



MINUTES OF THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

May 20, 2021

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairperson Salter, Vice Chairperson Mead, Board Member Fogarty, Board Member Ramos, Board Member Spencer, Board Member Villegas, Board Member Yee

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Historic Preservation Planner Harding, Senior Planner Statler, Assistant City Attorney Lindsay, Help Desk Technician Russo

STAFF VIRTUAL: Assistant Planning Director Cannon, Advisor Pristera

OTHERS PRESENT: Nick Pica, Mallory Gillette, Andy Thoms, Jarret Breslford, Shawn Marlow, Dana & Teddy McBride, Hastings & Anne Read, Ivo Alcala, Jeff Paul

CALL TO ORDER / QUORUM PRESENT

Chairperson Salter called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Historic Preservation Planner Harding reminded the Board of Form 8B for recusal; he explained it is common practice that any time someone recuses, it will be announced the reason for that recusal during the Board meeting; the form would then be uploaded to the back of the meeting minutes. Board Member Mead then made a motion to approve the April 15, 2021 minutes, seconded by Board Member Ramos, and it carried unanimously.

OPEN FORUM - None

NEW BUSINESS

Item 2

903 N. Barcelona Street

NHPD

Contributing Structure

PR-2

Action taken: Approved with Mobile Green Shutters – abbreviated review if not.

Erik and Lesa Gibson are requesting approval for new windows and shutters at a contributing structure.

Hastings Read presented to the Board and explained his company manufactured historically accurate door, shutters, and windows, and they tried to keep the historical elements on each elevation. He noted their shutters were historically accurate with holdbacks and hinges, and their

wood shutters were made of tropical hardwood and very durable for this climate; he provided an example for the Board's review. Chairperson Salter addressed the first-floor corner room facing the east and south elevations and asked about the decorative and non-decorative windows and change in the mullion pattern. Mr. Read explained the decorative windows pertained to the front of the house, and it made no sense to not have the decorative element; the south side was a porch; putting a 1 over 1 on the east elevation would ruin the whole effect. He explained their opinion was based on what felt right from the ground view. Board Member Spencer was satisfied with the applicant's response. Board Member Villegas asked for clarification of the shutter color, and Mr. Reed indicated "Mobile Green" (dark green) had been recommended.

Board Member Mead made a motion to approve, seconded by Board Member Yee. Board Member Villegas suggested an amendment to clarify the color as Mobile Green and that it be included in the submission. Chairperson Salter agreed because there was no sample of the final color, it should be submitted through an abbreviated review; it was accepted. It was noted North Hill had no objection to the project. Board Member Ramos explained the shutter example was in Mobile Green and asked to amend if they returned with any other color than Mobile Green, it would go through an abbreviated review; it was accepted. The motion then carried unanimously.

Item 3	420 E. Zarragossa Street	PHD
Noncontributing Structure		HC-1 / Wood Cottages
and Modern Infill Structure		
Action taken: Approved.		

Mark Chastain is seeking approval for exterior repairs and renovations to a noncontributing structure. Staff explained landscaping would not be part of the presentation.

Mr. Alcala presented to the Board and stated the owners wanted to install new gutters and downspouts, and they had designed a simple box to match the existing colors and blend in with the existing features. Chairperson Salter agreed the proposed elements would blend in with the existing structure. Mr. Alcala confirmed the roof now drains into the scupper and advised the two outlets would spill into the gutter, and they would install two new downspouts on the ends of those gutters on the inside corner of the east side of the balcony and the northwest corner of the same balcony, both tucked in.

Board Member Spencer made a motion to approve, seconded by Board Member Ramos, and it carried unanimously.

Item 4	909 N. Barcelona St	NHPD
Contributing Structure		PR-1AAA
Action taken: Approved.		

Professional Electrical Service, Inc. is seeking approval to add solar panels to the roof of a contributing structure. Twenty-five (25) panels are proposed to be added to the west and east sides of primary structure's roof. Staff explained the panels were placed around the dormers, with the solar meter and utility boxes on the rear side of the house hidden from view. The State Statute language was also provided to the Board.

Mr. Marlow presented to the Board. Chairperson Salter noted North Hill had no objections to this project. Board Member Mead questioned why the ARB was reviewing if the State has been preemptive. Historic Preservation Planner Harding explained in the past, the ARB had commented on the placement of the panels, and it was required by ordinance. Board Member Mead explained the Board appeared to be functionally preempted, and the City should have some general policies to reflect the placement and take it administratively out of the hands of the Board; Assistant City Attorney Lindsay advised she would bring this to the attention of the City Attorney. Staff advised

the fence policy had been changed to allow them to be considered in an abbreviated review. Mr. Marlow advised their goal in placement of the panels was for maximum production, but they tried to keep with the integrity of the home and stay off the front. Historic Preservation Planner Harding advised these types of projects were reviewed by staff, the ARB Chairperson, and Advisor before presentation.

Board Member Mead made a motion to submit these types of items for abbreviated review; if the reviewer thought necessary, it could be forwarded the Board for review. Chairperson Salter indicated he did not want to give up jurisdiction totally but agreed an abbreviated review would be a more efficient way to proceed. Assistant City Attorney Lindsay advised the motion had been made and if it were seconded and the Board directed the City Attorney's Office to change the procedures, it would. **Chairperson Salter seconded the motion.** Assistant City Attorney Lindsay pointed out it was not on the Board's agenda to make this motion, and it was not an item noticed to the public, but the Board could proceed with it. Board Member Mead explained just because it was not on the agenda did not mean the Board could not move on it. **Chairperson Salter clarified that this was a policy the Board would like to pursue. Board Member Mead advised this was the direction to staff to write a policy for abbreviated review with referral back to the Board was his understanding of the motion. The motion carried unanimously. Board Member Mead made a motion to approve the application, seconded by Board Member Villegas, and it carried unanimously.**

Item 5	430 E. Intendencia Street	PHD
Noncontributing Structure		HR-1 / Wood Cottages

Action taken: Approved with Comments.

Professional Electrical Service, Inc. is seeking approval to add solar panels to the roof of a non-contributing structure. Forty-two (42) panels are proposed to be added to the west and east sides of the primary structure's roof.

Chairperson Salter noted there appeared to be electrical panels behind a gate and wanted confirmation that the new equipment would be located behind the existing gate, and Mr. Marlow stated they would install as close to the meter as possible.

Board Member Fogarty made a motion to approve as submitted, seconded by Board Member Mead. Chairperson Salter proposed an amendment for clarification that the equipment must be mounted behind the fence; it was accepted, and the motion carried unanimously.

Item 6	214 W. Blount Street	NHPD
Noncontributing Structure		PR-1AAA

Action taken: Approved.

Jarret Brelsford is seeking approval to paint the exterior of a brick residence. Sections of the brick exterior, including brick surrounding all windows, have been painted in the past with tan and black latex paint. The applicant is proposing to use ROMABIO which is a breathable, mineral based, and toxin-free paint made specifically for brick and masonry features. The final product also appears as a natural finish rather than leaving a glossy or shiny surface.

Mr. Brelsford presented to the Board and stated the home was the 1948 Miller A. Gilmore house. Unfortunately, over the years there were many revisions to the outside with glue, paint, and wood which should not be there, and they were looking forward to getting it cleaned up and more unified. Board Member Mead asked for a sample of the new product, and Mr. Brelsford stated the sample in the packet was Richmond White which had one application shown. Richard Ingram Painting would reglaze all the windows. Chairperson Salter stated when he read the Code 12-3-10, Section 2 (d) stated for existing buildings and new construction, the Board could review the exterior design

and appearance of the building including the front, sides, rear and roof materials, textures, and colors. This house was not considered as contributing, but under the rules for noncontributing structures, the Board was directed to consider them as examples of their own time and period. When he looked at this building, he saw textured brick, shape and form, multiple colors, red brick, and glazed brick; it seemed the brick was intentionally picked to be a contributing detail and component of the architecture of this building. The existing paint is limited to a small percentage, and he believed there were products available to remove the paint without damage to the brick; he could not support painting the brick on this house. Board Member Mead stated the brick was representative of its time, and there were innumerable examples in the surrounding area. The City was not at risk of losing that type in the overall scheme of things; a whitewash was also typical for that time period. Board Member Spencer appreciated the Chair's diligence, but because it was noncontributing, he felt comfortable in supporting the request, and it would be a great improvement. Mr. Brelsford indicated originally there were two single-car garage doors, but that location had been turned into a mother-in-law suite. Eventually, they wanted to build a detached garage with textured brick and painted the same color. Board Member Villegas felt the double coat of paint would take away from the brick texture. Mr. Brelsford agreed and stated that was the reason for choosing this type of paint which was not thick and would not fill the vertical lines of the brick.

Board Member Spencer made a motion to approve, seconded by Board Member Mead, and it carried unanimously.

Item 7

824 Belmont Street

OEHPD

Contributing Structure

OEHC-2

Action taken: Approved with abbreviated review.

Teddy McBride is requesting approval to replace damaged wood siding with fiber cement at a contributing structure. In January 2018, Mr. McBride was issued a permit to replace the wood siding on the rear of the house with Hardie board fiber cement siding. Although the permit was issued and closed, it did not receive review or approval by ARB. The applicant was seeking approval to replace the remaining wood siding (except for on the front of the house) with fiber cement siding matching the January 2018 product.

Board Member Fogarty asked if there was a precedent set by the Board, and Historic Preservation Planner Harding stated for contributing structures, fiber cement siding was not approved by the Board; there were some instances where rear additions to contributing structures were allowed since those additions were considered new construction. New construction and modern infill did not have to utilize historic materials, and fiber cement siding would be allowed. He was not aware of any full replacement within OEHPD. He advised the applicant had received a permit in January 2018, but the permitting system was not set up as it is today; before you obtain a permit, there is a GIS search, and if the property is located within a historic district, ARB approval is required before a permit is issued.

Board Member Spencer stated he had visited 434 Zarragossa which has a new owner, and the historic contributing structure was replaced with non-wood siding with ARB approval. Staff clarified that those applicants were able to prove a hardship. Board Member Spencer explained the applicant had obtained a permit in 2018 allowing them to have this expectation. Ms. McBride stated most of the rear and second floor is now Hardie siding, and they wanted each side to be completed to match. She wanted to keep the glassed-in front porch with the original wood, but they were using the wood grain Hardie to be as close to the original as possible. Board Member Mead stated since they wanted to keep the main fabric on the front porch, it seemed to him if there were any compromised materials in the area of the door, they would salvage plenty of that from other surfaces to reuse. He asked that they keep to the original fabric on the front face; he

agreed having a permit issued and being relied upon for the replacements, it would be hard now to go back, especially when you have inconsistent materials on the same face of the building. Board Member Spencer asked if there was a corner board which would be a natural termination of the wood and resume with the Hardie board. Board Member Villegas stated it was unfortunate the permit was issued, but this was in such a visible spot on the end of Old East Hill. There was a difference in quality and shading of the contributing structure; the OEHPD stated there were very few opportunities to do right by Old East Hill. Board Member Yee offered a compromise for where the Hardie was already installed on the two-story structure which appeared to be an addition and have Hardie installed on that volume only and wood maintained on the one-story. Ms. McBride stated the Hardie on the two-story was installed down to the ground. Board Member Yee stated if there was a way to install wood on the east elevation of the original structure, the two-story volume would be a logical break. Board Member Mead stated the balance of the east facing two-story appeared to be wood, and it would have been preferable to have Hardie installed at the same spacing; he preferred keeping as much of the original material as possible. Ms. McBride indicated the east side was completely rotted, and there was not enough to salvage. Board Member Ramos agreed with Board Member Yee's suggestion, but was concerned that OEHPD did not approve this application.

Advisor Pristera explained the two-story addition would be permissible for Hardie, but if it all has to be replaced, it should be with a better looking material and not suburban style Hardie. His main concern was the one-story house since historic structures have different materials which contribute to the character and story of the house. He suggested getting a better match and saving anything original on the porch if salvageable. Mr. McBride, who is also the general contractor on the project, stated they do not make the existing siding anymore, but the rough-cut siding they are attaching matches the texture of the existing siding as close as possible. He pointed out it would coordinate better with the building next door which is also Hardie. Also, access to the west side of the house was limited due to a retaining wall, and he felt mixing and matching materials degraded the structure. Board Member Yee sent an email to staff for alternative materials which would more closely match. Board Member Villegas advised the Board followed the guidelines of the Federal government and the Department of Interior, but she respected all the arguments presented; she believed the value of the historical structure was in its integrity and not in the replacements.

Chairperson Salter read the 2018 permit application which called for Hardie replacement on the two-story addition. He then read the LDC section pertaining to restoration, rehabilitation, alterations, and additions to existing contributing structures in OEHPD. His perspective on the application was that the applicant had a unique circumstance with being previously approved to replace the siding on the two-story addition, and he believed they should be able to continue that siding on the two-story. However, the front portion has a very unique profile; with sections of the structure having tremendous deterioration, there was potential for unique circumstances; a board for board replacement would not be possible. One of the distinguishing characteristics was the profile of the siding and the shadow lines it created which were found on historic structures; he did not think the product being used on the rear addition was appropriate for the historical portion of the house. He advised that the Board would have to at least require a profile of siding as close as can be found to match, and if that profile were available in any composite or wood siding, the Board could take that into consideration as a special circumstance. Mr. McBride advised the siding with that profile was not available, and everything would need to be handmade from wood and extremely expensive. He explained they would not change any wood around the windows but the siding itself.

Board Member Mead made a motion as to the two-story structure to permit the use of Hardie or equivalent fiber cement so long as it is in the profile as close as commercially available to the profile of the original material in spacing and shadow line material identified by Board Member Yee, which might be a candidate for that, and submitted for abbreviated review with details showing spacing consistent with the existing structure and profiles for shadow lines; as to the existing wood on the second-story structure, that it be salvaged for purposes of reuse on the historic facade and to maintain as much of the historic material on the one-story portion of the structure which has the historical character; that to the extent there is a lack of sufficient material, that it be submitted for an abbreviated review to document, and preference be given to maintaining original materials and replace original materials with what is available on the east and south faces; if any further Hardie material is necessary because of shortage in salvaged material, it be used on the west face and preferentially in the lower portions where it would be of more use since it would be more exposed to weather. Staff asked for designation of the abbreviated reviewer since the review may involve a site visit or communication between the applicant and reviewer, and Chairperson Salter was agreeable for that review. The motion was seconded by Board Member Ramos. Mr. McBride stated they would have enough of the salvaged materials for the front of the building. It was clarified the abbreviated review would cover the final profile of the new siding. The motion then carried unanimously.

Item 8

423 E. Intendencia Street

PHD

Contributing Structure

HR-1 / Wood Cottages

Action taken: Approved with comments and abbreviated review.

Andy Thoms is requesting approval for exterior renovations to a contributing structure. Renovations include the replacement of all windows with new aluminum-clad wood windows, new paint consisting of a "Pearl Gray" body and "Westhighland White", new entry wood doors, and replacement wood decking for the front porch.

Mr. Thoms addressed the Board and stated the front porch wood decking would be replaced with 1x6 treated wood. Chairperson Salter stated it appeared the existing porch was tongue and groove, and there were only three original windows on the east elevation, and staff confirmed the others were metal or missing. Mr. Thoms stated he wanted to go with the Colonial 6 panel doors to match the windows. Chairperson Salter indicated in this location we try to keep the original elements to the best extent possible. Mr. Thoms explained the existing door was vertical and would not match the Colonial 6 panes with divided light; he stated it would be better not to have a mix of vertical lines in the glass with the Colonial style window. He also advised it would be the same color palette as 555 E. Government. The front door was determined to be old and needed to be replaced; the front steps were concrete, and the upper wood stairs were in good shape. Board Member Yee asked about the brick piers, and Mr. Thoms stated he was open to painting them. Advisor Pristera stated the door represented the period of the home, and if it could remain, it would be telling the story of the structure even though it was not the original style of the house; if it had to be replaced, it should be something in the cottage style. He believed the proposed replacement style had been used before in this district.

Board Member Villegas made a motion to approve with the new aluminum-clad wood windows and paint scheme proposed with the exception of the decking on the front porch, that it be replacement in kind and if it is to be replaced, it would be tongue and groove which shows to be 1x3 (not sure), and there is an intention to save the current door, but if it is replaced, that some thought be given to a cottage style door, and if that

is not possible, an abbreviated review to address the tongue and groove as well as the front door. Board Member Ramos amended that the color of the brick piers be in an abbreviated review; it was accepted. The motion was seconded by Board Member Ramos and carried unanimously.

Item 9 **1015 N. Barcelona Street** **NHPD**
Contributing Structure **PR-1AAA**

Action taken: Approved.

Nicholas Pica, Studio Pica Designs, is seeking approval for exterior renovations to a contributing structure.

Mr. Pica addressed the Board and stated all the existing bright white trim on the house would now be the Sherwin Williams America's Heritage, Extra White; all siding and exterior shake would be Sherwin Williams Historic, Classic Light Buff; accent exterior paint colors would be Sherwin Williams Historic, Copen Blue. The new windows would match the existing and all other windows would be Sherwin Williams America's Heritage, Tricorn Black; and the porch decking on the front and rear porches would be Sherwin Williams Historic, Library Pewter. Chairperson Salter appreciated the efforts to preserve as much of the exterior and originality of the home as possible, while making necessary interior upgrades.

Board Member Ramos made a motion to approve seconded by Board Member Fogarty, and it carried unanimously.

Item 10 **815 N. Baylen Street** **NHPD**
Contributing Structure **PR-2**

Action taken: Approved with Abbreviated Review.

Scott Sallis is seeking approval to renovate a two-story contributing structure. The renovations will include the additions of a new rear deck, new roof dormers, new exterior paint, new windows, and hardscape.

Mr. Sallis presented to the Board and advised they were not doing too much to the exterior, but they added dormers for proper egress to bedrooms and added a covered rear deck. They agreed with North Hill's comments regarding the light fixtures which would be changed. Regarding the ballast rock wall at the sidewalk property line, they would remove some of the wall for a driveway. The client has met with the City's arborist concerning the Magnolia tree that ties to that wall. He also stated they were going to replace all existing windows since most of them were rotten or broken except for the two full windows in the front which will be restored. All others would be replaced with a wood-clad product. The stain glass would remain. He indicated they had talked with North Hill about the wall and would remove only what was necessary for parking. Board Member Mead asked if they could reuse some of the stone to add wings to the drive, and Mr. Sallis stated that could be considered to border the driveway. Board Member Ramos asked that a more pervious paving for the driveway be considered.

Board Member Spencer made a motion to approve. Chairperson Salter made an amendment that any design associated with the driveway and wall not be approved here but returned in an abbreviated review; it was accepted. The motion was seconded by Board Member Villegas and carried unanimously.

Item 11 **16 Palafox Place** **NHPD**
Contributing Structure **C-2A**

Action taken: Approved with comments.

Scott Sallis, Dalrymple Sallis Architecture, is requesting approval for the addition of an outdoor dining area on the rear of the structure.

Mr. Sallis presented to the Board and stated they wanted the dining area to be open. The two columns built in the initial construction were to hold streetlights, but they have enough footing for the awning. Board Member Spencer asked what would the fasteners on the box truss be since this would become the front of the house, and Mr. Sallis explained they were holding it up with new steel saddles and bolts, and they could control the aesthetic. Board Member Villegas addressed the privacy canvas screening, and Mr. Sallis indicated the existing screens were installed to block the late sun and would be removed at the completion of the project. Board Member Mead addressed the trusses being asymmetric, and Mr. Sallis advised that was the result of existing conditions; the columns are there, and the roof they were attaching to does not align, and he was not aware of any treatment to make them less asymmetrical. Board Member Mead also stated they had an existing truss dimension palate established in the adjoining structure under the roof edge and felt it would be better to increase the dimension of the truss members since it would be a better balance for the visual of the rafters themselves and would also help to diminish the perception of asymmetry in the truss. Mr. Sallis assured all the truss cord members would be the same size; the renderings might not be accurate, but they would make sure that happened. Board Member Spencer was fine with the box truss slipping to the north. **Board Member Spencer made a motion to approve as submitted with the reference from Mr. Sallis that he would personally be involved as the architect in helping develop the shop drawings for the truss so that it maintains a more industrial aesthetic that provides evidence that any of the fasteners are meant to be exposed and seen. Board Member Villegas seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.**

Item 12 DISCUSSION ON UWF HISTORIC TRUST RECOMMENDATION TO ADOPT RESOLUTION ON ALTERNATIVE BUILDING MATERIALS

Action taken: Comments added and returned to the Board at next meeting.

UWF Historic Trust has recommended ARB consider a resolution concerning the use of alternative building materials. This resolution / policy would supersede all previous policies concerning the use of vinyl, aluminum, fiber cement, or other artificial materials. Per ARB's Rules and Procedures adopted in 2006, the Board may at its discretion adopt resolutions deemed beneficial in addressing its intentions or processes.

Historic Preservation Planner Harding advised this policy was for discussion only but wanted the opinion of Assistant City Attorney Lindsay on how to move forward. He pointed out the intent of the policy was to allow the Board to consider an applicant's request to use alternative materials. The U.S. Secretary of the Interiors Standard #6 states: Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials." However, the duplication of materials is sometimes not possible. The policy states 1) Any request for application of any siding to any building in the Pensacola historic districts shall be brought before the ARB prior to proceeding with the work. Item 2) addresses fiber cement siding on contributing structures. The Board had discussed having an image or photograph which outlines the allowed thickness of fiber cement and how it should be matched or installed, however, this would not be a blanket approval for the use of alternative materials but would allow applicants to bring them before the Board for consideration on a case-by-case basis with the applicant having the burden to prove how the product would match, installation, etc.

In item 3) railings, decking and other architectural details would be considered on a case-by-case basis. Item 4) was taken from the current policy which states vinyl and aluminum siding is prohibited. Item 5) states UWF Historic Trust Property and Collection Committee would make recommendations to the Board through the Historic Trust.

Assistant City Attorney Lindsay advised that Council Executive Kraher had been working on

procedures to submit to Council for all the Boards appointed by Council; this might be something the ARB would want to see on how the Council proceeds with those particular procedures. She also explained the Board would not be able to adopt any policy or resolution that would be inconsistent with the current ordinance with its restrictions on the Board's discretion. But within the Board's discretion, it may adopt a policy which allows guidance on how it would exercise its discretion; when this Board changes, the new Board could change that policy. We would hope the way the Board used its discretion would not be so out-of-bounds that a future Board would say they got it wrong. Under the ordinance, the Board had the authority to exercise that discretion in ways that may differ from time to time as long as it was not contrary to a specific prohibition that the Council had put in place that provided for the Board's operations. She offered vinyl siding was always going to be prohibited, but there were other things which were not specifically prohibited where the Board would have the discretion to decide to have some variances. She did think it was appropriate to look at a policy or a procedure. The Board had the authority to adopt those procedures for when a situation comes up, this would be how it handled its discretion with the standards it would apply. It could take into account the UWF recommendations but did not have to be limited by the recommendations. The staff would draft the procedures for the Board's approval. Nothing the Board recommended would require Council approval unless it was asking for revision to an ordinance; if there was a problem with the current ordinance, she asked that the Board ask staff to go to Council to get that update made.

Board Member Mead stated as he viewed the Board's role in terms of protecting the City, he did not want the Board's discretion to reach beyond anything than the handling of administrative matters. He agreed it was the standards in the Code which must be applied. He viewed the effort of the Board to be more in line with creating findings about the state of the art that is available to satisfy the standards in the Code based on the knowledge and experience of the Board. Assistant City Attorney Lindsay explained the Board did have the authority to create procedures, as long as the procedures the Board proposed were consistent with the ordinance which gives it the authority it does; she had no issue with any procedure and would check any procedure the Board would ask staff to draft. If the Board wanted to take any recommendations from the Historic Trust, she would also review to ensure that the Board was not adopting a recommendation that was inconsistent with its authority.

Board Member Mead saw the policy as a way to better advise applicants on what they need to bring to the table to meet these requirements or concerns of the Code and for the staff to be able to screen applications and furnish the policy for additional information which might be required before going to the Board. It would be a tool for the applicants and for the Board to better review and for staff to screen and advise applicants who are not meeting those qualifications.

Board Member Spencer introduced an item regarding signage in review districts. Staff advised if the ARB wanted to draft a letter to Engineering, Public Works, and the Mayor as far as suggestions and recommendations as to wayfinding signs, it would be part of its power and responsibility to do so. It would not be something ARB could mandate since their authority has always been within property boundaries and not within the rights-of-way. Board Member Spencer stated that earlier North Hill had presented a loud voice of concern regarding AT&T boxes being placed in rights-of-way. Board Member Mead stated he would support a letter. Staff advised the letter would be sent from the Chairperson of ARB to Council since the chairs of all boards act as liaison to Council.

Historic Preservation Planner Harding stated the comments from today would be incorporated into the policy on Alternative Building Materials for submission to the Board at the next Board meeting.

ADJOURNMENT – With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Gregg Harding

Historic Preservation Planner Harding
Secretary to the Board