin <CMauldin@cityofpensacola.com>; Cynthia Cannon <CCannon@cityofpensacola.com>; Derrik Owens <DOwens@cityofpensacola.com>; Diane Moore <DMoore@cityofpensacola.com>; Jonathan Bilby <JBilby@cityofpensacola.com>; Karl Fenner (AT&T) <KF5345@att.com>; Kellie L. Simmons (Gulf Power)



APPLICATION FOR SITE PLAN APPROVAL

Please Check Application Type and Required Fees:

Site Plan "A"	
☐	Conditional Use
☐	Special Planned Development
☐	Major Revisions to SSD's
☐	Exception to the 4,000 sq. ft. maximum area for a commercial use in an R-NC district
Site Plan "A" Fees:	
☐	Preliminary Fee: \$1,500.00
☐	Final Fee: \$1,500.00
☐	Preliminary & Final Fee: \$2,000.00
☐	Review Board Rehearing/Rescheduling Fee: \$250.00
☐	City Council Rehearing/Rescheduling Fee: \$750.00

Site Plan "C"	
☐	Non-residential Parking in a Residential Zone
Site Plan "C" Fees:	
☐	Application Fee: \$1,500.00
☐	Appeal to City Council Fee: \$250.00

Site Plan "B"	
☐	Conservation district (CO)
☐	Airport district – all private, non-aviation related development in the ARZ zone and all developments except single-family in an approved subdivision in the ATZ-1 and AZT-2 zones
☐	Waterfront Redevelopment district (WRD)
☐	South Palafox Business district (SPBD)
☐	Interstate Corridor district (IC)
☐	Multi-family developments over 35' high within the R-2A district
☐	Buildings over 45' high in the R-2, R-NC and C-1 districts
Site Plan "B" Fees:	
☐	Preliminary Fee: \$1,500.00
☒	Final Fee: \$1,500.00
☒	Preliminary & Final Fee: \$2,000.00
☐	Review Board Rehearing/Rescheduling Fee: \$250.00
☐	City Council Rehearing/Rescheduling Fee: \$750.00

APPLICATION DEADLINE IS 30 CALENDAR DAYS PRIOR TO THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING

Applicant Information:

Name: ADRIAN SMP ARCHITECTURE PA Date: 10/11/19
 Address: 40 S. PALAFOX PLACE, SUITE 202
 Phone: 850-712-2612 Fax: N/A Email: brishia@smp-arch.com

Property Information:

Owner Name: ADMIRALS ROW, LLC Phone: 850-434-5579
 Location/Address: SOUTH PALAFOX ST. (ADDRESS UNASSIGNED)
 Parcel ID: 00-05-00-9100-011-044 Square Feet/Acres: 1.47 ACRES

Legal Description: Please attach a full legal description (from deed or survey)

Purpose of site plan approval: PRELIMINARY & FINAL APPROVAL
SOUGHT BY PLANNING BOARD IN ORDER
TO PROCEED WITH DEVELOPMENT

I, the undersigned applicant, understand that payment of these fees does not entitle me to approval of this site plan and that no refund of these fees will be made. Also, I understand that any resubmissions based on non-compliance with City subdivision and/or development requirements will result in one-half (1/2) the initial application fee. I have reviewed a copy of the applicable zoning regulations and understand that I must be present on the date of the Planning Board and City Council meeting.

[Signature] Date: 10/11/19
 Signature of Applicant
 (Owner of Property or Official Representative of Owner)

SITE CONSTRUCTION PLANS
FOR
ADMIRAL'S ROW
SOUTH PALAFOX STREET
PENSACOLA, FLORIDA
October 9, 2019

RBA PROJECT NO.: 2018.242


SITE INFORMATION	
OWNER:	ADMIRALS ROW, LLC PO BOX 12346 PENSACOLA, FL 32591
DEVELOPER:	ADMIRALS ROW, LLC PO BOX 12346 PENSACOLA, FL 32591
PROPERTY REFERENCE NO:	00-0S-00-9100-011-044
PROPERTY ADDRESS:	800 BLOCK S PALAFOX STREET
PROPERTY AREA:	1.47 ACRES
PROJECT AREA:	1.47 ACRES
PROPERTY ZONING:	SPBD
FUTURE LAND USE:	COMMERCIAL
PROPOSED ACTIVITY:	MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL
REQUIRED BUILDING SETBACKS SPDB:	FRONT YARD - 0 FT. SIDE YARD - 0 FT. REAR YARD - 0 FT.

FEMA FLOOD INSURANCE RATE MAP INFORMATION					
THE PARCEL SHOWN FOR DEVELOPMENT IS LOCATED WITHIN THE FOLLOWING FLOOD ZONE(S) AS DETAILED BY FEMA FIRM (FLOOD INSURANCE RATE MAP) INFORMATION DESCRIBED BELOW:					
FLOOD ZONE(S)	COMMUNITY No.	MAP No.	PANEL No.	SUFFIX	MAP REVISION DATE
AE	120080	12033C	0390	G	SEPT 29, 2006

CONTACTS	
GULF POWER 5120 DOGWOOD DRIVE MILTON, FLORIDA 32570	CONTACT: CHAD SWAILS PHONE: 850.429.2446 FAX: 850.429.2432
COX CABLE 3405 McLEMORE DR. PENSACOLA, FLORIDA 32514	CONTACT: TROY YOUNG PHONE: 850.857.4510 FAX: 850.475.0621
ECUA 9255 STURDEVANT ST. PENSACOLA, FLORIDA 32514	CONTACT: TOMMY TAYLOR PHONE: 850.969.6516
ENERGY SERVICES GAS 1625 ATWOOD DRIVE PENSACOLA, FLORIDA 32504	CONTACT: DIANE MOORE PHONE: 850.474.5319 FAX: 850.474.5331
AT&T, INC. 605 W. GARDEN STREET PENSACOLA, FLORIDA 32501	CONTACT: JONATHAN BLANKINSHIP PHONE: 850.436.1489
CITY OF PENSACOLA ENGINEER 180 GOVERNMENTAL CENTER PENSACOLA, FLORIDA 32502	CONTACT: L. DERRIK OWENS PHONE: 850.435.1645
MCI	PHONE: 800.624.9675
SUNSHINE UTILITIES	PHONE: 800.432.4770



VICINITY MAP
SCALE: 1"=500'



REBOL-BATTLE & ASSOCIATES
Civil Engineers and Surveyors

2301 N. Ninth Avenue, Suite 300
Pensacola, Florida 32503
Telephone 850.438.0400
Fax 850.438.0448
EB 00009657 LB 7916

ECUA ENGINEERING MANUAL REFERENCE NOTE*				
*NOTES SHALL BE INSERTED IN THE UPPER RIGHT CORNER OF TITLE SHEET				
*APPLICABLE ONLY TO ECUA INFRASTRUCTURE TO BE CONSTRUCTED IN PUBLIC ROW OR IN UTILITY EASEMENT; NOT TO BE APPLIED TO PRIVATE WATER/SEWER FACILITIES ON PRIVATE PROPERTY (SEE BUILDING CODE)				
A. ECUA ENGINEERING MANUAL INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE				
THE ECUA ENGINEERING MANUAL, DATED DECEMBER 18, 2014, ALONG WITH UPDATE # 1 DATED SEPTEMBER 1, 2016 (HEREINAFTER "MANUAL"), LOCATED AT WWW.ECUA.FL.GOV, IS HEREBY INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE INTO THIS PROJECT'S OFFICIAL CONTRACT DOCUMENTS AS IF FULLY SET FORTH THEREIN. IT IS THE CONTRACTOR'S RESPONSIBILITY TO BE KNOWLEDGEABLE OF THE MANUAL'S CONTENTS AND TO CONSTRUCT THE PROJECT IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE MANUAL. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL PROVIDE ITS EMPLOYEES ACCESS TO THE MANUAL AT ALL TIMES, VIA PROJECT SITE OR OFFICE, VIA DIGITAL OR PAPER FORMAT. IN THE EVENT OF A CONFLICT BETWEEN THE MANUAL AND PLANS, CONTRACTOR SHALL CONSULT ENGINEER OF RECORD FOR PROPER RESOLUTION.				
B. ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS (TO BE COMPLETED BY THE ENGINEER OF RECORD)				
DOES THIS PROJECT HAVE ADDITIONAL TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS OR CONSTRUCTION DETAILS THAT SUPERSEDE THE MANUAL LISTED ABOVE?				
☐ YES ☒ NO				
IF YES, CONTRACTOR SHALL CONSTRUCT PROJECT IN ACCORDANCE WITH SAID DOCUMENTS AS LISTED AND LOCATED BELOW:				
DOCUMENT NAME	DOCUMENT TYPE		LOCATION	
	SPECIFICATION	DETAIL	PLANS	PROJECT MANUAL*
*PROJECT MANUALS USED ONLY WITH ECUA CIP PROJECTS				
C. ENGINEER OF RECORD RESPONSIBILITIES				
THE ENGINEERS OF RECORD (EORS) THAT HAVE AFFIXED THEIR SEALS AND SIGNATURES ON THESE PLANS WARRANT THEIR PORTIONS OF THE PLANS HAVE BEEN DESIGNED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE MANUAL (UNLESS OTHERWISE DIRECTED BY THE ECUA PROJECT ENGINEER). THE EORS SHALL BE KNOWLEDGEABLE OF THE MANUAL'S CONTENTS AND SHALL ASSUME RESPONSIBILITY FOR ITS USE ON THIS PROJECT.				

INDEX OF DRAWINGS

- C1.0 EXISTING SITE, DEMOLITION AND EROSION CONTROL PLAN
- C1.1 EROSION CONTROL DETAILS
- C2.0 SITE LAYOUT AND DIMENSION PLAN
- C2.1 SITE DETAILS
- C3.0 GRADING AND DRAINAGE PLAN
- C3.1 GRADING AND DRAINAGE DETAILS
- C3.2 GRADING AND DRAINAGE DETAILS
- C4.0 UTILITY PLAN
- C4.1 UTILITY DETAILS
- C4.2 UTILITY DETAILS

LEGAL DESCRIPTION

DESCRIPTION: (OFFICIAL RECORDS BOOK 4688, PAGE 1389)
LOT 11 THROUGH 20 AND 26 THROUGH 30 AND THE NORTH 30 FEET OF CYPRESS STREET ADJOINING LOT 20, 26, 27 AND 30, BLOCK 44, ALSO THE SOUTH HALF OF PINE STREET, ADJOINING LOTS 11, 25, 28, AND 29, BLOCK 44, WATERFRONT GRANT. MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS: BEGINNING AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF LOT 11, BLOCK 44, WATERFRONT GRANT; THENCE PROCEED SOUTH 10 DEGREES 34 MINUTES 11SECONDS EAST ALONG THE WEST RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE OF PALAFOX STREET (78.92' R/W) A DISTANCE OF 280.19 FEET TO THE CENTERLINE OF CYPRESS STREET (60' R/W AS VACATED); THENCE PROCEED SOUTH 79 DEGREES 25 MINUTES 49 SECONDS WEST ALONG THE CENTERLINE OF CYPRESS STREET A DISTANCE OF 219.42 FEET; THENCE PROCEED NORTH 10 DEGREES 34 MINUTES 11 SECONDS WEST A DISTANCE OF 155.10 FEET TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF LOT 26; THENCE PROCEED SOUTH 79 DEGREES 25 MINUTES 49 SECONDS EAST ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF SAID LOT 26 A DISTANCE OF 31.00 FEET TO THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF LOT 28; THENCE PROCEED NORTH 10 DEGREES 34 MINUTES 11 SECONDS WEST ALONG THE WEST LINE OF SAID LOT 28 FOR A DISTANCE OF 125.09 FEET TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAID LOT 28; THENCE PROCEED SOUTH 79 DEGREES 25 MINUTES 49 SECONDS WEST ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF LOT 25 A DISTANCE OF 31.00 FEET TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAID LOT 25; THENCE PROCEED NORTH 10 DEGREES 34 MINUTES 11 SECONDS WEST A DISTANCE OF 30.00 FEET TO THE CENTERLINE OF PINE STREET (60' R/W AS VACATED); THENCE PROCEED NORTH 79 DEGREES 25 MINUTES 49 SECONDS EAST ALONG SAID CENTERLINE OF PINE STREET A DISTANCE OF 219.42 FEET TO THE AFOREMENTIONED WEST RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE OF PALAFOX STREET; THENCE PROCEED SOUTH 10 DEGREES 34 MINUTES 11 SECONDS EAST ALONG SAID WEST RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE A DISTANCE OF 30.00 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING. THE ABOVE DESCRIBED PARCEL OF LAND IS SITUATED IN SECTION 42, TOWNSHIP 2 SOUTH, RANGE 30 WEST, ESCAMBIA COUNTY, FLORIDA. SUBJECT TO AND TOGETHER WITH RIPARIAN AND LITTORAL RIGHTS APPERTAINING THERETO.

THE CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING "RELEASED FOR CONSTRUCTION" DRAWINGS FROM REBOL-BATTLE & ASSOCIATES BEFORE BEGINNING CONSTRUCTION. REBOL-BATTLE & ASSOCIATES WILL NOT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY CONSTRUCTION BASED ON PLANS THAT HAVE NOT BEEN RELEASED FOR CONSTRUCTION.





ADMIRAL'S ROW

South Palafox Street,
Pensacola, Florida

A MULTI-RESIDENCE PROJECT
12.25 DWELLING UNITS PER ACRE

ADMIRAL'S
ROW
(Building "A")

GENERAL	
GA-001	COVER SHEET & INDEX OF DRAWINGS
CIVIL	
A-001	ARCHITECTURAL SITE PLAN
A-002	ENTRY GATE ELEVATION & SECTIONS
—	COVER SHEET
C1.0	EXISTING SITE, DEMOLITION & EROSION CONTROL
C1.1	EROSION CONTROL DETAILS
C2.0	SITE LAYOUT & DIMENSION PLAN
C2.1	SITE DETAILS
C3.0	GRADING & DRAINAGE PLAN
C3.1	GRADING & DRAINAGE DETAILS
C3.2	GRADING & DRAINAGE DETAILS
C4.0	UTILITY PLAN
C4.1	UTILITY DETAILS
C4.2	UTILITY DETAILS
ARCHITECTURAL	
BUILDING "A"	7 CONDOMINIUMS RESIDENCES
BUILDING "B"	9 CONDOMINIUMS RESIDENCES
BUILDING "C"	2 CONDOMINIUMS RESIDENCES

smp.
SMP Architecture, P.A.
40 S. PALAFOX STREET, SUITE 207
PENSACOLA, FL 32502 | P 850.432.7777
www.smp-arch.com • AIA/CES 11828

Listen. Interpret. Translate.

CERTIFICATION :

South Palafox Street
Pensacola, Florida

ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL
HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UN-
PUBLISHED WORK OF THE ARCHITECT
AND MAY NOT BE DUPLICATED IN ANY
PART WITHOUT THE WRITTEN CONSENT
OF THE ARCHITECT.

REVISIONS :

DRAWN BY: RAP

CHECKED BY: PDP


PROJECT NO. 1814

DATE : OCTOBER 9, 2019


SHEET TITLE :
COVER SHEET &
INDEX OF DRAWINGS
BUILDING "A"

SHEET NO. :
GA-001

©2018 SMP ARCHITECTURE



1. ALL WORK SHALL BE PERFORMED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THESE PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS AND THE REQUIREMENTS AND STANDARDS OF ALL GOVERNING AUTHORITIES.
2. PRIOR TO STARTING CONSTRUCTION, THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR CONFIRMING THAT ALL REQUIRED PERMITS AND APPROVALS HAVE BEEN OBTAINED. NO CONSTRUCTION OR FABRICATION SHALL BEGIN UNTIL THE CONTRACTOR HAS RECEIVED AND THOROUGHLY REVIEWED ALL PLANS AND OTHER DOCUMENTS APPROVED BY ALL OF THE PERMITTING AGENCIES.
3. THE LOCATION OF UNDERGROUND FACILITIES SHOWN ON THESE PLANS ARE BASED ON INFORMATION PROVIDED BY THE UTILITIES AND SHALL BE CONSIDERED APPROXIMATE. IT SHALL BE THE CONTRACTOR'S FULL RESPONSIBILITY TO CONTACT THE VARIOUS UTILITY COMPANIES TO LOCATE THEIR FACILITIES PRIOR TO STARTING CONSTRUCTION. NO ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION SHALL BE PAID TO THE CONTRACTOR FOR DAMAGE AND REPAIR TO THESE FACILITIES CAUSED BY HIS WORK FORCE.
4. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY THE SUPERINTENDENTS OF THE WATER, SANITARY SEWER, GAS, TELEPHONE, CABLE TELEVISION, AND POWER COMPANIES 10 DAYS IN ADVANCE THAT HE INTENDS TO START WORK IN A SPECIFIED AREA. THE OWNER DISCLAIMS ANY RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE SUPPORT AND PROTECTION OF SEWERS, DRAINS, WATER PIPES, GAS PIPES, CONDUITS OF ANY KIND, UTILITIES OR OTHER STRUCTURES OWNED BY THE CITY, COUNTY, STATE OR BY PRIVATE OR PUBLIC UTILITIES LEGALLY OCCUPYING ANY STREET, ALLEY, PUBLIC PLACE OR RIGHT-OF-WAY.
5. A.1. SITE CLEARING SHALL INCLUDE THE LOCATION AND REMOVAL OF ALL UNDERGROUND STRUCTURES, WHICH ARE NOT IN SERVICE AS NECESSARY FOR THE INSTALLATION OF PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS. THESE INCLUDE PIPES, VALVES, DRAINAGE STRUCTURES, ETC., AS INDICATED ON THE CONTRACT PLANS. CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY THE PROJECT OWNER AND ENGINEER OF ALL DISCOVERED UNDERGROUND STRUCTURES WHICH ARE IN CONFLICT WITH THE INSTALLATION OF THE PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS AND ARE NOT INDICATED ON THE CONTRACT PLANS OR LOCATED IN THE FIELD BY UTILITIES IN ACCORDANCE WITH GENERAL NOTE 1.
6. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL MAINTAIN TRAFFIC CONTROL IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE FOOT STANDARD ROAD BOOK (LATEST EDITION), FOOT STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS FOR ROAD AND BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION (LATEST EDITION) AND IN ACCORDANCE WITH ALL PERMIT REQUIREMENTS.
7. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL PLACE AND MAINTAIN ADEQUATE BARRIAGES, CONSTRUCTION SIGNS, FLASHING LIGHTS, TORCHES, RED LANTERNS AND GUARDS DURING PROGRESS OF CONSTRUCTION WORK IN ACCORDANCE WITH APPLICABLE MUTCD INDEX.
8. ALL AREAS, NOT PAVED, DISTURBED DURING CONSTRUCTION SHALL BE STABILIZED. REFER TO LANDSCAPE PLANS FOR PLANTING MATERIALS.
9. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL VISIT THE SITE TO FAMILIARIZE HIMSELF WITH EXISTING CONDITIONS AND THE EXTENT OF CLEARING AND GRUBBING REQUIRED.
10. ALL DIMENSIONS AND GRADES SHOWN ON THE PLANS SHALL BE FIELD VERIFIED BY THE CONTRACTOR PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY THE ENGINEER IF ANY DISCREPANCIES EXIST PRIOR TO PROCEEDING WITH CONSTRUCTION FOR NECESSARY PLAN OR GRADE CHANGES. NO EXTRA COMPENSATION SHALL BE PAID TO THE CONTRACTOR FOR WORK HAVING TO BE REDONE DUE TO DIMENSIONS OR GRADES SHOWN INCORRECTLY ON THESE PLANS IF SUCH NOTIFICATION HAS NOT BEEN GIVEN.
11. THE CONTRACTOR IS TO COORDINATE WITH THE RESPONSIBLE UTILITY PROVIDER FOR PROTECTION/HOLDING OF UTILITY POLES, GUY WIRES, AND GUY ANCHORS IN AREAS OF CONSTRUCTION. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL INCLUDE THE COST OF PROTECTING UTILITY POLES IN THEIR OVERALL PRICE TO THE OWNER.
12. NO SITE WORK ACTIVITIES SHALL TAKE PLACE WITHOUT CITY SITE REVIEW/APPROVAL OF PROPOSED EROSION CONTROL MEASURES AND ADVANCED NOTIFICATION OF THE REQUIRED INSPECTION IS REQUIRED.



00-05-00-910-0050-050
Account: 154408040
Owners: CITY OF PENSACOLA


REBOL-BATTLE & ASSOCIATES
Civil Engineers and Surveyors
2301 N. Ninth Avenue, Suite 300
Pompano Beach, Florida 33061
Telephone: (305) 781-0848
FAX: (305) 781-0848

EXISTING BITE, DEMOLITION & EROSION CONTROL PLAN

ADMIRAL'S ROW
800 BLK SOUTH PALAFOX STREET
PENSACOLA, FLORIDA

[illegible]

SEAL

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

Paul A. Battle, P.E.
No. 53126

Dr. By: GTP
Ck By: PAB
Job No.: 2018-242
Date: 10-09-2019

DRAWING No.

C1.0
SHEET 2 OF 11

90% PLANS

This drawing is the property of Rebel Battle & Associates, and may not be reproduced without written permission.

GENERAL NOTES FOR SOIL EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL:

1. ALL EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL PRACTICES TO BE INSTALLED PRIOR TO ANY MAJOR SOIL DISTURBANCE, OR IN THEIR PROPER SEQUENCE, AND MAINTAINED UNTIL PERMANENT PROTECTION IS ESTABLISHED.
2. ANY DISTURBED AREAS THAT WILL BE LEFT EXPOSED MORE THAN 30 DAYS, AND NOT SUBJECT TO CONSTRUCTION TRAFFIC, WILL IMMEDIATELY RECEIVE A TEMPORARY SEEDING, IF THE SEASON PREVENTS THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A TEMPORARY COVER. THE DISTURBED AREAS WILL BE MULCHED WITH STRAW OR EQUIVALENT MATERIAL, AT A RATE OF TWO (2) TONS PER ACRE, ACCORDING TO STATE STANDARDS.
3. PERMANENT VEGETATION TO BE SEED OR SODDED ON ALL EXPOSED AREAS WITHIN TEN (10) DAYS AFTER GRADING. MULCH TO BE USED AS NECESSARY FOR PROTECTION UNTIL SEEDING IS ESTABLISHED.
4. ALL WORK AND MATERIALS TO BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE FOOT "STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS FOR ROAD AND BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION", LATEST EDITION, SECTIONS 104, 570, 575 AND 980 TO 986.
- *5. A BITUMINOUS CONCRETE BASE COURSE WILL BE APPLIED IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING ROUGH GRADING AND INSTALLATION OF IMPROVEMENTS IN ORDER TO STABILIZE STREET'S, ROADS, DRIVEWAYS AND PARKING AREAS. IN AREAS WHERE NO UTILITIES ARE PRESENT, THE BITUMINOUS CONCRETE BASE SHALL BE INSTALLED WITHIN 15 DAYS OF THE PRELIMINARY GRADING.
- *6. IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING INITIAL DISTURBANCE OR ROUGH GRADING, ALL CRITICAL AREAS SUBJECT TO EROSION (I.E. STEEP SLOPES AND ROADWAY ENHANCEMENTS) WILL RECEIVE A TEMPORARY SEEDING IN COMBINATION WITH STRAW MULCH OR A SUITABLE EQUIVALENT, AT A THICKNESS OF TWO (2) TO FOUR (4) INCHES MIXED WITH THE TOP TWO (2) INCHES OF SOIL, ACCORDING TO STATE STANDARDS.
- *7. ANY STEEP SLOPES RECEIVING PIPELINE INSTALLATION WILL BE BACKFILLED AND STABILIZED DAILY, AS THE INSTALLATION PROCEEDS (I.E. SLOPES GREATER THAN 3:1).
- *8. A CRUSHED LIMESTONE, VEHICLE WHEEL-CLEANING BLANKET SHALL BE INSTALLED AT THE CONTRACTOR'S STAGING YARD AND/OR STOCKPILE AREAS TO PREVENT OFF-SITE TRACKING OF SEDIMENT BY CONSTRUCTION VEHICLES ONTO PUBLIC ROADS. BLANKET SHALL BE 15FT. X 50FT. X .8IN. (MINIMUM). CRUSHED LIMESTONE 2 1/2 INCHES IN DIAMETER. SAID BLANKET SHALL BE UNDERLAIN WITH A FOOT CLASS 3 SYNTHETIC FILTER FABRIC AND MAINTAINED IN GOOD ORDER.
9. AT THE TIME WHEN THE SITE PREPARATION FOR PERMANENT VEGETATIVE STABILIZATION IS GOING TO BE ACCOMPLISHED, ANY SOIL THAT WILL NOT PROVIDE A SUITABLE ENVIRONMENT TO SUPPORT ADEQUATE VEGETATIVE GROUND COVER, SHALL BE REMOVED OR TREATED IN SUCH A WAY THAT WILL PERMANENTLY ADJUST THE SOIL CONDITIONS AND RENDER IT SUITABLE FOR VEGETATIVE GROUND COVER. IF THE REMOVAL OR TREATMENT OF THE SOIL WILL NOT PROVIDE SUITABLE CONDITIONS, NON-VEGETATIVE MEANS OF PERMANENT GROUND STABILIZATION WILL HAVE TO BE EMPLOYED.
- *10. CONDUIT OUTLET PROTECTION MUST BE INSTALLED AT ALL REQUIRED OUTFALLS PRIOR TO THE DRAINAGE SYSTEM BECOMING OPERATIONAL.
11. UNFILTERED DEWATERING IS NOT PERMITTED. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL TAKE ALL NECESSARY PRECAUTIONS DURING ALL DEWATERING OPERATIONS TO MINIMIZE SEDIMENT TRANSFER.
12. SHOULD THE CONTROL OF DUST AT THE SITE BE NECESSARY, THE SITE WILL BE SPRINKLED UNTIL THE SURFACE IS WET. TEMPORARY VEGETATION COVER SHALL BE ESTABLISHED OR MULCH SHALL BE APPLIED IN ACCORDANCE WITH STATE STANDARDS FOR EROSION CONTROL.
13. ALL SOIL WASHED, DROPPED, SPILLED OR TRACKED OUTSIDE THE LIMIT OF DISTURBANCE OR ONTO PUBLIC RIGHTS-OF-WAY WILL BE REMOVED IMMEDIATELY.
14. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY EROSION OR SEDIMENTATION THAT MAY OCCUR BELOW STORMWATER OUTFALLS OR OFFSITE AS A RESULT OF CONSTRUCTION OF THE PROJECT.
15. ALL SOIL STOCKPILES ARE TO BE TEMPORARILY STABILIZED IN ACCORDANCE WITH SOIL EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL NOTE NUMBER 2 (ABOVE).
16. THE SITE SHALL AT ALL TIMES BE GRADED AND MAINTAINED SUCH THAT ALL STORM WATER RUNOFF IS DIVERTED TO SOIL EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL FACILITIES.
17. ALL SEDIMENTATION STRUCTURES SHALL BE INSPECTED AND MAINTAINED REGULARLY.
18. ALL CATCH BASIN INLETS SHALL BE PROTECTED WITH HAY BALES AS SHOWN ON DETAIL.
19. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL PREPARE A PLAN FOR THE PROPER DEWATERING AND DOWNSTREAM SLITATION PROTECTION OF EACH STREAM CROSSING PRIOR TO EXCAVATING THE STREAM BED. PLAN SHALL BE FORWARDED TO THE ENGINEER FOR APPROVAL. THE ENGINEER SHALL BE NOTIFIED FOR INSPECTION PRIOR TO EACH STREAM CROSSING CONSTRUCTION.
20. ANY AREAS USED FOR THE CONTRACTOR'S STAGING, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO, TEMPORARY STORAGE OF STOCKPILED MATERIALS (E.G. CRUSHED STONE, QUARRY PROCESS STONE, SELECT FILL, EXCAVATED MATERIALS, ETC.) SHALL BE ENTIRELY PROTECTED BY A SILT FENCE ALONG THE LOW ELEVATION SIDE TO CONTROL SEDIMENT RUNOFF.
- * WHERE APPLICABLE

TEMPORARY SEEDING DETAILS:

SEED BED PREPARATION:

SOIL TO BE THOROUGHLY PULVERIZED BY DISK-HARROWING AND BE LOOSE AND REASONABLY SMOOTH. APPLY FERTILIZER AT A RATE OF 250 LBS./ACRE OF 16-16-16 OR EQUIVALENT, APPLY DOLOMITIC LIMESTONE AT A RATE OF 800 TO 1000 LBS./ACRE TO PROVIDE A SOIL pH OF 5.5 TO 6.5. LIME & FERTILIZER TO BE WORKED INTO THE TOPSOIL TO A DEPTH OF 4" ADD SANDY LOAM TOPSOIL TO A MINIMUM OF TWO (2) INCHES WHERE REQUIRED.

SEED MIXTURE:

CONSISTING OF ANNUAL RYE (LOLIUM MULTIFLORUM) AT A RATE OF 174 LBS./ACRE.

PERMANENT SEEDING DETAILS:

SEED BED PREPARATION:

SOIL TO BE THOROUGHLY PULVERIZED BY DISK-HARROWING AND BE LOOSE AND REASONABLY SMOOTH. APPLY FERTILIZER AT A RATE OF 260 LBS./ACRE OF 16-16-16 OR EQUIVALENT, APPLY DOLOMITIC LIMESTONE AT A RATE OF 800 TO 1000 LBS./ACRE TO PROVIDE A SOIL pH OF 5.5 TO 6.5. LIME & FERTILIZER TO BE WORKED INTO THE TOPSOIL TO A DEPTH OF 4". ADD SANDY LOAM TOPSOIL TO A MINIMUM OF TWO (2) INCHES WHERE REQUIRED.

SEED MIXTURE CONSISTING OF:

SEED MIXTURE CONSISTING OF	RATE	PURITY	GERMINATION
ARGENTINE BAHIA	260 LBS./AC.	95%	80%
PENSACOLA BAHIA	260 LBS./AC.	95%	40%(MIN.)-80%(TOTAL)

SODDING:

SOD SHALL BE WELL ROOTED MATURE CENTPEDE OR BAHIA GRASS COMMERCIALY CUT TO A MINIMUM DIMENSION OF 12" x 24" x MAXIMUM OF 72 HOURS PRIOR TO PLACEMENT. SOD SHALL BE LIVE, FRESH AND UNINJURED, REASONABLY FREE OF WEEDS AND OTHER GRASSES, WITH A HEAVY SOIL MAT ADHERING TO THE ROOT SYSTEM. SOD SHALL BE GROWN, CUT, AND SUPPLIED BY A STATE CERTIFIED GROWER.

TRAFFIC CONTROL STANDARDS:

1. CONSTRUCTION TRAFFIC SHALL BE RESTRICTED TO ONSITE ACCESS BY MEANS SO DESIGNATED BY THE ENGINEER, POLICE/SHERIFF DEPARTMENT, ESCAIBA COUNTY HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT, AND/OR THE FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION.
2. TRAFFIC DURING WET WEATHER SHALL BE MINIMIZED AND APPROPRIATE ROADWAY AND SITE CLEAN-UP SHALL BE PROVIDED BY THE CONTRACTOR AS SHOWN AS WEATHER CONDITIONS PERMIT.

TREE PROTECTION:


1. DAMAGED TRUNKS OR EXPOSED ROOTS WILL BE PAINTED IMMEDIATELY WITH A GOOD GRADE OF "TREE PAINT".
2. TREE LIMB REMOVAL, WHERE NECESSARY, WILL BE DONE FLUSH TO TRUNK OR MAIN BRANCH AND THAT AREA PAINTED IMMEDIATELY WITH A GOOD GRADE OF TREE PAINT.

DUST CONTROL:

1. ALL AREAS OF CLEARING AND SUBANKMENT AS WELL AS CONSTRUCTION HAIL ROADS SHALL BE TREATED AND MAINTAINED IN SUCH A MANNER AS TO MINIMIZE ANY DUST GENERATION.
2. DISTURBED AREAS SHALL BE MAINTAINED IN A ROUGH GRADED CONDITION AND TEMPORARILY SEEDED AND/OR MULCHED UNTIL PROPER WEATHER CONDITIONS EXIST FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF PERMANENT VEGETATION COVER.
3. IN EVENT OF EMERGENCY CONDITIONS, TILLAGE WILL BE SATISFACTORY FREE BEFORE SOIL BLOWING STARTS.
4. CALCIUM CHLORIDE MAY BE APPLIED TO UNPAVED ROADWAY AREAS, ONLY, SUBJECT TO THE ENGINEER'S APPROVAL AND CONFORMANCE WITH FOOT STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS, SECTION 102-5, -LATEST EDITION.

PROPOSED SEQUENCE OF CONSTRUCTION:

1. THE INSTALLATION OF ALL SEDIMENT AND EROSION CONTROL DEVICES THAT CAN BE PLACED PRIOR TO ANY MAJOR SOIL DISTURBANCES.
2. CLEAR AND REMOVE ALL EXISTING VEGETATION IN THOSE AREAS WHERE NECESSARY. ALL REMAINING VEGETATION IS TO BE PROPERLY PROTECTED AND IS TO REMAIN IN ITS NATURAL STATE. TOPSOIL IN AREAS TO BE DISTURBED IS TO BE STRIPPED TO A MINIMUM DEPTH OF SIX (6) INCHES AND STOCKPILED SEPARATELY FROM OTHER EXCAVATED SOIL(S).
3. THE IMMEDIATE INSTALLATION OF ALL REMAINING SEDIMENT AND EROSION CONTROL DEVICES.
4. PERFORM ALL DRAINOUT WORK.
5. CONSTRUCT ALL UNDERGROUND UTILITIES AND STORM DRAIN SYSTEMS.
6. CONSTRUCT ROADS (SUBGRADE, CURB & GUTTER, BASE, PAVEMENT, SIDEWALKS AND LANDSCAPING).
7. COMPLETE STORMWATER PONDS.
8. UPON THE COMPLETION OF THE CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES, PROVIDE RESTORATION, FINE GRADE REMANEND OF SITE, RESPREAD STOCKPILED TOPSOIL AND STABILIZE WITH PERMANENT VEGETATIVE COVER AND LANDSCAPING.
9. THE REMOVAL OF APPROPRIATE TEMPORARY SEDIMENT AND EROSION CONTROL DEVICES.



STABILIZED CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCE DETAIL
N.T.S.



NOTE:
ALL PROTECTED TREES AS SHOWN ON THE PLANS TO REMAIN ARE TO BE PROTECTED DURING CONSTRUCTION. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL INSTALL ORANGE CONSTRUCTION FENCING AT THE DRIP LINE OF EACH PROTECTED TREE BEFORE WORKING IN THE VICINITY OF THE TREE.

TREE BARRICADE DETAIL
N.T.S.

DESCRIPTION:

FILTER BAGS WILL BE USED AS AN EFFECTIVE FILTER MEDIUM TO CONTAIN SAND, SILT AND FINES WHEN TRENCH DEWATERING. THE WETLAND FILTER BAG CONTAINS THESE MATERIALS WHILE ALLOWING THE WATER TO FLOW THROUGH THE FABRIC.

INSTALLATION:


WETLAND FILTER BAGS MAY REPLACE HAY BALE CORRAIS DURING TRENCH DEWATERING, AT THE DISCRETION OF THE ENGINEER INSPECTOR. TO INSURE PROPER INSTALLATION, FILTER BAGS WILL BE PLACED ON RELATIVELY FLAT TERRAIN FREE OF BRUSH AND STUMPS TO AVOID RUPTURES AND PUNCTURES. PROPER INSTALLATION REQUIRES CUTTING A SMALL HOLE IN THE CORNER OF THE BAG, INSERTING THE PUMP DISCHARGE HOSE, AND THEN SECURING THE DISCHARGE HOSE TO THE BAG WITH A HOSE CLAMP. FILTER BAGS WILL BE PLACED AS FAR AWAY FROM FLOWING STREAMS AND WETLANDS AS POSSIBLE.

MAINTENANCE:




PRIOR TO REMOVING A BAG FROM THE HOSE, THE BAG WILL BE TIED OFF BELOW THE END OF THE HOSE ALLOWING THE BAG TO DRAIN. ORANGE WILL NOT BE ALLOWED THROUGH THE INLET HOLE TO AVOID RUPTURE. THE BAGS WILL BE ATTENDED AND PUMPING RATES MONITORED. ONCE THE BAG IS INFLATED TO A HEIGHT OF 4 FEET, PUMPING WILL STOP TO AVOID RUPTURE. FILTER BAGS USED DURING CONSTRUCTION WILL BE BUNDLED AND REMOVED FOR PROPER DISPOSAL.

SPECIFICATION:

FILTER BAGS ARE CONSTRUCTED OF NON-WOVEN GEOTEXTILE FABRIC. A MAXIMUM OF ONE SIX INCH DISCHARGE HOSE WILL BE ALLOWED PER FILTER BAG. BAG CAPACITY WILL BE EXCEEDED BEYOND 2,000 GALLONS PER MINUTE. TYPICAL BAG DIMENSIONS ARE 15 FEET BY 13.25 FEET. TO HELP PREVENT PUNCTURES, GEOTEXTILE FABRIC WILL BE PLACED BENEATH THE FILTER BAG WHEN USED IN WOODED LOCATIONS. UNATTENDED FILTER BAGS WILL BE ENCLOSED WITH A HAY BALE OR SILT FENCE CORRAL. HOSE CLAMPS WILL BE USED TO SECURE THE DISCHARGE HOSE, WIRE OR STRING WILL NOT BE USED.




FILTER BAG DETAIL FOR TRENCH DEWATERING OPERATIONS
N.T.S.




SILT FENCE APPLICATIONS
N.T.S.

DO NOT DEPLOY IN A MANNER THAT SILT FENCES WILL ACT AS A DAM ACROSS PERMANENT FLOWING WATERCOURSES. SILT FENCES ARE TO BE USED AT UPLAND LOCATIONS AND TURBIDITY BARRIERS USED AT PERMANENT BODIES OF WATER.




STRAW BALES BACKED BY FENCE
N.T.S.




NOTICE: COMPONENTS OF TYPES AND I MAY BE SIMILAR OR IDENTICAL TO PROPRIETARY DESIGNS. ANY INFRINGEMENT ON THE PROPRIETARY RIGHTS OF THE DESIGNER SHALL BE THE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE USER. SUBSTITUTIONS FOR TYPES AND I SHALL BE AS APPROVED BY THE ENGINEER.



FLOATING TURBIDITY BARRIERS
N.T.S.




BARRIER FOR PAVED DITCH
N.T.S.




PROTECTION AROUND INLETS OR SIMILAR STRUCTURES
N.T.S.



STRAW BALE DETAIL
N.T.S.



MATERIAL STOCKPILE DETAIL
N.T.S.



REVISION	DATE	NO.


SEAL
NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

Paul A. Battle, P.E.
No. 53126

Dr. By: GTP
Ck By: PAB
Job No.: 2018-242
Date: 10-09-2019

DRAWING No.


C1.1
SHEET 3 OF 11



LEGEND	
	EXISTING ASPHALT
	EXISTING CONCRETE
	PROPOSED ASPHALT
	PROPOSED CONCRETE
	BOUNDARY LINE
	EASEMENT LINE
	LOT LINE
	RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE

00-05-80-910-0001-034
Account: 154375000
Owners: PENSACOLA CITY OF

N 10°34'11" W 155.10' (P)
N 09°33'36" W 155.10' (C)



90% PLANS

RBA

REBOL-BATTLE & ASSOCIATES
Civil Engineers and Surveyors
2201 N. North Avenue, Suite 300
Pensacola, Florida 32503
Telephone 850 438 0400 Fax 850 438 0448
EEO 00000657 1/8/2016

**SITE LAYOUT &
DIMENSION PLAN**

ADMIRAL'S ROW
800 BLK SOUTH PALAFOX STREET
PENSACOLA, FLORIDA

REVISION	
NO.	DATE


SEAL
NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

Paul A. Battle, P.E.
No. 53126


Dr. By: GTP
Ck By: PAB
Job No.: 2018-242
Date: 10-09-2019

DRAWING No.
C2.0
SHEET 4 OF 11

This drawing is the property of Rebol-Battle & Associates, and may not be reproduced without written permission.




WHEEL STOP DETAIL
N.T.S.




- NOTES:**
1. ALL CURB TO HAVE DUMMY JOINT AT 10' ON CENTER. MIN. DEPTH OF JOINT TO BE 2".
 2. EXPANSION JOINTS ARE TO BE 30' ON CENTER TYPICAL FOR ALL CURB.
 3. ALL CONCRETE SHALL BE 3000 psi AT 28 DAYS.

6" RIBBON CURB
N.T.S.




TYPICAL CONCRETE PAVERS DETAIL
N.T.S.




TYPICAL SECTION
N.T.S.


SIDEWALK DETAILS
N.T.S.



DUMMY GROVE




CONCRETE PAVING DETAIL
N.T.S.



SIGN USED AS PER FLORIDA STATUTES
FTP 25 Per FS 316.1955, FS 316.1956



HANDICAP PAVEMENT SYMBOL



HANDICAP PARKING STALL

HANDICAP PARKING STALL DETAILS
N.T.S.

NOTE:
ALL CONCRETE SIDEWALKS, RAMPS, DRIVEWAYS AND CURBING SHALL BE MINIMUM 3000 PSI, 28 DAY PCC, FIBER MESH REINFORCED CONCRETE UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE.

REVISION	DATE	BY


SEAL
NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

Paul A. Battle, P.E.
No. 53126

Dr. By: GTP
Ck By: PAB
Job No.: 2018-242
Date: 10-09-2019

DRAWING No.

C2.1
SHEET 5 OF 11




00-05-00-910-0001-034
Account: 154375000
Owners: PENSACOLA CITY OF

LEGEND	
	EXISTING ASPHALT
	EXISTING CONCRETE
	PROPOSED ASPHALT
	PROPOSED CONCRETE
	PROPOSED GRAVEL
	BOUNDARY LINE
	EASEMENT LINE
	LOT LINE
	RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE
	EXISTING CONTOUR
	PROPOSED CONTOUR
	UTILITY POLE
	LIGHT POLE
	TELEPHONE BOX
	BENCHMARK
	GUY ANCHOR
	FLOW ARROW
	EXISTING SPOT ELEVATION
	PROPOSED SPOT ELEVATION
	PROPOSED SPOT ELEVATION MEET EXISTING

- GENERAL NOTES:
1. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL CONTROL STORMWATER DURING ALL PHASES OF CONSTRUCTION.
 2. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL MAINTAIN RECORD DRAWINGS DURING CONSTRUCTION WHICH SHOW "AS-BUILT" CONDITIONS OF ALL WORK INCLUDING PIPING, DRAINAGE STRUCTURES, OUTLET STRUCTURES, DIMENSIONS, ELEVATIONS, GRADING, ETC. RECORD DRAWINGS SHALL BE PROVIDED TO THE ENGINEER OF RECORD PRIOR TO REQUESTING FINAL INSPECTION.
 3. ALL ASPECTS OF THE STORMWATER/DRAINAGE COMPONENTS AND/OR TRANSPORTATION COMPONENTS SHALL BE COMPLETED PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF A FINAL CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY.
 4. DISTURBED AREAS NOT SHOWN TO BE SOODED OR PAVED SHALL BE SWEDED, MULCHED & FERTILIZED.
 5. ALL NEW BUILDING ROOF DRAINS, DOWN SPOUTS, OR GUTTERS SHALL BE ROUTED TO CARRY ALL STORMWATER TO RETENTION/DETENTION AREAS. NEWLY PLACED SEED OR SOD IN THE RIGHT OF WAY SHALL BE WATERED UNTIL PERMANENT VEGETATION COVER IS REESTABLISHED.
 6. ALL RIP-RAP SHALL BE INSTALLED WITH A FILTER FABRIC INSTALLED UNDERNEATH FOR THE ENTIRE AREA OF THE RIP-RAP.
 7. THE PROJECT ENGINEER SHALL PROVIDE TO THE CITY OF PENSACOLA AS-BUILT CERTIFICATION AND/OR DRAWINGS FOR VERIFICATION AND APPROVAL ONE WEEK PRIOR TO REQUESTING A FINAL INSPECTION AND CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY.
 8. NO DEVIATIONS OR REVISIONS FROM THESE PLANS BY THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE ALLOWED WITHOUT PRIOR APPROVAL FROM BOTH THE DESIGN ENGINEER AND THE CITY OF PENSACOLA. ANY DEVIATIONS MAY RESULT IN DELAYS IN OBTAINING A CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY.
 9. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL INSTALL, PRIOR TO THE START OF CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTAIN DURING CONSTRUCTION ALL SEDIMENT CONTROL MEASURES AS REQUIRED TO RETAIN ALL SEDIMENTS ON THE SITE. IMPROPER SEDIMENT MEASURES MAY RESULT IN CODE ENFORCEMENT VIOLATION(S).
 10. THE DETENTION AREA SHALL BE SUBSTANTIALLY COMPLETE PRIOR TO ANY CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES THAT MAY INCREASE STORMWATER RUNOFF RATES. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL CONTROL STORMWATER DURING ALL PHASES OF CONSTRUCTION AND TAKE ADEQUATE MEASURES TO PREVENT THE EXCAVATED POND FROM BLINDING DUE TO SEDIMENTS.
 11. NOTIFY SUNSHINE UTILITIES 48 HOURS IN ADVANCE PRIOR TO DIGGING WITHIN RIGHT-OF-WAY. (1-800-432-4770)
 12. THE DEVELOPER/CONTRACTOR SHALL RESHAPE PER PLAN SPECIFICATIONS, CLEAN-OUT ACCUMULATED SILT, AND STABILIZE RETENTION PONDS AT THE END OF CONSTRUCTION WHEN ALL DISTURBED AREAS HAVE BEEN STABILIZED AND PRIOR TO REQUEST FOR INSPECTION.

00-05-00-910-0001-034
Account: 154375000
Owners: PENSACOLA CITY OF



00-05-00-910-0001-050
Account: 154408040
Owners: CITY OF PENSACOLA

RBA
REBOL-BATTLE & ASSOCIATES
Civil Engineers and Surveyors
2001 N. North Avenue, Suite 300
Pensacola, Florida 32503
Telephone: 904.438.0400 Fax: 904.438.0443
E: 100000637 L: 101916

GRADING & DRAINAGE PLAN

ADMIRAL'S ROW
800 BLK SOUTH PALAFOX STREET
PENSACOLA, FLORIDA

NO.	DATE	REVISION

SEAL
NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

Paul A. Battle, P.E.
No. 53126


Dr. By: GTP
Ck By: PAB
Job No.: 2018-242
Date: 10-09-2018

DRAWING No.



C3.0
SHEET 6 OF 11

90% PLANS

NYLOPLAST 12" INLINE DRAIN: 2712AG __ X



ADAPTER SIZE	B
4"	10.50
6"	11.50
8"	11.50
10"	11.25
12"	6.00



OUTFALL DETAIL
N.T.S.

GRATE OPTIONS	LOAD RATING	PART#	DRAWING#
PEDESTRIAN	MEETS H-10	1299CGP	7001-110-202
STANDARD	MEETS H-20	1299CGS	7001-110-203
SOLID COVER	MEETS H-20	1299CGC	7001-110-204
PEDESTRIAN BRONZE	N/A	1299CGPB	7001-110-205
DOME	N/A	1299CGD	7001-110-206
DROP IN GRATE	LIGHT DUTY	1201DT	7001-110-021

- GRATES/SOLID COVER SHALL BE DUCTILE IRON PER ASTM A536 GRADE 70-50-05, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE BRONZE GRATE.
- FRAMES SHALL BE DUCTILE IRON PER ASTM A536 GRADE 70-50-05.
- DRAINAGE CONNECTION STUB JOINT TIGHTNESS SHALL CONFORM TO ASTM D3212 FOR CORRUGATED HDPE (ADS N-12/HANDOR DUAL WALL), N-12 HP, & PVC SEWER.
- DIMENSIONS ARE FOR REFERENCE ONLY. ACTUAL DIMENSIONS MAY VARY.
- DIMENSIONS ARE IN INCHES.
- SEE DRAWING NO. 7001-110-215 FOR ADS N-12 & HANDOR DUAL WALL BELL INFORMATION & DRAWING NO. 7001-110-364 FOR N-12 HP BELL INFORMATION.

THIS PRINT IS THE PROPERTY OF NYLOPLAST. IT IS TO BE USED FOR THE PROJECT ONLY. IT IS NOT TO BE REPRODUCED OR COPIED IN ANY MANNER WITHOUT THE WRITTEN PERMISSION OF NYLOPLAST. THE RECEIPT OR POSSESSION OF THIS PRINT DOES NOT CONVEY, TRANSFER, OR LICENSE THE USE OF THE COMPANY OR TECHNICAL INFORMATION SHOWN HEREIN FOR ANY OTHER PROJECT OR FOR ANY OTHER PURPOSE. THE INFORMATION SHOWN HEREIN IS THE PROPERTY OF NYLOPLAST AND IS NOT TO BE REPRODUCED OR COPIED IN ANY MANNER WITHOUT THE WRITTEN PERMISSION OF NYLOPLAST.

CS013 NYLOPLAST



DATE	BY	PROJECT/NO.
04-03-06	MM	
DATE	BY	PROJECT/NO.
02-15-16	MM	
DATE	BY	PROJECT/NO.

DATE	BY	PROJECT/NO.
04-03-06	MM	
DATE	BY	PROJECT/NO.
02-15-16	MM	
DATE	BY	PROJECT/NO.



12" IN LINE DRAIN QUICK SP. BC. INSTALLATION DETAIL

DATE	BY	PROJECT/NO.
04-03-06	MM	
DATE	BY	PROJECT/NO.
02-15-16	MM	
DATE	BY	PROJECT/NO.



SOLID LID	A	B	C	E	F
R-1792-AL	10 3/4"	1 1/2"	8 2"	14 2"	4"
R-1792-BL	13 3/4"	1 1/2"	11 2"	17 2"	4"

CLEANOUT DETAIL

REVISION	DATE	BY
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		

SEAL


NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

Paul A. Battle, P.E.
No. 53126

Dr. By: GTP
Ck By: PAB
Job No.: 2018-242
Date: 10-09-2019

DRAWING No.

C3.2
SHEET 8 OF 11



1. IT IS THE CONTRACTOR'S RESPONSIBILITY TO DETERMINE THE EXACT LOCATION AND DEPTH OF EXISTING UTILITIES AND TO DETERMINE IF OTHER UTILITIES WILL BE ENCOUNTERED DURING THE COURSE OF THE WORK AND TAKE WHATEVER STEPS NECESSARY TO PROVIDE FOR THEIR PROTECTION.

2. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL COORDINATE WITH ECUA, GULF POWER, OR ANY OTHER UTILITY COMPANIES HAVING JURISDICTION FOR REMOVAL/RELOCATION AND/OR PROTECTION OF EXISTING UTILITY POLES, AERIAL LINES, FIRE HYDRANTS, AND OTHER UTILITIES AS NECESSARY TO COMPLETE CONSTRUCTION.

3. ALL NEW WATER LINES SHALL BE CLEANED, DISINFECTED, PRESSURE TESTED, AND BACTERIOLOGICALLY CLEANED FOR SERVICE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE LATEST AWWA STANDARDS AND THE FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION RULES AND REGULATIONS.

4. ALL WATER MAINS SHALL BE NSF APPROVED FOR POTABLE WATER USE.

5. MAINTAIN 18 INCH MINIMUM VERTICAL SEPARATION BETWEEN ALL POTABLE WATER MAINS AND SANITARY SEWER GRAVITY LINES. (WATER ABOVE SEWER).

6. THE TOP OF ALL CLEANOUTS SHALL BE FLUSH WITH THE PAVEMENT OR, WHEN NOT IN THE PAVEMENT, FLUSH WITH THE FINISH GRADE. CONNECTION POINTS FOR UTILITIES SHALL BE CLEARLY MARKED FOR FUTURE BUILDING CONNECTION. COORDINATE WITH THE PLUMBING CONTRACTOR.

7. ALL WATER AND SEWER WORK SHALL BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE LATEST EDITION OF THE ECUA ENGINEERING MANUAL.

8. ADEQUATE PROVISIONS SHALL BE MADE FOR THE FLOW OF SEWERS, DRAINS AND WATER COURSES ENCOUNTERED DURING CONSTRUCTION.

9. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY THE APPROPRIATE UTILITY COMPANIES 72 HOURS (3 BUSINESS DAYS) PRIOR TO BEGINNING CONSTRUCTION.

10. ALL NEW WATER AND SEWER SERVICE LINES SHALL HAVE A MINIMUM COVER OF 30 INCHES (MAXIMUM 36"). UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.


11. THE CONTRACTOR IS TO RESTORE ALL DISTURBED RIGHTS-OF-WAY IN ACCORDANCE WITH CITY OF PENSACOLA AND THE ECUA GUIDELINES.

12. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL COORDINATE WITH THE PLUMBING CONTRACTOR FOR BUILDING UTILITY CONNECTIONS.

13. ALL CONNECTIONS TO THE ECUA WATER AND SEWER SYSTEM SHALL BE MADE WITH ECUA PERSONNEL PRESENT.

15. ANY REMOVAL OR RELOCATION OF ECUA WATER/SEWER UTILITIES MUST BE APPROVED IN WRITING PRIOR TO THE WORK BEING DONE.

00-05-00-910-0001-034
Account: 154375000
Owners: PENSACOLA CITY OF



00-05-00-910-0050-050
Account: 154408040
Owners: CITY OF PENSACOLA



UTILITY PLAN

ADMIRAL'S ROW
800 BLK SOUTH PALAFOX STREET
PENSACOLA, FLORIDA

[illegible]

SEAL

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION


Paul A. Battle, P.E.
No. 53126

Dr. By: GTP
Ck By: PAB
Job No.: 2018-242
Date: 10-09-2019

DRAWING No.


C4.0
SHEET 9 OF 11

This drawing is the property of Rebol-Battle & Associates, and may not be reproduced without written permission.




FLEXIBLE PIPE BEDDING DETAIL
N.T.S.

- NOTES:
1. EXCAVATE TRENCH TO A DEPTH THAT PROVIDES MINIMUM COVER OF 30" FROM EXISTING GROUND SURFACE, OR FROM THE INDICATED FINISHED GRADE, WHICHEVER IS LOWER, TO THE TOP OF PIPE.
 2. FOR FIRE PROTECTION YARD MAINS OR PIPING, AN ADDITIONAL 6" OF COVER IS REQUIRED.



TYPICAL FIRE HYDRANT INSTALLATION
VALVE AND TEE CONNECTION
N.T.S.



FREESTANDING FIRE DEPARTMENT
CONNECTION DETAIL
N.T.S.

RBA

REBOL-BATTLE & ASSOCIATES
Civil Engineers and Surveyors
2001 N. North Avenue, Suite 300
Pensacola, Florida 32503
Telephone 850.438.0400 Fax 850.438.0440
EID00000507 LID1916

UTILITY DETAILS

ADMIRAL'S ROW
800 BLK SOUTH PALAFOX STREET
PENSACOLA, FLORIDA

NO	DATE	REVISION

SEAL

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

Paul A. Battle, P.E.
No. 53126


Dr. By: GTP
Ck. By: PAB
Job No.: 2018-242
Date: 10-09-2019

DRAWING No.

C4.2

SHEET 11 OF 11

This drawing is the property of Rebol-Battle & Associates, Inc. and may not be reproduced without written permission.



smp.

SMP Architecture, P.A.
40 S. PALAFOX STREET, SUITE 202
PENSACOLA, FLORIDA 32503 | P 850.432.7777
www.smpa.com | A0001628

Listen. Interpret. Translate.

CERTIFICATION :

**ADMIRAL'S
ROW**

South Palafox Street
Pensacola, Florida

ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL
HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UN-
PUBLISHED WORK OF THE ARCHITECT
AND MAY NOT BE DUPLICATED IN ANY
PART WITHOUT THE WRITTEN CONSENT
OF THE ARCHITECT.

REVISIONS :

95% Submittal
October 3, 2019

DRAWN BY : RAP

CHECKED BY : PDP

PROJECT NO. 1814

DATE : JULY 29, 2019

SHEET TITLE :
ARCHITECTURAL
SITE PLAN

SHEET NO. :

A-001

©2018 SMP ARCHITECTURE

Listen. Interpret. Translate.

CERTIFICATION:

ADMIRAL'S
ROW
(Building "A")

South Palafox Street
Pensacola, Florida

ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL
HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UN-
PUBLISHED WORK OF THE ARCHITECT
AND MAY NOT BE DUPLICATED IN ANY
PART WITHOUT THE WRITTEN CONSENT
OF THE ARCHITECT.

REVISIONS:

95% Submittal
October 3, 2019

DRAWN BY: RAP

CHECKED BY: PDP

PROJECT NO. 1814

DATE: SEPTEMBER 12, 2019


SHEET TITLE:

1ST FLOOR PLAN
BUILDING "A"

SHEET NO.:

AA-101

©2018 SMP ARCHITECTURE




1ST FLOOR PLAN (BUILDING "A")
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"
NORTH

GENERAL NOTES:

- COORDINATE REFLECTED CEILING PLAN (RCP) AND ACCESS PANEL LOCATIONS WITH ELECTRICAL & MECHANICAL DRAWINGS.
- REFER TO MECHANICAL DRAWINGS FOR DIFFUSER LOCATIONS AND INFORMATION.
- REFER TO UNLARGED UNIT PLAN FOR ADDITIONAL DIMENSIONED PLAN & INFORMATION.
- ALL SMOKE DETECTORS TO BE MONITORED. DETECTORS IN SLEEPING ROOMS TO BE FAULT PROTECTED (TYPICAL).
- REFER TO ADA-004 FOR WALL TYPES, CEILING TYPES & DESCRIPTIONS.

DRAWING LEGEND:




ELECTRICAL LEGEND:

- QUAD RECEPTACLE
- DUPLEX RECEPTACLE
- DUPLEX RECEPTACLE (GROUND FAULT CIRCUIT INTERRUPTER)
- DUPLEX RECEPTACLE (WATERPROOF)
- TELEPHONE OUTLET
- WALL SWITCH
- 3-WAY WALL SWITCH

KEY NOTES:

- STEEL COLUMN: REFER TO STRUCTURAL
- RAINLEADER FROM ROOF DRAIN. COORDINATE RISERS WITH PLUMBING & ELECTRICAL LINES
- CONCRETE FILLED BULLDOGS
- ELECTRICAL PANEL & COMMUNICATION PANEL: COORDINATE WITH ELECTRICAL DRAWINGS
- INLET: SEE CIVIL DRAWINGS



Listen. Interpret. Translate.

CERTIFICATION:

ADMIRAL'S
ROW
(Building "A")

South Palafox Street
Pensacola, Florida

ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL
HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UN-
PUBLISHED WORK OF THE ARCHITECT
AND MAY NOT BE DUPLICATED IN ANY
PART WITHOUT THE WRITTEN CONSENT
OF THE ARCHITECT.

KEYNOTES:

95% Submittal
October 3, 2019

DRAWN BY: RAP

CHECKED BY: POP

PROJECT NO. 1814

DATE: SEPTEMBER 12, 2019


SHEET TITLE:

2ND FLOOR PLAN
BUILDING "A"

SHEET NO.:

AA-102

©2018 SMP ARCHITECTURE



2ND FLOOR PLAN (BUILDING "A")
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"
NORTH

GENERAL NOTES:

- COORDINATE REFLECTED CEILING PLAN (RCP) AND ACCESS PANEL LOCATIONS WITH ELECTRICAL & MECHANICAL DRAWINGS.
- REFER TO MECHANICAL DRAWINGS FOR DIFFUSER LOCATIONS AND INFORMATION.
- REFER TO ENLARGED UNIT PLAN FOR ADDITIONAL DIMENSIONED PLAN & INFORMATION.
- ALL SMOKE DETECTORS TO BE HARDWIRED. DETECTORS IN SLEEPING ROOMS TO BE FAULT PROTECTED (TYPICAL).
- REFER TO AA-004 FOR WALL TYPES, CEILING TYPES & DESCRIPTIONS.

DRAWING LEGEND:




- 10'-0" CEILING HEIGHT ABOVE FINISHED FLOOR, TYPICAL U.N.O.
- EXP STUCCO SYSTEM OVER FIBERGLASS-MAT EXTERIOR SHEATHING.
- SCORCE WALL MOUNT (INTERIOR).
- WALL SCORCE (INTERIOR).
- DOWNLIGHT FIXTURE.
- DOWNLIGHT FIXTURE.
- Junction BOX.
- PENDANT.
- CEILING MOUNT LIGHT FIXTURE/CEILING F. FAN.
- UNDER CABINET LIGHTING.
- SUPPLY AIR DIFFUSER.
- RETURN AIR DIFFUSER.
- FOR ALIST FAN.

ELECTRICAL LEGEND:

- QUAD RECEPTACLE.
- DUPLEX RECEPTACLE.
- DUPLEX RECEPTACLE (GROUND FAULT CIRCUIT INTERRUPTER).
- DUPLEX RECEPTACLE (WATERPROOF).
- TELEPHONE OUTLET.
- WALL SWITCH.
- 3-WAY WALL SWITCH.

KEY NOTES:

- 01 STEEL COLUMN. REFER TO STRUCTURAL.
- 02 RAINWATER FROM ROOF DRAIN. COORDINATE RISERS WITH PLUMBING & ELECTRICAL LINES.
- 03 CONCRETE F.I. LED BOLLARDS.
- 04 ELECTRICAL PANEL & COMMUNICATION P. PANEL. COORDINATE WITH ELECTRICAL DRAWINGS.
- 05 PAINT: SEE CIVIL DRAWINGS.



Listen. Interpret. Translate.

CERTIFICATION :

ADMIRAL'S
ROW
(Building "A")

South Palafox Street
Pensacola, Florida

ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL
HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UN-
PUBLISHED WORK OF THE ARCHITECT
AND MAY NOT BE DUPLICATED IN ANY
PART WITHOUT THE WRITTEN CONSENT
OF THE ARCHITECT.

REVISIONS :

95% Submittal
October 3, 2019

DRAWN BY : RAP

CHECKED BY : POP

PROJECT NO. 1814

DATE: SEPTEMBER 12, 2019


SHEET TITLE :

3RD FLOOR PLAN
BUILDING "A"

SHEET NO. :

AA-103

©2018 SMP ARCHITECTURE



 1
AA-103


3RD FLOOR PLAN (BUILDING "A")

SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"

GENERAL NOTES:

1. COORDINATE RESTRICTED CEILING PLAN (ROP) AND ACCESS PANEL LOCATIONS WITH ELECTRICAL & MECHANICAL DRAWINGS
2. REFER TO MECHANICAL DRAWINGS FOR DIFFUSER LOCATIONS AND INFORMATION
3. REFER TO ENLARGED UNIT PLAN FOR ADDITIONAL DIMENSIONED PLAN & INFORMATION
4. ALL SMOKE DETECTORS TO BE HARDWIRED. DETECTORS IN SLEEPING ROOMS TO BE FAULT PROTECTED (TYPICAL)
5. REFER TO AA-004 FOR WALL TYPING, CEILING TYPES & DESCRIPTIONS

DRAWING LEGEND:




ELECTRICAL LEGEND:

- | | |
|---|---|
|  | QUAD RECEPTACLE |
|  | DUPLEX RECEPTACLE |
|  | DUPLEX RECEPTACLE
(GROUND FAULT CIRCUIT INTERRUPTER) |
|  | DUPLEX RECEPTACLE (WATERPROOF) |
|  | TELEPHONE OUTLET |
|  | WALL SWITCH |
|  | 3-WAY WALL SWITCH |

KEY NOTES :

- (01) STEEL COLLAR: REFER TO STRUCTURAL
- (02) RAINLEADER FROM ROOF DRAIN: COORDINATE RISERS WITH PLUMBING & ELECTRICAL LINES.
- (03) CONCRETE FILLED BOLLARDS
- (04) ELECTRICAL PANEL & COMMUNICATION PANEL: COORDINATE WITH ELECTRICAL DRAWINGS.
- (05) MEET: SEE CIVIL DRAWINGS.



Listen. Interpret. Translate.

CERTIFICATION :

ADMIRAL'S
ROW
(Building "A")

South Palafox Street
Pensacola, Florida

ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL
HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UN-
PUBLISHED WORK OF THE ARCHITECT
AND MAY NOT BE DUPLICATED IN ANY
PART WITHOUT THE WRITTEN CONSENT
OF THE ARCHITECT.

REVISIONS :

95% Submittal
October 3, 2019

DRAWN BY : RAP

CHECKED BY : PGP

PROJECT NO. 1814

DATE : SEPTEMBER 12, 2019


SHEET TITLE :

ROOF PLAN
(BUILDING "A")

SHEET NO. :


AA-104

©2018 SMP ARCHITECTURE



1 ROOF PLAN (BUILDING "A")

SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"



REFER TO AA-423 FOR
THE ARCHITECT OF THE STAIR



2 STAIR TO ROOF (BUILDING "A")


SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"

GENERAL NOTES:

- ALL DIMENSIONS ARE TO FACE OF STUDS, FACE OF CMU WALL, CENTERLINE OF COLUMNS AND/OR CENTERLINE STRUCTURAL GRID LINE, UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE.
- CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY ALL DIMENSIONS IN THE FIELD.
- COORDINATE WITH MECHANICAL & PLUMBING DRAWINGS FOR MECHANICAL ROOF TOP UNITS AND OTHER ROOF PENETRATIONS.
- COORDINATE WITH ELECTRICAL DRAWINGS FOR LIGHTNING PROTECTION LOCATIONS.
- TYPICAL NOTE:** ALL CRICKETS APPLICATION (C) SHALL BE PART OF THE ROOFING SYSTEM.
- REFER TO SHEET AA-423 FOR EXTERIOR STAIR TO ROOF.
- REFER TO AA-004 FOR WALL TYPES, CEILING TYPES & DESCRIPTIONS.

LEGEND :

- EOD EMERGENCY OVERFLOW DRAIN.
- RD ROOF DRAIN.
- DS DOWNSPOUT.
- ~ DIRECTION OF SLOPE TO DRAIN (1/4" PER FOOT).
- △ ROOF CRICKET (SEE NOTE #5).
- B BATHROOM EXHAUST.
- K KITCHEN EXHAUST.
- 1 PRE-FINISHED METAL COPING
- 2 ROOF MOUNTED EXHAUST FAN.
- 3 MECHANICAL ROOF TOP UNITS.
- 4 GAS FLUE.
- 5 ENGINEERED MEMBRANE ROOFING SYSTEM MECHANICALLY ATTACHED OVER APPROVED COVER BOARD ON 3" (MIN.) RIGID INSULATION ON DECKING. SLOPE STRUCTURE TO DRAIN; REFER TO STRUCTURAL DRAWINGS.



Listen. Interpret. Translate.

CERTIFICATION :

ADMIRAL'S
ROW
(Building "A")

South Palafox Street
Pensacola, Florida

ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL
HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UN-
PUBLISHED WORK OF THE ARCHITECT
AND MAY NOT BE DUPLICATED IN ANY
PART WITHOUT THE WRITTEN CONSENT
OF THE ARCHITECT.

REVISIONS :

95% Submittal
October 3, 2019

DRAWN BY : RAP

CHECKED BY : PDP

PROJECT NO. 1814

DATE : SEPTEMBER 12, 2019


SHEET TITLE :

EXTERIOR
ELEVATIONS
BUILDING "A"


SHEET NO. :

AA-201

©2018 SMP ARCHITECTURE




1 EAST ELEVATION - PALAFOX STREET - BUILDING "A"
AA-201 SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"




2 SOUTH ELEVATION - BUILDING "A"
AA-201 SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"


KEY NOTES :

- 01 ALUMINUM RAILING SYSTEM.
- 02 ALUMINUM CLAD WINDOW SYSTEM.
- 03 ALUMINUM CLAD ENTRY DOOR SYSTEM.
- 04 BRICK VENEER WALLS, COLUMNS & ARCHES/HEADERS.
- 05 STANDING SEAM METAL ROOF SYSTEM.
- 06 WOOD BRACKETS AND SUPPORTS.
- 07 STEEL COLUMN & SUPPORTS.
- 08 COMPOSITE GLASS-FIBER FIXED SHUTTERS & PANELS.
- 09 COMPOSITE GARAGE DOORS.
- 10 6S ALUMINUM GUTTER & RAINLEADER.
- 11 PRE-FINISHED METAL COPING.
- 12 STUCCO SYSTEM.
- 13 FASCIA TRIM.
- 14 LIGHT FIXTURES.
- 15 DORMER WITH FALSE LOUVER.
- 16 PARAPET WALL.






2 WEST ELEVATION - BUILDING "A"
AA-202 SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"




3 TYPICAL BRICK ARCH TYPES
AA-202 SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"



1 NORTH ELEVATION - BUILDING "A"
AA-202 SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"

KEY NOTES :

- (01) ALUMINUM RAILING SYSTEM.
- (02) ALUMINUM CLAD WINDOW SYSTEM.
- (03) ALUMINUM CLAD ENTRY DOOR SYSTEM.
- (04) BRICK VENEER WALLS, COLUMNS & ARCHES/HEADERS.
- (05) STANDING SEAM METAL ROOF SYSTEM.
- (06) WOOD BRACKETS AND SUPPORTS.
- (07) STEEL COLUMN & SUPPORTS.
- (08) COMPOSITE GLASS-FIBER FIXED SHUTTERS & PANELS.
- (09) COMPOSITE GARAGE DOORS.
- (10) 6" ALUMINUM GUTTER & RAINLEADER.
- (11) PRE-FINISHED METAL COPING.
- (12) STUCCO SYSTEM.
- (13) FASCIA TRIM.
- (14) LIGHT FIXTURES.
- (15) DORMER WITH FALSE LOUVER.
- (16) PARAPET WALL.



smp.

SMP ARCHITECTURE, P.A.
40 S. PALAFOX STREET, SUITE 202
PENSACOLA, FLORIDA 32502 P 850.432.7772
www.smp-arch.com AAC001828

Listen. Interpret. Translate.

CERTIFICATION :

**ADMIRAL'S ROW
(Building "A")**

South Palafox Street
Pensacola, Florida

ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL
HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UN-
PUBLISHED WORK OF THE ARCHITECT
AND MAY NOT BE DUPLICATED IN ANY
PART WITHOUT THE WRITTEN CONSENT
OF THE ARCHITECT.

REVISIONS :

95% Submittal
October 3, 2019

DRAWN BY: RAP

CHECKED BY: PDP

PROJECT NO. 1814

DATE : SEPTEMBER 12, 2019


SHEET TITLE :

**EXTERIOR
ELEVATIONS
BUILDING "A"**

SHEET NO. :

AA-202

©2019 SMP ARCHITECTURE



GENERAL NOTES:

1. ALL DIMENSIONS ARE TO FACE OF STUDS, FACE OF CMU WALL, FACE OF CONCRETE AND CENTER OF OPENING OR STRUCTURAL GRID LINE, UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE.

2. CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY ALL DIMENSIONS IN THE FIELD.

3. SEE STRUCTURAL DRAWINGS FOR ADDITIONAL BUILDING, WALL SECTIONS AND SLAB ELEVATION HEIGHTS INFORMATION.

4. SEE CIVIL DRAWINGS FOR CURB AND SIDEWALK INFORMATION.

5. COORDINATE REFLECTED CEILING PLAN (RCP) AND ACCESS PANEL LOCATIONS WITH ELECTRICAL, MECHANICAL & FIRE PROTECTION DRAWINGS.

KEYNOTES:

1 RUBBER PARKING STOP (TYP.)

2 STORM DRAIN - SEE CIVIL DRAWINGS

3 CONCRETE COLUMN - SEE STRUCTURAL DRAWINGS

4 ELECTRICAL METERS - SEE ELECTRICAL DRAWINGS

5 GAS METERS - SEE PLUMBING DRAWINGS

6 LINE OF FLOOR ABOVE

7 STEEL COLUMN - SEE STRUCTURAL DRAWINGS

8 CONCRETE PAVERS

9 ELEVATOR

10 ORNAMENTAL METAL GUARDRAIL

11 GLASS GUARDRAIL

12 FAUX COMPOSITE SHUTTER

13 LIQUID-APPLIED WATERPROOF MEMBRANE

14 LIQUID APPLIED TRAFFIC BEARING W.P. MEMBRANE

15 6" DIAMETER X 48" H. STEEL PIPE BOLLARD FILLED WITH GROUT.

16 PREFABRICATED MAILBOX UNITS

17 TILE ON WATERPROOFING SYSTEM.

Listen. Interpret. Translate.

CERTIFICATION :

ADMIRAL'S ROW Building "B"

South Palafox Street
Pensacola, Florida

ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UNPUBLISHED WORK OF THE ARCHITECT AND MAY NOT BE REPRODUCED IN ANY PART WITHOUT THE WRITTEN CONSENT OF THE ARCHITECT.

REVISIONS :

95% Submittal
October 3, 2019

DRAWN BY : RAP

CHECKED BY : ppp

PROJECT NO. 1814

DATE : SEPTEMBER 12, 2019

SHEET TITLE :
1ST FLOOR PLAN

SHEET NO. :

AB-101

©2018 SMP ARCHITECTURE


BLDG. 'A'

BLDG. 'C'

BLDG. 'B'

KEYPLAN
NO SCALE

PALAFOX STREET



1
A-102
2ND FLOOR PLAN
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"

GENERAL NOTES:

- ALL DIMENSIONS ARE TO FACE OF STUDS, FACE OF CMU WALL, FACE OF CONCRETE AND CENTER OF OPENING OR STRUCTURAL GRID LINE, UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE.
- CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY ALL DIMENSIONS IN THE FIELD.
- SEE STRUCTURAL DRAWINGS FOR ADDITIONAL BUILDING, WALL SECTIONS AND SLAB ELEVATION HEIGHTS INFORMATION.
- SEE CIVIL DRAWINGS FOR CURB AND SIDEWALK INFORMATION.
- COORDINATE REFLECTED CEILING PLAN (RCP) AND ACCESS PANEL LOCATIONS WITH ELECTRICAL, MECHANICAL & FIRE PROTECTION DRAWINGS.

KEYNOTES:

- RUBBER PARKING STOP (TYP.)
- STORM DRAIN - SEE CIVIL DRAWINGS
- CONCRETE COLUMN - SEE STRUCTURAL DRAWINGS
- ELECTRICAL METERS - SEE ELECTRICAL DRAWINGS
- GAS METERS - SEE PLUMBING DRAWINGS
- LINE OF FLOOR ABOVE
- STEEL COLUMN - SEE STRUCTURAL DRAWINGS
- CONCRETE PAVERS
- ELEVATOR
- ORNAMENTAL METAL GUARDRAIL
- GLASS GUARDRAIL
- FAUX COMPOSITE SHUTTER
- LIQUID-APPLIED WATERPROOF MEMBRANE
- LIQUID APPLIED TRAFFIC BEARING WP. MEMBRANE
- 6" DIAMETER X 48" H. STEEL PIPE BOLLARD FILLED WITH GROUT
- PREFABRICATED MAILBOX UNITS.
- T.I.E. ON WATERPROOFING SYSTEM.

ADMIRAL'S
ROW
Building "B"

South Palafox Street
Pensacola, Florida


ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL
HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UN-
PUBLISHED WORK OF THE ARCHITECT
AND MAY NOT BE REPRODUCED IN ANY
PART WITHOUT THE WRITTEN CONSENT
OF THE ARCHITECT.

REVISIONS:


WALL LEGEND:

- CONCRETE STRUCTURE.
- C.M.U. WALL CONSTRUCTION.
- BRICK VENEER / AIR SPACE C.M.U. WALL CONSTRUCTION.
- BRICK VENEER / AIR SPACE METAL STUD WALL CONSTRUCTION.
- (NON-RATED) G.M.S. WALL CONSTRUCTION
- (1HR FIRE RATED) WALL CONSTRUCTION AS SCHEDULED.
- (2HR FIRE RATED) WALL CONSTRUCTION AS SCHEDULED.

5% Submittal
October 3, 2019



DRAWN BY: RAP
CHECKED BY: RDP
PROJECT NO. 1814
DATE: SEPTEMBER 12, 2019
SHEET TITLE:
2ND FLOOR
PLAN
SHEET NO. 1
AB-102
©2018 SMP ARCHITECTURE



3RD FLOOR PLAN
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"
NORTH

GENERAL NOTES:

1. ALL DIMENSIONS ARE TO FACE OF STUDS, FACE OF CMU WALL, FACE OF CONCRETE, AND CENTER OF OPENING OR STRUCTURAL GRID LINE, UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE.
2. CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY ALL DIMENSIONS IN THE FIELD.
3. SEE STRUCTURAL DRAWINGS FOR ADDITIONAL BUILDING, WALL SECTIONS AND SLAB ELEVATION HEIGHTS INFORMATION.
4. SEE CIVIL DRAWINGS FOR CURB AND SIDEWALK INFORMATION.
5. COORDINATE REFLECTED CEILING PLAN (RCP) AND ACCESS PANEL LOCATIONS WITH ELECTRICAL, MECHANICAL & FIRE PROTECTION DRAWINGS.

KEYNOTES:

- 1 RUBBER PARKING STOP (TYP.)
- 2 STORM DRAIN - SEE CIVIL DRAWINGS
- 3 CONCRETE COLUMN - SEE STRUCTURAL DRAWINGS
- 4 ELECTRICAL METERS - SEE ELECTRICAL DRAWINGS
- 5 GAS METERS - SEE PLUMBING DRAWINGS
- 6 LINE OF FLOOR ABOVE
- 7 STEEL COLUMN - SEE STRUCTURAL DRAWINGS
- 8 CONCRETE PAVERS
- 9 ELEVATOR
- 10 ORNAMENTAL METAL GUARDRAIL
- 11 GLASS GUARDRAIL
- 12 FAUX COMPOSITE SHUTTER
- 13 LIQUID-APPLIED WATERPROOF MEMBRANE
- 14 LIQUID APPLIED TRAFFIC BEARING W.P. MEMBRANE
- 15 6" DIAMETER X 48" H. STEEL PIPE BOLLARD FILLED WITH GROUT.
- 16 PREFABRICATED MAILBOX UNITS.
- 17 TILE ON WATERPROOFING SYSTEM.

WALL LEGEND:

- CONCRETE STRUCTURE.
- C.M.U. WALL CONSTRUCTION.
- BRICK VENEER / AIR SPACE C.M.U. WALL CONSTRUCTION.
- BRICK VENEER / AIR SPACE METAL STUD WALL CONSTRUCTION.
- (NON-RATED) G.M.S. WALL CONSTRUCTION
- (1HR FIRE RATED) WALL CONSTRUCTION AS SCHEDULED.
- (2HR FIRE RATED) WALL CONSTRUCTION AS SCHEDULED.

BLDG. 'A'

BLDG. 'C'

BLDG. 'B'

KEYPLAN
NO SCALE

DRAWN BY: RAP

CHECKED BY: PDP

PROJECT NO. 1814

DATE: SEPTEMBER 12, 2019

SHEET TITLE:
3RD FLOOR PLAN

SHEET NO.:
AB-103

smp.
SMP Architecture, P.A.
40 S. PALAFOX STREET, SUITE 202
PENSACOLA, FLORIDA 32502 | P 904.432.7772
www.smp-arch.com - AAC001828

Listen. Interpret. Translate.
CERTIFICATION:

**ADMIRAL'S
ROW
Building "B"**


South Palafox Street
Pensacola, Florida

ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL
HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UN-
PUBLISHED WORK OF THE ARCHITECT
AND MAY NOT BE DUPLICATED IN ANY
PART WITHOUT THE WRITTEN CONSENT
OF THE ARCHITECT.

REVISIONS:

95% Submittal
October 3, 2019

©2018 SMP ARCHITECTURE



4TH FLOOR PLAN

SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"

GENERAL NOTES: **smp.**

1. ALL DIMENSIONS ARE TO FACE OF STUDS, FACE OF CMU WALL, FACE OF CONCRETE AND CENTER OF OPENING OR STRUCTURAL GRID LINE, UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE.
2. CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY ALL DIMENSIONS IN THE FIELD.
3. SEE STRUCTURAL DRAWINGS FOR ADDITIONAL BUILDING, WALL SECTIONS AND SLAB ELEVATION HEIGHTS INFORMATION.
4. SEE CIVIL DRAWINGS FOR CURB AND SIDEWALK INFORMATION.
5. COORDINATE REFLECTED CEILING PLAN (RCP) AND ACCESS PANEL LOCATIONS WITH ELECTRICAL, MECHANICAL & FIRE PROTECTION DRAWINGS.

KEYNOTES:

- (1) RUBBER PARKING STOP (TYP.)
- (2) STORM DRAIN - SEE CIVIL DRAWINGS
- (3) CONCRETE COLUMN - SEE STRUCTURAL DRAWINGS
- (4) ELECTRICAL METERS - SEE ELECTRICAL DRAWINGS
- (5) GAS METERS - SEE PLUMBING DRAWINGS
- (6) LINE OF FLOOR ABOVE
- (7) STEEL COLUMN - SEE STRUCTURAL DRAWINGS
- (8) CONCRETE PAVERS
- (9) ELEVATOR
- (10) ORNAMENTAL METAL GUARDRAIL
- (11) GLASS GUARDRAIL
- (12) FAUX COMPOSITE SHUTTER
- (13) LIQUID-APPLIED WATERPROOF MEMBRANE
- (14) LIQUID APPLIED TRAFFIC BEARING W.P. MEMBRANE
- (15) 6" DIAMETER X 48" H. STEEL PIPE BOLLARD FILLED WITH GROUT.
- (16) PREFABRICATED MAILBOX UNITS
- (17) TILE ON WATERPROOFING SYSTEM.

Listen. Interpret. Translate.

CERTIFICATION:

ADMIRAL'S
ROW
Building "B"

South Palafox Street
Pensacola, Florida

ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL
HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UN-
PUBLISHED WORK OF THE ARCHITECT
AND MAY NOT BE REPRODUCED IN ANY
PART WITHOUT THE WRITTEN CONSENT
OF THE ARCHITECT.

REVISIONS:

WALL LEGEND:

- CONCRETE STRUCTURE.
- C.M.U. WALL CONSTRUCTION.
- BRICK VENEER / AIR SPACE C.M.U. WALL CONSTRUCTION.
- BRICK VENEER / AIR SPACE METAL STUD WALL CONSTRUCTION.
- (NON-RATED) G.M.S. WALL CONSTRUCTION
- (1HR FIRE RATED) WALL CONSTRUCTION AS SCHEDULED.
- (2HR FIRE RATED) WALL CONSTRUCTION AS SCHEDULED.

95% Submittal
October 3, 2019

DRAWN BY: RAP

CHECKED BY: pdp

PROJECT NO. 1814

DATE: SEPTEMBER 12, 2019


SHEET TITLE:

4TH FLOOR
PLAN


SHEET NO.:

AB-104


©2018 SMP ARCHITECTURE



PALAFIX STREET



1 ROOF PLAN
 AB-105
 SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"



Listen. Interpret. Translate.

CERTIFICATION: _____

**ADMIRAL'S
 ROW
 Building "B"**

South Palafox Street
 Pensacola, Florida

ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL
 HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UN-
 PUBLISHED WORK OF THE ARCHITECT
 AND MAY NOT BE DUPLICATED IN ANY
 PART WITHOUT THE WRITTEN CONSENT
 OF THE ARCHITECT.

REVISIONS:

95% Submittal
 October 3, 2019

DRAWN BY: RAP

CHECKED BY: PDP

PROJECT NO. 1814


DATE: SEPTEMBER 12, 2019

SHEET TITLE:


**ROOF
 PLAN**

SHEET NO.:

AB-105



1 EAST ELEVATION - PALAFOX STREET - BUILDING "B"
AB-201 SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"



2 SOUTH ELEVATION - BUILDING "B"
AB-201 SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"

KEY NOTES :

- (01) ALUMINUM RAILING (PATTERN T.B.O.)
- (02) ALUMINUM WINDOW (TYP.)
- (03) ALUMINUM ENTRY DOOR (TYP.)
- (04) BRICK VENEER
- (05) STANDING SEAM METAL ROOF
- (06) GLASS RAILING
- (07) STUCCO ON CONCRETE COLUMN.
- (08) COMPOSITE FIXED SHUTTER.
- (09) STUCCO ON FRAMED COLUMN.
- (10) STUCCO SYSTEM.
- (11) PRE-FINISHED METAL COPING.

smp.

SMP Architecture P.A.
40 S. PALAFOX STREET, SUITE 202
PENSACOLA, FLORIDA 32502 | P 850.432.7772
www.smp-arch.com - AAC021528

Listen. Interpret. Translate.

CERTIFICATION :

ADMIRAL'S
ROW
Building "B"

South Palafox Street
Pensacola, Florida

ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL
HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UN-
PUBLISHED WORK OF THE ARCHITECT
AND MAY NOT BE DUPLICATED IN ANY
PART WITHOUT THE WRITTEN CONSENT
OF THE ARCHITECT.

REVISIONS :

95% Submittal
October 3, 2019

DRAWN BY: RAP

CHECKED BY: PDP

PROJECT NO. 1814

DATE: SEPTEMBER 12, 2019


SHEET TITLE :


EXTERIOR
ELEVATIONS
BUILDING "B"

SHEET NO. :


AB-201

©2018 SMP ARCHITECTURE





1 WEST ELEVATION - BUILDING "B"
AB-202 SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"



2 NORTH ELEVATION - BUILDING "B"
AB-202 SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"

KEY NOTES :

- (01) ALUMINUM RAILING (PATTERN T.B.D.)
- (02) ALUMINUM WINDOW (TYP.)
- (03) ALUMINUM ENTRY DOOR (TYP.)
- (04) BRICK VENEER
- (05) STANDING SEAM METAL ROOF
- (06) GLASS RAILING
- (07) STUCCO ON CONCRETE COLUMN.
- (08) COMPOSITE FIXED SHUTTER.
- (09) STUCCO ON FRAMED COLUMN.
- (10) STUCCO SYSTEM.
- (11) PRE-FINISHED METAL COPING.

smp.

SMP Architecture, P.A.
40 S. PALAFOX STREET, SUITE 202
PENSACOLA, FLORIDA 32502 | P 850.432.7772
www.smp-arch.com AAC001838

Listen. Interpret. Translate.

CERTIFICATION

ADMIRAL'S
ROW
Building "B"

South Palafox Street
Pensacola, Florida

ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL
HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UN-
PUBLISHED WORK OF THE ARCHITECT
AND MAY NOT BE DUPLICATED IN ANY
PART WITHOUT THE WRITTEN CONSENT
OF THE ARCHITECT.

REVISIONS :

95% Submittal
October 3, 2019

DRAWN BY : RAP

CHECKED BY : pdp

PROJECT NO. 1814

DATE : SEPTEMBER 12, 2019


SHEET TITLE :


EXTERIOR
ELEVATIONS
BUILDING "B"

SHEET NO. :

AB-202

©2018 SMP ARCHITECTURE







South Palafox Elevation



Building "A" looking south on Palafox



View at Palafox Entry Gate



LOOKING WEST




LOOKING NORTH-NORTHWEST



LOOKING SOUTH



LOOKING WEST - NORTHWEST





PLANNING SERVICES

MEMORANDUM

TO: Planning Board Members

FROM: Cynthia Cannon, AICP, Assistant Planning Services Administrator

DATE: November 4, 2019

SUBJECT: Request for License to Use Right-of-Way – 700-800 BLK South Palafox Street
"Admiral's Row"

Admirals Row, LLC, is requesting approval for a License to Use for improvements within the right-of-way of the 700-800 Block of South Palafox Street in connection with the "Admiral's Row" multi-family residential development. The purpose of this request is to provide balconies for a residential units along the northern portion of the development.

This request has been routed through the various City departments and utility providers and those comments are attached for your review.

Department:	Comments:
FIRE	No concerns.
PW/E	PW&F has no issue with this.
InspSvcs	No concerns.
ESP	Pensacola Energy has no comment on the License to Use Application.
ECUA	ECUA must ensure that minimum offset distances between its facilities in the right-of-way and buildings, foundations, balconies, overhangs etc. are met in order to maintain, access, repair and replace our facilities with large construction equipment.
GPW	No comments.
ATT	AT&T has no problem with the balcony overhang or vertical clearance in the ROW, however we are concerned with the decorative post shown on sheet AA-201. It appears these post extend about midway into the sidewalk. AT&T request that the application to use the public ROW as shown be denied, due to the following: The proposed post are decorative and non-structure in nature and prohibit the normal use and conveyance of the public ROW. AT&T has facilities in the ROW, the approval of this request would inhibit our ability to install and maintain our facilities. The Architect has stated that the post are not structural and the balconies can be constructed without the post as shown on Sheet AA-201, the end and middle units have no post.



APPLICATION FOR LICENSE TO USE CITY RIGHT OF WAY

Please check application type:



Residential License to Use

Application Fee: \$500.00

Rehearing/Rescheduling Fee: \$100.00

Annual Fee: NA



Commercial License to Use

Application Fee: ~~\$500.00~~ \$1000.00

Rehearing/Rescheduling Fee: \$100.00

Annual Fee: ~~\$500.00~~



License to Use for Sandwich Board Sign

Application Fee: \$100

Rehearing/Rescheduling Fee: NA

Annual Fee: NA

Applicant Information:

Name: Admirals Row, LLC , Attention Mr. Tom Bizzell

Address: P.O. Box 12448, Pensacola, FL 32591

Phone: 850-434-5574 Fax: 850-438-9256 Email: TomBizzell@cpabizzness.com

Property Information:

Owner Name: Admirals Row, LLC , Attention Mr. Tom Bizzell Phone: 850-434-5574

Location/Address: 800 Block of South Palafox

Parcel ID #: 00 - 05 - 00 - 9100 - 011 - 044

Purpose of use of city right of way/comments: The purpose of the City right of Way request is to provide balconies for a multi family residential development.

Please attach a map indicating the actual dimensions of the requested license.

I, the undersigned applicant, understand that submittal of this application does not entitle me to approval of this license to use. I have reviewed a copy of the applicable regulations and understand that I must be present on the date of the Planning Board and City Council meeting. If applicable, I understand a city right of way permit must be acquired from the Engineering Department prior to any work commencing within the right of way.

Signature of Applicant

SHIP ARCHITECTURE, P.A.

REPRESENTATIVE

Date

10/16/19

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

District: _____

Zoning: _____

Date Received: _____ e e e e e Case Number: _____ Date Postcards mailed: _____

Annual fee required: _____ Amount of insurance coverage: _____

Planning Board Date: e _____ Recommendation: _____

Date City Council meeting in newspaper: _____

Committee Date: _____ e e Council Date: _____ e e Council Action: e e e

Sec. 12-12-7. License to use right-of-way.

(A) *Planning board review and recommendation.* The Department of Planning and Neighborhood Development will distribute copies of the request for a license to use right-of-way to the appropriate city departments and public agencies for review and comment. Said departments shall submit written recommendations of approval, disapproval or suggested revisions, and reasons therefore, to the city Department of Planning and Neighborhood Development. The planning board shall review the license to use right-of-way request and make a recommendation to the city council.


(1) Public notice for license to use right-of-way.

- (a) The Department of Planning and Neighborhood Development shall notify addressees within a three hundred (300) foot radius, as identified by the current Escambia County tax roll maps, of the right-of-way proposed to be licensed with a public notice (post card prepared by Department of Planning and Neighborhood Development), at least five (5) days prior to the board meeting. The public notice shall state the date, time and place of the board meeting. Notice shall be at the expense of the applicant.
- (b) License to use right-of-way request must be submitted to the Department of Planning and Neighborhood Development at least nine (9) working days prior to the planning board meeting.

(B) *City council review and action.* The planning board recommendation shall be forwarded to the city council for review and action.

- (1) *Notice and hearing.* The Department of Planning and Neighborhood Development shall notify addressees within a three hundred (300) foot radius, as identified by the current Escambia County tax roll maps, of the right-of-way proposed to be licensed with a public notice (post card prepared by Department of Planning and Neighborhood Development), at least five (5) days prior to the board meeting. The public notice shall state the date, time and place of the board meeting. Notice shall be at the expense of the applicant.
- (2) *Action.* The city council shall approve, approve with modifications, or deny the license to use right-of-way request. If the request is approved by city council, a License to Use Agreement will be drawn, at which time the license becomes effective upon execution by the applicant and the city.

(Ord. No. 15-00, § 9, 3-23-00)



BUILDING SECTION THRU SOUTH PALAFOX STREET
(LOOKING SOUTH)

ADMIRAL'S ROW BUILDING "A" AND BUILDING "C"

Cynthia Cannon

From: ST PIERRE, ROB A <RS634Y@att.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 30, 2019 3:39 PM
To: Cynthia Cannon
Subject: SPBD Preliminary/Final Site Plan Application - Admiral's Row
Attachments: SPBD Site Plan Application_South Palafox St..pdf

Cynthia,

AT&T has no problem with the balcony overhang or vertical clearance in the ROW, however we are concerned with the decorative post shown on sheet AA-201. It appears these post extend about midway into the sidewalk.

AT&T request that the application to use the public ROW as shown be denied, due to the following:

- The proposed post are decorative and non-structure in nature and prohibit the normal use and conveyance of the public ROW.
- AT&T has facilities in the ROW, the approval of this request would inhibit our ability to install and maintain our facilities.
- The Architect has stated that the post are not structural and the balconies can be constructed without the post as shown on
Sheet AA-201, the end and middle units have no post.

Thanks,

Rob St. Pierre
Manager - OSP Plng & Eng
Technology Operations

AT&T
605 W Garden St. Pensacola, FL 32502
o 850.436.1701 | rs634y@att.com
MOBILIZING YOUR WORLD

This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are AT&T property, are confidential, and are intended solely for use by the individual or entity to whom this email is addressed. If you are not one of the named recipient(s) or otherwise have reason to believe that you have received this message in error, please notify the sender and delete this message immediately from your computer. Any other use, retention, dissemination, forwarding, printing, or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited.

Cynthia Cannon

From: Andre Calaminus <andre.calaminus@ecua.fl.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, October 29, 2019 3:27 PM
To: Cynthia Cannon
Subject: RE: LTU Application - 800 Block of South Palafox St.

Hi Cynthia,

I apologize for the delay in getting comments back to you about this license to use right-of-way. I am still waiting on a few comments from ECUA staff about this subject. ECUA must ensure that minimum offset distances between its facilities in the right-of-way and buildings, foundations, balconies, overhangs etc. are met in order to maintain, access, repair and replace our facilities with large construction equipment.

I expect comments from ECUA's Regional department soon which I will pass on to you. If there's anything you need in the meantime, please let me know. I hope this does not cause any problems.

Thanks,

Andre Calaminus | Right of Way Agent | Emerald Coast Utilities Authority |

P.O. Box 17089 | Pensacola, FL 32522-7089 | Web: www.ecua.fl.gov |

Phone: (850) 969-5822 | Fax: (850) 969-6511 |

From: Cynthia Cannon [mailto:CCannon@cityofpensacola.com]

Sent: Thursday, October 24, 2019 11:29 AM

To: Amy Hargett <ahargett@cityofpensacola.com>; Andre Calaminus <andre.calaminus@ecua.fl.gov>; Annie Bloxson <ABloxson@cityofpensacola.com>; Bill Kimball <bkimball@cityofpensacola.com>; Brad Hinote <bradhinote@cityofpensacola.com>; Brian Cooper <bcooper@cityofpensacola.com>; Chris Mauldin <CMauldin@cityofpensacola.com>; Cynthia Cannon <CCannon@cityofpensacola.com>; Derrik Owens <DOwens@cityofpensacola.com>; Diane Moore <DMoore@cityofpensacola.com>; Jonathan Bilby <JBilby@cityofpensacola.com>; Karl Fenner (AT&T) <KF5345@att.com>; Kellie L. Simmons (Gulf Power) <kellie.simmons@nexteraenergy.com>; Leslie Statler <LStatler@cityofpensacola.com>; Miriam Woods <MWoods@cityofpensacola.com>; Paul A Kelly(GIS) <PAKelly@cityofpensacola.com>; Robbie Weekley <rweekley@cityofpensacola.com>; Ryan J. Novota <RNovota@cityofpensacola.com>; Sherry Morris <SMorris@cityofpensacola.com>; Stephen Kennington (AT&T) <sk1674@att.com>

Subject: FW: LTU Application - 800 Block of South Palafox St.

****WARNING: This is an external email --- DO NOT CLICK links or attachments from unknown senders ****

All,

Please remember your comments are due on the attached application by close of business on **Tuesday, October 29, 2019.**

As always, please call with any questions.

Thank you,

Cynthia Cannon

From: Diane Moore
Sent: Monday, October 28, 2019 1:16 PM
To: Cynthia Cannon
Subject: RE: SPBD Preliminary/Final Site Plan Application - Admiral's Row

Cynthia,

My only comment is that Pensacola Energy has natural gas main under the sidewalk where they propose to saw cut. I would like to get gas shown on the plans.

Also, Pensacola Energy has no comment on the License to Use Application.

Thanks,
Diane

Diane Moore | Gas Distribution Engineer
Pensacola Energy | 1625 Atwood Drive, Pensacola, FL 32514
Desk: 850-474-5319 | Cell: 850-324-8004 | Fax: 850-474-5331
Email: dmoore@cityofpensacola.com

***Please consider the environment before printing this email.



For Non-Emergency Citizen Requests, Dial 311 or visit Pensacola311.com

Notice: Florida has a very broad public records law. As a result, any written communication created or received by City of Pensacola officials and employees will be made available to the public and media, upon request, unless otherwise exempt. Under Florida law, email addresses are public records. If you do not want your email address released in response to a public records request, do not send electronic mail to this office. Instead, contact our office by phone or in writing.

From: Cynthia Cannon <CCannon@cityofpensacola.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 24, 2019 11:27 AM
To: Amy Hargett <ahargett@cityofpensacola.com>; Andre Calaminus (ECUA) <andre.calaminus@ecua.fl.gov>; Annie Bloxson <ABloxson@cityofpensacola.com>; Bill Kimball <bkimball@cityofpensacola.com>; Brad Hinote <bradhinote@cityofpensacola.com>; Brian Cooper <bcooper@cityofpensacola.com>; Chris Mauldin <CMauldin@cityofpensacola.com>; Cynthia Cannon <CCannon@cityofpensacola.com>; Derrik Owens <DOwens@cityofpensacola.com>; Diane Moore <DMoore@cityofpensacola.com>; Jonathan Bilby <JBilby@cityofpensacola.com>; Karl Fenner (AT&T) <KF5345@att.com>; Kellie L. Simmons (Gulf Power) <kellie.simmons@nexteraenergy.com>; Leslie Statler <LStatler@cityofpensacola.com>; Miriam Woods <MWoods@cityofpensacola.com>; Paul A Kelly (GIS) <PAKelly@cityofpensacola.com>; Robbie Weekley <rweekley@cityofpensacola.com>; Ryan J. Novota <RNovota@cityofpensacola.com>; Sherry Morris <SMorris@cityofpensacola.com>; Stephen Kennington (AT&T) <sk1674@att.com>
Subject: FW: SPBD Preliminary/Final Site Plan Application - Admiral's Row

Cynthia Cannon

From: Annie Bloxson
Sent: Thursday, October 31, 2019 8:16 AM
To: Cynthia Cannon
Subject: RE: Request for Aesthetic Review - 997 S. Palafox St., Jaco's

Good Morning,

I do not have an issue with the color choice for the new roof.

Respectfully,

Annie Bloxson

Fire Marshal

Visit us at PensacolaFire.com

475 E. Strong St.

Pensacola, FL 32501

Office: 850.436.5200

abloxson@cityofpensacola.com



Florida has a very broad public records law. As a result, any written communication created or received by City of Pensacola officials and employees will be made available to the public and media, upon request, unless otherwise exempt. Under Florida law, email addresses are public records. If you do not want your email address released in response to a public records request, do not send electronic mail to this office. Instead, contact our office by phone or in writing.

From: Cynthia Cannon <CCannon@cityofpensacola.com>

Sent: Tuesday, October 29, 2019 3:57 PM

To: Amy Hargett <ahargett@cityofpensacola.com>; Andre Calaminus (ECUA) <andre.calaminus@ecua.fl.gov>; Annie Bloxson <ABloxson@cityofpensacola.com>; Bill Kimball <bkimball@cityofpensacola.com>; Brad Hinote <bradhinote@cityofpensacola.com>; Brian Cooper <bcooper@cityofpensacola.com>; Chris Mauldin <CMauldin@cityofpensacola.com>; Cynthia Cannon <CCannon@cityofpensacola.com>; Derrik Owens <DOwens@cityofpensacola.com>; Diane Moore <DMoore@cityofpensacola.com>; Jonathan Bilby <JBilby@cityofpensacola.com>; Karl Fenner (AT&T) <KF5345@att.com>; Kellie L. Simmons (Gulf Power) <kellie.simmons@nexteraenergy.com>; Leslie Statler <LStatler@cityofpensacola.com>; Miriam Woods <MWoods@cityofpensacola.com>; Paul A Kelly (GIS) <PAKelly@cityofpensacola.com>; Robbie Weekley <rweekley@cityofpensacola.com>; Ryan J. Novota <RNovota@cityofpensacola.com>; Sherry Morris


Cynthia Cannon

From: Derrik Owens
Sent: Friday, October 25, 2019 8:26 AM
To: 'Robert Penullar'; Cynthia Cannon; Leslie Statler
Cc: Brian Spencer; Philip Partington
Subject: RE: Admiral' Row - Buiding A and C

Thanks for sending and PW&F has no issue with this...

From: Robert Penullar [mailto:roberto@smp-arch.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 24, 2019 4:05 PM
To: Derrik Owens <DOwens@cityofpensacola.com>; Cynthia Cannon <CCannon@cityofpensacola.com>; Leslie Statler <LStatler@cityofpensacola.com>
Cc: Brian Spencer <brian@smp-arch.com>; Philip Partington <philip@smp-arch.com>
Subject: Admiral' Row - Buiding A and C

Roberto A. Penullar
p • 850.432.7772 x203 e • roberto@smp-arch.com
40 S. Palafox Street • Suite 202
Pensacola, Florida 32502



Listen. Interpret. Translate.



PLANNING SERVICES

MEMORANDUM

TO: Planning Board Members

FROM: Cynthia Cannon, AICP, Assistant Planning Services Administrator

DATE: November 4, 2019

SUBJECT: Planning Board Discussion of the Proposed Amendment to the Tree Ordinance
LDC Amendment – Sec. 12-6, Tree/Landscape Regulations

On July 18, 2019 the City Council referred a proposed amendment to Section 12-6 of the City's Land Development Code, Tree and Landscape regulations, to the Planning Board and Environmental Advisory Board for review and recommendation.

Background and review timeline:

- September 10, 2019 Planning Board Meeting - Discussion item to determine best process and procedures for going forward with the review process.
- October 8, 2019 Planning Board Meeting - Discussion item to consider future workshop dates and community engagement.
- October 24, 2019 Planning Board Workshop – Fact finding workshop to seek community input and consider future direction based on citizen feedback.

Comment cards and speaker cards collected from the workshop, along with other written correspondence are attached for your consideration.

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

- Thank you Laurie
- I love trees
- Benefits to reduce stormwater requirements on commercial projects
- Incentivize developers

@Gulf Power?

CITY OF PENSACOLA PLANNING BOARD WORKSHOP

October 24, 2019

- How is City tree fund being utilized?
- Zoning variances allowed if tree is saved.
- Collaborate w/ Esc. Co. if they are proposing changes?

WRITTEN COMMENTS TO PLANNING BOARD

Amir Fooladi

Name (print) & address (optional)

Please return form to the Planning Board Secretary as soon as possible.

1. Please provide comments below regarding the Proposed Amendment to the Tree Ordinance.

I know that trees improve quality of life, & the urban tree canopy ~~is~~ is an important reason why Pensacola is a growing destination. Similar to our beaches, I believe trees benefit the environment & economy, however these proposed changes to the regulations will hamper economic growth. The compliance cost of these changes to regulations will drive up cost of housing. There needs to be a fair and balanced approach to determine any changes to the tree ordinance. The balance between economic development and our environment is best determined by the local community, the businesses effected, and others that will be effected by any changes to the tree ordinance. I ask that the planning board request City Staff to conduct a workshop with the community & local businesses if any changes are to be proposed to the current ordinance.

**CITY OF PENSACOLA
PLANNING BOARD WORKSHOP**

October 24, 2019

Elsie Zhang

WRITTEN COMMENTS TO PLANNING BOARD

Name (print) & address (optional)

Please return form to the Planning Board Secretary as soon as possible.

1. Please provide comments below regarding the Proposed Amendment to the Tree Ordinance.

1. Heritage Tree List (Appendix A) includes Laurel Oak. Laurel Oak has very shallow roots and can cause damages during hurricane season.
2. 6" DBH high quality shade tree is huge and too expensive and hard to find (not highly available). keep 3" DBH size requirement.
3. define "High Quality Heritage Tree" "Champion Tree"

**CITY OF PENSACOLA
PLANNING BOARD WORKSHOP**

October 24, 2019

WRITTEN COMMENTS TO PLANNING BOARD

Margaret Hostetter 1715 E. Gonzalez St
Name (print) & address (optional)

Please return form to the Planning Board Secretary as soon as possible.

1. Please provide comments below regarding the Proposed Amendment to the Tree Ordinance.

Tree Ordinance should have clear procedure for Notification of tree permit removal or severe trim. Signs + copies of permits, including permit costs and a document city will provide ~~if~~ if no permit is required.

Also, we need better education for citizens and Tree Services on the rules.

**CITY OF PENSACOLA
PLANNING BOARD WORKSHOP**

October 24, 2019

WRITTEN COMMENTS TO PLANNING BOARD

John Herron 1900 East La Rue

Name (print) & address (optional)

Please return form to the Planning Board Secretary as soon as possible.

1. Please provide comments below regarding the Proposed Amendment to the Tree Ordinance.

Please see attached addressing the importance of establishing reasonable rules for leafblower use that balances competing interests.

**CITY OF PENSACOLA
PLANNING BOARD WORKSHOP
October 24, 2019**

REGISTRATION TO ADDRESS PLANNING BOARD

BLAINE FLYNN
Name (print)

1300 OLIVE RD.
PENSACOLA, FL 32514
Address

Please circle an Agenda # below if you desire to address the Planning Board. Return form to the Planning Board Secretary prior to the start of the meeting.

AGENDA ITEM # -Please Circle One

- 1. Discussion on Procedure for Planning Board's Review of the Proposed Amendment to the Tree Ordinance**

Note: Comments must be made from the speaker's podium to be part of the official record of the proceedings. The Chairman may limit comments to five (5) minutes per speaker.

**CITY OF PENSACOLA
PLANNING BOARD WORKSHOP
October 24, 2019**

REGISTRATION TO ADDRESS PLANNING BOARD

Margaret Hostetter
Name (print)

10/24/19
1715 E. Gonzalez St
Address

Please circle an Agenda # below if you desire to address the Planning Board. Return form to the Planning Board Secretary prior to the start of the meeting.

AGENDA ITEM # -Please Circle One

1. Discussion on Procedure for Planning Board's Review of the Proposed Amendment to the Tree Ordinance

Tree Ordinance should have clear - better procedure for notification of Tree permit removal requests. Signs + copies of permits or a city document stating no permit is required and why, should be posted a few days ahead of the cutting.

Note: Comments must be made from the speaker's podium to be part of the official record of the proceedings.
The Chairman may limit comments to five (5) minutes per speaker.

also, we need better education for citizens and Tree Services on the rules.

**CITY OF PENSACOLA
PLANNING BOARD WORKSHOP
October 24, 2019**

REGISTRATION TO ADDRESS PLANNING BOARD

Eve Herron
Name (print)

1900 East La Rua
Pensacola, FL 32501
Address

Please circle an Agenda # below if you desire to address the Planning Board. Return form to the Planning Board Secretary prior to the start of the meeting.

AGENDA ITEM # -Please Circle One

- 1.** Discussion on Procedure for Planning Board's Review of the Proposed Amendment to the Tree Ordinance

Include provisions to address (1) grass clippings left in street gutters and (2) leaf blower hours of use. In the alternative, ~~and~~ address

Note: Comments must be made from the speaker's podium to be part of the official record of the proceedings. The Chairman may limit comments to five (5) minutes per speaker.

these issues and weigh in with opinions for future consideration.

**CITY OF PENSACOLA
PLANNING BOARD WORKSHOP
October 24, 2019**

REGISTRATION TO ADDRESS PLANNING BOARD

John Herron

Name (print)

1900 East La Rua
Pensacola, FL 32501

Address

Please circle an Agenda # below if you desire to address the Planning Board. Return form to the Planning Board Secretary prior to the start of the meeting.

AGENDA ITEM # -Please Circle One

1. Discussion on Procedure for Planning Board's Review of the Proposed Amendment to the Tree Ordinance

Include provisions to address (1) grass clippings in street gutters, and (2) leaf blower hours of use.

Note: Comments must be made from the speaker's podium to be part of the official record of the proceedings. The Chairman may limit comments to five (5) minutes per speaker.

Thank you for your great work. Good morning. My name is John Herron and I live on East La Rua Street. We have a grand 400 year old live oak in our yard. We love it. My wife and I moved to Pensacola just over two years ago because we want to raise our kids here. We are delighted to be back. We are excited to be a part of Pensacola's new energy and growth. But there is a problem I want to raise – neighborhood noise. Sometimes, it's just too loud.

One neighbor believes 5 hours of continuous blowing with 2 or more leaf blowers in a neighborhood is reasonable. I asked him to tone it down, and he said I'm unreasonable. Another thinks it's OK to have blowers and tree trimming saws operate past 7:30 at night. Another has a worker operate a loud blower every Sunday for hours, even after we explain our kids are napping. This is why I'm here to talk about leaf blowers today and neighborhood noise. One recent weekend, we experienced 11 hours of leaf blower noise exposure – that's in 1 weekend. And that's in addition to the other leaf blower noise during the week.

When I first learned about leaf blowers and the issues they raise, I thought it wouldn't be that big of a deal. But I soon learned it is a big deal. And don't just take my word for it. Cities across the country are doing acting on leaf blowers, and CivicCon speaker James Fallows thinks it's a big deal too. So let me briefly explain why. I'll address noise, particulate matter, and air pollution.

The noise – just about every federal agency that oversees public safety, environmental safety or worker safety recognizes noise from leaf blowers is a public health issue – it's a problem.

Now these are federal agencies, but the policy making for noise is up to us, because noise is a local matter and it depends a lot on local characteristics. So, I ask you to consider the science.

A lot of research on environmental noise comes from the University of Michigan and the Harvard Medical School (Attachments 1 and 2). Like many, I used to view environmental noise from the aspect of hearing loss – there’s a short-term change in hearing, and a long-term risk (hearing loss). But research shows there’s more to it. We need to consider other acute effects (reduced sleep, increased annoyance, stress, distraction), chronic effects (reduced learning and productivity, hypertension) and also the long-term risk of heart disease. The evidence linking these adverse effects to environmental noise is growing.

Too much noise affects our children. Researchers identify learning and behavioral difficulties from too much environmental noise. They also identify adverse health, and decreased school performance. The World Health Organization strongly recommends 53 decibels or less for general outdoor noise. I typically view 70 dB or more at the property line for gas leaf blowers, and normally a max of 77 dB and sometimes more. Now, our kids might be able to tune out loud noise from leaf blowers, but the question is, if they do, what else are they tuning out?

And there’s new research analyzing the sound characteristics of gas-powered leaf blowers (Attachment 3). There’s a low frequency dominance of gas-powered leaf blowers, and the sound energy decreases only a little over distance. This is concerning because low frequency sound travels far, penetrates walls and windows. This, of course, impacts our health, productivity, and quality of life.

As to education, we all have a shared interest in a good learning environment for our children. There are great benefits from early childhood education. The more kids hear, the more they learn. But what if they can’t hear what we say? What if they’re often distracted? What if they’re often stressed? That’s what motivated organizations like the Children’s Environmental Health Network to educate the public about how loud leaf blower noise impacts children.

Excessive environmental noise is more than just an annoyance – it's distracting, it creates stress because it can't be controlled, and research shows it reduces learning and productivity. I've provided 2 newsletters from CEHN where they convey these research-based concerns to people like you – policy makers.

you discussed earlier and poor air quality
The particulate matter - particulate matter is the tiny particles kicked up off the ground from the high-powered leaf blowers (Attachment 4), and it's generally 10 micrometers or less. Particulate matter contains dust, pollen, animal poop, mold, fungus, and more – and all of these are dangerous when inhaled. I expected the American Lung Association would weigh in, but I was surprised to learn how much the American Heart Association weighed in too. Then there's the research.

“Conclusions regarding the relationship between PM_{2.5} and lung cancer risk [are] robust”,

“Particulate matter ... is a significant source of heart-damaging air pollution. ... when inhaled, it can reach deep inside the lungs leading to a wide range of health problems”, according to the American Heart Association.

Recently,
The pollution – last Saturday afternoon, I volunteered myself as a crash test dummy. There were 2 backpack leaf blowers operating nearby, so I walked over and positioned myself downwind. The smell was awful. I haven't smelled so much pungent exhaust since walking on the flight deck of an aircraft carrier during cyclic ops. I think, perhaps, an F-14 burns cleaner than 2 gas leaf blowers – because it burns gas. You see, the 2 stroke leaf blower engines burn a combination of gas and oil and about 1/3 of that is spewed into the air along with the exhaust.

Now, here's the good news. Battery technology is evolving at a rapid pace and landscaping equipment is adapting. After some resistance, businesses are responding positively to clients who want less noise, less pollution, and less perfect lawns. And it's beginning to happen locally.

My asks. First, let's educate landscapers and residents about the dangers associated with leaf blowers, particularly gas-powered leaf blowers. Let's encourage smart and sparing use. I

~~prepared a draft information pamphlet for staff to consider, and because this doesn't involve~~

~~legislating, I respectfully ask the Transition Team to recommend the Mayor take action right~~

~~away. The information is from a top-rated back pack blower instruction manual, a landscape~~

~~magazine, and guidance from the Outdoor Power Engine Institute trade association.~~

~~Second, I respectfully ask the Transition Team to recommend amending our noise~~

~~ordinance. Many cities have, they've addressed environmental noise in general and leaf blowers~~

~~in particular, and they are better off for it. An amended noise ordinance should address the "3~~

~~D's" – decibels (or device), days of use, and duration (hours of use). It should distinguish~~

~~between residential use by homeowners and commercial use, and it should strive for balance.~~

Peace and quiet will provide many benefits for our neighborhoods and enrich our communities. We all deserve a quiet neighborhood. Someday, I think we will view gas-powered leaf blowers in a residential neighborhood like smoking in a crowded airplane. Thank you for the opportunity to speak, and I welcome any questions you have.

**CITY OF PENSACOLA
PLANNING BOARD WORKSHOP
October 24, 2019**

REGISTRATION TO ADDRESS PLANNING BOARD

Name (print) Amir Fooladi Address 700 N. DeVilliers

Please circle an Agenda # below if you desire to address the Planning Board. Return form to the Planning Board Secretary prior to the start of the meeting.

AGENDA ITEM # -Please Circle One

1. Discussion on Procedure for Planning Board's Review of the Proposed Amendment to the Tree Ordinance

Note: Comments must be made from the speaker's podium to be part of the official record of the proceedings. The Chairman may limit comments to five (5) minutes per speaker.

**CITY OF PENSACOLA
PLANNING BOARD WORKSHOP
October 24, 2019**

REGISTRATION TO ADDRESS PLANNING BOARD

<u>John ONeill</u>	<u>13 Mandero Circle</u>
Name (print)	Address
	<u>32507</u>

Please circle an Agenda # below if you desire to address the Planning Board. Return form to the Planning Board Secretary prior to the start of the meeting.

AGENDA ITEM # -Please Circle One

1. Discussion on Procedure for Planning Board's Review of the Proposed Amendment to the Tree Ordinance

Note: Comments must be made from the speaker's podium to be part of the official record of the proceedings. The Chairman may limit comments to five (5) minutes per speaker.

**CITY OF PENSACOLA
PLANNING BOARD WORKSHOP
October 24, 2019**

REGISTRATION TO ADDRESS PLANNING BOARD

Name (print)

MICHAEL WOLF

Address

6048 AUGUSTINE
DR.

Please circle an Agenda # below if you desire to address the Planning Board. Return form to the Planning Board Secretary prior to the start of the meeting.

AGENDA ITEM # -Please Circle One

1. Discussion on Procedure for Planning Board's Review of the Proposed Amendment to the Tree Ordinance

Note: Comments must be made from the speaker's podium to be part of the official record of the proceedings. The Chairman may limit comments to five (5) minutes per speaker.

**CITY OF PENSACOLA
PLANNING BOARD WORKSHOP
October 24, 2019**

REGISTRATION TO ADDRESS PLANNING BOARD

Pat Imhof

Name (print)

1170 Ellison Dr
Pensacola FL 03

Address

Please circle an Agenda # below if you desire to address the Planning Board. Return form to the Planning Board Secretary prior to the start of the meeting.

AGENDA ITEM # -Please Circle One

1

Discussion on Procedure for Planning Board's Review of the Proposed Amendment to the Tree Ordinance

Note: Comments must be made from the speaker's podium to be part of the official record of the proceedings. The Chairman may limit comments to five (5) minutes per speaker.

**CITY OF PENSACOLA
PLANNING BOARD WORKSHOP
October 24, 2019**

REGISTRATION TO ADDRESS PLANNING BOARD

David Peaden
Name (print)

4400 Bayou Blvd., St 45
Address Pensacola, FL 32503

Please circle an Agenda # below if you desire to address the Planning Board. Return form to the Planning Board Secretary prior to the start of the meeting.

AGENDA ITEM # -Please Circle One

1. Discussion on Procedure for Planning Board's Review of the Proposed Amendment to the Tree Ordinance

Note: Comments must be made from the speaker's podium to be part of the official record of the proceedings. The Chairman may limit comments to five (5) minutes per speaker.

**CITY OF PENSACOLA
PLANNING BOARD WORKSHOP
October 24, 2019**

REGISTRATION TO ADDRESS PLANNING BOARD

Sarah O'Neill
Name (print)

607 N. Spring St.
Pensacola, FL 32501
Address

Please circle an Agenda # below if you desire to address the Planning Board. Return form to the Planning Board Secretary prior to the start of the meeting.

AGENDA ITEM # -Please Circle One

1. Discussion on Procedure for Planning Board's Review of the Proposed Amendment to the Tree Ordinance

~~Vision Q~~ * Difference in standards between our architectural requirements + our tree protection.
* Close community + the decision of one person affects the conditions + safety for those around.

Note: Comments must be made from the speaker's podium to be part of the official record of the proceedings. The Chairman may limit comments to five (5) minutes per speaker.

* Importance of licensed arborist to examine trees that are not connected to a tree cutting service.

* Tree Services should be required to obtain permits in order to cut + not leave homeowners to be liable. A lot of confusion about how to obtain permits.

* Importance of developers to recognize the value trees add to a property.
1300 E Scott St.

**CITY OF PENSACOLA
PLANNING BOARD WORKSHOP
October 24, 2019**

REGISTRATION TO ADDRESS PLANNING BOARD

Sam O'Toole
Name (print)

1300 west Government St
Pen, FL 32503
Address

Please circle an Agenda # below if you desire to address the Planning Board. Return form to the Planning Board Secretary prior to the start of the meeting.

AGENDA ITEM # -Please Circle One

1. Discussion on Procedure for Planning Board's Review of the Proposed Amendment to the Tree Ordinance

Note: Comments must be made from the speaker's podium to be part of the official record of the proceedings.
The Chairman may limit comments to five (5) minutes per speaker.

**CITY OF PENSACOLA
PLANNING BOARD WORKSHOP
October 24, 2019**

REGISTRATION TO ADDRESS PLANNING BOARD

Name (print) Diane Mock Address 121 Mango St,

Please circle an Agenda # below if you desire to address the Planning Board. Return form to the Planning Board Secretary prior to the start of the meeting.

AGENDA ITEM # -Please Circle One

- 1. Discussion on Procedure for Planning Board's Review of the Proposed Amendment to the Tree Ordinance**

Note: Comments must be made from the speaker's podium to be part of the official record of the proceedings. The Chairman may limit comments to five (5) minutes per speaker.

**CITY OF PENSACOLA
PLANNING BOARD WORKSHOP
October 24, 2019**

REGISTRATION TO ADDRESS PLANNING BOARD

<u>Christian Wagley</u> Name (print)	<u>801 E. Lora St.</u> <u>Pcode 32501</u> Address
---	---

Please circle an Agenda # below if you desire to address the Planning Board. Return form to the Planning Board Secretary prior to the start of the meeting.

AGENDA ITEM # -Please Circle One

- 1. ☒ Discussion on Procedure for Planning Board's Review of the Proposed Amendment to the Tree Ordinance**

Note: Comments must be made from the speaker's podium to be part of the official record of the proceedings. The Chairman may limit comments to five (5) minutes per speaker.

**CITY OF PENSACOLA
PLANNING BOARD WORKSHOP
October 24, 2019**

REGISTRATION TO ADDRESS PLANNING BOARD

Glen Miley

Name (print)

3821 Scenic Hwy

Address

Please circle an Agenda # below if you desire to address the Planning Board. Return form to the Planning Board Secretary prior to the start of the meeting.

AGENDA ITEM # -Please Circle One

- 1. Discussion on Procedure for Planning Board's Review of the Proposed Amendment to the Tree Ordinance**

Note: Comments must be made from the speaker's podium to be part of the official record of the proceedings.
The Chairman may limit comments to five (5) minutes per speaker.

**CITY OF PENSACOLA
PLANNING BOARD WORKSHOP
October 24, 2019**

REGISTRATION TO ADDRESS PLANNING BOARD

STEVE CORBAE ARBORIST 4571 MARIANE DR.
Name (print) Address

Please circle an Agenda # below if you desire to address the Planning Board. Return form to the Planning Board Secretary prior to the start of the meeting.

AGENDA ITEM # -Please Circle One

1. Discussion on Procedure for Planning Board's Review of the Proposed Amendment to the Tree Ordinance

LOCATION OF PROPOSED BUILDING

Note: Comments must be made from the speaker's podium to be part of the official record of the proceedings. The Chairman may limit comments to five (5) minutes per speaker.

**CITY OF PENSACOLA
PLANNING BOARD WORKSHOP
October 24, 2019**

REGISTRATION TO ADDRESS PLANNING BOARD

Shenni Myers

Name (print)

Address

Please circle an Agenda # below if you desire to address the Planning Board. Return form to the Planning Board Secretary prior to the start of the meeting.

AGENDA ITEM # -Please Circle One

1. Discussion on Procedure for Planning Board's Review of the Proposed Amendment to the Tree Ordinance

Note: Comments must be made from the speaker's podium to be part of the official record of the proceedings. The Chairman may limit comments to five (5) minutes per speaker.

**CITY OF PENSACOLA
PLANNING BOARD WORKSHOP
October 24, 2019**

REGISTRATION TO ADDRESS PLANNING BOARD

Name (print) Tamara Abrecht Address 1528 E Pensacola St
Pensacola FL 32503

Please circle an Agenda # below if you desire to address the Planning Board. Return form to the Planning Board Secretary prior to the start of the meeting.

AGENDA ITEM # -Please Circle One

1. Discussion on Procedure for Planning Board's Review of the Proposed Amendment to the Tree Ordinance

Note: Comments must be made from the speaker's podium to be part of the official record of the proceedings. The Chairman may limit comments to five (5) minutes per speaker.

Cynthia Cannon

From: earthethicsaction <earthethicsaction@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 28, 2019 2:44 PM
To: Cynthia Cannon
Subject: Tree Ordinance Workshop Comments

Hi Cynthia –

I just wanted to provide a few comments on last week's tree ordinance workshop. Thanks to the planning board for hosting it. I don't have details comments per se on the information that was provided at the event. I do have a few suggestions however. Please note that it's not my intent to increase anyone's work load. Also, I want to apologize for the length of the email.

I do believe that the City's ordinance should be reviewed and any necessary changes should be made to reflect the will of the community and city.

I'm sure that you are aware that the City of Pensacola is recognized by Tree City USA (Arbor Foundation) and has been for the last 29 years. I have listed the Four standards for recognition below.

Based on this information and if we want to adhere to these standards, the city should have an arborist on staff that not only conducts site inspections when someone (residential or commercial) submits a permit application for tree(s) removal, but host educational workshop and webinars to educate residents and professionals on the application process, ordinance, and other relevant information (i.e. native vs nonnative) including the benefits of trees; if the city decides to move forward with the review and subsequent changes to the ordinance, we should create a volunteer, diverse, inclusive board (citizen led tree board) that will work together to incorporate suggestions/updates;

Four Standards for Tree City USA Recognition:

Standard 1 - A Tree Board or Department

Someone must be legally responsible for the care of all trees on city- or town-owned property. By delegating tree care decisions to a professional forester, arborist, city department, citizen-led tree board or some combination, city leaders determine who will perform necessary tree work. The public will also know who is accountable for decisions that impact community trees. Often, both professional staff and an advisory tree board are established, which is a good goal for most communities.

The formation of a tree board often stems from a group of citizens. In some cases a mayor or city officials have started the process. Either way, the benefits are immense. Involving residents and business owners creates wide awareness of what trees do for the community and provides broad support for better tree care.

Standard 2 -A Tree Care Ordinance

A basic public tree care ordinance forms the foundation of a city's tree care program. It provides an opportunity to set good policy and back it with the force of law when necessary.

A key section of a qualifying ordinance is one that establishes the tree board or forestry department—or both—and gives one of them the responsibility for public tree care (as reflected in Standard 1). It should also assign the task of crafting and implementing a plan of work or for documenting annual tree care activities.

Ideally, the ordinance will also provide clear guidance for planting, maintaining and removing trees from streets, parks and other public spaces as well as activities that are required or prohibited. Beyond that, the ordinance should be flexible enough to fit the needs and circumstances of the particular community.

For tips and a checklist of important items to consider in writing or improving a tree ordinance, see Tree City USA Bulletin #9.

Standard 3 - A Community Forestry Program With an Annual Budget of at Least \$2 Per Capita

City trees provide many benefits—clean air, clean water, shade and beauty to name a few—but they also require an investment to remain healthy and sustainable. By providing support at or above the \$2 per capita minimum, a community demonstrates its commitment to grow and tend these valuable public assets. Budgets and expenditures require planning and accountability, which are fundamental to the long-term health of the tree canopy and the Tree City USA program.

To meet this standard each year, the community must document at least \$2 per capita toward the planting, care and removal of city trees—and the planning efforts to make those things happen. At first this may seem like an impossible barrier to some communities. However, a little investigation usually reveals that more than this amount is already being spent on tree care. If not, this may signal serious neglect that will cost far more in the long run. In such a case, working toward Tree City USA recognition can be used to reexamine the community's budget priorities and redirect funds to properly care for its tree resources before it is too late.

Standard 4 - An Arbor Day Observance and Proclamation

An effective program for community trees would not be complete without an annual Arbor Day ceremony. Citizens join together to celebrate the benefits of community trees and the work accomplished to plant and maintain them. By passing and reciting an official Arbor Day proclamation, public officials demonstrate their support for the community tree program and complete the requirements for becoming a Tree City USA!

This is the least challenging—and probably most enjoyable—standard to meet. An Arbor Day celebration can be simple and brief or an all-day or all-week observation. It can include a tree planting event, tree care activities or an award ceremony that honors leading tree planters. For children, Arbor Day may be their only exposure to the green world or a springboard to discussions about the complex issue of environmental quality.

The benefits of Arbor Day go far beyond the shade and beauty of new trees for the next generation. Arbor Day is a golden opportunity for publicity and to educate homeowners about proper tree care. Utility companies can join in to promote planting small trees beneath power lines or being careful when digging. Fire prevention messaging can also be worked into the event, as can conservation education about soil erosion or the need to protect wildlife habitat. You can get more information at <https://www.arborday.org/programs/treeCityUSA/standards.cfm>

I'm not sure how realistic this is, but I will help where I can. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Great seeing you again!

Mary Gutierrez
Executive Director
Earth Ethics, Inc.
Earth Action, Inc.
850.549.7472
www.earthethics.us
www.facebook.com/earthethics
[@earthethicsinc](http://earthethicsinc)
<http://earthethics.us/donations/>

Sent from a girl trying to save the world.

We do not inherit the earth from our ancestors, we borrow it from our children - First People Proverb

Think **GREEN** - Is it necessary to print this email?

**Submission to the Planning Board Workshop
City of Pensacola
October 24, 2019**

Tree/Landscape Regulations: Leaf Blower Noise

by John Herron

Palm Beach adopted a lawn maintenance ordinance in February 2018 limiting commercial landscaping hours similar to the limitations on construction work, and limits leaf blowers similar to the limitations on heavy equipment. Palm Beach also prohibits gas-powered leaf blowers on any property less than one acre. The ordinance exempts golf courses, and allows residents performing lawn maintenance on their own yards more leeway than commercial landscapers.¹ Commercial landscapers are allowed to work Monday through Friday from 8 am to 5 pm, with longer hours during the off-season. "Quiet work" is allowed on Saturdays from 9 am to 5 pm. Residents working on their own lawns are allowed to work Saturday, Sundays and holidays after 9 am. Similar ordinances exist in Coral Gables², Key Biscayne³, and elsewhere.

The overuse of gas-powered leaf blowers is a problem in our neighborhoods because they make too much noise. One weekend last year, our family was exposed to more than eleven hours of loud leaf blower noise. Last Saturday morning, commercial landscapers started their engines next door at 7:40 am. After that, commercial landscapers operated three gas-powered leaf blowers nearby for about an hour. Peace and quiet has become a rarity.

Cities across the nation are establishing rules for leaf blower use because there is increased public awareness about the dangers of noise, particulate matter, and air pollution. Responsible policy makers are considering new research and recognize the overall health risks created by leaf blowers, especially gas-powered leaf blowers. Accordingly, they implement sensible rules to eliminate or mitigate those risks. Nearly all commercial landscapers in Pensacola continue to use two-stroke gas-powered leaf blowers that generate chronic noise far exceeding health and safety standards. They create excessive noise and particulate matter pollution in our neighborhoods, near our schools and around our parks. Chronic noise produced by leaf blowers is a public health issue that should be mitigated by policy makers.

The noise

The CDC recognizes leaf blowers as a source of hazardous noise and tells us "continual exposure to noise can cause stress, anxiety, depression, high blood pressure, heart disease, and many other health problems," and people at higher risk are those who "are exposed to loud sounds at home and in the community." More specifically, the CDC recognizes leaf blowers cause too much noise that can cause permanent hearing loss.⁴

The Department of Labor says commercial leaf blowers create noise in the range of 102-112 decibels ("dBs") at the ear of the operator, well above levels deemed safe without hearing protection. Numerous federal agencies declared noise levels above 85 dBs harmful.⁵ Noise level

is measured on a logarithmic scale, so an increase of 17 dBs or more represents a huge change in the amount of noise and the potential damage to a person's hearing.⁶

University of Michigan researchers estimate more than 100 million Americans are at risk for noise-related health problems, and over 145 million at risk of hypertension due to noise, and even more at an increased risk of heart attack.⁷ The researchers said: "I can't think of any other environmental hazard that affects so many people and yet is so ignored. ... There are a lot of assumptions that noise exposure is self-inflicted, which is often not the case. We'd like to have people see connections beyond hearing loss and expand the conversation."⁸ The researchers advise "[t]here is a clear need for policy aimed at reducing noise exposures."⁹ (See **Attachment 1**, Effects of noise).

The EPA says children are particularly susceptible to chronic environmental noise because unwanted noise, often dismissed as a "nuisance", can become particularly harmful while growing and it poses a serious threat to a child's physical and psychological health.¹⁰ Researchers identified learning and behavioral difficulties from too much environmental noise, and adverse health effects include heart disease, hypertension, and decreased school performance.¹¹ They found strong evidence uncontrollable noise significantly impairs cognitive performance because it can induce learned helplessness, increase arousal, alter the choice of task strategy, and decrease attention to a task.¹² Important effect-modifying factors are anxiety and a feeling the noise is unnecessary.¹³ This explains why noise is more irritating to unwilling recipients than its creator. (See **Attachment 2**, Adverse effects of noise exposure).

The World Health Organization strongly recommends 53 decibels or less for general outdoor noise and warns continuous noise above this level is associated with adverse health effects. It recognizes environmental noise is an important public health issue and in its latest report found stronger evidence of cardiovascular and metabolic effects from loud environmental noise.¹⁴ Most leaf blowers are powered by loud and inefficient 2-stroke engines, and a recent and important study of sound metrics reveals leaf blower noise is higher than the World Health Organization recommendation of 53 dB out to a distance of 800 feet. Of significance, there is a low frequency dominance of gas-powered leaf blowers. This is concerning because of the ability of the low frequency sound to travel over long distances, penetrate construction walls, and negatively impact health, productivity, and/or quality of life. This low frequency characteristic is an important metric for policy considerations, and it is very important to understand the impact this has on surrounding communities.¹⁵ (See **Attachment 3**, Frequency characteristics of leaf blowers). Acoustic experts explain the low frequency characteristic (100 to 125 Hz) of gas-powered leaf blowers has a greater impact on people and the surrounding community because the low frequency sound travels further, is audible over greater distances, and transmits most easily through windows and glass doors of homes. Accordingly, it's more audible inside surrounding homes and has a greater impact on communities.¹⁶

Particulate matter blasted into the air, and our lungs

Leaf blowers blast dangerous contaminants called particulate matter – dirt, dust, pollen, excrement, mold, fungus spores, pesticides, herbicides, etc. – into the air after high-velocity and high volume air disturbs the topsoil. Particulate matter is then absorbed into our lungs and can

increase the number and severity of asthma attacks, bronchitis, and other lung diseases, particularly among children and the elderly as well as landscapers.

Particulate matter (PM) is grouped into two categories (1) PM_{2.5} or “fine particles”, which are < 2.5 micrometers in diameter and travel deeply into the respiratory tract and worsen medical conditions; and (2) PM₁₀ or “coarse particles”, which are < 10 micrometers in diameter, can consist of chemicals, soil particles, and allergens (pollen or mold spores). An Integrated Science Assessment by the EPA explains particulate matter is easily inhaled, causing or exacerbating lower respiratory tract diseases, such as chronic bronchitis, asthma, pneumonia, lung cancer, and emphysema.^{17 18} (See **Attachment 4**, Particulate matter). “Conclusions regarding the relationship between PM_{2.5} and lung cancer risk [are] robust”, according to the International Agency for Research on Cancer, in a study published September 2014.¹⁹

Particulate matter is harmful to our hearts too. The American Heart Association warns about the dangers of particulate matter that comes from sources such as windblown dust – like the fine particles shot into the air from a high-powered leaf blower. “Particulate matter ... is a significant source of heart-damaging air pollution. Of greatest concern is fine particulate matter ... because PM_{2.5} is so small, when inhaled, it can reach deep inside the lungs leading to a wide range of health problems”, according to the AHA.²⁰

Doctors with the AHA explain the biological mechanisms linking particulate matter exposure to cardiovascular disease and identified three biological pathways.²¹ (See **Attachment 5**, Particulate matter effects). Popular Mechanics reports on new personal protection equipment for landscapers that includes protective masks specifically designed to filter fine dust that “can be a real danger to your lungs.”²² What about the rest of us?

Air pollution

Two-stroke engines burn a mixture of oil and gas that generates high levels of ozone-forming chemicals. In addition to kicking up particulate matter from the ground, leaf blower engines are their own source of fine particulate matter. These chemicals and particulate matter are then inhaled by leaf blower operators and passers-by. An independent research laboratory, Edmonds, compared emissions from a Echo PB-500T two-stroke gas-powered leaf blower with a 2011 Ford Raptor. The leaf blower generated 23 times the carbon monoxide and nearly 300 times the non-methane hydrocarbons than the Raptor. In other words, to equal the emissions of a half-hour yard work with one two-stroke leaf blower, you would have to drive the Raptor 3,877 miles, or the distance from Pensacola to Whitehorse in the Yukon Territory.²³

Conclusion – educate; establish simple, balanced and reasonable rules; continuing education

The good news is battery technology is evolving at a rapid pace and landscaping equipment manufacturers are adapting. After some resistance, businesses are responding positively to cities and clients who want less noise, less pollution, and less perfect lawns. Local retailers now display leaf blowers with rated noise levels and they are competitively priced. Improved battery technology and quieter leaf blowers are now readily available. Cities that have enacted gas powered leaf blower bans haven’t reported any substantial cost increases. Furthermore, leaf

blower manufacturing representatives recognize the ability to adapt to quieter and less polluting methods and recommend landscapers to use quiet leaf blowers exclusively and responsibly.²⁴

Positive steps forward include, first, educate professional landscapers and residents about the dangers associated with excessive use of leaf blowers. Second, consider amending the City's noise ordinance to address leaf blower use in light of new scientific research and increased policy-making awareness about the dangers associated with the dangerous environmental noise and hazardous particulate matter. An amended noise ordinance should address leaf blower machine noise ratings, days of use, and duration. It should distinguish between residential use by homeowners on their own yards and commercial use. It should perhaps exempt large land parcels greater than one acre, golf courses and athletic arenas. Also, blowing leaves and debris into streets should be addressed. Third, implement a continuing education process for commercial landscapers and residents as science and technology continues to evolve. We should encourage commercial landscapers to use best landscape practices.

This issue of loud landscaping practices no longer belongs in the realm of neighborhood squabbling. A shift is underway, battery technology has evolved, and science and environmental evidence shows battery powered leaf blowers are a viable and cost-effective alternative to antiquated gas-powered leaf blowers. Also, innovative cities have shown reasonable limitations of leaf blower use are appropriate – like loud construction equipment such as pile drivers, pneumatic hammers, and other loud equipment. Peace and quiet will provide multiple benefits for our neighborhoods and enrich our communities.

¹ Palm Beach Municipal Code 42-196, et seq. Despite assertions of increased labor costs of 20 to 40 percent, a staff report revealed no landscaping businesses went out of business or raised rates as a result of leaf blower bans or limitations, enforcement warnings worked as an enforcement mechanism because self-compliance was the goal, and awareness campaigns assisted greatly with enforcement.

² Coral Gables Municipal Code 34-166, et seq.

³ Key Biscayne Municipal Code 17-1, et seq.

⁴ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) Fact Sheet, "Too Loud! For Too Long!, Loud noises damage hearing", (<https://www.cdc.gov/vitalsigns/hearingloss/index.html>, retrieved 11/18/2018).

⁵ U.S. Department of Labor, Occupational Safety and Health Guide to Instruction, "How Do We Protect Our Ears?", Professional Landcare Network, 2012 (https://www.osha.gov/dte/grant_materials/fy10/sh-21001-10.html, retrieved 11/17/2018).

⁶ U.S. Department of Labor, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, "Occupational Noise Exposure, How loud is too loud?" (<https://www.osha.gov/SLTC/noisehearingconservation/>, retrieved 11/17/2018).

⁷ Hammer M.S., Swinburn T.K., Neitzel R.L., "Environmental Noise Pollution in the United States: Developing an Effective Public Health Response", *Environmental Health Perspectives*, Vol. 22, No. 2, February 2014, pp. 115-19, (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3915267/>). These researches are from the University of Michigan School of Public Health.

⁸ "U-M researchers highlight hazards of noise pollution", by Laurel Thomas Gnagey, The University Record, December 5, 2013 (<https://record.umich.edu/articles/u-m-researchers-highlight-hazards-noise-pollution>).

⁹ “Environmental Noise Pollution in the United States”, *supra*, at 117.

¹⁰ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, “Noise and Its Effects on Children, Information for Parents, Teachers and Childcare Providers, EPA-410-F-09-003, November 2009 (https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-07/documents/ochp_noise_fs_rev1.pdf, retrieved 11/17/2018).

¹¹ Passchier-Vermeer W., Passchier W.F., “Noise Exposure and Public Health”, *Environmental Health Perspectives*, Vol. 108, 2000, pp. 123-31, (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1637786/pdf/envhper00310-0128.pdf>).

¹² “Noise Exposure and Public Health”, *supra* at 128 (“There is overwhelming evidence from laboratory experiments that the presence of uncontrollable noise can significantly impair cognitive performance. Noise can induce learned helplessness, increase arousal, alter the choice of task strategy, and decrease attention to the task.”).

¹³ “Noise Exposure and Public Health”, *supra* at 126 (“Important nonacoustical effect-modifying factors are anxiety, fear of the noise source, and a feeling that the noise could be avoided.”).

¹⁴ World Health Organization Environmental Noise Guidelines, October 10, 2018, p. 30 (<http://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/environment-and-health/noise/environmental-noise-guidelines-for-the-european-region>, retrieved 11/16/2018).

¹⁵ Walker E, Banks J, “Characteristics of Lawn and Garden Equipment Sound: A Community Pilot Study”, *J Environ Toxicol Stu*, October 31, 2017, p. 4 (<https://sciforschenonline.org/journals/environmental-toxicological-studies/JETS-1-106.php>) (“The results of this study indicate that landscape maintenance sound produced by [gas-powered leaf blowers] may travel over long distances in a community at levels known to increase the risk of adverse health effect. Vulnerable populations include workers, children, the elderly, the sick, those who work from home, and those who work overnight shifts.”).

¹⁶ Testimony of Chris Pollock, PE, Arup, before the D.C. City Council Committee, July 2, 2018 (<http://www.quietcleandc.com/testimony/july-2-pollock>).

¹⁷ “Particle Pollution (PM)”, *AirNow*, January 31, 2017 (<https://www.airnow.gov/index.cfm?action=aqibasics.particle>) (“Small particles less than 10 micrometers in diameter pose the greatest problems, because they can get deep into your lungs, and some may even get into your bloodstream. Exposure to such particles can affect both your lungs and your heart. . . . Exercise and physical activity cause people to breathe faster and more deeply- and to take more particles into their lungs.”)

¹⁸ U.S. EPA Integrated Science Assessment (ISA) for Particulate Matter, December 2009, at pp. 2-1 to 2-26 (<https://cfpub.epa.gov/ncea/risk/recordisplay.cfm?deid=216546>, retrieved 11/18/2018) (“Controlled human exposure studies have demonstrated PM_{2.5}-induced changes in various measures of cardiovascular function among healthy and health-compromised adults” . . . “The recent epidemiologic studies evaluated report consistent positive associations between short-term exposure to PM_{2.5} and respiratory [emergency department] visits and hospital admissions . . .”).

¹⁹ “Outdoor Particulate Matter Exposure and Lung Cancer: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis”, *Environmental Health Perspectives*, Vol. 122, No. 9, Hamra, GB, Guha N, et al, September 2014, at pp. 906-11, at p. 910 (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24911630>).

²⁰ American Heart Association, “FACTS, Danger in the Air, Air Pollution and Cardiovascular Disease”, 2014 (https://www.heart.org/idc/groups/heart-public/@wcm/@adv/documents/downloadable/ucm_463344.pdf).

²¹ “Particulate Matter Air Pollution and Cardiovascular Disease”, *Circulation, American Heart Association Scientific Statement*, Brook RD, MD, Rajagopalan S, MD, et al., June 1, 2010, pp. 2331-78, at p. 2353 (<https://www.ahajournals.org/doi/pdf/10.1161/CIR.0b013e3181d8cece1>).

²² “How Not to Maim Yourself, Hands, eyes, toes, ears, lungs – if you care about a body part, you’ll want to protect it while you’re working”, *Popular Mechanics*, September 9, 2018, p. 92.

²³ “Emissions Test: Car vs. Truck vs. Leaf Blower”, Edmonds, December 5, 2011 (<https://www.edmunds.com/car-reviews/features/emissions-test-car-vs-truck-vs-leaf-blower.html>)(article) and (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pDxQIHOTmxs>)(video).

²⁴ “Industry specialist warns leaf blower bans are coming if changes are not made”, *Total Landscape Care*, January 18, 2018.




Figure 1

Select effects of noise.

- Children in noisy environments have poor school performance, which leads to stress and misbehavior. They also have decreased learning, lower reading comprehension, and concentration deficits. [p 116]
- 145.5 million people potentially at risk of hypertension due to noise. [p 117]
- Direct regulation that sets maximum emission level for noise sources is the only intervention that guarantees population-level exposure reductions. The NPS supports noise source reduction as the most cost-effective intervention to protect health. [p 117]

“Environmental Noise Pollution in the United States: Developing an Effective Public Health Response”, *Environmental Health Perspectives*, Vol. 22, No. 2, February 2014, at p. 116.

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3915267/>

Attachment 1, Biopsychosocial model of chronic noise

Table 1. Long-term effects related to exposure to noise and classification of the evidence for a causal relationship between noise and effect. The last three columns contain information on the observation threshold of an effect for which the causal relationship with noise exposure (second column) is judged to be sufficient.^a

Effect	Classification of evidence ^b	Exposure situation	Observation threshold		
			Metric	Value (dB(A))	Indoors/ outdoors ^c
Hearing impairment	Sufficient	Occ	$L_{Aeq,8h}$	75	Indoors
		Env	$L_{Aeq,24h}$	70	Indoors
		Occ unb	$L_{Aeq,8h}$	< 85	Indoors
Hypertension	Sufficient	Occ ind	$L_{Aeq,8h}$	< 85	Indoors
		Env	L_{dn}	70	Outdoors
Ischemic heart disease	Sufficient	Env	L_{dn}	70	Outdoors
Biochemical effects	Limited	Occ			
		Env			
Immune effects	Limited	Occ			
		Env			
Birth weight	Limited	Occ			
		Env air			
Congenital effects	Lacking	Occ			
		Env			
Psychiatric disorders	Limited	Env air			
Annoyance	Sufficient	Occ office	$L_{Aeq,8h}$	< 55	Indoors
		Occ ind	$L_{Aeq,8h}$	< 85	Indoors
		Env	L_{dn}	42 ^d	Outdoors
Absentee rate	Limited	Occ ind			
		Occ office			
Psychosocial well-being	Limited	Env			
Performance	Limited	Occ env			
	Sufficient	School	$L_{Aeq,school}$	70	Outdoors
Sleep disturbance, changes in					
Sleep pattern	Sufficient	Sleep	$L_{Aep,night}$	< 60	Outdoors
Awakening	Sufficient	Sleep	SEL	55	Indoors
Sleep stages	Sufficient	Sleep	SEL	35	Indoors
Subjective sleep quality	Sufficient	Sleep	$L_{Aep,night}$	40	Outdoors
Heart rate	Sufficient	Sleep	SEL	40	Indoors
Hormone levels	Limited	Sleep			
Immune system	Inadequate	Sleep			
Mood next day	Sufficient	Sleep	$L_{Aep,night}$	< 60	Outdoors
Performance next day	Limited	Sleep			

Abbreviations: env, living environment; ind, industrial; occ, occupational situation; school, exposure of children at school; unb, unborn; exposure of pregnant mother. ^aThe table is adapted from Table 1 of the 1994 Health Council report (6). ^bClassification of evidence of causal relationship between noise and health. ^cValue relates to indoor or outdoor noise assessment. ^dThe observation threshold for percentage of highly annoyed persons is about 12 dB(A) lower for environmental impulse noise.

“Noise Exposure and Public Health”, *Environmental Health Perspectives*, Vol. 108, 2000, at p. 125.

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1637786/pdf/envhper00310-0128.pdf>

Attachment 2





Figure 2: Sounds levels by frequency over distance

“Characteristics of Lawn and Garden Equipment Sound: A Community Pilot Study”, *J Environ Toxicol Stu*, October 31, 2017, at p. 3.

<https://sciforschenonline.org/journals/environmental-toxicological-studies/JETS-1-106.php>

Attachment 3



- **Coarse dust particles (PM₁₀)** are 2.5 to 10 micrometers in diameter. Sources include crushing or grinding operations and dust stirred up by vehicles on roads.
- **Fine particles (PM_{2.5})** are 2.5 micrometers in diameter or smaller, and can only be seen with an electron microscope. Fine particles are produced from all types of combustion, including motor vehicles, power plants, residential wood burning, forest fires, agricultural burning, and some industrial processes

Particle pollution illustration

“Particle Pollution (PM)”, *AirNow*, January 31, 2017.

<https://www.airnow.gov/index.cfm?action=aqibasics.particle>

Attachment 4




Figure 3. Biological pathways linking PM exposure with CVDs. The 3 generalized intermediary pathways and the subsequent specific biological responses that could be capable of instigating cardiovascular events are shown. MPO indicates myeloperoxidase; PAI, plasminogen activator inhibitor; PSNS, parasympathetic nervous system; SNS, sympathetic nervous system; and WBCs, white blood cells. A question mark (?) indicates a pathway/mechanism with weak or mixed evidence or a mechanism of likely yet primarily theoretical existence based on the literature.

“Particulate Matter Air Pollution and Cardiovascular Disease”, *Circulation, American Heart Association Scientific Statement*, June 1, 2010, at p. 2353.

<https://www.ahajournals.org/doi/pdf/10.1161/CIR.0b013e3181dbecel>

Cynthia Cannon

From: Cynthia Cannon
Sent: Wednesday, October 30, 2019 10:31 AM
To: Cynthia Cannon
Subject: FW: Tree Fund

From: Dick Barker Jr
Sent: Tuesday, October 29, 2019 12:50 PM
To: Sherry Morris <SMorris@cityofpensacola.com>; Keith Wilkins <KWilkins@cityofpensacola.com>; Kerrith Fiddler <KFiddler@cityofpensacola.com>; Brian Cooper <bcooper@cityofpensacola.com>; Jonathan Bilby <JBilby@cityofpensacola.com>
Cc: Cynthia Cannon <CCannon@cityofpensacola.com>; Laura Picklap <lpicklap@cityofpensacola.com>
Subject: RE: Tree Fund

This my understanding on the matter based on the questions asked.

1. Amount Currently in the Tree Fund - The unaudited amount in the Tree Fund at the end of FY 2019 is \$495,450.87
2. Who Controls It - City Council controls the appropriation of funds and from a departmental level, in the past most of it has been handled by Parks and Recreation.
3. How is it Spent - The funds are spent according to appropriations by City Council.
4. Is there a requirement for the funds to be applied to the area where the trees are being mitigated or can it be used at-large per the discretion of staff – No there is not a requirement for the funds to be applied to the area where the trees are being mitigated. The funds are expended based on where they are appropriated by City Council. However, once Council has appropriated, there is a stipulation in the City Code that the mayor may make expenditures for projects up to \$25,000 to replant trees, or to plant new trees and other appropriate landscape vegetation, purchase irrigation supplies and purchase equipment dedicated to the planting and maintaining of city trees. Once appropriated by City Council, there is also a stipulation in the Code that states the first priority for expenditure of funds deposited in the tree planting trust fund is for restoration of the tree canopy in the area where trees generating the funds were removed. Any expenditure in excess of \$25,000 must be approved by the City Council following review by the environmental advisory board.

You can see further details in Section 12-6-10 of the City Code. Please note there is an item in Granicus (#19-00483) pertaining to a management plan for the Tree Trust Fund for the November 14, 2019 meeting.

Richard Barker, Jr.
Chief Financial Officer
Financial Services Department

Visit us at <http://cityofpensacola.com>
222 W Main St.