



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

**September 30, 2020**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chairperson Quina, Vice Chairperson Crawford

**MEMBERS VIRTUAL:** Board Member Fogarty, Board Member Mead, Board Member Salter, Board Member Villegas

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** None

**STAFF PRESENT:** Historic Preservation Planner Harding, Board Advisor Pristera (virtual), Assistant Planning Director Cannon, Planning Director Morris (virtual), Assistant City Attorney Lindsay, Planning Technician Hargett, Digital Media Coordinator Rose

**OTHERS PRESENT VIRTUAL:** Nicholas Forte, Doug Nix, Scott Field, Bob Switzer, Christy Cabassa, Matt Caldwell, Christian Voelkel, Nanette Chandler

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

Chairperson Quina called the Architectural Review Board (ARB) meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. He also indicated this was his last Board meeting and stated it had been his pleasure to serve on the ARB. He explained everything the Board had accomplished in the past 25-30 years had been equally as important to downtown preservation and the downtown economy as anything else that had happened. When the Board says "no" to someone, they usually say they can "do it this way." In his opinion, the Board has been one of the greatest downtown development promoters. He agreed that the Boards should not be dominated by the same people over many years and was stepping aside and looking forward to new ideas and new blood on the Board. It was noted new Board Member Spencer was unable to attend and would be sworn in at the next meeting.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**Board Member Mead made a motion to approve the August 20, 2020 minutes, seconded by Vice Chairperson Crawford, and it carried unanimously.**

Chairperson Quina determined a quorum was present and explained the procedures of the

virtual Board meeting. Staff advised the public had been informed of the rescheduled meeting, and emails and phone calls would be monitored for participation.

**OPEN FORUM** - None

**NEW BUSINESS**

**Item 1**

**100 W. Brainerd Street**

**NHPD**

**Contributing Structure**

**Action taken: Approved with abbreviated review.**

Nicholas Forte is requesting approval to construct a new side yard driveway, porch stairs and a replacement walkway with matching pavers located in the rear yard. The applicant is also requesting approval to pave the enclosed west side yard and a small sand area between the front porch and front Magnolia tree with matching pavers.

North Hill's recommendations were provided to the Board. Staff advised there was no maximum yard coverage in this district; the maximum coverage was reserved for commercial spaces and some residential zones outside of the preservation districts. Board Member Mead asked the reason for the second driveway, and Mr. Forte stated there was no parking directly in front of the house, and they planned to use the front door more often. Board Member Villegas was concerned with removing some of the green area and thought a ribbon drive would be more complimentary to the style of the home. Mr. Forte confirmed the Magnolia tree would remain and felt the area would be better with pavers than the existing sand pit. He explained they intended to use potted plants in the area. He also stated he was trying to match the existing pavers in the rear. It was determined the 17' driveway was within the allowable size with 12' minimum and 24' maximum width permissible. It was noted that a ribbon driveway would be a narrower footprint and would reduce the impact of the paving. Board Member Salter addressed the pavers on top of the sidewalk and up to the steps of the house, questioning the style of the pavers; he was not sure this was the best solution. He had no objection to the side yard or the driveway. Chairperson Quina clarified that it would be agreeable to keep the concrete steps and sidewalk as a pedestrian element and then use the pavers only for the vehicular path; Vice Chairperson Crawford also agreed. **Vice Chairperson Crawford made a motion with the following modifications: 1) that the new driveway be a ribbon driveway style to be submitted for an abbreviated review, from the street edge to the front edge of the house or wherever the privacy gate begins, 2) for the front walk to remain concrete; addressing the additional pavers in the requested area between the two, that the motion not include that area to be completely paved – Mini Mondo Grass might work. Board Member Villegas amended the motion to indicate the pavers should be more in line with the front façade of the house – the style of brick. Vice Chairperson Crawford accepted and clarified the existing pavers had more square and rectangle portions, and a more traditional brick (4 x 8) pavers in addition to the color would be preferable. Board Member Villegas seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.**

**Item 2**

**434 E. Intendencia St**

**PHD**

**Non-Contributing Structure**

**HR-1**

**Action taken: Approved.**

Doug Nix is seeking approval to add 36 solar panels to the roof of a non-contributing structure.

Mr. Nix presented to the Board. Chairperson Quina indicated the solar panels would only be slightly seen from the intersection, and Mr. Nix agreed. The roof was determined to be metal. **Board Member Salter made a motion to approve as submitted taking into consideration that the layout does appear to be thoughtful to the neighborhood with regard to the symmetrical layout of the roof, and that the pitch does provide for a minimal impact to the roof and visual impact to the property. Board Member Fogarty seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.**

**Item 3**

**319 W. Gadsden Street**

**NHPD**

**Contributing Structure**

**PR-2**

**Action taken: Approved with comments.**

Scott and Charlotte Field are requesting approval to add a rear screen porch to a contributing structure. An Administrative Variance was granted for the east side yard setback to be 7.4' rather than 7.5' and the North Hill comments were provided to the Board. Mr. Field presented to the Board. Board Member Salter advised that it appeared that the new porch roofline was intended to match the existing roofline, and Mr. Field stated that was correct. Board Member Villegas was concerned with the siding materials, and they were determined to be wood shiplap; the dark green material on the front of the house was determined to be painted brick. Vice Chairperson Crawford stated it appeared from the street view, they were looking at an original brick pier foundation that was infilled with CMU block and painted dark green. He explained the Board should give direction for the addition and suggested that either lattice be added to the infilled CMU piers and the CMU piers painted black, or potentially adding stucco between the piers to differentiate them from the brick and replicate the stucco for the addition. He also suggested that the openings for the screened porch be trimmed out with wood to match the windows on the house. Board Member Villegas pointed out this particular structure was on the corner and wanted the materials to be indicated. **Vice Chairperson Crawford made a motion to approve as submitted with the following modifications: 1) that the porch addition foundation wall finish be skim coat stucco painted to match the color of the existing building, with a suggestion, but not a requirement, that the original structure be skim coat stucco added to the infill between the brick piers, 2) that window trim replicating the original windows be added to the screened porch openings. The motion was seconded by Board Member Mead and carried unanimously.**

**Item 4**

**226 E. Government St**

**PHD / HC-1**

**Contributing Structure**

**Wood Cottages**

**Action taken: Approved with comments.**

Christy Cabassa is requesting final approval for exterior changes and additions to the main structure. The applicant has provided elevations of the existing house, those that were conceptually approved at the July meeting, and proposed final drawings which incorporate the Board's past input.

Mr. Switzer presented to the Board and stated one of the last comments from the prior meeting was a request to keep the windows. With some concessions from the Board, they

would be willing to keep those walk-thru windows in the style original to the structure. They wanted to upgrade the windows with new safe energy efficient sashes, and the look and function would be the same as the original. They also proposed Hardie Artisan painted siding on the building; the wood would be removed. Board Member Salter had noticed that a lot of the infilled structures used Hardie. When comparing those houses with the historical structures, it was easy to see the difference. Using these materials on the street-facing side distracts from the structure. He felt it was important to use materials to maintain the historic character on the street fronts at these locations. He explained that an elevation highly visible from the street would, when possible, need the authentic materials. Mr. Switzer stated the historical architects working on his projects indicated Hardie was an acceptable product for the National Park Service historical renovations. He explained the price of wood had gone up considerably since they began this project, and he did not feel you could really tell the difference between new wood and new Hardie board from a distance of 15'. Ms. Cabassa advised there were homes on Zaragoza where the Board had approved Hardie board on contributing structures. Staff confirmed 434 Zaragoza was constructed with Hardie board on all sides of that renovation. 424 Zaragoza had original materials except on the rear addition. Advisor Pristera stated he had worked with Mr. Switzer to come up with a compromise. He also advised when the house was moved to the historic district, it was to fill in holes to prevent the construction of parking lots. He suggested they were changing the building but not too drastically and preserving the historic features; he was comfortable with the siding as a concession. Chairperson Quina reminded the Board members that they were following the guidelines approved by the City Council for rehabilitating historic structures; if you are aware that there is clear documentation of an existing material, you should simply use that material in any renovation or restoration and even minor alterations. He asked if the Board saw a unique circumstance that would substantiate a variance to the material requirement. He emphasized that 434 Zaragoza was not approved for Hardie on all sides of that structure. Mr. Switzer stated the current front of the house (1978) was formerly the side of the house; is it now a contributing structure when it was a placeholder in the district. Staff stated that 434 Zaragoza came before the Board in April 2019 and the elevations showed Hardie Artisan lap siding which was approved on all sides since the wood lap siding on the house was determined not historic, and the applicant was encouraged to salvage as much as possible, but it was understood much of it could not be reused.

Board Member Salter advised that according to Section 12-13-3 which establishes the ARB, the Board's duties are to preserve the historic integrity and ancient appearance within any and all historic districts established; this property exists within an established historic district and identified within that district as a historic structure regardless of where it came from or what its original orientation on its previous lot was. He pointed out 434 Zaragoza was beautifully renovated but did not look historic to him, and this Board's function is to protect the historic character of the districts which includes materials. Perhaps if they could maintain some of the architectural elements of more importance, the siding might be borderline and justifiable. Vice Chairperson Crawford offered the Board must enforce the Code given to them. He respected the efforts of the architects and owners to restore this building and maintain the architectural detail such as the window treatment and others, however, this was the Wood Cottages District. Chairperson Quina confirmed the Board had approved the conceptual design, and details and materials were on the agenda today.

The July 2020 motion stated **“Board Member Crawford made a motion to approve conceptually as submitted with notes that the front door, shutters and three major openings including the four small gable openings, be looked at closely for restoration or replication with like materials. Board Member Mead seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.”** Board Member Mead explained the Code states to duplicate materials unless there is something unique to the project. After further discussion, staff read the April 2019 minutes concerning 434 Zaragoza regarding Artisan siding and the full removal and replacement of the existing termite damaged siding. The applicant was requested to save as much of the original siding as possible with the understanding that much of the siding could not be reused, and the windows should also be restored if possible.

**Board Member Salter made a motion to approve the application with the following modifications: 1) that the proposed Hardie siding not be allowed but instead a traditional material more common to the historical district of a wood siding be used as well as all the trim and materials be wood; 2) that the five openings on the various street front elevations be refurbished, existing openings doors and windows; 3) that the other openings on the house because they are relocated can be the submitted clad material. Board Member Fogarty seconded the motion. Board Member Salter clarified his motion to include specific reference to Sections 12-13-3(E) regarding maintaining the ancient appearance, and 12-2-10(A) regarding the Board considering the materials. The motion then carried 5 to 1 with Board Member Mead dissenting.** It was noted construction could continue as long as the applicant used wood siding.

**Item 5  
Contributing Structure –  
New Construction**

**425 and 427 E. Romana**

**PHD / HC-1  
Brick Structures**

**Action taken: Approved with comments/abbreviated review.**

Irby & Voelkel Engineering is seeking final approval for the design of a new residence as well as modifications to an existing contributing structure. The proposed work includes the combination of two lots into one parcel.

Chairperson Quina advised the applicant had responded to the Board's questions quite well. Mr. Voelkel presented to the Board and indicated a landscape plan had been submitted. The stairway had been narrowed on the streetscape leading up to the home; they also lowered the height of the rear structure. Board Member Villegas offered in going forward, showing a finished rendering would be appreciated. Vice Chairperson Crawford suggested the front stairs be widened to the full width of the center bay, that way the handrails required for either side connect to the columns of the new house. Also, on a house this grand, an 8' minimum deep porch would be more appropriate and complimentary to the house. Mr. Voelkel did not know if the porch was for sitting or just for architectural value. Staff determined the stairs were already encroaching on the rear yard setback which was 20', but as long as the Building Official agreed with it, they could encroach over the rear yard no more than 3.5'. Regarding the existing structure, Board Member Salter stated leaving the trim on the right would be more appropriate to that structure, and the applicant agreed. It was confirmed they were adding brick infill between the piers, replacing the windows and painting the structure. The infill between the piers would be inset behind into the middle of the column to give prominence to the original piers.

Board Member Salter explained typically the Board required the replacement windows to be a simulated divided light system, and he could not find the interior divided piece on this product. It was determined that those details were available to the Board. The brick and trim colors were explained. Vice Chairperson Crawford offered on the south elevation that newel posts would be appropriate on the handrails to line up with the support columns. Also, for the underside ceiling of the porches, he suggested a tongue and groove wood which the applicant stated would be used. Water drainage was also addressed. Board Member Salter had concerns with the mortar and brick matching which would not read as a residence. **Vice Chairperson Crawford made a motion to approve with the following comments: 1) that the entry stairs to the new structure be widened to the width to the central bay with handrails that match the rest of the building, 2) that newel posts be added to the rear elevation handrails, 3) that the trim on the front of the existing building remain as is, and the mortar submitted through an abbreviated review. Board Member Villegas seconded the motion. Board Member Salter amended the motion for the existing contributing structure that the brick infill skirting be installed as described by the applicant to be recessed between the piers to approximately the center point. Also, that a sample of the brick and mortar be submitted for abbreviated review. The amendments were accepted, and the motion carried unanimously.**

<b>Item 6</b>	<b>43 S. Palafox Place</b>	<b>PHBD / C-2A</b>
<b>Contributing Structure</b>	<b>(REMOVED)</b>	
<b>Action taken:</b>		

<b>Item 7</b>	<b>611, 621 and 631 N. Davis Hwy</b>	<b>OEHPD / OEHC-2</b>
<b>New Construction</b>		
<b>Action taken: Approved.</b>		

Nannette Chandler is seeking approval for three new accessory structures to accompany three single-family residences approved in December 2019. At that time, the garages were listed on the site plan as optional although their dimensions, locations, related hardscapes and concepts were discussed and approved. However, elevations and the garage doors were not presented at that time and were intended to come back to the Board for review.

Ms. Chandler presented to the Board. Board Member Villegas wanted clarification on the garage styles and paint colors. Ms. Chandler stated the paint for the garage doors would match the front doors of the homes, either painted or stained. The body structures of the garages and paint colors would also match the paint colors on the homes. She wanted each home to have its own style of carriage door. **Board Member Salter made a motion to approve as submitted, seconded by Board Member Mead, and it carried unanimously.**

<b>Item 8</b>	<b>205 E. Zaragoza Street</b>	<b>PHD / HC-1</b>
<b>Non-Contributing Structure</b>		
<b>Action taken: Approved.</b>		

Ross Pristera, UWF Historic Trust, is requesting approval to replace the wood decking on the rear porch of the Tivoli High House with 1-1/2" thick, rough-sawn lumber attached using period correct nails. This same decking has been approved and used on the 1805 Lavalle House and the 1805 Julee Cottage. The proposed decking will not be painted and will gray

naturally.

Advisor Pristera presented to the Board. **Board Member Villegas made a motion to approve as submitted, seconded by Vice Chairperson Crawford, and it carried unanimously.**

**DISCUSSION**: Historic Preservation Planner Harding thanked Chairperson Quina and Vice Chairperson Crawford for their service on the Board and their influence on shaping the downtown of Pensacola. Board Member Mead expressed his appreciation for their insights to detail as constructive and creative. Board Member Villegas stated she had learned so much from them in the short time she has served and hoped they would return in the future.

Staff advised the Board would be returning to normal procedures in October with in-person attendance in the Hagler-Mason conference room.

**ADJOURNMENT** – With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:31 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

 10/5/2020

Historic Preservation Planner Harding  
Secretary to the Board