

PLANNING SERVICES

***Architectural Review Board***

**MINUTES OF THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**

June 20, 2019

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chairman Carter Quina, Michael Crawford, Derek Salter, Anna Fogarty

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Nina Campbell, George Mead, Susan Campbell-Hatler

**STAFF PRESENT:** Gregg Harding, Historic Preservation Planner, Leslie Statler, Planner, Ross Pristera, Advisor

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Councilwoman Hill, Bev Elliott, Dottie Dubuisson, Carol Wilson, Bob Wilson, Lori Smith, Alicia Ahern, Dan Ahern, Debbie Tullos, Sally Rausa, Melissa Koch, Teresa Hill, Bruce Block, Tony Rhodes, Christy Cabassa, Mark Bednar, Lou Courtney, Blanding Fowler, J Veal, Kathy Tanner, Danny Zimmern, Christian Wagley, Beverly Perry, Collier Merrill

**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. Salter made a motion to approve the May 16, 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 Ms. Dubuisson thanked the Board for their service and reminded them of the historic community they serve.

**NEW BUSINESS**

Due to improper notification, the variances on Item 7 and 9 were removed from the agenda. Because of scheduling conflicts, Item 15 was moved up to the first item to be considered by the Board.

**Item 1** **210 S. Alcaniz Street** **PHD**  
**Contributing Structure** **HC-1 / Wood Cottages**  
**Action taken: Approved with comments.**

Nick and Melissa Koch are requesting approval for exterior modifications at a single-family residence. Ms. Koch presented to the Board and stated they had active roof leaks. Chairman Quina stated the Board had allowed metal or asphalt shingles in the past but noted the metal would last longer. Mr. Salter wanted clarification of the fence at the rear, and Ms. Koch advised they wanted to mimic the existing style with vertical fencing with a stepdown to 5' and an augmented wrought iron gate. She also

stated the regular fence at the front would be painted white. Mr. Crawford inquired about the gate, and Ms. Koch advised they needed a puppy panel at the bottom with an 8' long sliding gate which would slide behind the house. Mr. Salter advised the roof had been referred to him in an abbreviated review, and he referred it to the full Board because it was a defining element of structure, noting that the Board is particular with the profiles and the level of detail fitting with the historical nature of the structure, and he was concerned since it was a highly visible roof on a prominent location. He asked if a roof was a less permanent item and more easily replaced. Chairman Quina stated his experience on these types of cottages was that the original roof was not attainable, and metal roofs last longer. Ms. Koch advised they had an estimate of \$8,000.00 to repair the existing metal roof, and replacing it was only \$2,000.00 more. Mr. Pristera pointed out other cottages had the metal roofing, and historically, the wooden shakes were replaced with metal. Asphalt was not a favorite, but he understood the financial burden.

With no speakers, **Mr. Crawford made a motion to approve the front fence, rear fence to match the vertical pickets with a top and bottom cap on the posts, and for the gate design to match the spear arched top of the fence indicated on the application, with the exception being a sliding gate. The roof was also approved. The motion was seconded by Mr. Salter and carried unanimously.**

**Item 2** **211 N. Palafox Street** **PHBD**  
**Contributing Structure** **C-2A**  
**Action taken: Approved.**

The Episcopal Day School is requesting FINAL approval for a landscape plan.

Mr. Fowler presented to the Board and stated they proposed five support poles for the soccer netting, with Japanese Yews on the outside of the fence in front of the poles; the poles would be painted a tan color. He also advised they would retain the Crepe Myrtle plants for extra coverage.

With no speakers, **Mr. Crawford made a motion to approve, seconded by Ms. Fogarty, and it carried unanimously.**

**Item 3** **141 S. 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue** **PHD**  
**New Construction** **HC-1 / Brick Structures**  
**Action taken: Approved with comments.**

Christy Cabassa is requesting FINAL approval for the construction of a two-story single-family residence. Ms. Cabassa presented to the Board and stated the only difference from conceptual was the front elevation which had been softened, and the look was differentiated from Mr. Montgomery's home on the corner. They had asked for Jeld-Wen metal clad windows, but they wanted to use PGT vinyl, and she provided samples along with samples of Kolbe Forgent to the Board as an alternate. It was determined the vinyl clad windows had been approved in this district.

With no speakers, **Mr. Crawford made a motion to approve as submitted with PGT vinyl or Kolbe Forgent windows. He amended his motion for the preference of PGT dark bronze, seconded by Mr. Salter, and it carried unanimously.**

**Item 4** **307 E Gadsden Street** **OEHPD**  
**Contributing Structure** **OEHC-1**  
**Action taken: Approved.**

Danny Grundhoefer, Quina Grundhoefer Architects, is requesting approval for a new ramp to accommodate handicap accessibility to the rear of a contributing structure.

Chairman Quina recused himself. Mr. Guarisco presented to the Board and advised they would use Trex decking to level out the deck and build the ramp. He did not believe the baluster was original, but they

were trying to preserve it to act as a guardrail. Mr. Crawford stated since it was only visible from the rear of the property and had vertical pickets, he had no questions. Mr. Salter questioned the overlaying of the deck and asked if this material had been allowed on decks; Mr. Crawford stated it had. Mr. Guarisco explained if the original deck remained, it might trap moisture, and their intent was to remove it and indicated the entire back deck had been altered in its appearance. Mr. Harding advised to staff's knowledge, Trex materials had not been approved in OEHPD but had been used in PHBD which would have covered the Vinyl Music Hall.

Ms. Elliot stated the balustrades on the front were not original to the house, and the house originally had a lean-to which had been removed. She explained the deck boards were cypress and the baluster was original, but she didn't have enough materials to place it on the front. Mr. Salter advised since this was the rear deck and the use was for accessibility to the home, he was agreeable with allowing the Trex for the ramp onto the back porch to allow for the elevation change. He further explained it was part of the accessible path provided to the rear door, and in this case could argue that it was appropriate and could be easily maintained.

**Mr. Salter made a motion to approve, seconded by Ms. Fogarty, and it carried 3 to 1 with Chairman Quina recusing.**

<b>Item 5</b>	<b>125 W. Romana Street</b>	<b>GCD / PHBD</b>
<b>Variance</b>		<b>C-1 / C-2A</b>
<b>Action taken: Denied without prejudice.</b>		

David Hughes is seeking a Variance to increase the maximum allowed door signage from 4 sf per street front elevation to 5.43 sf. to accommodate signage above the main entry door identifying the building name.

Ms. Smith presented to the Board. Chairman Quina pointed out that the variance application was incomplete and asked why the letters needed lighting since the building was not open at night. Ms. Smith indicated someone else had submitted the paperwork. She advised the request for the variance was for visibility and to allow the letters to be backlit. She explained the original letters were not lit, and 6" backlit letters were not available from the manufacturer. Chairman Quina inquired if a variance had been approved without a hardship indicated, and Mr. Harding stated it had not to his knowledge. Mr. Crawford was concerned it was being driven simply by what was manufactured, and the use was not clear from a variance standpoint. Mr. Salter also did not see a hardship. Chairman Quina read the variance criteria and offered it to Ms. Smith for future use.

Ms. Tullos, the property manager, pointed out the original letters were smaller and not reverse lit and were not easily seen from the street or the parking area, and they were trying to brand their building and keep up with the newer buildings going up. However, the manufacturer would not build a 6" backlit letter. Mr. Crawford explained the Board needed to follow the protocol to grant a variance and demonstrate a hardship. Mr. Harding stated in 12.12.2 all seven of the variance criteria must be met.

**Mr. Crawford made a motion to deny without prejudice for lack of information provided, seconded by Ms. Fogarty, and it carried unanimously.**

<b>Item 6</b>	<b>125 W. Romana Street</b>	<b>GCD / PHBD</b>
<b>Non-Contributing</b>		<b>C-1 / C-2A</b>
<b>Action taken: Removed from agenda.</b>		

David Hughes is requesting approval for replacement signage at a non-contributing structure.

<b>Item 7</b>	<b>714 E. LaRua Street</b>	<b>OEHPD</b>
---------------	----------------------------	--------------

**Variance**

**OEHR-2**

**Action taken: Removed from agenda.**

Frank Daughtry is requesting a Variance to increase the maximum allowed rear yard coverage from 277.5 sf to 728.4 sf.

**Item 8**

**714 E. LaRua Street**

**OEHPD**

**Contributing Structure**

**OEHR-2**

**Action taken: Discussion only.**

Frank Daughtry is requesting *CONCEPTUAL* approval for a two-story multiple-family residential structure in the rear yard.

Mr. Daughtry presented to the Board and stated the new structure was to accommodate an elderly relative living on the premises. The former site plans submitted were too tight, and the revised plan was only encroaching 10' into the rear yard. The structure would be connected by a breezeway to the existing building. The two living units would be next to the main building with the garage on the right side and accessed off 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue. He then discussed the placement of the dormers and garage doors. Mr. Crawford asked if this item should be discussed since the variance was not being considered. Mr. Daughtry explained if the variance was not granted, they would only be building a one-car garage. Chairman Quina advised that all seven reasons for a variance should be addressed in the next proposal. He emphasized the Board could talk about the new site plan and conceptual designs, but the Board could not approve anything. Ms. Statler stated the Board was limited in discussing the site plan since the site plan presented relied on the variance approval. Mr. Crawford asked for an explanation on if the building was removed, it would allow them to build lot line to lot line; Mr. Daughtry explained in OEHR-2, the lot coverage was NA, and they could build within the setbacks, allowing for stormwater drainage and compatibility with the neighbors. Mr. Salter addressed the window sizes. Mr. Crawford suggested reducing the variance by eliminating the front porch; turning the porch 90 degrees was also worth investigating.

Ms. Courtney addressed the Board and indicated the Old East Hill Property Association liked the transoms over the doors, the dormers didn't echo the principle house, and the garage door and windows were not in proportion but more rectangular and not in proportion to the principle structure. They were also concerned with rental use of the property. Section 12.5.55 states no more than four rooms can be rented on any building site; four were already rented, and this construction opened the door to four more.

Mr. Wagley was happy to see improvements but was concerned with the awkwardness of reviewing something without a variance; what was being considered was different from the version released to the public, and the committee had considered the location as originally submitted.

Mr. Crawford advised with the bar being high for a building in the National Register, it is up to the architects and builders to live up to and complement that structure. Ms. Statler stated there were a maximum number of bedrooms to be rented out as a bed and breakfast, but this was an odd situation in that this was not technically a bed and breakfast but operated as an Airbnb; a bed and breakfast would be limited to four sleeping rooms with the owners occupying the principle dwelling; it is an allowed use within this district. This addition could be used as a multi-family structure which is also allowed in the district. Mr. Daughtry disagreed with considering the structure multi-family. Ms. Statler stated the building official had considered the bedrooms as individual lodging units. Mr. Daughtry considered them additional bedrooms only. He indicated the plans would be presented again to the Board for review considering the Board's comments.

**Item 9**

**820 E. LaRua Street**

**OEHPD**

**Variance**

**OEHC-1**

**Action taken: Removed from agenda.**

Alicia and Daniel Ahern are seeking a Variance to increase the minimum required west side yard setback from 5 feet to 2 feet to accommodate a rear addition.

**Item 10**

**820 E. LaRua Street**

**OEHPD**

**Contributing Structure**

**OEHC-1**

**Action taken: Discussion only.**

Alicia and Daniel Ahern are requesting *CONCEPTUAL* approval for a rear addition.

Ms. Ahern stated the goal was to use the original footprint of the house and foundation in order to add a kitchen and master suite to accommodate issues with mobility. Chairman Quina stated when they submit for the variance, to make sure the information is submitted properly. Mr. Crawford also emphasized meeting the criteria for the variance. Mr. Pristera stated he did not mind the jog in the design, but the design from the outside did not matter either way.

Mr. Wagley again addressed the variance criteria and stated the drawing details were not available to their committee, however, the structure was in the rear and not visible to the street.

Ms. Ahern asked if they needed to provide plans showing use of the original footprint with the variance and one without, and Chairman Quina stated they should put the plans together with the other variance documentation.

**Item 11**

**220 W. Gadsden Street**

**NHPD**

**Demolition**

**PR-2**

**Action taken: Approved.**

Jim Veal is requesting approval for the demolition of a non-contributing structure.

Mr. Veal addressed the Board and advised the lot was unique with interesting structures. They realized they could have two lots to offset the cost of the home. They also considered an easement for rear-loading garages with a common driveway. He indicated Engineering and the Fire Department were agreeable with the format, however, the plans had to be accelerated in order to submit for the demolition. Mr. Pristera had no site file information, and at the time of the survey, the structure was not contributing but could be considered contributing through another survey. Mr. Veal stated they intended to keep the trees, and the client would build on the corner lot. Ms. Fogarty preferred not demolishing the structure. Mr. Veal explained the existing house was past the point of being restored; some of the floors were below the ground with rot in the floor system and roof. The electrical system also had issues. Mr. Crawford asked if the demolition criteria had been met for non-contributing, and Ms. Statler explained the Board should determine if this was a non-contributing structure. Chairman Quina pointed out a lot of structures were becoming 50 years old, and the Board had to consider what was truly eligible. Mr. Pristera advised the structure did not match the narrative of NHPD; clusters of a style within the district would be considered contributing; one structure scattered in the district would have to be significant or a great example of ranch style (long and horizontal) to be considered contributing. Chairman Quina indicated he always thought this house should be torn down.

**Mr. Crawford made a motion for demolition noting the future plans, seconded by Mr. Salter who felt the structure was more hodgepodge. The motion then carried unanimously.**

**Item 12**

**220 W. Gadsden Street**

**NHPD**

**New Construction**

**PR-2**

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

Jim Veal is requesting *CONCEPTUAL* approval for a new single-family residence.

Mr. Veal stated they had met all of the literal requirements of the district, read the NHPD comments and agreed with most of them. Chairman Quina indicated they should try to be more stylistic and build something which blends, and if building a more historic home, they might want to choose one of the historical styles. Mr. Veal confirmed they were interested in providing something more stylistic in the neighborhood. Mr. Crawford agreed it was difficult to ascribe a style to the home and could see it going in a number of directions. Chairman Quina pointed out this was a corner lot, and they should give that some consideration in picking the style. Mr. Veal indicated he would get with staff and Mr. Pristera before submitting the final plans. Mr. Crawford felt like they had submitted just enough to proceed with the demolition permit, but the input from the Board might be enough for the applicant to work to the next level. With that, **Mr. Crawford made a motion for approval of the subdivision of the lots, the massing of the house as described in the meeting today, with further development of the individual floorplan and elevations of what has been shown based on input given in the meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Fogarty.** It was clarified that the demolition permit would be pulled upon final approval of the plans. Chairman Quina pointed out that the Board had seen demolitions which resulted in vacant lots for years and then parking lots established, and this procedure was developed to require final approval of the project before demolition. Mr. Veal inquired about a potential buyer for a property, and Ms. Statler stated they would have to come forward with a final plan. Mr. Crawford explained it would not require a full set of construction documents but detail of the exterior, elevations, lighting, and should match what was being permitted. **The motion then carried unanimously.**

**Item 13** **36 E. Garden Street** **PHBD**  
**Demolition** **C-2A**

**Action taken: Partial Demolition Approved.**

Scott Sallis, Dalrymple Sallis Architecture, is requesting approval for the partial demolition of a contributing structure.

Mr. Sallis presented to the Board and advised his client had the ability to develop an entire city block, and the best way to make that happen and to demolish as little as possible was to remove a portion of the building which is a windowless wall. The intent is to create the East Garden District. The rear of this building has never had a principle purpose and has a hodgepodge structure, and they saw no reason to keep this portion of the building. Mr. Pristera explained this part of the building was the service wing of a hotel; the hotel burned in 1902, and everything in front of it had changed multiple times. Mr. Sallis advised it was a good example of a building that was simply old, and the inside was as bad as the outside. Chairman Quina pointed out in creating an outdoor plaza in its place, maybe they could carve up the structure and allowed it to possibly support the canopies and be interpreted archeological architecture. Mr. Sallis explained it would be a futile effort since it had a lot of EIFS on the structure. **(The Board then considered the conceptual approval.)**

**Ms. Fogarty made a motion for partial demolition of the contributing structure, seconded by Mr. Crawford.** Chairman Quina clarified that the building was fairly insignificant but hampered the further development of this property, and it was never intended as a streetscape. **The motion then carried unanimously.**

**Item 14** **36 E. Garden Street** **PHBD**  
**New Construction** **C-2A**

**Action taken: Conceptual Approval.**

Scott Sallis, Dalrymple Sallis Architecture, is requesting *CONCEPTUAL* approval for a new outdoor plaza and mixed-use building.

Mr. Sallis advised since his client owns the west side of Jefferson Street, the first step of the entire

development would be to activate the corner with a restaurant which would require removal of the back portion of the existing building. To have additional tenants for the long block, their intent was to push the building back and create a plaza with two small standalone retail buildings which they called dueling depots reflecting old Milton train depots. The concept for the Reynolds Building was to highlight and heighten the corner, and they planned to keep everything they could of the Reynolds Music portion, removing the EIFS and exposing the brick if possible. He advised they wanted to add a column and a canopy to create a great loggia along the long walk to the plaza and hotel. With these plans, their desire would be to narrow Jefferson Street. They have had successful meetings with the City and DOT, and all were onboard to giving a major road diet to Jefferson Street. Removing the rear portion of the building would enable a service drive for rear mixed use buildings and Perfect Plain. He also indicated they were going to be successful in removing utility poles, lines and transformers on Garden Street. The service drive would be just as much a utility easement as a service access. He emphasized it would be so helpful to obtain the demolition approval to ensure the underground utilities which would allow them to move forward for the overall vision.

Chairman Quina pointed out Jefferson was an underused street, and the opportunity to place a hotel in this area was an amazing project. Chairman Quina clarified that the applicant wanted approval for the plaza and the mixed use building which follows the rear building demolition. Ms. Statler explained they needed plans for the restaurant, and Mr. Sallis agreed. **(The Board then returned to the demolition.)**

Mr. Salter liked the concept of the dueling depots but saw more of a beach shack; this was a fantastic opportunity to re-introduce the L&N Depot and other elements. Ms. Fogarty liked the concept with different design elements. Mr. Salter questioned the canopy being continuous and thought it distracted from the statement which could be made on the corner. Mr. Sallis explained there were many structures in the old Palafox core which had the eyebrow canopies with the loggias, and they wanted to activate the street with outdoor dining. Mr. Sallis clarified they wanted conceptual approval for the partial demolition for the underground utilities. Chairman Quina advised the corner project was a fairly dramatic change from the remaining Reynolds Building. Mr. Pristera furnished photos of the building and alleyway. He also stated that this summer UWF was going to study the history of that block. Chairman Quina suggested Mr. Sallis take the photos to help in designing the project.

**Mr. Crawford made a motion for conceptual approval noting the input and direction from the Board regarding looking at ways to preserve or maintain aspects of the Reynolds Music House in a way to be determined with evidence one way or another, and the application in terms of its comprehensive nature and ability to transform that block, the overall picture is strongly approved with the ways and direction to improve that block. With no speakers, Ms. Fogarty seconded the motion.** Mr. Sallis stated it was fair to say that when the team returned, they would probably be asking conceptual approval for this building, the one next door and the alley in between. **The motion then carried unanimously.**

**Item 15**

**213 W. Garden Street  
215 W. Garden Street  
25 S. Spring Street**

**PHBD / GCD  
C-2 / C-2A**

**Contributing and  
Non-contributing Structure**

**Action taken: Conceptual Approval.**

200 West Garden, Inc. is requesting *CONCEPTUAL* approval for the development of residential and mixed-use properties. This proposal is not seeking approval for the demolition of the School Board building. Rather, the applicant is asking for conceptual approval of the proposed development and design plans as well as the mitigation and possible reuse of the School Board building.

Mr. Carson presented to the Board and stated they hoped this project would be the catalyst for downtown's march to the west. He indicated they were researching available grants to offset some of the costs for rehabilitating the School Board building and were hopeful they could blend the renovated building with those of the new development to make it successful. He explained they had decided to give this consideration 60 days. In the meantime, they requested conceptual approval. Chairman Quina advised if the Board approved the conceptual plans, and they decided on demolition, the density would be increased.

Mr. Jernigan explained the parcel which was constricted by the Credit Union property. He pointed out there was not enough land for surface parking, and the downside of a parking garage was the dimension and geometry as well as the impact on the site. By leaving the existing administration building, they had no room to have those units on Romana Street wrap around the south side of the parking garage. He explained they had looked at additional height along Spring Street which could provide for additional amenity spaces and rooftop bars. He explained the structure would have five stories at Garden, with increased height along Spring Street and then stepped down. The current density would be 242 units without the existing building. The ideal density according to the marking study was 280 units. He confirmed these were rental units. The parking garage currently supported the current design. If the additional property to the west was purchased, the parking garage would be larger. He also indicated they were considering 15,000 sq. ft. of retail space.

Mr. Studer addressed the Board and stated tearing down the old Pensacola News Journal building was hard because it had historical relevance with past photographs and furnishings, and he hoped they could save the School Board building. Mr. Jernigan advised since time is money, they were looking a modularized construction since the project was too tall for a wood frame.

Mr. Salter appreciated the applicants listening to the community, and Ms. Fogarty appreciated the arches in the new design. Mr. Pristera appreciated the applicants researching other avenues in order to preserve the existing building. Mr. Crawford appreciated the great effort to make all things fit together and possibly preserving the old building, and this was a responsible effort in the development of the west side. Chairman Quina shared Mr. Mead's suggestions regarding the double-tower articulation on the other two building form frontages.

Mr. Cossen was in favor of preserving the School Board building and felt it made the project unique to Pensacola.

**Mr. Crawford made a motion to for conceptual approval as submitted, seconded by Ms. Fogarty, and with no additional speakers, it carried unanimously.**

**Item 16**

**226 S. Palafox Place**

**PHBD**

**Contributing Structure**

**C-2A**

**Action taken: Conceptual Approval.**

The UWF Historic Trust is requesting *CONCEPTUAL* approval to install a large building wallscape on the north side of a contributing structure. This project is a continuation of the previous wallscape project that was completed in April 2018. Mr. Pristera addressed the Board and stated the group reviewing these murals was composed of UWF personnel and business owners as well as other professionals. He pointed out that the intent was that you don't see more than one mural or wallscape at a time. He indicated the lighting and frames were the same as previously approved. He pointed out the murals had held up very well with no fading, were easily changed once the wall system was in place, and they had received a lot of interest. He also provided the lighting specifications.

Mr. Merrill stated they were hoping to establish early on what they were looking for; he pointed out this location lends itself to a tall ship; his grandfather commissioned the painting which was based on an actual picture. Mr. Salter advised this was a great location, a great idea, and this is what Pensacola is about. **Mr. Salter made a motion for conceptual approval, seconded by Ms. Fogarty, and it carried**



unanimously.

**Item 17** **33 S. Palafox Street** **PHBD**  
**Contributing Structure** **C-2A**

**Action taken: Conceptual Approval.**

The UWF Historic Trust is requesting *CONCEPTUAL* approval to install a large building wallscape on the west side of a contributing structure. This wallscape would be of a 1910 photograph of the wooden L&N passenger station.

**Ms. Fogarty made a motion for conceptual approval, seconded by Mr. Crawford, and it carried unanimously.**

**Item 18** **2 N. Palafox Street** **PHBD**  
**Contributing Structure** **C-2A**

**Action taken: Conceptual Approval.**

The UWF Historic Trust is requesting *CONCEPTUAL* approval to install a large building wallscape on the east side of a contributing structure. Mr. Pristera stated the frame had been installed, but the graphic would be submitted to the Board.

**Mr. Crawford made a motion for conceptual approval, seconded by Ms. Fogarty, and it carried unanimously.**

**Item 19** **70 N. Baylen Street** **PHBD**  
**Contributing Structure** **C-2A**

**Action taken: Conceptual Approval.**

The UWF Historic Trust is requesting *CONCEPTUAL* approval to install a wallscape on the parking lot wall of a contributing structure. Although the final photographs have not been selected, historic images of the San Carlos Hotel were provided as samples. Mr. Pristera stated the frames were not installed, and there would be two frames for each panel. Mr. Salter pointed out they would be covering up the non-conforming block wall.

**Mr. Crawford made a motion for conceptual approval, seconded by Mr. Salter, and it carried unanimously.**

**Item 20** **11 E. Zarragossa Street** **PHBD / PHD**  
**Contributing Structure** **HC-2**

**Action taken: Approved with comments & abbreviated review for fiberglass product.**

Mark Bednar is requesting approval for new windows.

Mr. Bednar presented to the Board and advised the existing windows were leaking. He provided additional prints to the Board. He advised four windows on the second story were replaced with all wood 20 years ago. His contractor advised against all wood on the south and west elevations. His recommendation was clad aluminum over wood or vinyl with a moisture barrier. He confirmed he would paint it and preserve the historical value of the building. Chairman Quina suggested researching Marvin Fiberglass windows (Integrity) which would be a better product which looks more like a wood window and was much easier to install.

With no speakers, **Mr. Crawford made a motion for approval with aluminum-clad or fiberglass windows in the pattern to match the existing mullion patterns and color to match the existing color.**

**Ms. Fogarty seconded the motion. Mr. Crawford amended the motion to have the fiberglass product have the same design characteristics as the aluminum-clad window with raised mullion patterns. Mr. Salter amended the motion for the fiberglass product to go through an abbreviated review. The**

**amendments were accepted, and the motion carried unanimously.**

**OPEN FORUM** – None.

**DISCUSSION** – None.

**ADJOURNMENT** – With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:57 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Gregg Harding', written in a cursive style.

Gregg Harding  
Secretary to the Board