

Board Member mead stated that he had a chance to review the packet very carefully. He found the cupola on top of the tower is difficult and it appear more of an Italianate style. Overall, eclectic is widely used in this area, so mixtures of styles can be done. However, this has more of a Victorian-Italianate style, but that does not carry to the rest of the elevations. It should be more incorporated into the roof forms. Overall, the front façade should work. The cupola is too flat and should be more pointed, a little more gothic if the Victorian theme is to be used. The shingle siding treatment is appropriate for a Victorian.

Item 7	39 E. Chase Street	PHBD / C-2A
Demolition of a noncontributing structure		
Action taken: Approved		

Mr. Henderson provided an overview of the East Garden District plan. Board Member Mead pointed out that it was a noncontributing structure, and its review was not contingent on replacement plans per Sec. 12-3-10(1)j. He found that the building did not have any historical significance per the section of ordinance.

**Item 7** **39 E. Chase Street** **PHBD / C-2A**  
**Conceptual review for new construction.**

Chad Henderson and Tosh Belsinger are requesting conceptual review of a new hotel. The proposed new construction will be a Hilton Tapestry and will consist of nine stories. The first floor will be a lobby, restaurant, and kitchen, and the second floor will consist of two ballrooms, a meeting room, and fitness room. Floors two through eight will be guest rooms, and the ninth floor will have a rooftop restaurant and bar. This review includes a conceptual site plan, floor plans and building elevations along with detailed renderings. Although the renderings show the greater East Garden District plan, this review is only for the hotel building and site. Façade materials were chosen to complement the historic commercial district with precast stone and brick being the primary elements. Since this is for conceptual review, a final review with more information on specific materials will follow.

Mr. Ebent presented to the Board and provided an architectural overview of the proposed hotel building. Chairman Salter stated that this is a very exciting project and that this section of town needed an addition like this. In regards to the hotel design, he had several comments. Since the building sits on the corner (Jefferson and Chase), and since the front of the building is identified as being on Jefferson, the Chase Street side appears to be a service elevation with mechanical screening on the second floor. Chase Street is one-way and is somewhat of an exit street out of Pensacola as opposed to an entrance. Keeping that in mind, he didn't have an issue with how it is laid out but would like to see further consideration on how the mechanical screening and the Chase Street elements are addressed since much of it will be visible, both from the street level and from the elevated roadways. He wanted this elevation to have a lot of care. Chairperson Salter also spoke to the middle masonry sections. He appreciated the masonry element and wanted to know if there was any thought into having some additional brick detailing such as recesses or on exaggerating the details a bit. The building is not trying to be historic which is ok. But the detail elements in our existing historic buildings are not minor so the exaggerated details give our existing historic buildings a monumental feel. Chairperson Salter asked if consideration could be given to these thoughts going forward so that the mass and monumentality of the masonry middle section could relate in a way to nearby historic buildings.

Board Member Mead echoed Chairperson Salter's comments. The south side of the building spoke to and feels like Pensacola. The Jefferson Street side with the large awning did not so much. It was clear that the building was opening from the inside out in terms of the fenestration. From the ARB perspective, he was looking for a way to open the building up from the outside in so that it can be appreciated and be an amenity to the city. He also echoed comments about the treatment of the service areas but turning the corner with the limestone and with the strong vertical elements spoke to the federal courthouse building. We need to make sure we're relating the building to how citizens would want to experience the building from the outside looking in. Board Member Mead stated that he would almost like to see more balcony treatment than awning on the Jefferson Street side. Having walkout areas, especially in the meeting areas, would be an amenity from the standpoint of the use of those areas from the inside out. It may not make sense to wrap it around the corner on the Chase side but recessed in from the corners will provide an amenity to the use and to the streetscape. The building is a little too monumental at the low level. Monumental works up high, but not so much at the lower level. On the height – Board Member Mead asked if there were exceptions and staff clarified that there were, but only for non-occupiable spaces and Sec. 12-3-62 was referenced. Mr. Ebent clarified that most of the height exceeding 100 feet was mechanical space. Board Member Mead was amenable to the height, especially if it were for service areas. He liked the top as it was an interesting juxtaposition. Advisor Pristera really like the building and looked forward to seeing development on this block. For once, it wasn't an entire block being developed at once and was nice to see individual buildings being built on separate parcels. He echoed the Board's comments and emphasized that the north and east elevations were the weakest sides. They would be seen from Chase Street and other areas, and they should be considered. There was originally planned to be a parking garage on the east side. Mr. Belsinger addressed the Board and clarified the parking solutions for the project. They are advancing a surface parking lot behind this building which will be heavily landscaped. There are also conversations with the city regarding off-site parking. Advisor Pristera recommended some treatment to the east wall; maybe recessed areas which will provide an aesthetic in the meantime. Mr. Ebent clarified that the east side was situated along a zero-lot line, so windows were not an option. Board Member Yee echoed the comments of the Board and was excited for this project. Board Member Mead agreed that Chase Street was an exit corridor and understood the north elevation being sparser. However, the top of

the building above the street level is very visible from the Interstate 110 flyover. From that perspective, it would be very helpful to have a rendering of what people will see as they're driving into Pensacola. Advisor Pristera mentioned that this building will be one of the main things that people see, so we don't want the two weakest sides hurting the project.

**Board Member Mead moved to approve with the comments to be addressed in the final submission. Board Member Yee seconded the motion and it carried 6-0.**

**ADJOURNMENT** – With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:44 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Sarah", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Historic Preservation Planner Harding  
Secretary to the Board