Architectural Review Board

MINUTES OF THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

September 20, 2018

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Carter Quina, Michael Crawford, Ray Jones, George Mead

MEMBERS ABSENT: Nina Campbell, Susan Campbell-Hatler

STAFF PRESENT: Brandi Deese, Assistant Planning Services Administrator, Leslie Statler, Planner, Ross Pristera, Advisor, Jonathan Bilby, Building Official, Robbie Weekley, Inspections

OTHERS PRESENT: Don Kraher, Council Executive, Ryan Blanton, Lee Elebash, Todd Alford, Scott & Charlotte Field, Elizabeth Schrey, Charles Hicks, Jared Willets, Bob Cordes, Douglas Lee, Jeff Hogue, Amber Hoverson, Pat Bolster, Dottie Dubuisson, Drew Buchanan, Ed Carson, Sam Kuhn, Jesse Kirkland, David Luttrell, Angie Crosby

CALL TO ORDER / QUORUM PRESENT

Chairman Quina called the Architectural Review Board (ARB) meeting to order at 2:04 p.m. with a quorum present and explained the Board procedures to the audience.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Mead made a motion to approve the August 16, 2018 minutes, seconded by Mr. Jones, and it carried unanimously.

OPEN FORUM – Ms. Dubuisson expressed gratitude to the Board and particularly to Mr. Jones who was leaving the Board and for the times he stood up for preservation.

NEW BUSINESS

Item 1 **534 E. Zarragossa Street** **PHD**
Non-Contributing Structure **HC-1 / Wood Cottages**
Action taken: Approved.

Arcadia ICR Group LLC is requesting approval for a change in materials for exterior repairs. The scope of work proposed includes the removal of the existing wood handrails and deck boards and their replacement with aluminum handrails and Trex deck boards. The handrails would be "Light Gray" the deck boards would be "Winchester Grey". This project was originally approved as a "board for board" replacement. However, the scope was modified when the extent of repairs necessary increased and the materials proposed were not the same as the original. Mr. Elebash presented to the Board explained from the street, the pickets would look less aluminum and more wood. Mr. Mead inquired about the rail height, and it was determined to be compliant at 42" and structurally safe. **Mr. Crawford made a motion to approve, seconded by Mr. Mead, and it carried unanimously.**

Item 2 **319 W. Gadsden Street** **NHPD**
Contributing Structure **PR-2**
Action taken: Approved.

Scott & Charlotte Field are requesting approval for the replacement of 8 windows. The applicants are proposing to replace the windows on the sides and rear of the residence with Windsor metal-clad windows. The proposed double-hung windows would be white in color. The applicants made a similar request of the Board in March 2018; however, that request was for solid vinyl windows. It was denied with the Board suggesting the applicants look at alternatives including clad options. Comments from North Hill were provided.

Mr. Field explained only two front windows were original. Ms. Field stated the materials were available through Bluewater Lumber at a considerably cheaper cost. Chairman Quina asked about a grill pattern in the windows, and it was determined a 6 over 6 would match the existing. He asked that they measure and try to match the existing muttons which might be 5/8". **Mr. Jones made a motion to approve, seconded by Mr. Mead.** The color was verified to be white. **The motion carried unanimously.**

Item 3 **319 E. Jackson St.** **OEHPD**
Non-Contributing **OEHC-1**
Action taken: Approved.

Douglas Speck is requesting approval for siding replacement on the rear and sides of the structure. The applicant is proposing to replace the rotten wood siding on the structure with James Hardie "Cedarmill" lap siding. The windows would also be trimmed in Hardie planks with drip-cap. The new materials would be painted to match the existing color palette. The applicant's request is consistent with the scope of work approved and completed on the structure immediately adjacent to the west. The approval for 317 E. Jackson Street was granted in January 2016.

Mr. Speck presented to the Board and advised the bulk of the siding had been replaced. Chairman Quina indicated the Board had allowed Hardie siding in East Hill, however, this structure looked more contributing. Mr. Speck advised they would retain the Hardie trim on the outside of the windows and the color to match the existing. Chairman Quina stated the Board discouraged Cedarmill, and Mr. Speck advised they could go with a smoother version. Chairman Quina explained if the applicant was requested to use novelty wood, it would be replaced in 5 or 6 years. Mr. Pristera offered lap would be acceptable. **Mr. Crawford moved to approve.** Mr. Mead asked about the condition on the front, and it was determined to be in good shape. **Mr. Mead seconded the motion** and encouraged the applicant to salvage materials for repairs on the front to retain that façade. **The motion carried unanimously.**

Chairman Quina then welcomed the new Building Official, Jonathan Bilby, to the meeting.

Item 4 **300 BLK E. Belmont Street** **OEHPD**
New Construction **OEHC-1**
Action taken: Approved with comments.

Elizabeth Schrey, Flynn Built, is requesting approval for a new single family dwelling. The proposed two-story residence features James Hardie lap siding and a metal roof. A cantilevered deck on the front is supported with architectural brackets; the same brackets accent the roof over the rear entrance. Windows are proposed to be PlyGem 2-over-2 vinyl in oil-rubbed bronze.

Therma-Tru "Smooth Star" 3/4-lite doors will be used for the exterior doors; the rear with built-in blinds. The balcony railings will be solid metal with an oil-rubbed bronze finish. A wooden privacy fence will enclose the rear yard. The color palette consists of Benjamin Moore "White Wisp" for the body and trim and Benjamin Moore "Black Bean" for the doors with the roof in galvalume.

Ms. Schrey stated they received comments from Mr. Wagley and were agreeable to shifting the driveway to the east; they would install a standing seam metal roof, and the fence would be stained to match the door. She offered a pot-belly railing style since the owners preferred metal to wood.

Mr. Mead emphasized if the Board was agreeing to the height of a foundation, they would need to make sure the elevation was maintained at the front for the proper appearance. Ms. Schrey confirmed they agreed to an 18" elevation with a railing. The Board recommended stucco for the finished floor elevation, and Ms. Schrey was agreeable and possibly in white. In moving the driveway to the east, the porch would be separated from the driveway which would result in a step up to the porch. She also indicated the fence would be metal and not dog-eared with two gates (single gate on the front). **Mr. Jones made a motion to approve with a resubmittal of landscaping, verification of the railing, front porch design, and steps and how they relate to the driveway. Mr. Mead seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.**

Item 5 **904 N. Barcelona Street** **NHPD**
Variance **PR-2**
Action taken: Approved

Jeff Hogue is requesting a Variance to reduce the rear setback from 5.0 feet to 3.0 feet to accommodate a detached garage with residential living quarters. The Ordinance allows accessory structures, including residential accessory structures, to be located 3 feet from the rear property line subject to height provisions. However, residential accessory structures located above a detached garage have different performance standards with the rear setback required to be 5 feet. The applicant is requesting a Variance of 2.0 feet to allow the detached garage with living quarters to be closer to the rear property line. This item is under consideration with Item 6.

Mr. Hogue and Mr. Cortes presented to the Board and explained the stairway and addition to the front was actually on the side in order to provide another exit to the upstairs. They offered the shed roof was original to the house, and they did not want to detract from the front which was a great Victorian style. Chairman Quina asked how far back the proposed addition was from the front, and it was determined to be 5'. Ms. Deese explained that residential accessory structures located above a detached garage have different performance standards which allows for a much greater height of up to 30'. It was determined the garage elevation would be lower than the house so it would not appear that high. Ms. Deese then read the variance requirements. She explained the Code distinguished the difference between accessory and accessory residential structures. Mr. Bilby stated overhangs would be subject to a 4' separation. Mr. Mead wanted to determine if this would cause undue hardship to the neighbor, and Mr. Bilby explained if they stayed at 3' and the adjacent landowner built to 3' there would be no fire rating to the exterior walls. He stated they would allow a 1' overhang across the 3' setback; once the overhang went beyond 3' within 2' of the lot line, it would have to be fire rated. The adjoining neighbor had no objection to the overhang.

Mr. Cortes advised the garage was as narrow as they could get it; a single door did not create the intent, so they decided on two double doors. Mr. Hogue stated the 9 on 12 roof put them at 5'. Chairman Quina stated they encouraged more density in the neighborhoods, and the extra unit would be something the Council would like to see. Mr. Crawford advised the applicants had demonstrated hardship by the configuration of the lot and thought it was a reasonable request.

It was determined to be the minimum footprint to allow two carriage style doors. **Mr. Crawford moved to have the variance approved, seconded by Mr. Jones, and it carried unanimously.**

Item 6 **904 N. Barcelona Street** **NHPD**
Contributing Structure **PR-2**
Action taken: Denied without prejudice.

Jeff Hogue is requesting approval for a detached garage and exterior modifications to the residence to accommodate additions to the north and southeast sides. The addition to the southeast adds a wraparound porch on the first floor. The addition on the north side provides direct access to the second floor. A detached garage with residential accessory unit is proposed in the rear yard. A breezeway is proposed to connect the detached garage with the primary structure. The applicant is also proposing to construct a block wall around the north and east sides of the property. This item is under consideration with Item 5.

Mr. Hogue advised he would return with the garage doors which would be carriage style. He asked if there were any other substrates the Board would allow; he stated the house had been sandblasted and the wood was destroyed. He indicated he would use the appropriate material on the house and the addition. Mr. Jones stated composites had been approved for decking. Mr. Hogue advised they would restore all the original windows, and the new windows would match the existing. Mr. Cortes pointed out they were moving three windows on the rear to the front. Mr. Mead advised North Hill had concerns about the application of Hardie board, and the Board had approved Hardie mainly with new construction on lower sections and on the rear. He explained they had maintained a policy of not using Hardie on contributing structures and it was a policy; he stressed there was a consistent problem with duplicating historic sidings. However, he could not see any objection in using the siding if it was duplicated in the existing home, making it more durable and longer lasting (Beveled & Dutch Cove).

Ms. Deese confirmed the request was not for conceptual approval, and it could not be changed during the meeting, but the Board could pick and choose what portions it approved; the applicants could also choose to withdraw the application. Mr. Mead offered the Board could deny without prejudice with no additional fees to the applicant; the Board could also offer comments, and the applicant could return with specifics and new materials.

Mr. Mead pointed out the pinnacle on the expanded porch area was lower, but he felt it did not achieve the objective. He also mentioned the fish scale on the garage and suggested adding an ornamental treatment. Mr. Crawford offered hipping the front and adding a dormer. Mr. Jones stated appreciated the details provided to the Board. Mr. Mead had no problem with the connection between the garage. Mr. Hogue stated they would bring samples of the garage doors. He also stated the purpose of the block wall was to build a courtyard type area with a living wall not seen from the street and verified both neighbors were not opposed to the wall. Mr. Jones asked about using other materials for the block wall, and Mr. Hogue stated they did not work as well. Chairman Quina clarified the applicant was building the wall as a substrate for ivy.

Mr. Mead made a motion to deny with comments and without prejudice. Mr. Crawford seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously. Mr. Hogue confirmed the Board desired details on siding, windows, garage doors and modifications to the front. The Board suggested he bring his model to the meeting, and if there were new modifications, they needed to be shared in a timely manner before the deadline. Ms. Deese advised staff could be flexible since they were reapplying.

Item 7 **249 E. Intendencia Street** **PHD**
Contributing Structure **HC-1 / Wood Cottages**
Action taken: Approved with comments.

Gerald Baxter, Merrill Land Construction, is requesting approval for an addition, exterior modifications, and hardscape improvements. The scope of work includes the construction of an addition to the rear of the residence and the reconfiguration of the existing rooflines with the new addition to create a consistent line for the entire building. The siding will match the existing materials. With the addition and interior renovations, the windows in the residence will be replaced with JeldWen “Siteline” clad windows. A new color palette is being proposed with Sherwin Williams “Neutral Ground” as the body, “Sherwin Williams “Blue Sky” as the porch ceiling, Sherwin Williams “Majolica Green” as the window and door trim, and Sherwin Williams “Library Pewter” as the soffits, porch components, and foundation. Two options have been provided for the roof material and style. The project also includes hardscape improvements to match the surrounding properties.

Mr. Touchstone presented to the Board and stated they were demolishing the rear portion, and the siding would be wood to match the lap siding, possibly done with cypress. Mr. Crawford asked if there would be a break between the old and new, and Mr. Touchstone advised they would be feathered in. He explained most of the windows do not function, and they would be replaced with a clad window. Mr. Crawford preferred the second option for the roof with 12” being a better choice for this structure. Chairman Quina asked about the side elevation, and it was determined it would mimic the front.

Mr. Jones asked about the piers since they were proposing block in the rear. Mr. Touchstone advised they would probably cover the block in stucco and were proposing to do the stem wall from where the addition was placed, removing the piers in the remodeled portion. He stated the piers in the main portion would remain. The front porch consisted of wood with lattice between the piers. Mr. Mead indicated block and stucco would be appropriate. **Mr. Crawford thought it was a nice addition and made a motion to approve, seconded by Mr. Mead.** Comments regarding the rear elevation being hip, with 12" ribbed metal roof and the foundation covered in stucco and lattice were added to the motion. Chairman Quina suggested making a distinction between the original house and the addition, and Mr. Pristera agreed with this treatment. **Mr. Crawford did not attach the condition about the stucco with the lattice infill, but thought it was a good recommendation, but it was not tied to the motion. Mr. Mead agreed to the comments. The motion then carried unanimously.**

Item 8 **104 W. Jackson Street** **NHPD**
Contributing Structure **PR-2**
Action taken: Approved with comments.

Ryan Blanton, Gator Tough General Contractor & Roofing, is requesting approval for a detached garage with living quarters. The proposed exterior will be James Hardie lap siding on the body and James Hardie staggered shakes in the gable. The Owens Corning "Oakridge" shingles will match the principle structure. Wood-clad windows and Craftsman-style fiberglass doors will be utilized within the design. A change to the color palette for the principle structure is being proposed at this time: Benjamin Moore "Coventry Gray" for the body and gable shakes, Benjamin Moore "Duxbury Gray" for the doors and garage door, and "Pure White" trim and rails. The proposed detached garage with living quarters will match, as shown in the drawings.

Mr. Blanton presented to the Board and referenced North Hill comments. He stated they lose 5' elevation from the curb down, and they were not installing new driveway but would be using a ramp. He preferred a reduction to 3' from the rear setback, but Mr. Mead advised the setback could not be approved without a variance request. Mr. Blanton stated there was a kitchenette on the front, and Mr. Mead asked if the headers could be moved up making all headers at the same height.

Mr. Blanton stated he could design to accommodate. He also stated the siding exposure would be the same**. Mr. Mead made a motion to approve with the modification that the headers of the windows be at a consistent height.** Mr. Crawford asked about the roof pitch and stated the hip will look more flat. Mr. Mead agreed the pitch of the roof hip should match the main pitch of the front side of the house. Mr. Crawford suggested the porch railing should also match the house. **Mr. Mead revised his motion to approve with the alteration of the headers at the same level as the windows on the east elevation, increase the pitch of the roof hip to match the main hip, and turned balusters and newel posts on the balcony to match the house porch. Mr. Jones seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.**

Item 9 **820 N. Baylen Street** **NHPD**
Contributing Structure **PR-2**
Action taken: Denied with exception of brick repair.

Drew Dennis, Omega Construction, is requesting approval for exterior modifications. The scope of the work proposed includes the reconfiguration of the rear of the structure to accommodate an exterior stairwell to access the second level living space in conjunction with an interior renovation. The changes to the exterior on the upper level include the removal of the smaller window on the rear and its replacement with a door. A new code-compliant stairwell with a landing will be constructed. The decking material has not been determined; the railings will be metal and will match the railings on the front porches. A change to the color palette for the principle structure is also being proposed at this time: Sherwin Williams "Agreeable Gray" for the body, Sherwin Williams "Zurich White" for the trim, and Sherwin Williams "Urbane Bronze" for exterior accent. Plans for improvements to the detached garage will be brought back at a later date.

Mr. Willets and Mr. Dennis presented to the Board. Chairman Quina asked if there was an illustration of the before and after on the stairwell; Mr. Dennis explained that North Hill recommended wood for the material. He also stated the garage was a Phase II item. He advised after repairs, they wanted to paint the exterior as well. Mr. Willets advised the masonry was leaking almost everywhere, and the house was very fragile. Mr. Dennis stated the brick had significant horizontal and diagonal cracks. All the windows would be refurbished; five out of 58 had been completed. Chairman Quina explained that traditionally, the Board did not allow historic brick to be painted unless there were very special circumstances. Mr. Mead pointed out they would still have rising vapor which would require ventilation at the top in addition to weep holes at the bottom. Mr. Dennis stated it would have a sealed cornice system, and the house did not breathe in that manner, but the Board could recommend an alternative ventilation system within the wall cavity. Mr. Mead explained from an aesthetic standpoint, it would be ruined by painting, and there were other options to deal with moisture which would not affect the exterior appearance. Mr. Willets believed the palette would make the house more attractive. Mr. Pristera offered that painting brick was "opening a can of worms" noting that the Lighthouse spent a large amount of money removing paint, and at Old Christ Church they had to use whitewash to allow the paint to breathe.

Mr. Jones confirmed the wood structure with metal railings. Mr. Crawford asked about a site plan. Mr. Mead stated currently they had interior stairs and didn't understand the need for the exterior stairwell. Mr. Dennis advised there was a dangerous condition in the bathroom; the wall that the tank sat on was not original and buts into the window above the door, and the stairs in that entire assembly was never like that; there was some element of a stair in that location, but that entrance to the house was not original. Mr. Willets stated the stairs were particularly steep and short and very unsafe especially if you were carrying anything.

Mr. Dennis offered with some assistance with the stair design, there was an existing fence they could bring to the outside corner of the building line and put in some decent landscaping to conceal the back of the stairs. This would also create a large courtyard for that property between the garage and stairs. He indicated he was open to feedback on the structure of the stairs. Mr. Mead pointed out the need for the stair was the removal of the existing interior stairs and did not see a need to remove them. Winding stairs were not unheard of with this era in this type of structure. Mr. Willets explained the stair was for the rear entrance and would be the one most used since that is the location of their vehicles. Chairman Quina advised there was nothing in the Code or zoning to prevent an exterior stair, and he could relate to the floorplan issue on the interior in providing a more usable bathroom if the interior stairwell was removed. Mr. Mead still did not see where an exterior stairwell fits on the structure and with the overall aesthetic. Mr. Dennis stressed they were asking for approval of a stair at that location, and Mr. Pristera felt the Board was struggling since they did not design stairs and were only responsible for approving what was submitted. Chairman Quina stated the issue was did the Board approve it as drawn or deny it as drawn, and if denied, what could the Board suggest to make improvements. Mr. Dennis stated in November 2016 he submitted a proposal with Artisan siding at 209 W. Strong, and it was shut down; as the Board is fully aware of Artisan siding now, they were not at that time and he was trying to be a frontrunner in that sense. The fact that it was acceptable today was upsetting. Every presentation he had given to the Board was thorough.

Ms. Dubuisson advised in observing from the audience, there seemed to be a communication issue going on and suggested everyone take a breath and recognize that what she heard was that they had established a second floor residential use which had not previously been separated. She assumed there was a kitchen on the second floor, so to have an exterior stair for a fire exit would seem very reasonable. She also believed the builder had stated the stairwell as illustrated was not his intention but was an incomplete design, so to invite the Board to give comments for the next time around would be appropriate and would not have to be decided today.

Mr. Mead clarified the application requested the reconfiguration of a stairwell for access which he did not believe the Board should approve. With the existing stairwell, he had questioned the need for a stairwell altogether. **His motion was to deny what had been supplied.**

Likewise, because the Board did not have the design of a stair and the approval of a stairwell element, he would not approve the addition or the change of the smaller window and replacement with a door, and the Board did not have decking materials or composition of the railings. Mr. Dennis pointed out the stairwell was only a small percentage of the package. Chairman Quina stated repairing the masonry was something he was allowed to do – board-for-board**. Mr. Mead moved to not approve any paint with regard to the historic brick. Chairman Quina clarified the motion was to deny the request with the exception to the brick repair work. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jones.** Chairman Quina advised the applicant to spend more time on the stair design getting it engineered and structured. His comment was that it should be a steel stair since this was a masonry/urban location. He offered Mr. Pristera could provide input on the right way to treat masonry. Mr. Willets confirmed they could return to the Board with a specific design for the staircase. Chairman Quina advised they could return to the next Board meeting. Mr. Mead was still not convinced there was a need for the stairwell as submitted. **The motion then carried unanimously.**

Item 10 **118 S. Palafox Street** **PHBD**
Contributing Structure **C-2A**
Action taken: Denied without prejudice.

Jeffrey Sharp, Saenger Theater, is requesting approval for the installation of storefront doors to enclose the entrance alcove on Palafox Street.

The scope of work proposed is the installation of three sets of doors across the alcove opening. The storefront is intended to match the doors on the south elevation as well as other businesses within the vicinity. It will provide a secure area for the walk-thru metal detectors used to screen guests entering the facility.

Please be advised the storefront installation has been completed. City staff was made aware of the work during construction.

Although a stop work order was issued initially, Inspections Services allowed the work to be completed since the walls were exposed to the elements, with the understanding the ARB could deny the request and the improvements would have to be removed and the building façade returned to its original state.

Saenger management acknowledges in their application there was a misunderstanding of the approval process and the status of their project's approval. Decorative gates for the main alcove were originally proposed in August 2014; ARB tabled the request to allow the applicant to return with more information and details. The minutes from that meeting as well as the elevation drawings of the original proposal have been attached. The application was not resubmitted.

Chairman Quina recused himself since he was the pro-bono architect. Mr. Mead wanted clarification on what was approved the last time, and Ms. Deese advised decorative metal gates for the alcove were originally proposed in August 2014, and ARB tabled the request to allow the applicant to return with more information and details. The Board did not approve the actual enclosure of the vestibule at the street frontage, and construction took place without approval.

Doug Lee represented the Saenger Theater to the Board and verified they did not secure the proper permits before beginning the project. A former staff member secured the pro-bono work to get the drawings of the storefront and worked with Mr. Quina on the concept of the gate. As things changed over the years, they opted to proceed with the storefront look rather than the gate look. Since 2014, they have had three people in that position, and the ball was dropped, and they did not return to the Board. A contractor was selected and instructed to secure permits, but they did not, and the doors were under construction before that was noticed. He stressed they did not intend to slight the Board in any way.

Mr. Mead had a two-fold question with an ongoing debate with making everything flat front on Palafox, and it had been resisted in places depending on the situation. The Saenger was one where the Board drew a line on because the vestibule was not an insignificant piece of architecture to the streetscape as it stands, with the ticket windows and plaques on the walls which add to the grandeur and significance of the structure.

He recognized the nature of the ongoing street life not being conducive to these vestibules, but that was a question of policing. There is a function with entering off a commercial street and departing into a fantasy world of theatre and music. It removes you and invites you into that and would not function as that with a storefront structure. The gates could be opened and closed at night but a storefront would be totally different. Mr. Crawford stated it was the level of significance of this structure compared to others. Mr. Mead pointed out this was not a commercial/retail structure where there's a function. Mr. Crawford explained that the gates had been a reasonable compromise because they were transparent, but this was such an integral part of downtown, it should not have been constructed that way. Mr. Lee stated they had examined the gates and brought them before this group and were denied because the comment at the time was gates made it look like jailing in downtown. The second issue was the design of the gates which would require they be left open when the building was occupied with rehearsals and meetings; they would be left open but not necessarily attended. He pointed out closing the gates at night would solve some of the problems but not all of the problem with the downtown streetscape. He stated that they remove people on a regular basis who have moved in during the daytime and set up housekeeping including their personal habits. Mr. Mead explained this was not unique to the Saenger.

Mr. Lee stated another reason for opting for a storefront was the higher level of security required for public assembly, making it necessary to screen audience members before entering the building. Walk-thru metal detectors have been installed, and a space was needed to perform this that was not outdoors, and their lobbies were too small to allow this process. Another reason was the noise level which has developed on Palafox; during performances, they hear noises on Palafox in the chambers. He pointed out gates were a place to collect items of disposal. He further explained the Saenger was a living, breathing auditorium, and if it does not work as an auditorium, it serves no purpose and becomes a museum. He pointed out most of the streetscape along Palafox looks like the Saenger, with alcoves removed and replaced with storefronts. He referenced the Vinyl Music Hall as having new doors exactly like the Saenger (provided current pictures).

Mr. Mead understood the noise levels being tolerated and the policing issues, but walling off the building was not necessarily the solution, and even if it was, he could never approve what had been installed; it needs to be more iconic and speak to the rest of the façade. Vinyl speaks to the rectilinear façade of the building on Garden and Palafox Street sides and speaks to the function of the building. He stressed he could not approve what had taken place and could not have approved it in the first place.

Mr. Monk appear before the Board and stated he had called Planning Services and made the complaint on the construction because he had not seen this project on the Planning Board agenda, where he sits as a member, or the ARB agenda. He also did not see a permit, and made the call since it did not seem like anything which would have made it through approval of either Board. Availability to the theater was a part of the nature and character of the Pensacola experience, and he hated that it might go away since some people had a problem with blight. He pointed out there was no way they would perform security screenings in 100 degree weather in that atrium with no air-conditioning. He stated the real issue was that some homeless people occasionally crash out in that location. For the last decade, he had been beating his chest on issues and solutions that could be done in Pensacola which would end the use of Palafox as a sleeping space. The same people are on Palafox because the situation has not been addressed. It has changed the character of Palafox and taken the fun out of that space for everyone else who wants to use it. He pointed out this item was not permitted or approved and did not see any reason for it to stand.

Mr. Buchanan pointed to the Saenger as a landmark on the National Register, and it should be treated as such. With this type of alteration to a very significant building, it would set a huge precedence if it was retroactively approved. While he respected the Saenger and the City's approach to preservation, this was a City-owned asset, and he recommended approving the gated structure referenced in 2014, denying this request and returning to the drawing board.

Mr. Pristera pointed out the contractor should be held accountable since they should know better, and he did not want to see this happen again especially to a significant structure. Mr. Crawford agreed this would be the place to draw a line in the sand.

Mr. Lee advised they had dealt with a subject matter expert and had this storefront drawn, and the one installed was drawn by the subject matter expert; they felt they had done their due diligence. As managers of the building, they felt this was the best solution to keep the building safe and operational.

Mr. Mead explained Mr. Lee had laid his finger precisely on the point but perhaps not in the way he intended. By matching the things around it, he defeated the purpose of the Saenger façade which was precisely not to match anything on that streetscape, and its entrance should reflect that in every respect. He advised the City was not without remedy for work which is done without a permit, and that should not be overlooked. **Mr. Mead made a motion to deny the request for approval of the work done without prior approval of this Board. Mr. Jones seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.**

Item 11 **270 N. Palafox Street** **PHBD**
Contributing Structure **C-2A**
Action taken: Denied without prejudice.

Blake Foster is requesting approval for exterior modifications to accommodate a brewery/bar. The applicant is proposing to convert the space into a brewery/bar and utilize half-height garage windows along the southern portion of the front to engage the pedestrians on the street. Additional openings are proposed for the rear of the building, specifically a full-height garage door, a glass door, and a metal door. The ARB approved exterior modifications to this property in June 2018 and in June 2017; neither have been completed.

Mr. Kuhn presented to the Board. The prior June 2018 approval was submitted to the Board. They have developed a plan which does not work with the previously approved plan. They proposed alterations on the front and the rear with roll-up operable windows, with the one on the rear having a full operable glass door. The client specifically asked for an outdoor space, and in opening up the back area and allowing the air flow into that space would create the outdoor space requested. The brewery also needed a large delivery access. He pointed out half of the building was approved (northern half) and half was not. They desired to activate the streetscape but would not be serving through the window, but it would give an opportunity for people to communicate in creating an indoor/outdoor atmosphere. He stated this could be achieved in one 6x16 unit. Also the previously approved windows fell between steel supports, and this (overhead window type) would fit conveniently between the two columns on the front. Mr. Mead explained there was a very symmetrical façade which was approved that kept the unity across the façade and created more light with the sill height going across. He questioned the reasoning for raising the sill and floor height. Mr. Kuhn explained the sill height was appropriate for the bar top height. Mr. Mead pointed out the New Orleans type roof which did not speak to the roof and north façade; he also did not see the rollup feature working. He explained Perfect Plain had the rollups and treated them as two separate units, going with the asymmetrical balance. He stated they had not divided the building to indicate what was different. Mr. Kuhn indicated they operated differently, but aesthetically it could all match. Mr. Mead pointed out the roll-up door with a horizontal profile broken up was fighting with the remainder of the fenestration. He suggested they stick with what the Board approved for balance. Mr. Pristera pointed out the entire façade had been modified several times. Mr. Mead stated we have what we have and approved what we approved. He had no problem with the rear, but he did have a problem with what was visible on the street. Chairman Quina stated the biggest issue was now it was four bays instead of three. Mr. Crawford asked if they clad the lower 30” in metal to match the storefront system so it would read more vertically. Mr. Mead suggested bringing the sill height down and having three bays closer in configuration; the bar application could stay when it was rolled up and be removed when rolled down. Mr. Crawford mentioned the other tenant had ADA treatment on the front, and Mr. Kuhn verified the center door met that requirement. He also advised there would be a garage door on the rear. Mr. Crawford suggested returning with three bays with the mullions to match.

Mr. Mead moved to deny without prejudice for resubmittal to the Board addressing its comments, seconded by Mr. Crawford, and it carried unanimously.

Item 12 **220 W. Garden Street** **PHBD**
Demolition **C-2A**
Action taken: Approved.

Dave Luttrell, DAG Architects, Inc., is requesting approval for the demolition of the drive-thru building. The structure served as the drive-thru banking center for a former occupant of 200 W. Garden Street. The removal of this building is desired for the redevelopment of the site and the re-use of this area. This item is under consideration with Item # 13.

Mr. Luttrell presented to the Board. **Mr. Mead made a motion to approve, seconded by Mr. Jones, and it carried unanimously.**

Item 13 **220 W. Garden Street** **PHBD**
New Construction **C-2A**
Action taken: Approved.

Dave Luttrell, DAG Architects, Inc., is requesting approval for the redevelopment of the site with two drive-up ATMs. The primary proposed redevelopment and re-use of this area involves the installation of drive-up ATM kiosks. The existing curb-cuts and driveways will be utilized; the driveways will be resurfaced. This item is under consideration with Item # 12.

Mr. Luttrell presented to the Board and explained the drive-up kiosks. **Mr. Mead made a motion to approve, seconded by Mr. Jones.** It was noted signage had been approved, but they might need an additional drive-thru sign for wayfinding. **The motion then carried unanimously.**

OPEN FORUM – Mr. Jones advised he would no longer be on the Board, and stated it had been a pleasure serving with the Board and felt they had made a substantial contribution to the City. He also thanked staff for their availability in accommodating his requests even on the weekends. Chairman Quina stated CivicCon had been bringing in speakers almost weekly, and they were all saying the same thing – that the Board had gotten some things right lately. He pointed out the rest of the state and the country were paying attention to what we are accomplishing, and the Board should be proud of what it has done.

Mr. Carson always felt in coming before this Board, Mr. Jones always gave him a fair shake, and being from a neighboring county, he appreciated his hard work.

DISCUSSION – Mr. Mead asked if the Board had any guidance for staff on grade elevation and foundation in terms of the application (DeSoto property). Ms. Deese stated in all fairness to Mr. Bilby, they should give him time to get settled, and some of those issues might be improved, and there is a little bit of a disconnect in what the Board approves and what actually is finished on the ground. Mr. Mead noted the application in question showed the site completely flat, and there was no way for the Board to specify you have to maintain the exposure to the front.

The Board then welcomed new member Derek Salter.

ADJOURNMENT – With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:08 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Brandi Deese
Secretary to the Board

Item 12 **220 W. Garden Street** **PHBD**
Demolition **C-2A**
Action taken: Approved.

Dave Luttrell, DAG Architects, Inc., is requesting approval for the demolition of the drive-thru building. The structure served as the drive-thru banking center for a former occupant of 200 W. Garden Street. The removal of this building is desired for the redevelopment of the site and the re-use of this area. This item is under consideration with Item # 13.

Mr. Luttrell presented to the Board. **Mr. Mead made a motion to approve, seconded by Mr. Jones, and it carried unanimously.**

Item 13 **220 W. Garden Street** **PHBD**
New Construction **C-2A**
Action taken: Approved.

Dave Luttrell, DAG Architects, Inc., is requesting approval for the redevelopment of the site with two drive-up ATMs. The primary proposed redevelopment and re-use of this area involves the installation of drive-up ATM kiosks. The existing curb-cuts and driveways will be utilized; the driveways will be resurfaced. This item is under consideration with Item # 12.

Mr. Luttrell presented to the Board and explained the drive-up kiosks. **Mr. Mead made a motion to approve, seconded by Mr. Jones.** It was noted signage had been approved, but they might need an additional drive-thru sign for wayfinding. **The motion then carried unanimously.**

OPEN FORUM – Mr. Jones advised he would no longer be on the Board, and stated it had been a pleasure serving with the Board and felt they had made a substantial contribution to the City. He also thanked staff for their availability in accommodating his requests even on the weekends. Chairman Quina stated CivicCon had been bringing in speakers almost weekly, and they were all saying the same thing – that the Board had gotten some things right lately. He pointed out the rest of the state and the country were paying attention to what we are accomplishing, and the Board should be proud of what it has done.

Mr. Carson always felt in coming before this Board, Mr. Jones always gave him a fair shake, and being from a neighboring county, he appreciated his hard work.

DISCUSSION – Mr. Mead asked if the Board had any guidance for staff on grade elevation and foundation in terms of the application (DeSoto property). Ms. Deese stated in all fairness to Mr. Bilby, they should give him time to get settled, and some of those issues might be improved, and there is a little bit of a disconnect in what the Board approves and what actually is finished on the ground. Mr. Mead noted the application in question showed the site completely flat, and there was no way for the Board to specify you have to maintain the exposure to the front.

The Board then welcomed new member Derek Salter.

ADJOURNMENT – With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:08 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Brandi Deese
Secretary to the Board