



## PLANNING SERVICES

### ***Architectural Review Board***

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

**January 17, 2019**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chairman Carter Quina, Michael Crawford, Derek Salter, George Mead, Susan Campbell-Hatler

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Nina Campbell, Anna Fogarty

**STAFF PRESENT:** Brandi Deese, Assistant Planning Services Administrator, Leslie Statler, Planner, Ross Pristera, Advisor,

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Brad Calhoun, Ellen Vickery, Larry Vickery, Steve Fluegge, Kenneth Carter, Joseph Dha, Lissa Dees, Jack Sparks, Carlos Godinez, Christian Wagley, Drew Buchanan, Kyle Patterson, Teresa Hill, Carrie Webster, Brian Webster, Derek Cosson, Drew Buchanan, Jeff Hogue, Mallory Gillette, R. Scott Holland

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

Chairman Quina called the Architectural Review Board (ARB) meeting to order at 2:00 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 December 20, 2018 minutes, seconded by Mr. Crawford, and it carried unanimously.

#### **OPEN FORUM – No speakers.**

#### **NEW BUSINESS**

##### **Item 1**

**1 W. Lloyd Street**

**NHPD**

##### **Contributing Structure**

**PC-1**

##### **Action taken: Denied**

Ed Hansen is requesting approval for an attached car cover. The proposed car cover will be attached on the west side of the primary structure. The wood rafters will be attached as a "shed" roof and will have details along the fascia to match the railings on the porch. The applicant indicated it would be painted to match the residence. Comments from North Hill were provided. Mr. Hansen presented to the Board and provided additional information and explained they were located more than 5' feet from the front property line. It was noted there was an existing curb cut. Mr. Hansen advised he was trying to blend the new addition with the existing structure.

EVERYTHING THAT'S GREAT ABOUT FLORIDA IS BETTER IN PENSACOLA.

222 West Main Street Pensacola, FL 32502 / T: 850.435.1670 / F: 850.595.1143/[www.cityofpensacola.com](http://www.cityofpensacola.com)

Chairman Quina pointed out the comments from North Hill suggested the submission was incomplete and could not be properly reviewed without a site plan, proper details and photos of adjacent properties. Mr. Crawford explained the bar was set high when adding a carport to historic structures, but there were not enough details to give an approval. Mr. Mead advised he would need uplift calculations which might change the size of the posts, and they might choose not to connect it to the house. More details were needed structurally even before it could be addressed architecturally. Mr. Hansen stated he was asking for conceptual design approval. Mr. Mead stated he was not sure the shed treatment was the way to go. Chairman Quina suggested pushing the structure back so it would not compete with the front and replicate the porch on the east side. Mr. Crawford suggested seeking a design professional to help with specifics. Chairman Quina suggested tabling the item, and Ms. Deese advised this was not possible with the 31-day requirement. There were no audience speakers. **Mr. Mead then made a motion to deny the application in its current form.** He was open to seeing different designs and one that would be buildable and would fit the existing house. **Mr. Crawford seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.**

**Item 2**  
**Contributing Structure**

**509 N. Alcaniz Street**

**OEHPD**  
**OEHC-1**

**Action taken: Approved with comments.**

Kenneth Carter is requesting approval for exterior modifications to a contributing structure. The proposed modifications include the replacement of siding, windows, and doors and the re-installation of porch railing. The existing siding is proposed to be replaced with Hardie Cedarmill lap siding. The existing aluminum windows are proposed to be replaced with white Jeld-Wen vinyl windows with Colonial grids. The proposed front door will be a craftsman style fiberglass door. The new porch railing system is proposed to be simple wood deck railing painted with the approved trim color, Sherwin Williams "Roycroft Vellum". Exterior colors were previously approved via Abbreviated Review and were provided to the Board along with comments from Old East Hill.

Mr. Carter presented to the Board and was agreeable to the siding with the reveal of 5". Mr. Crawford referred to the 6-lite door in the package, and Mr. Carter was also agreeable to that. Chairman Quina advised the muntins on the front windows needed more depth. Mr. Carter explained the sun room was going away and only two windows would be placed on the rear. Mr. Crawford suggested the railing for the front porch have the posts on top and placing a top rail to hide the spindles. He also offered they might be happier with a larger front window. Mr. Carter stated the porch columns would resemble the adjacent property to the north. Mr. Crawford suggested a painted skim-coated stucco covering for the porch foundation.

Mr. Wagley advised the Board had addressed all of his concerns. **Mr. Crawford made a motion to approve with the following modifications: (1) a 5" exposed Hardie siding be used, (2) window on the front porch be enlarged to match the existing opening and exterior mounted mullions be used on that window, (3) porch columns and railing match the adjacent north property, (4) skim-coat stucco be used on the porch base, and (5) the front door be a 6 panel ¾ lite as shown in the package.** Mr. Mead seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.

**Item 3**  
**New Construction**

**111 South 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

**PHD**  
**HC-1 / Brick Structures**

**Action taken: Approved with comments.**

Dean Dalrymple, Dalrymple Sallis Architecture, is requesting approval for a single family residence with detached garage with living quarters. The proposed development has been designed to comply with the Streetscape Type III standards. The proposed exterior will consist of a stucco on wood framing, rusticated brick veneer painted to match the stucco, and a roof of asphaltic shingles on the main body and standing seam metal roofing on the bracketed awning roofs. The principle structure will be connected the garage via a covered adjacent to an open patio/courtyard. Wood gates at the front of the residence and powder-coated metal gates at the garage will compliment and/or match the wood railings on the dwelling.

Bahama and false fiberglass shutters will be stained to match the brackets and handrails. Jeld-Wen products are proposed for the doors and windows with the windows proposed to be Jeld-Wen double-hung vinyl and the front doors proposed to be fiberglass from their *Aurora* Collection. The garage doors, which will front onto Privateers Alley, are proposed to be insulated steel or fiberglass and painted brown and white. The driveway and courtyard will be comprised of pavers. The privacy wall will be stucco and wood in the same finishes as the residence and garage. The color palette and exterior finishes, included within the packet, are Sherwin Williams "White Wisp" and "Urbane Bronze", and oil-rubbed bronze.

Mr. Dalrymple presented to the Board and advised they had received approval from Bob Montgomery for the submittal. He advised the style was 30-A vernacular, and the X braces would meet Code. Mr. Mead questioned no railing on the landing, and Mr. Dalrymple stated that would be addressed. Mr. Crawford explained this project did not go through Aragon review, and Mr. Dalrymple stated they did not have the guidelines they usually adhere to, and the wall was necessary for protection and security since residents were exposed to the park across the street. The wall would be 6' to 7' in height. For clarification, Ms. Deese stated this district was unique in that the setbacks were measured from the street edge and not the property line, and the sidewalk was within the setback. Chairman Quina pointed out the Privateers' Alley multi-family project had a wall on the sidewalk. Mr. Crawford stated the structure goes well with others on the street. Chairman Quina asked for speakers, and there were none. Mr. Crawford point out they were not bound by height restrictions of a fence since the wall was in the front setback. He suggested a motion to exclude the wall since they were creating a different streetscape. Mr. Salter explained the question was how the wall met the street, and could they possibly approve with the wall returning to the Board for final approval. Regarding steps and railing, Mr. Dalrymple stated the wall would have to come up to the height of the porch. Chairman Quina confirmed the wall would need to be at the landing height. **Mr. Mead agreed the wall could come later in the process and made a motion to approve, with the exclusion of the front stoop and front wall treatments and configuration to return for full Board approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Salter.** There were no speakers from the audience. **The motion then carried unanimously.**

**Item 4**

**605 N. Spring Street**

**NHPD**

**New Construction**

**PR-2**

**Action taken: Approved with comments.**

Brad Calhoun, Mack Custom Homes, is requesting *FINAL* approval for a single family residence and detached garage with living quarters. This project received *conceptual* approval in October 2018. As previously noted, the subject property is a legal non-conforming lot and has reduced setbacks applied per Sec. 12-1-6(B). Per the Board's suggestions, additional windows have been added to the northern elevations, carriage doors are being utilized on the garage, and shutter hardware has been included. Noting comments from North Hill, Ms. Deese explained the tree language within the Code was very specific, codified and enforced by the Building Official during the permitting process.

Mr. Calhoun presented to the Board and stated since the conceptual approval, they had added windows and a balcony above the garage along with carriage doors and updated porch columns. The front steps were changed from a simple brick design to a more flared design prevalent in the North Hill area. Stairs were moved to the interior, and the driveway was changed to a ribbon style. He stated they could also change the shutters to a louver style. Mr. Crawford asked if the shutters were operable, and Mr. Calhoun stated at this point they might go with operable shutters. It was determined the project would align with the sister house to the north. Chairman Quina suggested using bricks more typical of the period. Ms. Deese explained front yard averaging would allow the applicant to bring the house closer. Mr. Crawford stated lining up with the neighbors would be great, and they would get more distance between the house and the garage. Mr. Mead addressed the Cedarmill siding stating the deeper profile was now available with the Artisan product. He explained the handrail could be evaluated through an abbreviated review.

Mr. Calhoun asked about vinyl windows being approved in the North Hill area in previous Board minutes.

Ms. Deese stated there was a period of time when the Board did not point out those details and were not as cognizant of the windows being vinyl or vinyl clad (902 N. Spring). Mr. Calhoun stated if allowed they would use Viwinco which was a top of the line vinyl window and a superior product and is also less expensive because of the manufacturing costs of wood windows. Ms. Deese read from the Code concerning new construction and adjacent sites in the immediate vicinity and the visual compatibility. Mr. Mead's chief concern was when going to a historic template, you match as closely as possible with what can be provided. He noted vinyl windows were so poor before but are now more structurally sound. The main problem was with the mutton profiles from the exterior and the recess of windows which treats it more appropriately to the style. Mr. Calhoun advised he had brought a sample window to the last ARB meeting when the project was considered for conceptual review; Mr. Mead explained it had to do more with the placement. Mr. Crawford stated he did not see any specific language in the Code which would prohibit this and suggested the windows come back before the full Board for further consideration. Another consideration would be nicer windows on the front with less expensive windows on the sides and rear. Ms. Campbell-Hatler pointed out this would be setting a standard. Chairman Quina explained the JeldWen, Premium Atlantic and PGT vinyl clad windows best simulated the wood windows.

Mr. Mead addressed the curb cut, and Chairman Quina suggested curving the driveway. Ms. Deese explained the front yard averaging process for siting the building and dictating the setbacks. **Mr. Mead made a motion to approve with the following exceptions: (1) consideration of a change of material in the siding to give a greater shadow line in the composite material consistent with the product approved in North Hill – Artisan, (2) that the applicant change out the metal railing to the turned wood indicated, with the 5" reveal, (3) use operable shutters louver style, (4) curving rather than moving the curb cut, (5) the bricks to match the adjacent houses (abbreviated review), (6) return with the windows and how they are set in the frame of the house to have an understanding of how they relate to the siding and trim – provide a sample.** Ms. Campbell-Hatler seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.

**Item 5  
New Construction**

**314 E. LaRua Street**

**OEHPD  
OEHC-1**

**Action taken: Approved with comments.**

Alison Mooneyham Lacour is requesting approval for a single family residence. The proposed exterior will consist of a Hardie lap siding with a 5" exposure on the lower level and sides, Hardie board and batten on the upper level of the front elevation, a roof of asphalt shingles, and brick skirting on the front elevation and steps. The windows are proposed to be PlyGem vinyl windows in white. Plastpro Craftsman-style fiberglass doors will be used for the front door; the rear doors will be Therma-Tru fiberglass French doors with blinds between the glass. Atlas "Pinnacle Pristine" asphalt shingles in "Coastal Granite" has been chosen as the primary roofing material; the metal roof noted on the plans over the fireplace will also be asphalt shingles. Although the entrance walkway to the residence and the parking pad appear to be pavers in the site plan, the owner has chosen to use poured concrete in this area. The color palette was chosen consists of PPG "Antique Silver" (body) and Sherwin Williams "Extra White". Comments from Old East Hill were provided.

Mr. James presented to the Board and stated 314 and 322 E. LaRua were going to be the same house. Chairman Quina stated Old East Hill had a problem with two parking spaces in the front and suggested one parking spot on the street since that would be available at the curb. Using a ribbon drive would also use less concrete. Mr. James stated the house would be 12" off-grade. Chairman Quina advised 18" had been the minimum, and Mr. James said anything under 24" was acceptable. Mr. Mead advised the 18" would be desirable for the front elevation; Mr. James confirmed the grade would be around 12" for the rear. Mr. Crawford suggested small vertically proportioned windows at the bathrooms, and Mr. James stated they could take the window out of the toilet area and put in two 2x2 windows for the showers.

Mr. Wagley wanted to make sure the 18" minimum would be shown on future plans. With the parking as shown, the house would not be visible and not characteristic with the neighborhood.

He also pointed out the existing brick wall along the front had some Gonzalez stamped bricks and suggested reusing them in some form. He also explained Old East Hill performed a landscaping project through the Neighborhood Grant Program and asked that those plants be relocated or replaced at the expense of the applicant. Ms. Deese explained landscaping in the right-of-way was out of the Board's jurisdiction. Mr. Salter addressed the door, and Mr. James stated it was a Craftsman style single panel and not glazed. Mr. Wagley also stated the retaining wall should be replaced. After further discussion, **Mr. Salter made a motion to approve with the following revisions: (1) the driveway be reduced to a single car with the ribbon style drive and moved as far as one way or another, (2) modify the left elevation of the windows to more square style as opposed to the horizontal at two locations, (3) refurbish the existing low retaining wall in front of the property, (4) replace any existing landscaping in the right-of-way as close as possible to the existing location, (5) the front of the residence be 18" above grade.** Mr. Crawford seconded the motion. With no speakers from the audience, the motion carried unanimously.

**Item 6  
New Construction**

**322 E. LaRue Street**

**OEHPD  
OEHC-1**

**Action taken: Approved with comments.**

Alison Mooneyham Lacour is requesting approval for a single family residence. This item was the same as Item 5 with exterior colors being the only difference.

**Mr. Mead made a motion to replicate the motion in Item 5 since it was essentially the same structure and location, and all concerns of the Board would apply. Mr. Crawford seconded the motion. With no speakers from the audience, the motion carried unanimously.**

**Item 7  
Non-Contributing Structure**

**101 S. Jefferson Street**

**PHBD**

**Action taken: Approved with comments.**

Carlos Godinez, STOA Architects, is requesting approval for exterior modifications, including a new storefront. The proposed changes effect the east and south elevations of the building and will accommodate a tenant space conversion. The scope of work includes the removal of the existing doorway and replacement with a new metal storefront system 10 feet in width. A second storefront entrance and matching storefront windows will also be added to the front of the building. All three will be metal finished in "dark bronze". The addition of a 5' by 5' louver to match the existing louvers on the elevation will complete the proposed modifications. The existing canopy is to remain on the front of the building.

Mr. Godinez presented to the Board and stated the intention of the storefront was to open up the elevation since there was only one very small storefront entrance and one very small window. While he understood the storefront elevation did not follow the remainder of the existing building, he believed it was a step in the right direction to open up the space and serve clients. The louver on the south elevation was for the exhaust for the kitchen hood. He also advised the glass would be tempered with a fabric shield. Mr. Mead questioned the storefront treatment because of the existing doorways with the typical French door profile consistent to the corner, and this would be in the same overhang and profile of the structure as a whole with a cohesive facade. However, he said the revision did not need to be wood but needed to be something in the scale and profile of the existing patterns. Mr. Salter suggested maintaining the same height, and Mr. Godinez was agreeable. He stated the glazing had some visibility. Ms. Campbell-Hatler felt the overhang prevented some visibility into the tenant space. Mr. Mead agreed and pointed out everything across the street had been raised. He could raise the canopy or use a different style. Ms. Campbell-Hatler suggested they were recreating their problem with the darker color, and perhaps they should consider clear glass instead of the tinted windows to draw customers in.

Mr. Crawford asked about mullions and simulated divided light on the doors, and Mr. Mead suggested an abbreviated review for this.

Mr. Mead then made a motion to approve with a change to the doors to match in height profile and muntin treatment in an appropriate metal material for the existing doors on the same façade under the canopy. Mr. Crawford amended the motion that the position of the storefront within the frame be set to the back edge of the wall to get a shadow line; Mr. Mead accepted the amendment. Mr. Crawford seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.

**Item 8**

**316 N. Spring Street**

**PHBD**

**Demolition**

**R-NC**

**Action taken: Approved.**

Joseph Dhaiti is requesting approval for the demolition of a contributing structure. The structure has deteriorated from years of neglect. The applicant recently purchased the property with the intent to rehabilitate the structure; however, given the extent of damage, the applicant is proposing to construct a new home if allowed to demolish the existing structure. Although this property is listed as a "Contributing Structure", the city's files do not contain the Florida Master Site File Data documentation.

Mr. Dhaiti presented to the Board and stated the bottom of the north side was sitting on the ground. Mr. Pristera toured the structure and stated it looked fairly good from the outside but there was damage to the rear and the inside, and to be restored would require a complete rebuild. Mr. Mead appreciated the pictures and questioned the rear addition and main body of the cottage. Mr. Pristera confirmed there was evidence of floor sagging in the main body.

There were no audience speakers. Mr. Pristera confirmed the properties next to the structure were contributing, but there was no master file on this location.

Ms. Deese read the Code under Demolition, Section B for contributing structures. **The Board tabled the vote to review Item 9 for the replacement.**

**After consideration of Item 9, Mr. Mead made a motion to approve since the applicant had shown unusual and compelling circumstances with regard to the condition of the structure and the expense of its buildability, and it would have to be rebuilt which would be inconsistent with the scale and scope of the property concerned and that its architectural and historical character, while consistent with the district that it was originally built in, is not necessarily of any addition to the surrounding areas, the surrounding structures or modernizing commercial area. The replacement plans will suitably replicate elements consistent with the comments the Board made regarding conceptual concerns; it can be made into a contributing element to the district again. On that basis, the Board could and should approve the demolition. Mr. Crawford made an amendment that the circumstances of evaluation were made from a historic preservationist and not an engineering firm or contractor. Mr. Mead agreed to the amendment. Mr. Crawford seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.**

**Item 9**

**316 N. Spring Street**

**PHBD**

**New Construction**

**R-NC**

**Action taken: Conceptual Approval with comments.**

Joseph Dhaiti is requesting *CONCEPTUAL* approval for a new single family residence. The proposed dwelling will be a narrow two-story residence with a balcony on the front elevation. The hip roof is proposed to be fiberglass shingles. The exterior will be fiberboard horizontal lap siding on the lower level and board and batten on the second floor. The porch will have a brick base with the remainder of the base having a stucco finish. Ms. Deese explained the applicant must seek approval of replacement plans prior to receiving a demolition permit.

Mr. Mead stated because the applicant was replacing a contributing structure, it would be nice to consider echoing a significant element of that façade, the most being the drop hip on the porch; it would lower the profile of the house to the street and keep that element on the street façade consistent with the existing structures. Mr. Crawford liked the 4x4 posts and picking up on something that was being removed from a contributing structure.

Mr. Mead suggested placing the siding all the way up with the band at the mid-level, and Mr. Dhaiti agreed. Mr. Mead explained that even though this was new construction, he might consider the nail fins at the edge of the structure, and possibly pulling back into the wall would be a nicer effect. In considering the grocery store to the north, he also suggested flipping the house to the south for better light and security. (Mr. Mead then made a motion for the demolition.)

**Mr. Mead made a motion to grant conceptual approval with the requirement that the Board see a proper site plan, consideration of flipping the floorplan for access to the south side, changing the siding profiles to be consistent lap siding with a mid-level wall band, and that the applicant consider modifying the columns on the porch to a more narrow profile consistent with the existing structure. He felt it was important to drop the hip of the porch on the second floor and make the main roof into a gable form also consistent with the existing structure. Mr. Crawford seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.**

**\*\* This item was referred to the Full Board through Abbreviated Review\*\***

**Item 10**

**226 S. Palafox Street**

**PHBD**

**Signage**

**C-2A**

**Action taken: Denied.**

Kyle Patterson, Hilight Electronic Displays, is requesting approval for new freestanding signage for a commercial parking lot. This application was presented through the Abbreviated Review process and has been referred to the Full Board for discussion of the sign design and requirements per Sec. 12-2-21(F)(4)(a). The proposed parking area is being utilized as a commercial parking lot. The signage proposed is similar in style to those previously used by the vendor during their partnership with DIB. The proposed freestanding signs comply with the sign area and height requirements as outlined within the Ordinance.

Mr. Patterson presented to the Board and stated the concern was to advertise that the lot was for paid parking. Mr. Salter explained the size of the sign was allowable within the district but referred this item to the full Board because of the language "that the sign will not impair the architectural or historical value of any building to which it is attached nor any adjacent building and that such sign is consistent within the theme and spirit of the block of where it is to be located." He observed there were no tall pole signs in the area, and most were located closer to the ground or monument type signs. However, there were three of these pole type signs located on Baylen but not within the same block. Ms. Deese explained the signs along Baylen were in the right-of-way and not in the Board's purview. Ms. Campbell-Hatler indicated there needed to be an overall plan for traffic and wayfaring signage. Mr. Mead pointed out the location was across the street from what the Board had approved in the Jefferson Street façade.

Ms. Dees from the Downtown Improvement Board (DIB) addressed the Board and asked that the Board reject the proposed signage. She stated they had severed their parking partnership and were seeking other parking providers. She advised some of the Baylen parking signage would be corrected. She pointed out the applicant currently had temporary signs at both entrances to the parking lot and signage that made it very evident it was private parking, with several other signs within the lot also indicating it was private. The location of the two signs on Government and Jefferson was also the location of on-street parking managed by the DIB, and this made it confusing to the public. There were no other speakers.

**Mr. Mead made a motion to deny the signage on grounds that it does not fit with the adjoining property nor any of the surrounding properties. Mr. Salter seconded the motion.** Mr. Patterson asked what the Board would like to see. Chairman Quina explained he would like all the parking signs removed from this property and replaced with one simple sign with a design that is simple and shows that the owner cares about the parking lot and building; he also suggested landscaping in the beds that are allowed and a fence between the sidewalk and the back of the cars with street lighting so it would be a safe parking lot.

Mr. Crawford explained it should be a planned approach in a complete signage package. Mr. Mead suggested looking around the area and making the signs consistent in size, scale, type and style within the district. **The motion then carried unanimously.**

**OPEN FORUM** – Mr. Wagley brought forward some of the concerns from Old East Hill regarding projects approved by the ARB, but when constructed, the end product was not what the Board approved. He advised he met with Mr. Bilby, Building Official, who was open to addressing this situation. Chairman Quina stated the intent was for the Board to be clear enough so that the building inspectors could actually ensure the items documented in the meetings actually get built, but sometimes they have to look through the meeting minutes. The solution is to make sure the documents submitted for permit have the changes in them that the Board has asked them to consider in its meetings. Mr. Mead explained two things could help the process: (1) Approach the Council and amend the Code to require that the applicant submit his approval in the form of the minutes, and other matters that were submitted to the Board be made a part of his building package so the building officials have the relevant materials in their permit file, and (2) require (at the Mayor's level) that the ARB rulings are made a part of the permit package as an administrative matter. Chairman Quina stressed the inspectors were supposed to get a good set of plans, and those were supposed to be the plans approved by ARB; if they were not followed, they should not receive their permit. He also stated that at every ARB pre-meeting consisting of Planning, Building Inspections and Mr. Pristera, each plan is reviewed, and building inspectors are aware of what is going on. They do not issue a permit unless they have the approval letter.

Ms. Deese advised Planning did not perform a plan review as a part of their process, but a copy of the agenda, marked in an edited version to illustrate what was approved as submitted or with the following comments, was submitted to Inspections. She indicated with the new administration and new building official, this process would get much better.

Mr. Wagley also brought up the issue with paint colors within the preservation districts. Ms. Deese stated information in the package would be brought forward to the Board, but they did not have the authority to approve paint colors in Old East Hill. He also brought up accessory dwelling units and was working with Jordan Yee. He announced a workshop on February 2, 2019, titled Accessory Dwelling Units - Housing Diversity for Pensacola. Chairman Quina explained the Airbnb issue had come up in the more tourist oriented urban areas where the intent was if you owned a house and had a room, it could be rented. But if you bought the house across the street only so it could be an Air BNB, this was not the intent since that changed the whole profile of the neighborhood. He explained you can only do this if you are the owner and live there which also makes it more controllable. Mr. Mead pointed out ancillary units could be used for those functions.

**DISCUSSION** – None

**ADJOURNMENT** – With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:46 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Brandi Deese', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Brandi Deese  
Secretary to the Board