

PLANNING SERVICES

Architectural Review Board

MINUTES OF THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

September 19, 2019

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: Michael Crawford

STAFF PRESENT: Gregg Harding, Historic Preservation Planner, Leslie Statler, Senior Planner, Michael Ziarnek, Transportation Planner-Complete Streets, Heather Lindsay, Assistant City Attorney, Ross Pristera, Advisor

OTHERS PRESENT: Scott Brady, Chuck G. Lewis, Christy Cabassa, Ryan Frazier, John Esposito, Robert Davis, Allen Bounds, Eve Herron, Steve Freeman, Paula & Jared Willets, Bianca Villegas, Alistair McKenzie, Jordan Yee, Greg Uzdevenes, Kelly Wieczorek, J. Veal

CALL TO ORDER / QUORUM PRESENT

Chairman Quina called the Architectural Review Board (ARB) meeting to order at 2:01 p.m. with a quorum present and explained the Board procedures to the audience.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Mead made a motion to approve the August 15, 2019 minutes, seconded by Mr. Salter, and it carried unanimously.

OPEN FORUM – Scott Brady addressed the Board concerning 5G towers being placed in the downtown area in every two blocks, varying in height. He explained each cell tower was proprietary for each carrier, with several carriers requesting permits. Legislation allows them to self-approve if they are not reviewed within three weeks. He stated they had been assured the cell towers would be placed on existing poles, and if a new one was necessary, it would be a decorative pole. Instead of co-locating on an existing pole, the contractors were installing new poles. He pointed out a new 40' wooden pole had been installed in the Seville historic district. He was informed this tower's permit had not been approved at that time but it was already installed. He suggested that the ARB take any action it could to protect the aesthetics and characteristics of the neighborhoods.

Eve Herron also addressed the Board and pointed out a 5G pole was being installed on her neighbor's property by an individual with no ID and no state license. They learned that these poles were being installed at every 8 to 10 homes in the historic neighborhood. To date, there were more than 150 existing permits for these cell towers. They had been told the 5G equipment was the size of a backpack and would be located on existing poles; she stated the 40' tall equipment was large and intrusive. She explained the neighborhood would not spend the money for underground equipment when the 5G equipment could be installed in the same place. She also advised homeowners did not like being exposed to excessive radiation and wanted the

City to preserve the safety and integrity of the historic neighborhoods by supporting federal bills that would restore local control and make wireless carriers accountable for their actions.

Chairman Quina advised the Board had not seen any information regarding the 5G poles and shared their concerns. He pointed out we do not want more poles downtown and in the historic districts and this would not be something the Board would recommend. **Ms. Campbell-Hatler made a motion to send a letter to Council to allow the Board more oversight.** Mr. Mead agreed that nothing the City controlled in terms of its appropriateness or appropriate appearance should be going into areas of jurisdiction of the Board by default because the City has not been able to amend their timelines to comply with the statutory changes. Also, with devices installed without permits, there were consequences to that which would be addressed by another department; the Board could not address this.

Mr. Harding could not speak on the department's attitude but explained they were attempting to work with the main cell phone providers in an attempt to have them co-locate on existing Gulf Power poles and existing structures; the potential visual impact was addressed during the review process, and some have already been reviewed in the north sections of the City. He explained he would be working with Council and the FCC and was actually in the process of registering the City with the FCC which would give a more proactive approach in providing our opinions of the impacts of these poles.

Chairman Quina asked about neighborhoods where the cables have already been buried underground and about the necessity of 5G. He advised he would compose a letter to Council to be considered on the next agenda. **The motion was seconded by Mr. Mead and carried unanimously.** Without any speakers, **the motion carried unanimously.**

NEW BUSINESS

Item 1

313 E. Intendencia Street

PHD

Variance

HC-2 / Wood Cottages

Action taken: Approved.

Christy Cabassa is seeking a Variance to increase the minimum required east side yard setback from five (5) feet to three (3) feet, six (6) inches to accommodate an addition. Ms. Cabassa addressed the Board and stated the existing house was built in 1983 and 3.5' off the east property line, and they wanted to build the addition off the east property line, removing an existing storage shed and leaving the existing guest house. Neighbors wrote letters approving the variance. She also explained there was no way to accomplish this request without the variance. Mr. Pristera verified this property was a reconstructed home and not original. Chairman Quina pointed out it would be a non-contributing structure. Mr. Salter stated the land survey clearly established the existing 3.5' setback which was consistent down the entire length of the property; the proposed addition was consistent and in line with that and took the place of one of the buildings being removed. With the approval letters provided, he had no issue with the request. **Mr. Salter then made a motion to approve the variance request, seconded by Ms. Fogarty, and it carried unanimously.**

Item 2

313 E. Intendencia Street

PHD

Non-Contributing Structure

HC-2 / Wood Cottages

Action taken: Approved with abbreviated review.

Ms. Cabassa presented to the Board and stated the entrance would be on the side and explained the modifications. The neighbors to the south were agreeable to the solar panels on the south. Chairman Quina explained the new structure was attempting to replicate a historic cottage and would require wood windows according to the Code. Ms. Cabassa stated they were replacing the existing metal windows with the PGT windows with panes between the glass and applied muntins. They were also removing the vinyl siding. Mr. Harding explained according to the statute, the ARB cannot deny

homeowners from accessing or collecting natural energy; what ARB could do was suggest locations based on aesthetics. Regarding the windows, the Code states all of the buildings will be recognized as products of their own time; streetscape and paint colors shall apply according to contributing structures. Chairman Quina questioned a requirement when a new construction was emulating a historic structure. Mr. Mead explained this was new construction renovating a 1983 building. Mr. Harding pointed out in 12-2-10(A)(8) indicating if new construction is intended to match historical designs, the building elements describe in paragraph (6) A thru L (including windows), should be used as guidelines. It should be decided if the structure was a remodel of a non-contributing or replicating a historic structure.

Ms. Cabassa stated the clients wanted windows with the Bahama shutters off the bedroom which would probably remain closed for privacy. She stated they could place a vertical shutter down the middle to make it look like two shutters. Ms. Campbell-Hatler thought there were too many deviations to look historic. Ms. Cabassa advised the solar panels were not an issue. Mr. Mead explained the porch was a problem. Chairman Quina explained they could have a clad wood window, with the wood window receiving paint or a cladding which would replace the paint. Ms. Cabassa stated they could go to a Jeld-Wen product if that was an issue. Mr. Mead pointed out the major concern was the treatment of the front side. Chairman Quina asked if the compromise would be using appropriate materials on the front porch and allowing secondary materials on the other sides – a fiberglass front door with Jeld-Wen windows on the front. **Mr. Mead made a motion to approve with the following changes in an abbreviated review: 1) use of the Jeld-Wen wood products on the front façade, 2) the allowance of replacement of one window and keeping an operable door, 3) with allowance for an operable gate at the head of the steps if desired, 4) PGT vinyl on the remaining facades, 5) shutters to be two panel. The motion was seconded by Mr. Salter and carried unanimously.**

Item 3 **601 N. Palafox Street** **NHPD**
Contributing Structure **PR-2**
Action taken: Approved.

The Episcopal Day School is requesting approval for an outdoor seating structure. Mr. Frazier presented to the Board and stated the structure would be mounted to the ground and would be treated wood lumber. It would also be an amphitheater type bench. Chairman Quina noted that North Hill had no objections. Mr. Frazier explained it would also be naturally stained and sealed wood. **Mr. Salter made a motion to approve, seconded by Mr. Mead. With no speakers, the motion carried unanimously.**

Item 4 **820 E. LaRua Street** **OEHPD**
Contributing Structure **OECH-1**
Action taken: Approved with comments.

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. Revised elevations as well as comments from Old East Hill were provided to the Board. Mr. Veal presented to the Board and advised he might switch to slab on grade at the north end of the structure because of the upward slope of the land. Mr. Salter addressed the garage with the plain, flush door and believed it should be something more appropriate to the style of the house. Mr. Veal stated since it was on the back side, he thought this would blend in better, and it was low on the priority list. Mr. Salter indicated a fiberglass could be used, and Mr. Veal agreed he would do a 6-panel. Mr. Salter then addressed the west elevation showing a horizontal window and asked it that could be broken into two square windows. Mr. Veal agreed that could work; Mr. Salter suggested bringing the trim around and identifying them as two square windows to keep with the theme. Mr. Mead pointed out the house was fairly obscure and

asked about the foundation skirting. Mr. Veal explained this was shown as a mortar wash – cement to stucco type. **Mr. Mead made a motion to approve as submitted, seconded by Ms. Campbell-Hatler. Mr. Salter felt strongly about the west elevation window being broken into two square windows, and Mr. Mead accepted the amendment. With no speakers, the motion carried unanimously.**

**Item 5
Non-Contributing Structure
Action taken: Denied.**

1400 N. Spring Street

**NHPD
PR-1AAA**

John and Ashley Esposito are requesting approval for exterior modifications to a non-contributing structure (built in 1951) including replacement windows and a change of paint color. Comments from North Hill were provided to the Board. Mr. Harding advised the property was renovated in 1980.

Mr. Esposito presented to the Board and explained the current windows were painted shut and non-operable, and they desired to replace them with upgraded vinyl. He explained the windows were not rotting. Chairman Quina explained removing operable, non-rotting wood windows was not a recommendation from the Secretary of State Guidelines for historic preservation. He indicated if there was a new survey performed, this would be a contributing structure since it was over 50 years old and of a style that would contribute to the standard of historic buildings in North Hill; North Hill was fine with the paint colors, questioned if the structure was non-contributing or contributing based on 1951, and were concerned with the windows. They suggested replacing the wood windows with the same kind. Chairman Quina pointed out the Board had not approved vinyl windows in a contributing structure. Mr. Esposito spoke of a gentleman who had gone through this process to replace his wood windows with vinyl windows and had submitted a presentation showing those which had been approved and those that were installed without approval. Ms. Statler remembered the incident but did not remember all of the structures submitted. Mr. Truluck replaced his wood windows on a ranch style structure after two denials by the Board; he was granted approval on the third submittal for vinyl. Chairman Quina understood the basis for allowing vinyl on a non-contributing structure. Ms. Statler explained this particular property was on the end of the block that bordered North Hill.

Mr. Mead asked about the muntin profile, and Mr. Esposito provided a sample window. Chairman Quina pointed out the muntins were buried in the glass, and the requirements were for the muntins to be exposed on the outside. Mr. Mead stated the overall profile of the window did not match the historical version. Chairman Quina stated the PGT version of the vinyl window came close to matching, and that this home would be listed as contributing if resurveyed; he suggested maintaining the existing wood windows. Mr. Mead suggested researching clad windows which would meet the historic profile. Ms. Statler offered vinyl windows at 420 N. Reus were approved on a non-contributing renovation in December 2014, one over one with no mullions. Also at 421 W. Blount non-impact vinyl windows were approved on a non-contributing renovation in January 2016. Chairman Quina pointed out the only way to approve vinyl was to determine this was a non-contributing structure, using a vinyl product as appropriate as possible. Mr. Pristera explained in a project he was performing, renovating the wood windows cost the same and possibly was cheaper than replacing depending on the window size. He pointed out that unlike wood windows, you cannot repair vinyl, and they would be replaced at some point. Fabric shields were an option for weather protection. Chairman Quina explained a vinyl clad wood window would be approved. There were no speakers from the audience. Mr. Salter advised the house being as old as it was and being a nice example of style, even though it was listed as non-contributing, did have value and should be preserved; he pointed out the window provided was not acceptable but did not know if the Board could mandate the restoration of the wood windows since they had allowed certain clad windows on contributing structures; he was not willing to approve as submitted.

Mr. Salter made a motion to deny as submitted on the grounds that the proposed window was not an acceptable profile, (Sec. 12-2-10(B)(7)) using a product of its own time, and that the style of the proposed

window, profile, and view from the street was not in keeping with the theme of the neighborhood. Ms. Campbell-Hatler seconded, and it carried unanimously.

Item 6 **820 N. Baylen Street** **NHPD**
Contributing Structure **PR-2**

Action taken: Approved with comments.

Paula and Jared Willets are requesting approval to add a rear porch and staircase to a contributing structure. Comments from North Hill were commendable.

Mr. Salter liked the back porch and addressed the CMU columns being 6x6x12. Mr. Willets stated the ones on the front were constructed of cinderblock, and they also preferred to use them on the rear. Mr. Mead asked if they considered a different roofline to keep the integrity of the symmetry of the porch. Ms. Willets did not know if there was enough room in between the eave and where it starts to make it separate; on the front of the house it comes off the second story. Chairman Quina advised one easy way would be to have the extension stop just short of the primary façade, so it would return first and then extend down, which would give cover and maintain the balance. **Mr. Mead made a motion to approve with tracking the stairway cover extension back to the line of the column, seconded by Ms. Fogarty. With no speakers, the motion carried unanimously.**

Item 7 **514 E. Government Street** **PHD**
New Construction **HC-1 / Wood Cottages**

Action taken: Approved with comments.

Greg Uzdevenes is requesting approval for a new single family residence with an attached carport. Mr. Uzdevenes presented to the Board and stated Ms. Fetterman asked Mr. Quina to design a house for her in 2017, but the construction costs exceeded her budget. Mr. Uzdevenes had been retained to construct the house within their financial limits. Mr. Salter pointed out Type I and Type II in this district limit the setbacks to 15' from the street. This setback is 32' from the sidewalk which is a significant difference; he was concerned this would not maintain the streetscape. Mr. Harding advised streetscape for Type I was a setback of 15' from the street edge; he thought this would be intended as a minimum. Mr. Salter noted most of the structures at this location were closer to the street. Ms. Fetterman stated the original photograph of the house showed it was set back far enough for two cars in front of it. Mr. Salter pointed out according to the minutes, it was farther back than the previously approved house. Mr. Quina's setback was at 22.9' and the current setback was at 32'. Ms. Fetterman indicated she was not opposed to bringing the house closer to the street.

Mr. Salter asked if they would oppose one additional window on the front. Ms. Fetterman explained because of the tiny little room behind those windows, they were going to place a bookshelf at this location, and she preferred fewer windows in the house for security reasons. Chairman Quina pointed out the Board had approved front shutters, and what they were proposing was a door, a blank (shutter), and a window and the shutters would be closed. He confirmed the previous setback was approved at 22.9'. With no speakers, Mr. Salter asked about the City's stance on the 15' setback (minimum or set). Mr. Harding stated historically, they had considered it a minimum because it dictates where the buildable area begins in the PHD. Mr. Pristera felt the current setback was too far back from the street, and it should match the neighboring properties or at least be close to them. Since the applicant already had a previous approval for 22.9' **Mr. Salter made a motion to approve with no greater setback than 22.9'. Ms. Fogarty seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.**

Item 8 **200 BLK S. 9th Avenue** **PHD**
New Construction **HC-1 / Brick Structures**

Action taken: Denied as submitted.

Allen Bounds, Bounds Architecture Studio, is seeking final approval for a single-family residence. This project was previously presented to the ARB in May 2018 and in November and December 2017. Mr. Bounds presented to the Board and stated he was hired to begin from scratch on this project. He presented the structure as Type III, and stated the property was unique. He explained the intent was to hold down the street front on 9th Avenue, sliding the structure up to the sidewalk and providing the mass that would continue with the adjacent lot owners. The ECUA pumping facility is located on the far west side, with an easement consisting of an asphalt drive. Chairman Quina asked what was proposed in the rear yard, and Mr. Bounds indicated landscaping was proposed in the back section, and there was a chain link fence between this property and the ECUA property. Chairman Quina advised the north elevation where they indicated a garage and concrete fence would be highly visible from 9th Avenue. Mr. Bounds stated the fence would not enclose the remaining portion of the property.

Mr. Mead addressed the overall massing roofline, the hips mixing with the New Orleans type body. Mr. Bounds stated they wanted the massing as close to the front setback as possible, and as it proceeds to the rear, it would have a more traditional roof shape which would be akin to some of the structures which have a brick façade and a traditional V-shaped roof in the cottage district. He pointed out the property was surrounded by wood cottages on the rear side. Mr. Mead suggested dealing with the townhouse motif and carrying the hip forward. Chairman Quina offered it appeared to be two houses on the east and west side, with the balconies, gardens and landscaping having more importance than the main elevation. He inquired about the brick, and Mr. Bounds stated the property had terrible soils with a piling structure and garage underneath. Taking the brick up higher would subject it to cracking, and Chairman Quina suggested using stucco instead. Ms. Statler confirmed the entire structure could be stucco to meet the guidelines.

Ms. Campbell-Hatler advised the windows on the east and west elevation were nice and suggested continuing to develop that language with a warehouse feel. She did suggest reconsidering the rear and the proportion of the stairs and placing the masonry all the way down. Mr. Mead suggested using scribed stucco below the line and smooth above which would be very appropriate. Mr. Salter had the same concerns. He pointed out to the north of the property was Privateers Alley and asked if they had considered setting the structure back. He said that did not seem to work, but changing the materials could make it possible. Chairman Quina explained bringing the structure forward would create a storefront feel. He suggested the entrance from the street through the lower garden with a door leading up to the foyer, but the scale needed to be proportional and suggested softening the garden with railings. Ms. Fogarty echoed everything but asked about the Cypress trellis at the north, and Mr. Bounds stated it bumped out as far as the extension, and the idea was to repeat this around the house with the Cypress brackets. Ms. Fogarty suggested this treatment be on the same scale.

Chairman Quina explained the item was for final approval, but the level of detail was not adequate for final approval in terms of the drawings, and more detail information was needed for the portion facing 9th Avenue, paying attention to the wall on 9th Avenue since there were very few fences on the street in the downtown district. **Mr. Mead made a motion to deny as submitted and encouraged the applicant to resubmit with response to the Board's comments. Ms. Campbell-Hatler seconded.** Steven Steck, the owner, addressed the Board and stated they really liked the brick on the bottom and liked stucco on the front but asked that the houses to the north not define what the rest of them were trying to do. Since there was so much stucco to the north, they were trying for a little more diverse material. Chairman Quina explained they could do the whole building in brick but be cognizant of how that detail would work with brick transitioning to stucco. Mr. Mead stated the issue was the way the materials were mixed and needed to be integrated more. Since they had started the process over again, Mr. Steck thanked the Board for their consideration and patience. **The motion then carried unanimously. Mr.**

Mead clarified his motion was that the proposal was inconsistent with 12-2-10(A)(8) and 12-2.2 with regard to integration and consistency with the standards set forth in PHD.

Item 9 **1304 N. Barcelona Street** **NHPD**
Contributing Structure **PR-1AAA**

Action taken: Approved with abbreviated review.

Scott Sallis, Dalrymple Sallis Architecture, is requesting approval for exterior modifications and additions to a contributing structure. Mr. Sallis presented to the Board and stated that North Hill appreciated the design and detail of the proposed renovations. Mr. Pristera addressed the gothic fencing, and Mr. Sallis advised a document from the City had indicated among the styles to choose from, Gothic was the most decorative that matched. Ms. Shadiya pointed out the adjacent property also had the Gothic fencing, and they wanted to maintain that style. Mr. Salter pointed out the horizontal pool house fencing, and Mr. Sallis advised his client's style was contemporary, and anything inside the fence, they wanted contemporary. He clarified there were different types of fencing on the property, with a high budget main fence on the corner that consists of masonry pylons and metal, and the picket style fence matches the windows. All of the fencing along Barcelona would not be visible because of existing vegetation. The painted wooden fence was at the rear property line and not on the corner. He explained the side yard and pool area was constructed for entertainment with the idea that a significant amount of guests would come from street parking directly to the pool yard, so they wanted to make that entrance clear. Mr. Mead stated with the gate, to possibly use some kind of return like the rear yard view where the door drops into the window band. Chairman Quina suggested making it more contemporary. Mr. Pristera asked about the lot coverage and setbacks, and Mr. Harding explained everything was in compliance. **Mr. Mead made a motion to approve with an abbreviated review on the gate element. Mr. Salter seconded the motion, and with no speakers, the motion carried unanimously.**

Item 10 **109 W. Romana Street** **PHBD / GCD**
Contributing Structure **C-2A**

Action taken: Approved with abbreviated review.

Scott Sallis, Dalrymple Sallis Architecture, is requesting approval of exterior modifications to a contributing structure including a change of paint color, the installation of windows on the front and side elevations, and replacement side doors. Mr. Sallis presented to the Board and stated new clients would operate their businesses within this warehouse. He explained they wanted more light with more windows; the two main window additions would be along the Romana street front; they also wanted two additional windows along the west façade which faces the parking lot and the One Pensacola Plaza building. He explained they would continue to paint the building white, with the doors and windows being dark bronze to contrast the white. Mr. Salter addressed the window muntins on Romana Street and was not sure the windows needed more division for this building style. **Mr. Mead made a motion to approve as revised with the addition of a paint treatment to make the front façade on the Romana door more visually harmonious with the new window treatments and remove the muntins which can go through an abbreviated review. Ms. Fogarty seconded the motion, and with no speakers, it carried unanimously.**

Item 11 **30 W. Garden Street** **PHBD**
New Construction **C-2A**

Action taken: Conceptual Approval with comments.

George Williams is seeking *conceptual* approval for a new two story bank building on the corner lot currently occupied by the Beach Bank drive-through lanes. Ms. Wiczorek addressed the Board and

stated they preferred to push the building to the property line and create a bookend for the block. She stated parking was on the back side, so the entry would be on the south side. There is an egress door on the north side of the building, but no entry on Garden Street. The bank wanted the control point to be on the parking side. There will be sidewalks on Garden and Baylen with plantings and a bus stop. The structure would be brick and glass, with the north and west sides being a more modern look. She furnished a canopy illustration. Mr. Salter pointed out they were placing the final piece in this block, and there was the opportunity to do something which does not have to relate to other buildings and encouraged more exploration into what this could mean to this block. With every building in the block having an entrance on Garden Street, it was a concern that this one did not, and he asked as the project developed to reconsider since downtowns were established for walking; he encouraged moving the entrance back to Garden Street. Chairman Quina appreciated the bank locating at this corner but agreed that this could be a flashier bookend. He also pointed out common lines with the adjacent buildings that could apply to the windows and the brick. Ms. Campbell-Hatler agreed with reconsidering the entry on the front. Ms. Wiczorek indicated she could pass along the comments of the Board. Depending on how this project moves forward, Mr. Harding explained the Board would also have to approve the demolition of the existing structure. **With no speakers, Mr. Salter made a motion for conceptual approval with comments noted to be considered as the project is developed. Mr. Mead seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.**
(Item 12 was pulled and the Board moved to Item 16 to accommodate Mr. Yee in Item 13)

Item 16

217 E. Zaragoza Street

PHD

Contributing Structure

HC-1 / Brick Structures

Action taken: Approved with abbreviated review.

The UWF Historic Trust is requesting approval to build a 12'x16' storage shed adjacent to the Quina-Singh House. Mr. Pristera explained the shed would accommodate gasoline-powered equipment which could be a temporary solution until they find another location. This would allow easy access to the equipment and would not be visible from the Historic Village but would be visible from Main Street. Even though the shed would not have deep foundations, the archaeologists suggested keeping it close to Main Street. He also explained they wanted to match the Quina-Singh property. Ms. Campbell-Hatler indicated the shed was lovely. Ms. Fogarty asked about the elevation on Main Street, and Mr. Pristera advised they could use faux shutters with the metal roof. **Mr. Mead made a motion to approve with the addition of the metal roof consistent with the Quina-Singh House with the addition of two faux dual-leaf shutters on the Main Street facing side and otherwise details to match the Quina-Singh House to be submitted in an abbreviated review. Mr. Salter stated regarding the window proportion between the proposed design and the example, he felt that the example shed was more in keeping with the style of the area. Mr. Mead agreed but also thought they needed to make sure they were tying into the Singh structure, and this could be in an abbreviated review. Mr. Salter seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.**

Item 13

100 BLK W. Garden Street

PHBD

New Construction

C-2A

Action taken: Conceptual Approval with comments.

Jordan Yee is requesting *conceptual* approval for a two-story commercial development. The future site will be located in the south half of an existing parking lot on the northeast corner of Garden and Spring Streets. Mr. Salter recused himself from the item since he was involved with the project. Mr. Yee presented to the Board and stated they wanted conceptual approval for a food hall to be located in a vacant parking lot. He pointed out the adjacent buildings were built in the 1970s, and this was an urban

corner. The structure would front both Garden and Spring. Mr. McKenzie stated the concept was the same as European markets. It would house local artisan restaurants and local boutiques. It would also have an entertainment element. Mr. Yee had provided supplemental information but stated the plan was essentially the same. He clarified there would be 10 to 11 vendors with different types of food, and the food hall was a low entry for new businesses in Pensacola. Chairman Quina preferred the new version of the Spring Street entry presenting more of a shade structure and thought it was very appropriate for that corner. Mr. Yee indicated they wanted a fenced children's area for families. Mr. Mead suggested pines along the Spring Street side. Ms. Campbell-Hatler suggested a playground in the center with the tables surrounding so parents could watch their children. Mr. Mc Kenzie advised they wanted to use more sculpture rather than regular playground equipment. He also indicated the second floor could be used for meeting purposes. Ms. Fogarty indicated this was a great concept for that corner. **Mr. Mead made a motion to approve conceptually, seconded by Ms. Campbell-Hatler, and it carried 4 to 1 with Mr. Salter abstaining.**

OPEN FORUM – None

DISCUSSION – None

ADJOURNMENT – With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:03 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,



Gregg Harding
Secretary to the Board