

PLANNING SERVICES

***Architectural Review Board***

**MINUTES OF THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**

**July 18, 2019**

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

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

**STAFF PRESENT:** Gregg Harding, Historic Preservation Planner, Leslie Statler, Planner, Heather Lindsay, Assistant City Attorney, Ross Pristera, Advisor

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Dan Ahern, Nicole Endacott, Michael Boles, C. Ray Jones, Lou M. Courtney, Connie L. Formby, Phil Christensen, David Alsop, John Marshall, Bruce Block, Antonio Rhodes, Ron Helms, J Veal

**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 introduced Heather Lindsay, Assistant City Attorney.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Mr. Salter made a motion to approve the June 20, 2019 minutes, seconded by Chairman Quina, 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** **820 E. LaRua Street** **OEHPD**  
**Variance** **OEHR-1**

**Action taken: Application withdrawn.**

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.

Ms. Ahern presented to the Board and stated the variance was in order to keep the original foundation and roofline intact in order to add an addition. Chairman Quina advised the Board was to evaluate the variance according to the 7 variance criteria points, and Ms. Ahern felt they had met all of them. She pointed out they were trying to make the property appropriate for aging in place; if they did not get the variance, they couldn't make the bathroom large enough to accommodate them. They were seeking to remove the back porch and part of the kitchen, coming off the original footprint.

Mr. Mead stated OEHPD referenced the adjacent property with respect to being unique but did not think that applied. He noted their house was built to a 2' setback which was not uncommon in that

time. However, he was concerned about the detriment to others by extending the building further back and wanted to know about the uses of the adjacent property. Ms. Ahern stated the property had been uninhabited since 2004 and owned by an out-of-town military couple who used it as an itinerant place for military personnel, and it had been for sale around 14 years. She also advised there was a large building adjacent to the fence. Mr. Harding confirmed the use of the property as residential, and proper notification was given including newspaper, postcard and signage notifications. Mr. Mead asked what would happen if they did not use the existing foundation; Ms. Ahern stated it would change the width of the hallway and make the shower smaller. She also pointed out the variance was actually more like 18". Mr. Mead pointed out a 10" variation in the wall line. Mr. Harding advised the drawings depicted the house at 2.4' away from the property line, but staff's interpretation of the plans was that the house was not exactly parallel to the property line and thought the variance should be opened up to 2' in case the back portion of the addition encroached further on the setbacks. Chairman Quina noted they were placing a one-car garage on the rear property line; Mr. Harding confirmed there was no setback on the front or rear yards. Mr. Mead was mindful that the house was not parallel to the property line but was not certain they had met all the variance factors and was concerned there was no information on the impact of the adjacent property; a depiction of the relationship would be helpful. Ms. Ahern advised the adjacent property was a derelict property and suspected the shed was not permitted. Mr. Salter stated in looking at the plans, he found it hard to justify that the addition could not work unless the variance was granted; he felt an addition could work with some minor modifications and did not see the variance as necessary for an addition to the house. He pointed out many historical structures had jogs in the rear, and there were several ways to do them; he did not see the necessity of building the addition in line with the existing structure. Chairman Quina pointed out sometimes a distinction between structures was a good thing. The Board then viewed the adjacent property via Cityview. **Mr. Mead then made a motion that on the packet submitted, he did not find that they had met the requirements of Item 4 of the application regarding the detriment to the general welfare of others or to the property rights of others in the vicinity particularly in regard to the adjoining property; secondly, it did not meet the requirement in Item 2 that the present setback requirements would not allow the use contemplated under the Code; he did not think the requirement to meet the setbacks with this type of addition was going to be inherently detrimental to that use. He moved to deny the application without prejudice in order for the applicant to resubmit an application covering those points. The motion was seconded by Mr. Salter.** Ms. Lindsay pointed out to the Board that if they denied this request, the applicant would not be able to return for one year, and suggested possibly tabling the item. Mr. Mead advised the Board's experience in these circumstances where there were requirements under the Code, the Board allowed liberal withdrawal so the applicant could reapply without the penalty, but it had to be done in writing. Ms. Lindsay clarified if they withdrew the application, they could resubmit a more complete application based on the feedback they received from the Board; Mr. Harding advised there was no timeframe on this procedure. Ms. Courtney then addressed the Board in Mr. Wagley's absence. She stated they would welcome the Ahern's back into the neighborhood and valued their contribution but was concerned they did not meet all the variance requirements. She preferred seeing a survey depicting how the house sits on the property and really appreciated when these houses take a jog which tells the story of the structure. Ms. Ahern pointed out this was a new addition and nothing historical about it. **The applicant requested a 3-minute conversation before returning to the Board.** Chairman Quina advised the Board could still table this request but needed to know within 30 days; if a decision had not been made, the decision was automatically approved. **Staff asked for a short recess to confer. At this time, the applicant withdrew the application.**

**Item 2**

**820 E. LaRue Street**

**OEHPD**

**Contributing Structure**

**OEHR-1**

**Action taken: Withdrawn (Board moved to Item 3 – application withdrawn).**

Alicia and Daniel Ahern are requesting *FINAL* approval for exterior modifications to a contributing structure including a rear addition, a detached garage, and replacement fencing.

**Item 3**

**300 W. Gonzalez Street**

**NHPD**

**Contributing Structure**

**PR-1AAA**

**Action taken: Approved.**

Nicole Endacott is requesting approval for exterior modifications to a contributing structure. Ms. Endacott presented to the Board. Mr. Mead noted there was no plan view of the pavers, and Ms. Endacott pointed out the plan on the screen. Chairman Quina stated the North Hill comments were favorable. Mr. Salter asked about approval of the fiberglass doors, and Chairman Quina stated the fiberglass doors had more detail, and it was hard to obtain wood; fiberglass had been allowed on new construction in North Hill, and the existing door was steel and not original. **Ms. Campbell-Hatler made a motion to approve, seconded by Mr. Mead. With no speakers, the motion carried unanimously.**

**Item 4**

**219 E. Intendencia Street**

**PHD**

**Contributing Structure**

**HC-1 / Brick Structures**

**Action taken: Approved.**

Michael Boles is requesting approval for exterior modifications at a contributing structure. The applicant is seeking approval to replace an existing broken asphalt driveway with pavers. The new driveway will extend along the east property line for approximately 91 feet and will be approximately 13 feet at its widest. The pavers will be laid in a geometric pattern and bound by Acme Brick Courtyard Harvest. In addition, three planters will be inset along the west side of the new driveway.

Mr. Boles presented to the Board. **Mr. Mead made a motion to approve as presented, seconded by Ms. Campbell-Hatler, and it carried unanimously.** It was clarified that Engineering would review this proposal since it involved a driveway.

**Item 5**

**714 E. LaRue Street**

**OEHPD**

**Contributing Structure**

**OEHR-2**

**Action taken: Approved with comments.**

Frank Daughtry is requesting *FINAL* approval for a two-story duplex and a detached garage at a contributing structure. Mr. Daughtry presented to the Board and stated it took two years to place this home on the National Register of Historic Places. He addressed the concerns of the OEHPD and felt the Queen Anne asymmetric arrangement for this structure was completely correct. He emphasized the windows were 2 over 2, and the siding would match the existing structure. Regarding the finished floor elevation at 18" he stated he was building next to a contributing structure with accommodations for an elderly person. He went on to thank Ms. Statler, Mr. Harding and Mr. Bilby for taking time to review the project to ensure it met Code. In order to meet the requirements, they defined the building as a two-story duplex, which meant on each floor there would be a small kitchenette, and each floor would be classified as a single unit. The accessory building in the rear also met all the requirements. He provided illustrations of the Jeld Wen windows and fiberglass doors along with the Wayne Dalton fiberglass garage doors with carriage door hardware. The Timberline shingles would also match the existing.

Chairman Quina advised the mullions needed to be seen on the surface of the glass but did not have to be true divided light. Mr. Salter wanted to clarify that Mr. Daughtry was proposing what he would

classify as 2 sash over 2 sash instead of the 4 over 4 as shown; Mr. Daughtry advised it would be 2 over 2. He assured the siding on the entire structure would be novelty. Mr. Mead addressed the dormers, and the end gables on the house and suggested something to give the gable more presence and less window, and Mr. Daughtry agreed. Chairman Quina noted the east elevation showed two doors, and Mr. Daughtry stated the purpose was to have curtains for privacy, and the extra door was good access and added to the asymmetry.

Ms. Courtney addressed the Board and explained that Old East Hill appreciated the fact the home was placed on the National Register and the fact the architect considered some of their suggestions. She pointed out there were last minute changes last month as well as this month which led to some confusion. She stated the only asymmetrical portion was the doors, and the windows were drawn 4 over 4 instead of 2 over 2 as suggested to complement the original house. She also suggested the 16-light windows be reduced to 12-light in the dormer.

Mr. Pristera advised the dormer in the garage did not add much and suggested it be eliminated. Also, the Queen Anne's did have irregularities, but he did not see the reason for the second floor door since people could exit through the curtain. Chairman Quina suggested French doors, and Mr. Daughtry agreed. Mr. Harding advised any changes could be approved in an abbreviated review but a motion to include those aspects could be formulated. Mr. Daughtry confirmed the siding was novelty wood siding. Ms. Campbell-Hatler explained the Board had discussed reduction of windows, French doors and removal of a dormer. At this time, Mr. Daughtry commented on his exchange with Ms. Courtney that architectural training was a hard thing to do, and it takes a long time to get good at it. Mr. Salter explained that you don't have to be a good architect to appreciate good well-balanced design. **Ms. Campbell-Hatler made a motion to approve with the change in reducing the size of the windows in the dormer for more space, changing the double doorway to a double French door, and removing the dormer from the garage. Mr. Salter amended to clarify the new windows would be 2 over 2, and it was accepted. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mead, and it carried unanimously.**

**Item 6**

**220 W. Gadsden Street**

**NHPD**

**New Construction**

**PR-2**

**Action taken: Approved with comments.**

Jim Veal is requesting *FINAL* approval for a new single-family residence. Mr. Veal addressed the Board and stated they had made revisions to the plans in response to the Board and North Hill. He advised the package should meet requirements for final approval. They added double columns over the pebble-dash stucco base; they propose to use a fiberglass stucco on the stem wall. The stairs are wide and roofline revisions were made according to comments from the Board and North Hill. They presented a detailed product selection. The only negative comment addressed the aluminum rails, and they were willing to use a composite material. He advised the plate height was 10' and there were no exposed rafter tails. The windows would be Jeld Wen Singleline which is a bonafide wood; their intent was to use a 3 over 1 product.

Mr. Pristera stated the Sanborn maps show the lot with a large two-story Victorian. Chairman Quina encouraged the applicant to go higher on the ceiling since there were very tall adjacent homes on the block. Mr. Veal explained the height from grade was 35". Mr. Pristera suggested a lot of the houses had the gable pushed forward and asked if they had considered moving the gable out to give it height. Mr. Veal stated his client's hope was to qualify for the hipped roof benefit in insurance, but they would be open to moving it out as far as possible. Regarding changing the railing, they planned to use a square baluster. Mr. Mead asked about a possible denial of aluminum railings in the North Hill comments, and Mr. Harding explained there had been a project approved where there was a comment to change the aluminum railing; in an abbreviated review, a composite was used.

C. Ray Jones addressed the Board and supported the partition of the property and the demolition of the former structure. He explained this area was the original North Hill, and the previous home was likely Victorian. He bought his property in 1975 and was the first to raise the flag to keep architectural integrity in the area. He referenced major projects on Spring Street and 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and while it took several ARB meetings, a much more appropriate design was obtained for both and also fit the neighborhoods much better. He asked about the driveway materials, and Mr. Veal explained the presumption at this time would be concrete, but they were open to other considerations. The proposed property division has yielded a positive impact with respect to the shared driveway, so the homes have rear entry garages and do not affect the streetscape. Chairman Quina asked if they had considered making this structure Victorian, and Mr. Veal stated his client preferred a simple house that blended into the neighborhood. Chairman Quina was surprised that North Hill didn't comment on the importance of the corner. Mr. Veal explained his client liked this look and they had endeavored to bring it to the level needed. He advised his client would consider raising the heel height and the roof height. Mr. Mead suggested a gable-skirted façade on the porch which might help with the insurance benefit. Mr. Veal did not remember seeing something quite like that in the neighborhood, and a shed roof was probably more appropriate. They could add one foot to the heel but emphasized they still needed the demolition permit, and this was their plan going forward. **Mr. Mead explained he was fine with the structure as is and then made a motion to approve with the applicant's willingness to substitute the indicated wood for the aluminum railing and to consider but not require raising the heel height. The motion was seconded by Mr. Salter, and it carried unanimously.**

<b>Item 7</b>	<b>125 S. Palafox Place</b>	<b>PHBD</b>
<b>Contributing Structure</b>		<b>C-2A</b>
<b>Action taken: Approved.</b>		

Endry Properties LTD is requesting approval for exterior modifications to a contributing structure. Mr. Harding stated the attached signage would be evaluated in an abbreviated review. Mr. Endry presented to the Board and stated the building was built in 1881, and they added 4800 square feet to the rear of the building including an elevator, and totally remodeled the upstairs into office space. Meadows Jewelry had been located in this space for years, but it was now leased to a retail store. They want to remove the recessed door and make it flush with the building to eliminate the problems with outdoor occupants using it as a hideaway. The door would move forward three feet and some inches but still be slightly recessed from the building. Ms. Campbell-Hatler felt it was a good improvement and liked that it was slightly recessed and included additional windows. **Mr. Mead made a motion to approve, seconded by Ms. Campbell-Hatler who stated she liked that the door was not the same as other businesses. With no speakers, the motion carried unanimously.**

<b>Item 8</b>	<b>43 S. Palafox Place</b>	<b>PHBD</b>
<b>Contributing Structure</b>		<b>C-2A</b>
<b>Action taken: Approved with window modifications.</b>		

Sam Marshall Architects is seeking approval for exterior modifications to a contributing structure. Mr. Marshall presented to the Board and stated the main reason for the work was because the south and west walls were in a state of eminent collapse. He indicated they would replace the walls with new footings and structural steel columns to brace the walls. An 8" wall would be faced with sheathing, waterproofed and faced with new painted brick. He explained they were emulating what was happening further up Palafox where storefronts had been remodeled. They were also creating the same entry pattern as on Palafox and adding more glass. Mr. Salter confirmed they were basically removing the south and west walls and asked about the Palafox location on the east side and any

proposed modifications to the exterior of that wall. Mr. Marshall pointed out there was an existing cast iron aluminum column which would be exposed with a wall built behind it for a logical transition at that corner from the new painted brick and stucco front on the Palafox elevation. This would be a very similar detail to the end of the block. He explained the stucco would wrap around the exposed column, with the new brick beginning on the south face running to the west. Mr. Salter asked if they would consider breaking up the horizontal window on the west elevation and southern corner into smaller square windows, and Mr. Marshall had no objection. **Mr. Mead made a motion to approve with the window modifications, seconded by Ms. Campbell-Hatler. With no speakers, the motion carried unanimously.**

**Item 9**

**2 N. Palafox Street**

**PHBD**

**Contributing Structure**

**C-2A**

**Action taken: Approved with comments.**

The UWF Historic Trust is requesting *FINAL* approval to install a large building wallscape on the east side of a contributing structure. Mr. Harding explained according to the LDC, this wallscape was considered signage. Mr. Pristera presented to the Board and advised he had informed the client that the logo and East Garden District lettering would have to be removed. He advised they were trying to tilt the map, and Ms. Campbell-Hatler thought the map itself was interesting but thought some type of orientation to show it was a map was preferable. Mr. Mead suggested taking the actual text of the historical map and say "Plan - Town of Pensacola – 1767" which simply identifies the map and could be lettered in the same typography as illustrated in the three panels. Ms. Campbell-Hatler thought having the wayfinding direction at the bottom right-hand corner would punctuate what it actually is. Mr. Harding then read the LDC definition of signage. Mr. Mead explained he could make the argument that it is not a sign because it is not attracting anyone to the thing that it is, because that thing that it is, is the place where you are; it is basically a "you are here" but 1767. Mr. Harding also explained it was an off-premise sign (off of the property) which was not allowed in this zone. Ms. Statler pointed out even though they were looking at it as a historic map and citing what might have been on it, there was also a development by that same name. Mr. Pristera advised they could remove the logo and lettering and enlarge the name of the map and the date. **Mr. Mead made a motion to approve, removing the East Garden District lettering, removing the logo and using the original text identifying the map "A Plan of the Town of Pensacola 1767" in an appropriate reconfigured way in the three-panel presentation with the same orientation of the map. Ms. Campbell-Hatler asked that the wayfinding arrow be scaled up at the bottom right. Mr. Mead agreed to that amendment. It was seconded by Ms. Campbell-Hatler, and with no speakers, it carried unanimously.**

**Item 10**

**201 Zaragoza Street**

**PHD / PHBD**

**Contributing Structure**

**HC-1 / Brick Structures**

**Action taken: Approved.**

The UWF Historic Trust is requesting approval for the installation of a new storefront door. Chairman Quina recused himself. Mr. Pristera stated this was part of a project where the UWF Engineering Department was coming into the Museum of Commerce with two very large milling machines which needed access to the building. They found two rooms being used for storage, and the doors were originally freight doors. They had always wanted to open these doors to make the building look active. They also wanted to use the frameless system since the doors needed security and water protection for storefront uses. He explained this would be the first step in activating that side of the building. He clarified the doors would be used as loading doors to get the machines into the building and then closed afterwards. Chairman Quina explained that eventually they wanted all glass doors, and the shutters

would go away. Mr. Pristera advised the doors were not original, and there was block fill behind them. **Ms. Campbell-Hatler made a motion to approve, seconded by Mr. Salter. With no speakers, the motion carried 3 to 1 with Chairman Quina abstaining.**

**Item 11** **628 E. Government Street** **PHD**  
**Fence** **HC-1 / Wood Cottages**  
**Action taken: (Removed at the request of applicant.)**

**Item 12** **113 S. Alcaniz Street** **PHD**  
**Contributing Structure** **HC-1 / Wood Cottages**  
**Action taken: Approved.**

Phil Christensen is requesting approval for exterior modifications to a contributing structure. Mr. Christensen presented to the Board and explained at this time the structure must be brought up to current hurricane standards. Chairman Quina clarified that the existing wood siding would remain on the sides. Mr. Christensen explained he would carry some type of matching siding down the driveway portion of the house. The new piers would be faced with matching brick veneer to blend with existing materials. **Ms. Campbell-Hatler made a motion to approve, seconded by Mr. Mead. With no speakers, the motion carried unanimously.**

**OPEN FORUM** – None.

**DISCUSSION** – The Board noted the screen resolution compared to the laptop, and Mr. Harding stated he would make that a priority to resolve.

**ADJOURNMENT** – With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:33 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,



Gregg Harding  
Secretary to the Board