

Member Mead noted that answers to his questions also informed him of the fourth criterion which says, “that literal interpretation of the provisions of this title would deprive the applicant of rights commonly enjoyed by other properties in the same zoning district under the terms of this title and would work unnecessary and undue hardship on the applicant”. Given that, he could not see the facts as submitted meeting the criteria that the board has to find to grant the variance. Therefore, he was opposed to the variance request. He added that the site-specific development which was referenced nearby was an exercise of legislative will and created by Council and should not be considered as relevant context. Chairperson Salter agreed with many of Board Member Mead’s statements and that the board had to review the application in accordance with the variance criteria. He did not believe that all the criteria had been met.

Board Member Mead moved to deny the variance request based on the findings that criteria 1, 2, 3, 4, and 7 (of the Architectural Review Board Variance Criteria provided in the application packet and in reference to Sec. 12-11-2(A)(2) and Sec. 12-12-3(5)b) are not met based on the facts shown on the application and by the testimony and other matters presented. Board Member Ramos seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

Item 7	660 E. Government Street	PHD
New Construction		HC-1
Item was pulled from the agenda		

Item 8	223 E. Garden Street	PHD
Conceptual New Construction		HC-1
Action taken: Approved.		

Chairperson Salter recused himself from the item since this was a project by the company that he is employed by. Board Member Mead assumed the position of Chair.

DAG Architects, Inc. is seeking *conceptual* review for a new commercial building on the corner of Garden and Alcaniz Streets. The proposed structure is in the brick structures sub-district and has been designed as a streetscape type 3 building. As such, the height is restricted by the adjacent building to the west. The conceptual drawings show a three-story office and laboratory building for IHMC and is meant to complement the nearby Levin Center while also communicating with the two-story IHMC building to the west and the one-story bank to the south. Conceptual site plan and building elevations have been provided which speak to the building’s proposed massing and materiality.

Jesse Kirkland presented to the board and clarified that the review was for conceptual approval and reserved final review for another time. Mr. Kirkland stated the intent was to bridge the downtown district and the historic district on Alcaniz, and to focus on the design of an urban campus for IHMC.

Brian Spencer also addressed the board and stated that IHMC is growing and provides an opportunity for a prime corner and vacant site in the downtown historic area. This property has two zones, the commercial zoning, and the historic zoning. They wanted to restore a street edge which had historically disappeared. This area has heavy traffic and high volume which is rather unique with the historic district. This building was intentionally designed to belong with the other buildings in the IHMC campus. Mr. Spencer discussed the surrounding buildings. Mr. Kirkland provided information and reasoning on the placement and design of the building along the street front of Garden and Alcaniz.

Board Member Ramos appreciated the sensibility to the corner and to the urban landscape in trying to establish a connection to other portions of the campus. The building was inviting and asked if the change in materiality on the streetscape was intentional. While the whole building

would be brick, there would be a change in color. Board Member Ramos pointed out that the back, west elevation was still very visible and asked that this side be also treated as a main elevation and to soften it. This could be a permanent elevation, especially considering the placement of the parking lot. Board Member Yee asked for clarification on the zoning boundaries and the different regulations of the district criteria. Staff clarified that the building was in the historic brick structures district where a streetscape III's height is reliant on adjacent buildings and that the western portion of the building was in the Palafox Historic Business District. Board Member Fogarty liked the building and recognized the link to the existing IHMC Levin building. She wondered how this structure would communicate with the historic structure directly to the east. She also wanted to see some more attention paid to the west elevation. Chairman Mead noticed that there was a hardscape element incorporated into Alcaniz Street and Mr. Kirkland replied that a road diet project is a possibility. Advisor Pristera thought that the concept had a good balance and hopes that the streetscape project will work. He was concerned with the mechanical penthouse and wanted the designer to be aware of the materials since the rooftop will be seen from the interstate. Board Member Fogarty brought up concerns on flooding in the southeast corner of the property and hoped that the infrastructure in that area would be addressed. **Board Member Fogarty made a motion to approve the conceptual plans as submitted. Board Member Ramos asked to amend the motion with the consideration of the Board's comments, and it was accepted. The motion was seconded by Board Member Ramos, and it carried 6 to 0.**

Item 9

808 N. 12th Avenue

East Hill
R-2

Demolition Review

Action taken: Delayed 60 days

Per the City of Pensacola's Historic Building Demolition Review Ordinance, the referenced structure has been found to be potentially significant in regards to its location and the historic development of the East Hill neighborhood. Per the ordinance, the Board is tasked with determining whether or not this structure meets the criteria for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. If eligible and deemed historically significant by those criteria, the Board must also determine if the building is subject to a demolition delay of no more than 60 days. To determine that a historically significant building is subject to a demolition delay, the Board must find that in the interest of the public it is preferable that the building be preserved or rehabilitated rather than demolished.

Staff advised that the East Hill neighborhood association has been notified as well as Council Members Hill and Broughton. Bob Cordes presented to the board. Advisor Pristera also provided information on the property and that he referred the demolition review to the board since there had been much development within the area. 12th Avenue is the gateway to East Hill and this particular street is a good representation of the neighborhood from the early 1900's. The exterior has had some changes, but the overall architectural integrity is solid. If this were a historic district, this would be a contributing structure. He wanted to at least allow the board to provide feedback since the neighborhood would be interested in any development here. It was unfortunate that the East Hill neighborhood association did not provide comments.

Board Member Courtney thought the house was in good condition and has restored a home in far worse condition than how this one appeared. She is certainly sympathetic to the owner's business needs but was sad to see the loss of this house. Board Member Mead asked for clarification on the future of the property. Mr. Cordes clarified that the existing building to the south would be added onto along with parking and a possible stormwater element. Mr. Cordes also added that he had been in contact with someone who wished to purchase and move the