



MINUTES OF THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

March 19, 2020

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairperson Quina, Vice Chairperson Crawford, Board Member Fogarty, Board Member Mead, Board Member Villegas

MEMBERS ABSENT: Board Member Campbell-Hatler, Board Member Salter

STAFF PRESENT: Historic Preservation Planner Harding, Senior Planner Statler, Board Advisor Pristera, Assistant City Attorney Lindsay, Assistant Planning Director Cannon, Network Engineer Chris Johnston

OTHERS PRESENT: James Bozeman, Bryan Creed, George Williams, Myles Sampson, Brian Spencer, Melanie Nichols

CALL TO ORDER / QUORUM PRESENT

Chairperson Quina called the Architectural Review Board (ARB) meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. with a quorum present and explained the Board procedures to the audience as well as the City's adoption of social distancing requirements to limit the spread of Covid-19.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Board Member Villegas made a motion to approve the February 20, 2020 minutes, seconded by Board Member Fogarty, and it carried unanimously.

OPEN FORUM - None

NEW BUSINESS

Item 1

18 and 20 E. Garden St

PHBD

Contributing Structures

C-2A

Action taken: Approved.

Scott Sallis is requesting approval to renovate the storefronts of two retail spaces. This project came before the Board at the February 2020 meeting where modifications to 20 E. Garden Street was approved as presented. A request for modifications to 18 E. Garden Street was, however, denied due to consideration of the sill walls.

Mr. Sallis addressed the Board and presented historical pictures which illustrated the many different facades of the properties and the extent of glazing. Mr. Pristera advised they had found the pictures, and the walls were not original as well.

Board Member Crawford made a motion to approve, seconded by Board Member Mead. With no audience speakers, the motion carried unanimously.

Item 2 **415 N. Alcaniz Street** **OEHPD / OEHC-1**
Contributing Structure

Action taken: Conceptual approval with exceptions.

Scott Sallis is requesting *CONCEPTUAL* approval to renovate the 1928 Mount Olive Christian Church.

Mr. Sallis addressed the Board and stated Nashville developers purchased this building and agreed to disrupt the exterior of the building as little as possible. He explained it would be a boarding house, airbnb style with a custom restaurant. Chairperson Quina suggested this could also become an affordable housing project. He also asked about window placement, and Mr. Sallis stated they had not decided since this was conceptual, and they had not chosen a brand. The large worship center would require a different system, and budget might not allow for a curtain wall system. He indicated the original smaller windows were wood with the taller sanctuary windows being steel with single-pane glass.

Board Member Mead indicated it appeared the exterior was unpainted brick, and the pale beige diminished the pediment; he was concerned about preserving as much as possible the historic fabric of the brick since it appeared to be a dominating character of the building. Mr. Sallis indicated the overall masonry of the building was chaotic, and different sides of the building were using masonry in different ways. They were not led to work hard to preserve it in that sense. The masonry inside was chaos, with one wall being tile, with the other brick, and there was no order. He explained they were painting the building, and the masonry wall had no ability to place a vapor barrier; with the present codes, they would have a weather barrier on the exterior walls and insulate from the inside. He also stated the clients and neighborhood were happy with their approach. Mr. Mead was concerned with the treatment of the brick sides of the pediment and the difference between the base and body. Mr. Sallis explained the white pediment was not original; it was brick covered in stucco. The parking lot will be paved with pavers and can be used as an event space. He advised they were required to have 9 to 10 parking spaces; they would also have street parking and with CRA reductions, no parking for the restaurant. Regarding the paint, staff stated typically, this Board had not reviewed paint colors for Old East Hill, and Board Member Mead stated it was not the paint color but painting over the brick that was a concern since it was a contributing structure.

Board Member Mead made a motion to approve conceptually with the following exceptions: Further discussion of painting the brick and the impact of the selection of colors and the method of painting the brick, and the details on how they affect the pediments both the primary and secondary. Board Member Villegas seconded the motion. Staff advised there were comments from the neighborhood which indicated they were happy with the project but concerned about parking. **The motion then carried unanimously.**

Item 3 **804 E. Wright Street** **OEHPD / OEHC-2**
New Construction
Action taken: Approved with abbreviated review.

George Williams is seeking final approval for a new single story retail building. The new space will be an addition to the DUH commercial campus and has been designed to match the existing building to the east.

Mr. Williams presented to the Board and furnished information to the Board members and stated the structure would be a continuation of the main structure. He advised the original building they were adjacent to needs repainting and minor repair to the board and batten. The landscape plan was being designed. The survey had been completed but there was no stormwater plan, however the plan was to use the property between the buildings as a nice swell; the original plan for a pond had been negated. The neighborhood wanted to make sure the materials presented would be the ones installed. He also indicated they had adequate parking without adding additional spaces. Board Member Mead advised he liked the relating to the railroad warehouse. Regarding the brackets, he asked if they had considered inspiration from the railhouse since the brackets did not really relate to the site. He asked about the lighting detail, and Mr. Williams stated they would have soffit lighting under the overhang. Board Member Villegas felt the renderings were not presented properly and had a problem with final approval, and Board Member Crawford agreed. Board Member Mead agreed the landscaping was a concern and explained the cedar tree should probably be kept. Board Member Fogarty was concerned with the bracket columns looking spindly. **Board Member Crawford made a motion to approve with an abbreviated review on landscaping, more detail on the bracket columns for the front porch, final stormwater layout and final storefront details. Board Member Villegas seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.**

Item 4

400 BLK Cevallos St

PHD / HC-1 Wood
Cottages

New Construction

Action taken: Approved with abbreviated review.

Brian Spencer is requesting final approval for a new multi-family residential building. This project received conceptual approval in September 2017. While the scale of the building has changed, the configuration of the setbacks and design concept remain consistent with those approved in 2017.

Mr. Spencer presented to the Board and advised this project provided high density with concealed parking. The condominium project consists of 8 residences, ranging from 1100 sq ft to 2010 sq ft. He explained the neighboring property was also an 8 residency condominium structure. He indicated all materials had been furnished to the Board. He also stated there was an intentional skirting on the sides, providing a more neighborhood feel base. He advised Marvin fiberglass windows were a much better product for historical structures. He explained they were using a combination of Artisan lapsiding and board and batten with a Benjamin Moore color palette, along with two types of guardrails, one being louvered and the other picket. He also stated there would be a standing seam metal roof. Chairperson Quina suggested this structure would complete the corner. Board Member Crawford pointed out two miniscule brackets holding up the massive bay. Board Member Mead suggested considering the same setup as the Bayfront side to give more substance. Board Member Crawford suggested a corbeled beam. Board Member Villegas addressed the board and batten mix, and Mr. Spencer felt that as the mass moved around the curve, he wanted to accentuate that with a change in the direction of the material.

Board Member Crawford made a motion to approve with the name of the paint chips, a review of the brackets on the east facing balcony, and the landscape plan for an abbreviated review. The motion was seconded by Board Member Fogarty and carried unanimously.

Item 5 **5 E. Garden Street** **PHBD / C-2A**
Contributing Structure

Action taken: Approved with material provided.

Carter Quina, Quina Grundhoefer Architects, is requesting approval to install nine new aluminum windows in existing masonry openings.

Chairperson Quina recused himself since he was presenting the item. He advised that Perrett wood was the preferred product for the third floor, using the all wood mahogany windows to match the original vinyl window along with insulated impact-rated glass. The same window will be used on the second floor as Phase II. He also explained by using this product, they were assured of their tax credit for a 20 percent savings. He pointed out there were no original windows left.

Board Member Mead made a motion to approve. Board Member Crawford asked that the material be provided as part of the approval; the amendment was accepted. The motion was seconded by Board Member Villegas, and it carried 4 to 1 with Chairperson Quina recusing.

Item 6
Demolition / Contributing Structure **211 W. Cervantes Street** **NHPD / PC-1**

Action taken: No action taken.

Bryan Creed will be requesting approval to demolish a contributing structure at the April 2020 meeting. The following discussion is meant to introduce the Board to the proposed project and to request that the Board hold a special on-site meeting to gather information. No action on this item will be taken at this meeting.

Mr. Creed addressed the Board and stated he purchased the building in January, and after discussion with Mr. Spencer, it was suggested that the building be taken down to provide a safer structure for the proposed project. It was noted that Historical Preservation Planner Harding, Mr. Pristera and Board Member Villegas had already toured the building. Mr. Pristera advised it would be his fear it would be a reconstruction, tearing it down to the frame, removing the roof, and he was trying to track down the history of the changes to see what would be original and significant to its story. He explained it was a hodge-podge of things and encouraged the Board members to go through it. Board Member Villegas stated there had been a fire in the roof, but it consisted of old heart pine and would not be as much of a reconstruction project. Mr. Creed stated the intended use would be an assisted living facility which would feel like a home to the residents.

Historical Preservation Planner Harding stated that originally they had wanted to hold a special meeting on this property, but the Building Official advised they should not have a special meeting because it was not ADA complaint and not safe enough to have a large group tour at the same time. He also advised North Hill had been invited to tour the building. Board Member Mead explained this was an atypical structure on Cervantes, and

he was not aware of any other structure in town like it. Board Member Villegas stated she had already visited the structure and did not want to push her opinion until other members had visited.

Mr. Spencer explained this would be an introduction which might lead to a replacement for the Board to review. He explained that West Florida Preservation Inc. played a major role in reviewing the proposed replacements both architecturally and from a programming standpoint. At one point, a law firm had proposed to build there, but West Florida did not believe that was the appropriate use. He advised there were memorable streetscape elements and pieces which could reappear in a new building and rejuvenate the streetscape.

Board Member Villegas agreed with the hodge-podge context. Historically, there was also space for the marrying of ideas, and there were many historical structures in our country where they chose to bring together ideas which had different architectural designs. In the last two years, the buildings within that two-block area had been purchased and were being restored. Board Member Mead stated when West Cervantes was widened, they took more of the frontage of the south side and asked that staff furnish more information on the various plans or possibilities with road diet and what would be feasible. Staff advised that this structure was zoned commercial PC-1 and furnished the setbacks. Mr. Spencer stated if any variances were necessary to maintain the proximity and the scale, including height variances, they would put forth a conceptual design requesting those variances. They completely recognized the importance of the continuity of streetscape.

Ms. Nichols furnished the Board with pictures of the Cervantes gateway and presented an overview of North Hill properties which had been renovated. She explained you need to look past the scars, and at least the interior is already blown out for a new use. They appreciated Mr. Creed and Mr. Spencer for their efforts but wanted the Board to review this property seriously since this was a one-of-a-kind structure. Chairperson Quina confirmed that from North Hill's perspective, similar homes in similar conditions had been restored to pleasant and stable uses. Mr. Creed provided his email and phone number to the Board and thanked them for their time and consideration.

Item 7

15, 17, 19 W. Strong St

NHPD / PC-1

New Construction

Action taken: Denied.

Jim Bozeman is requesting approval for changes to three new single-family residences. This project initially came before the Board in September 2017 and was approved with comments. At that time, a Variance to reduce the required rear yard setback was also approved. Because of design changes, the current plans were referred to the Board during the required Planning and Zoning Review.

Chairperson Quina confirmed this was the continuation of the Covington Place project. Mr. Bozeman stated one of the changes was to make the porch 6' instead of 4' and inside they opened up the side units with a side porch which allowed the owners to go out on a small patio. The color scheme was basically the same.

Ms. Nichols advised North Hill was excited about the new plan with the porches being deepened. In 2017, the project originally had turned wood spindles and wood railings, but when the project was executed, it turned into aluminum railings and handrails. Also, the

courtyard wall was lost, and the stair handrails in some places reach down to city sidewalks. The gate was pushed forward to the street and attached to the staircase. These new homes will face Victorian homes, so they were concerned in getting them right moving forward, ensuring any changes return to the Board. Mr. Bozeman advised he would be addressing the gates and the aluminum rails. Board Member Mead asked what happened regarding all the variations. The first set of buildings were built, but now they were significantly modifying exterior elevations in a far more derogatory way, architecturally speaking, compared to what was approved in 2017, particularly with those facing the east and west sides. He was still concerned with the porches, railings and gates with regard to those previously approved. He did not feel comfortable at all with the application here when there was a significant departure unexplained and did not know how they would accomplish what the Board was asked to approve. Mr. Bozeman stated when the next units were turned in, he would not have aluminum. Board Member Mead stated his real issue was when the Board approved something and it did not happen, what was its purpose. He did not feel comfortable moving forward with a change under these circumstances and did not know why the unapproved changes were put in.

Senior Planner Statler could not speak to the unapproved changes but to current policy and procedure. She advised that Planning and Zoning was now fully entrenched in plan review, and all of the plans that come through are looked at with Historical Preservation Planner Harding dealing with the historical districts, and everything the Board sees, he sees; he reviews page by page the construction documents versus what they have submitted, what the Board approved, comparing it to any additional supplemental information which might have been approved as well. She advised they have that system in place now, but could not speak to what happened earlier. She explained moving forward we have a good check and balance method in place. Board Member Mead explained whatever happened with this developer, was approved by the developer first with the process of going forward between the developer and contractor. With a lot more of this site to go forward, he was very concerned about the process and wanted to know where the breakdown occurred. Stated advised they could research more, but with the current procedure, Planning and Zoning has been involved with inspections and permitting in the construction process; construction documents were submitted to the Building Department, and when that happens, Planning and Zoning review would occur. Minor deviations were usually handled internally with an abbreviated review, but this did not meet that criteria. He did expect a number of these projects to come back before the Board as they review these projects in historic districts.

Board Member Mead made a motion to deny the application from the change of the September 2017 approval on the grounds that the deviation from the side elevations are a significant detriment to the street affect of the structure both to the public and to the adjoining property owner and are not in keeping with the overall architectural affect of the front elevation and saw no reason to approve it. Board Member Crawford seconded the motion. He stated the Board would have other applications for structures not yet approved and wanted to know where the process broke down whether it be on the City side or if we could from City records determine where it broke down on the other side if that was the case. He wanted to know the applicant brought forward the project in good faith and did not conclude there was bad faith, but could not conclude there was

good faith all around either.

Mr. Fox stated he came on after the structure was built as a point of contact and would be a point of contact for the future buildings, overseeing the project and sales effort as well. He could not speak to the breakdown. Staff advised they would look through MaxxVault for a history on the project. Mr. Fox gave his contact information if there were any questions moving forward. **The motion then carried unanimously.** Chairman Quina explained a denial meant the applicant must submit a reapplication for next month. He explained the Board wanted to see the changes and a resubmittal for April.

It was determined due to the Covid-19 virus, the scheduling of the April 2020 ARB meeting would be up to Council.

ADJOURNMENT – With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

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

Historic Preservation Planner Harding
Secretary to the Board