



PLANNING SERVICES

Architectural Review Board

MINUTES OF THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

March 21, 2019

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Carter Quina, Michael Crawford, Derek Salter, George Mead, Anna Fogarty, Nina Campbell

MEMBERS ABSENT: Susan Campbell-Hatler

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

OTHERS PRESENT: Marina Mitchell, Ken Mitchell, William Tibbits, Nancy Pope, John Provo, Tracey Hyman, Mark Casson, Steve Fluegge, Bridget Fluegge, Cas Walker, Diane Dixey, Lou Courtney, Scott Bollinger, Lissa Dees, Matt Caldwell, Philip Oliver, Christian Wagley, Derek Cosson, J. Veal, Brad Calhoun, Jordan Yee, Brad Alexander, Dottie Dubuisson, Dean Dalrymple

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.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Mead made a motion to approve the February 21, 2019 minutes, seconded by Ms. Fogarty, and it carried unanimously.

OPEN FORUM – Chairman Quina explained the Board procedures to the audience and asked for speakers, and there were none.

NEW BUSINESS

Item 1

213 S. Alcaniz Street

PHD

Contributing Structure

HC-1 / Wood Cottages

Action Taken: Approved with comments.

Ed Dotson, Dotson Builder, LLC, is requesting approval for exterior modifications to include a new paint palette and replacement windows, back door and crawlspace covers.

Mr. Tibbits presented to the Board. It was determined the windows would be impact rated and match the existing, and they were replacing a side door. The mullions would be 7/8" and Mr. Crawford stated the original appeared to be thinner which was preferred. It was clarified that the divided light had exterior mullions, and the door would be wood with impact glass. Mr. Crawford explained in the Wood Cottages District, the concern was with replacement, and Mr. Pristera advised aluminum clad had been allowed in the past.

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

Mr. Tibbits indicated the trim would be the same, and they would try to reuse as much as possible. Since the windows under the porch were usually not as damaged, Mr. Crawford suggested a motion for restoring the front windows to maintain the historical integrity. Mr. Tibbits explained as a builder, protecting the home through window glazing was very important and preferred to replace those windows as well. It was determined the lattice would be vinyl, and the frame would be treated and painted to match the house; vinyl could be provided if preferred. Mr. Pristera advised vinyl was not preferred, and he had not seen a good vinyl to match the look. Chairman Quina pointed out a wood lattice would not last a year. With no speakers from the audience, **Mr. Crawford made a motion to approve as submitted with the exception that the window mullion sizes match the original to the closest degree possible with a thinner profile; that the lattice work and frame be pressured treated wood; that the doors be approved as presented, and recommended the front windows be restored if possible but did not tie that to the motion. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mead and carried unanimously.**

Item 2	404 E. Intendencia Street	PHD
Contributing Structure		HR-1 / Wood Cottages
Action Taken: Denied with abbreviated review on wood doors.		

John Provo, Provo Construction Inc., is requesting approval for replacement doors.

Mr. Provo presented to the Board and advised one door was too short and the other door could not be repaired. Ms. Deese advised there was no precedent for fiberglass doors in this district. Mr. Provo pointed out they made sure the style was the same with the exception of the panels, with one door at the rear and one at the side and neither visible from the street. Mr. Mead did not see any reason to set a precedent, and stated the doors should have been reviewed before installation. Mr. Crawford explained the Wood Cottage District was held to different standards. **Mr. Mead made a motion to deny as submitted with failure to meet the requirements of 12-2-10(A)(6)(e). With no speakers from the audience, Mr. Crawford seconded the motion.** Chairman Quina asked if the applicant would like approval for a wood door. **Mr. Mead explained he would be happy to allow for abbreviated review of a wood door to substantially match the existing original doors; Mr. Crawford accepted the amendment, and the motion carried unanimously.**

Item 3	555 E. Government Street	PHD
Contributing Structure		HC-1 / Wood Cottages
Action Taken: Approved with comments.		

Dean Dalrymple, Dalrymple Sallis Architecture, is requesting approval for exterior modifications to include foundation changes, replacement shutters, and a porch expansion.

Mr. Dalrymple presented to the Board and stated the property was being converted from commercial to a residential property. They were replacing the vinyl 1 over 1 windows with an aluminum clad 6 over 6 window which was more fitting for the time period of the home. It was determined none of the windows were original. They were removing the rear porch structure to expand it and install bronze screening and Aeratis fiberglass shutters for minimal maintenance. They would also extend the existing white picket fence around the perimeter of the property and remove the chain link fence. Mr. Salter questioned the Jeldwen product sheet not showing exterior muttons. Mr. Dalrymple stated they could provide that and would change out the existing front window to a triple hung. **Mr. Crawford made a motion to approve as submitted, seconded by Ms. Campbell. With no speakers, Mr. Salter explained the motion should include the exterior mutton requirement; the amendment was accepted, and the motion carried unanimously.**

Item 4	405 W. Strong Street	NHPD
New Construction		PR-2
Action Taken: Conceptual Approval with comments.		

Tracy Hyman is requesting *CONCEPTUAL* approval for a single family residence with detached garage.

Mr. Hyman, the owner, presented to the Board and stated the three remaining lots in North Hill would contain a single family residence. He indicated they would use Hardie plank with a stacked stone foundation and metal garage doors. He explained they were trying for a Craftsman style look. Mr. Crawford pointed out the board and batten was a coastal look with exception of the stone base. Mr. Mead stated it was similar in feel to a new built house on DeSoto, and he did not feel the stone was appropriate, and they might want to consider varying from board and batten to horizontal lap siding for a Craftsman style. Mr. Salter offered there were lots of sizes for brick, and this might be an opportunity to do something different but something that related to the neighborhood. Mr. Crawford addressed the driveways, and Chairman Quina stated the Board would prefer one driveway, and with a large lot, the driveway could be circular. Mr. Mead was concerned with the amount of hard paving, but if they had two driveways, he suggested a way to differentiate them. **Mr. Mead then made a motion to approve conceptually with reconsideration of the treatment of the driveways, and of the exterior materials particularly with regard to changing out the foundation from the stack stone to something more appropriate to the neighborhood. Ms. Campbell seconded the motion. With no speakers, the motion carried unanimously.**

Item 5	425 E. Romana Street	PHD
Contributing Structure	427 E. Romana Street	HC-1 / Brick Structures

Action Taken: Denied without prejudice on relocation-conceptual approval for building in rear.

Matt Caldwell, Caldwell Home Builders, is requesting *CONCEPTUAL* approval for the relocation of a Contributing Structure and the construction of a new single family residence.

Mr. Caldwell presented to the Board and stated they wanted to relocate the existing structure to the rear and build in front, and the design of the new home was completely open. It was determined the existing structure was around 675 sq. ft. Chairman Quina asked for Mr. Pristera's comments, and he preferred leaving the house where it was. Mr. Mead indicated if the structure was moved back on the lot, he felt strongly about maintaining its proximity to the lot line to keep some visual element to the street. If they could preserve some visibility of that structure by keeping it close to the lot line, they would gain more interior room, and if it required a variance, he was amenable to that. Chairman Quina asked if two single family houses were allowed on one lot. Ms. Deese explained because of the size of the original structure, they were able to consider that as an accessory structure, and it met the percentages. Mr. Caldwell stated his client was open to any suggestions. Mr. Crawford explained that flipping the location might also help with the parking. Ms. Campbell suggested leaving the structure at its current location and managing a curb cut. **Mr. Mead made a motion to deny without prejudice for consideration of the removal, with an understanding that conceptual approval will be given to building something along the lines of what is proposed on the rear section of the lot. Ms. Campbell seconded the motion. Chairman Quina explained the Board was amenable with placing the main structure in the rear yard. With no speakers, the motion carried unanimously.**

Item 6	500 N. Alcaniz Street	OEHPD
New Construction		OEHC-1

Action Taken: Approved with comments-abbreviated review for landscaping.

Ken Mitchell is requesting FINAL approval for a single family residence with attached garage.

Mr. Mitchell presented to the Board and explained the lot was zoned commercial. He stated he was interested in attracting clients interested in living in Old East Hill, offering attached parking amenities, and preserving the old warehouse look. Chairman Quina advised the comments from Old East Hill mainly addressed the garages. Mr. Mitchell stated this structure was on the corner with the entrance access through the courtyard, and they were also trying to keep cars off the street. Mr. Crawford pointed out the Board was trying to keep the streetscape pedestrian friendly. In a previous project, having the character of two double-car curb cuts around the perimeter of that earlier project was not what they had envisioned for the neighborhood. He pointed out sometimes residents do not pull into the garage.

Mr. Mead suggested this was a fairly limited area in which to do that with 5' to the property line. He asked how much room there was on the additional right-of-way which would essentially provide an "informal parking pad" that the Board was trying to avoid. Mr. Mitchell stated there was no parking pad option unless they built a tiny unit. Mr. Crawford stated he did not discount the effort, but the Board needed to consider individual lots 40' wide with approximately 30' of driveway. Mr. Mitchell stated he could put two strips for the driveway, but emphasized a two-car garage was what people wanted. Mr. Mead suggested merging the entrances asymmetrically which would make it a more interesting variation.

Mr. Wagley pointed out Old East Hill was clearly opposed to the garage doors in the front but was agreeable to the overall design of the project and happy for new investment in the neighborhood. Chairman Quina clarified that Old East Hill was agreeable to the corner unit in the beginning, but now that there were three units with six garages and six driveways, they were concerned with the overall impact. Mr. Wagley stated garage doors on the front had never been a characteristic part of the historic neighborhoods. This corner unit was not such a big deal, but the garage doors on the other units were not supported by Old East Hill.

Mr. Mitchell stated because this is a commercial location, he felt it would not distort the look and feel of the neighborhood. Mr. Mead explained that adding two more units deeper into the neighborhood would change the character. Chairman Quina clarified the complaint was six garage doors or six pads in a row. Mr. Mead suggested reorienting the garages on the A unit to load from Alcaniz. Mr. Mitchell stated there was a storm sewer at that location with no on street parking, and there would be no curb cuts.

Ms. Waller, the owner of the property to the east of the third building, indicated her garage was in the rear of her 40' lot. She stated Escambia County was a red zone in the state of Florida for bicycle and pedestrian accidents. She explained the 5' setback was not conducive to the Mayor's initiatives; 7 to 10' was needed for a vehicle to back out before the driver could see a pedestrian or bicyclist. She had also observed a lot of foot traffic in this area as well.

Ms. Campbell asked if Mr. Mitchell had considered converting to a one-car garage, and he stated he had not since that was not the look and feel of the market they were pursuing. He pointed out the Board had already approved the first unit conceptually, and they were just here for doors and windows. Mr. Mead looked at the overall site plan and stated with the plans submitted, Mr. Mitchell could pull them apart with a common drive and place the garages to the rear, putting in some sort of courtyard treatment more to the front of the streetscape which would be more amenable to the neighborhood. By consolidating the curb cut on the first one, they would go from six curb cuts to two, retaining the two-car garages.

Ms. Dubuisson indicated LaRua was her cut-across, and it had become a major cut-across for most bikers. She questioned the angle of incline between the street and the pad since some were having to walk or bike at a 30 degree angle; she also addressed the issue of cars not pulling into the garages and not completely clearing the sidewalk. She pointed out if the project was to be a continuation of the walkable community, the people she talked to were not requesting two-car garages and were paying for houses without garages with the intent to ride their bikes. She explained the driveway strips would also be more applicable for stormwater purposes.

Mr. Bollinger, the past president of the Old East Hill Association, explained they were a very residential area – commercial residential, but they have a very strong network to make sure they do the right things for the neighborhood. He stated they do appreciate the possibility of the project, but the streetscape with the garage doors would not give it the small residential feel, and you would not see that in any other part of the neighborhood. He offered if there was a way to make it more pedestrian friendly, it would be more amenable with the community.

Mr. Mitchell stated they care deeply about what the community looks like, and they could try to soften it up with the driveway strips, but he still felt since the buyers would be older, they would want an elevator with the master bedroom being upstairs. Mr. Mead explained there were three separate agenda items. Ms. Fogarty asked about the minimum garage depth, and Mr. Mitchell stated it was a tight fit. Ms. Fogarty stated she appreciated the project and commended their efforts.

Mr. Mead made a motion to approve Item 6 as being consistent with the conceptual approval previously granted with the modification that the curb cut for the garage be reduced to one and that a blended approach to the two garage doors be configured as discussed. Ms. Campbell seconded the motion. Mr. Salter suggested the fake garage doors facing Alcaniz Street should be recessed with a brick infill to look like a renovated warehouse. He also suggested left elevation A and rear elevation A where the slope of the roof is exposed to have a parapet installed to hide the roof slope from the street which would be appropriate for the development. The amendment was accepted. Mr. Crawford asked a landscape plan be provided which would address the concerns relating to how wide the curb cut is, where is the landscaping, where are pavers, etc. The amendment was accepted with the landscaping to return for an abbreviated review.

Item 7	402 E. LaRua Street	OEHPD
New Construction		OEHC-1
Action Taken: Denied.		

Ken Mitchell is requesting FINAL approval for a single family residence with attached garage.

Mr. Mead made a motion to deny items 7 and 8 under 12-2-10(C)(5)(c)2b which requires in the case of a proposed new building such building will not in itself or by reason of its location on the site impair the architectural historical value of the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity and that no plans for a new building be approved if that building will be injurious to the general visible character of the district in which it is to be located considering visual compatibility standards such as height, proportion, shape, scale, style, and materials and in addition, pursuant to 12-2-10(C)(9) which provides that regulations for new construction in the Old East Hill Preservation District, new construction shall be built in a manner that is complimentary to the overall character of the district in height, proportion, shape, scale, style and building materials, regulations established in paragraph 6 relating to streetscape elements shall apply to new construction.... Mr. Crawford seconded the motion. Mr. Mead further explained the corner lot was different, with the other interior lots relating more to the interior elements of the neighborhood than does the corner. The motion carried 5 to 1 with Ms. Fogarty dissenting. Chairman Quina was amenable to offering a variance to the side yard setback in order to achieve the revisions for the streetscape.

Item 8	406 E. LaRua Street	OEHPD
New Construction		OEHC-1
Action Taken: Denied.		

Ken Mitchell is requesting FINAL approval for a single family residence with attached garage.

Denied under 12-2-10(C)(5)(c)2b and 12-2-10(C)(9)

Item 9	313 E. Jackson Street	OEHPD
New Construction		OEHC-1
Action Taken: Conceptual Approval with comments.		

Mark Casson is requesting CONCEPTUAL approval for a single family residence.

Mr. Casson presented to the Board and stated the access was through an easement in the rear. It was determined vinyl windows were on the sides. Comments from Old East Hill were favorable. It was explained the railing only needed to be 3' in height, and Mr. Casson stated the ceiling height on the adjacent homes was 8' but agreed to measure them. Mr. Crawford explained the thin columns were more acceptable to the adjacent properties. He also pointed out the porch was framed differently to give it more character. Mr. Crawford suggested defining the height off-grade with the minimum being 18" and the taller, the more effective. Mr. Casson advised there was a slight elevation slope going east to west. Mr. Mead wanted to make sure to preserve the elevation of the foundation at the streetscape regardless of the grade of the lot, keeping the 18" to 24" at the front.

Mr. Mead made a motion to approve conceptually with adjustments to the porch columns to make them more consistent with columns of adjacent structures, to address the height of the porch railing to 3' and to validate the grade to keep 18" to 24" on the front as the grade falls or rises, and that they address the treatment of the porch roof to distinguish it from the body of the house in an appropriate manner. The motion was seconded by Ms. Campbell.

Mr. Wagley asked about a finished floor elevation and was informed the review was conceptual. The motion then carried unanimously.

Item 10	17 S. Palafox Street	PHBD
Contributing Structure		C-2A

Action Taken: Approved with abbreviated review on soffit color.

Jim Veal, JV Architecture, is requesting approval for canopy modifications. This application was submitted via Abbreviated Review and has been referred to the full Board for consideration.

Mr. Veal presented to the Board and stated a lot of additional requirements had been necessary by the National Park Service. He explained the ceiling of the canopy was approved as a plaster ceiling, and it was not considered appropriate, so they proposed a smooth metal soffit panel. He indicated the canopy was built in 1958 or 1959, and they had found the original drawings. The second component was a canopy soffit profile corrugated metal ceiling which was the ceiling and waterproofing surface caulked to the building. They proposed to put an actual roof above the structure for water tightness and flash it properly to the building, discharging into the gutters at every column. Waterproofing at the inverted knees was designed as pitch-pockets around the penetrations to retain the inverted knees. They proposed to lower the fascia height since it was deemed an unnecessary change; they also preferred to use bronze metal. It was determined the canopy modifications would occur at the Brent Building, however, the canopy might be removed at V Pauls. Mr. Veal clarified the soffit would be champagne with the fascia being bronze in color. **Mr. Crawford made a motion to approve with the clarification on A-2 of Mr. Veal's drawing that the knee cover has been deleted, finish on the exterior metal fascia is bronze, and the champagne color finish on the exterior metal soffit is to be submitted for abbreviated review. Ms. Campbell seconded the motion. With no speakers, the motion carried unanimously.**

Item 11	100 S. Palafox Street	PHBD
Contributing Structure		C-2A

Action Taken: Denied.

Jordan Yee is requesting approval for exterior modifications to accommodate a new entrance and storefront with ADA accessibility. Mr. Pristera provided the Board with historical information.

Mr. Yee addressed the Board and stated the owner wanted to convert the downstairs to office space; there was no floorplan. He offered the new openings on Romana were an improvement to that streetscape and also indicated they had a personal injury law firm with no accessible entrance. The entrance off Palafox would have a similar ramp to what Subway has which is about 4" and would not require railings but would occur within the footprint of the building. Mr. Mead's chief concern was that they were fighting the trim on the remainder of the building, and there was no coherence since part would be black and some would be white. Mr. Yee explained the larger building would be broken into thirds with the ground level massing remaining the same. He pointed out the historical picture showed dark trim on the bottom and white on the top. Mr. Mead addressed the new penetrations on the ground floor north façade; the rhythm of the upper windows could be followed on the ground floor. He explained they could fit the first three from west to east on the north façade under the paired windows above them and deal with the last one as they wished. Mr. Crawford questioned the decision to use the contemporary minimal frame storefront system on this prominent corner. Mr. Yee noted that V Paul had a butt-glazed storefront – exterior frame with a hidden seal. Chairman Quina explained an office space on the ground floor along Palafox was not the highest use since retail and restaurants were at this level.

Mr. Yee advised the owner was placing his business there. Chairman Quina stated if it really was an office, they could take the same 8 windows on the second floor and repeat them on the ground floor to maintain that portion. Ms. Campbell agreed she would like to see a repeat of the top portion. Chairman Quina also preferred the existing storefront. Mr. Mead suggested taking the low arches in the two rear openings and carrying them forward on the ground floor and balancing them with the windows above. Mr. Yee pointed out the really tall windows with low window sills might be above where a new ceiling would be located. He stated they would be looking at a conceptual approval of ground level office space, and they could look at an alternate entry scheme that addressed the concerns with the homeless. Mr. Mead explained they could do a variety of things either from back to front or top to bottom. Chairman Quina advised with the way the application was given, the Board would have to approve or deny. **Mr. Mead made a motion to deny noting comments and encouraging resubmission pursuant to 12-2-21(F)(1), 12-2-21(F)(2)A, 12-2-21(F)(4)(D) & (E). Ms. Campbell seconded the motion. With no speakers, the motion carried unanimously.**

Item 12(A)	21 E. Garden Street	PHBD
Signage	226 S. Palafox Street	C-2A
Action taken: Denied.		

Philip Olivier is requesting approval for freestanding signage for private commercial parking lots. The ARB denied that application at their January 17, 2019, meeting. The applicant has modified the proposed signage and returned for consideration with 3 additional locations. This application is for two locations within the PHBD.

Mr. Olivier presented to the Board and explained the signage was to inform the public the parking was now open to them. Chairman Quina suggested over time, signs become less important once you are established. Mr. Olivier indicated they could make the 3'x5' signage smaller; the number of signs was to over communicate their policies for locals and tourists as well. Mr. Pristera questioned the parking at internal lots, and Mr. Olivier indicated there was a sign for every three or four spaces; in the larger lots, there would be one for every 10 or 12 spaces. Ms. Deese clarified that ARB was reviewing the entire sign package for the property. Chairman Quina explained there were private lot owners with an agreement with Premium, and part of the agreement was that Premium paid for signage. Mr. Salter stated what was being proposed were tall pole mounted signs, and the guidelines of the district stated they must maintain the character and size consistent with maintaining the theme and character of the district; he had not observed any pole mounted signs. He indicated the typical signage in the district was ground mounted monument type or a wall mounted sign. Mr. Olivier suggested possibly making the sign lower but keeping a 9' clearance below it and preferred having it at the corner of the property and overhanging the sidewalk; he suggested reducing the signage to 3' tall and 2' wide. Ms. Fogarty suggested a lower monument sign. Chairman Quina explained the opinion was the monument style was preferred to the pole sign where they fit, with a height no higher than a 9'6" clearance on any pole mounted sign.

Ms. Dees of the DIB stated they do have signage on the street to direct parking, and while it is beneficial in private lots, having the signs and kiosks near the sidewalks causes more confusion than the parkers need. She pointed out some existing signage had not come before this Board, and suggested the City needed to get the signage under control before it allows more signage. She suggested we need to make it more comprehensible and understandable for anyone who comes to the downtown area.

Ms. Campbell agreed the signage did need to be managed better. Chairman Quina suggested working together with the owners to get what makes the most sense.

Ms. Dubuisson suggested we need to have hanging signs reviewed for License to Use or risk assessment. For advertising, the visual clutter needs to be addressed, and the visibility triangle also needs to be considered. She pointed out a master plan was the right thing, and the current operators were already in violation.

Mr. Salter stated signage is per property and questioned if these are private commercial lots, they count against the total allowable signage for the property even if it is on the building.

Ms. Deese explained she felt the Legal Department should be consulted since this was part of a larger issue with the parking and how we move forward with DIB. Obviously, the Board did not feel comfortable in approving the package before it, and it was not a situation it had dealt with before. Some of these issues should be flushed out before the Board was asked to render a decision. Chairman Quina asked if Premium Parking had received a formal violation notice; they had received a call from Code Enforcement and had completed the appropriate application. Ms. Deese stated Code Enforcement does try to be less invasive if possible, after a call to the company, they quickly complied with the necessary application. With regard to Item 12(B), Mr. Salter asked if private commercial parking lots were allowed in HC-2, and Ms. Deese explained it would be an existing use since it was allowed in HC-1, and the Code is accumulative to allow it in HC-2. The parking lot already existed, and the Code did not distinguish between private and commercial, so we would go with the closest fit which would be a commercial parking lot; she did not believe the City could enforce a private only parking lot.

Ms. Dubuisson again stated if the parking lot was not being used for parking for the business licensed at that address, this would be another business happening at that address, and a business license for each of the parking facilities they were managing would also be required. She suggested the Board deny the request and let the City determine the outcome. She explained a workshop would be the best route to take. She also advised that Risk Assessment provided guidance in the Belmont DeVilliers project. **Ms. Campbell made a motion to deny the request and refer to the City Legal Department regarding interpretation of the procedures that are appropriate. Mr. Crawford made an amendment to include the lack of a comprehensive plan, and these signs are in the Palafox Historic Business District, referencing 12-2-21(F)(1), 12-2-21(F)(2) and 12-2-21(F)(4) as the basis of the denial. The current signage was on a sidewalk, and he was certain we could find a better solution to meet their business needs that was not intrusive and fit in the district; the request had not been presented in a format the Board could evaluate and felt a comprehensive approach would be his preference. Ms. Fogarty seconded the motion. Mr. Crawford also amended the motion to include addressing the existing non-compliant signage. Those amendments were accepted, and the motion carried unanimously.**

Item 12(B)	101 E. Government Street	PHD / PHBD
Signage	200 BLK S. Jefferson Street	HC-2

Action Taken: Denied with 12(A).

Philip Olivier is requesting approval for freestanding signage for private commercial parking lots.

Item 13	805 E. Gadsden Street	OEHPD
Contributing Structure	807 E. Gadsden Street	OEHC-1

Action Taken: Approved.

Carter Quina, Quina Grundhoefer Architects, is requesting *FINAL* approval for exterior modifications and an addition. This item was previously presented to the ARB at their February 21, 2019, meeting; it was denied. The applicant has taken the Board's suggestions into consideration.

Chairman Quina recused himself, and Mr. Crawford presided as Chairman. Mr. Guarisco presented to the Board and stated they had recessed the connecting bridge using a more permanent aluminum structure. They also lowered the ridge line of the addition on the rear so it meets the lowered bridge, and it would not be visible from the front. Mr. Salter indicated they had addressed the Board's concerns, and what they proposed was now respectful of the original structures. Mr. Crawford pointed out the plans were more simple and presented a good job. **Ms. Fogarty made a motion to approve, seconded by Mr. Salter.**

Mr. Bollinger appreciated the work but was concerned that in 1991, there were 190 contributing structures in the neighborhood, and since that time they had lost 30 of those structures that they were aware of. He was concerned that if they join two buildings together, they might be losing two contributing structures which could significantly affect the status on the National Register of Historic Places.

Mr. Crawford explained the buildings were already connected, and that would not affect the historic status, but it was something the ARB contended with in all the districts with contributing structures. He felt it was a great way to save two structures and add value to the neighborhood. With no other speakers, **the motion carried unanimously.**

Item 14

1 S. Jefferson Street

PHBD

Non-Contributing Structure

C-2A

Action Taken: Approved with comments.

Lissa Dees, Downtown Improvement Board, is requesting approval for "tactical urbanism" methods to serve as guides for vehicular and pedestrian traffic at the garage entrance. This application was submitted via Abbreviated Review and has been referred to the full Board for consideration.

Ms. Dees presented to the Board and stated the garage in their opinion was surrounded by blight, and the mural on the Jefferson Street side was there to improve the aesthetics of the garage. Mr. Alexander said they were taking the striping from the delivery zone on the west side where there is a right turn into the garage and proposing bollard-type piping. They were using bollards and paint to distinguish between the pedestrian and vehicular zone. Chairman Quina stated the idea of making the street, curb and sidewalk all the same level promoted the concept and could be used in other places. Mr. Alexander advised the paint should be viewed as a temporary use, and they did not propose to use thermoplastic striping; the bollards would be fixed to the ground. He provided samples of the 2" piping for the bollards which were not meant to stop a vehicle but guide the vehicles down Jefferson. Mr. Salter advised he used this garage daily and liked how they were delineating the turn lane into the garage but did not like lane reduction out of the garage since traffic leaving the garage backed up because of the signal light at Garden. Anyone turning right would wait through several lights, and a right and left turn out of the garage was an important element. He was not completely in favor of painting the ground, and one of the hazards to pedestrian safety was the existing hut which creates a blind spot with cars leaving not being able to see pedestrians on the sidewalk. Ms. Dees clarified the hut was being removed.

Mr. Crawford asked about the paint, and it was determined to be sprayed on with a minimum of three coats in the San Diego Buff color. Ms. Deese also clarified that the plans called for the hut to remain, so the motion should include demolition. Ms. Dees stated she believed the removal was previously approved, but Ms. Deese asked that it still be added to the motion just in case it was not previously approved. Ms. Fogarty felt the proposal was an improvement and a great temporary solution. It was determined the loading zone would remain.

Ms. Dubuisson supported the project. Regarding a future plan, she stated there had been a lag in project funding and furnished Page 5 of the Series 2017 Project Bond where the monies were acquired by borrowing from the CRA.

Ms. Dees explained the current concrete bollards would remain. Mr. Alexander advised the 2" diameter bollards could use reflective tape. For concerts downtown, A-frames would be used to block entrances. Ms. Dees stated they were repainting the bands in the colors to match or blend with Southtowne. **Mr. Crawford made a motion to approve, seconded by Ms. Fogarty. Mr. Salter made an amendment that the existing hut be removed. The amendment was accepted, and the motion carried unanimously.**

Item 15

605 N. Spring Street

NHPD

New Construction

PR-2

Action Taken: Approved.

Brad Calhoun, Mack Custom Homes, is requesting approval for vinyl windows with screens. This application and sample window was submitted via Abbreviated Review and has been referred to the full Board for consideration.

Mr. Calhoun presented to the Board and stated the previous window had a beveled edge for a screen channel. They were able to find a better vinyl window from Schwinco.

The grid pattern would be 2 over 2. **Mr. Crawford** thought it was a marked improvement and made a motion to approve, seconded by Ms. Fogarty, and it carried unanimously.

OPEN FORUM – None

DISCUSSION – None

ADJOURNMENT – With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:30 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