



MINUTES OF THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

November 18, 2021

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairperson Salter, Vice Chairperson Mead, Board Member Courtney, Board Member Fogarty, Board Member Ramos, Board Member Yee

MEMBERS ABSENT: Board Member McCorvey

STAFF PRESENT: Historic Preservation Planner Harding, Senior Planner Statler, Advisor Pristera, Assistant City Clerk Tice, Assistant City Attorney Lindsay, Help Desk Technician Russo

STAFF VIRTUAL: Planning Director Morris

OTHERS PRESENT: Mathew Lopez, Sid Williams-Heath, Walter Pierce, Calli Sivils, Brian Stocks, Lois Renaud, Brad Alexander, Summer Carter, Brent Guilbeau, McDaniel Wyatt, Danny Baldassaro, John Buzzell, Jim Homyak, Steve Dana

CALL TO ORDER / QUORUM PRESENT

Chairperson Salter called the meeting to order at 2:03 p.m. with a quorum present. The swearing in of Board Member Mead was conducted by the City Clerk's Office.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Board Member Mead made a motion to approve the October 21, 2021 minutes, seconded by Board Member Ramos, and it carried 6 to 0.

OPEN FORUM - None

NEW BUSINESS

Item 3
Noncontributing Structure
Action taken: Approved.

430 E Intendencia Street

PHD
HR-1 / Wood Cottages

Matthew Lopez is seeking approval for a new accessory structure at a noncontributing structure. It was noted that the garage faced the north which is a private alleyway for the Aragon Neighborhood Association, and there was approval to access the garage from that route. Mr. Lopez addressed the Board and confirmed all the materials and paint colors would be exactly

the same as the main house. With no speakers, **Board Member Mead made a motion to approve, seconded by Board Member Courtney, and it carried 6 to 0.**

Item 4

513 N Davis Hwy

OEHPD

Variance

OEHC-1

Action taken: Approved.

Summer Carter (Northwest Florida Investment Group LLC) is seeking a variance to reduce the side yard setback requirements of Table 12-3.10 of the City of Pensacola Land Development Code. The variance request is to decrease the minimum south side yard setback from 5 feet to 3 feet to accommodate a new single-family residence and access to off-street parking.

Ms. Carter presented to the Board and stated the parking across the street issue and vehicles parked in front of the houses had been addressed with shared driveways in the rear, but that would require a variance to allow enough room between houses for the parking. Staff advised Old East Hill had provided comments. Ms. Carter advised they had received DOT approval to remove the curb cut to accommodate the shared driveway. Staff explained that the only requirements in this zoning district were side yard setbacks which would be reduced to provide more room for the shared driveway. In the prior presentation, the ribbon drives in the front were deemed inappropriate for the district. It was also noted there were no minimum size lot widths in this district. Board Member Mead asked if there was anything in granting this common access that would affect any other lots or parcels in the district. Staff indicated there was a similar case on North Davis Highway which involved 3 houses requesting a similar variance. It was noted this variance request was 3' but the site plan indicated 3.5' just in case; the development was shown as the minimum required to make this plan work; the on-street parking was not on the side of the development and presented a safety issue. Board Member Yee asked Board Member Mead if this answered his questions and showed a variance was appropriate in this instance, and he confirmed he was prepared to approve a variance in this case.

Staff indicated variances were quasi-judicial hearings, and this would become a legal process with all 9 criteria required to be met. **Board Member Ramos made a motion to approve the variance considering that it did meet the variance criteria per Section 12-12-2(A)(2).** Assistant City Attorney Lindsay stated specific findings were required when a variance was denied, but specific findings were not required on approvals as long as the Board made clear that it had considered whether the variance criteria had been met; she asked if 12-13-3(E)(1) had also been met and could the motion be amended to indicate that as well. **Board Member Ramos amended the motion that the variance request met the 12-13-3(E)(1) requirements as well. Board Member Mead seconded the motion, and it carried 6 to 0.**

Item 5

515 N. Davis Hwy

OEHPD

Variance

OEHC-1

Action taken: Approved.

Summer Carter (Northwest Florida Investment Group LLC) is seeking a variance to reduce the side yard setback requirements of Table 12-3.10 of the City of Pensacola Land Development Code. The variance request is to decrease the minimum north side yard setback from 5 feet to 3 feet to accommodate a new single-family residence and access to off-street parking.

Board Member Mead asked staff if there was any difference in 515 No. Davis, and staff confirmed there was not. **Board Member Mead made a motion to approve the variance which met 12-12-2(A)(2) and 12-13-3(E)(1) criteria. Board Members Ramos and Fogarty seconded the motion, and it carried 6 to 0.**

Item 6

513 N. Davis Hwy

**OEHPD
OEHC-1**

New Construction

Action taken: Approved with Abbreviated Review.

Summer Carter (Northwest Florida Investment Group LLC) is requesting *FINAL* review of a new single-family residence.

Ms. Carter addressed the Board and presented pictures of the side and rear doors as well as those in the initial packet; the narrow windows were also replaced with those similar to a residence built just to the north. Old East Hill had requested the roof pitch be increased from 6' to 12' which was the minimum typically allowed. It was determined the siding reveal was 5". The mullion pattern of 2:1 for the windows was preferred and more common to the district. Board Member Courtney thought a transom added over the front door would enhance the appearance. She questioned the dormer, and Advisor Pristera explained the way it was presented, he did not think it added to the house. Board Member Courtney also addressed the top of the slab since there had been issues with sloping off grade. Chairperson Salter stated the measurement was usually 18", and Ms. Carter explained they try to go higher in those instances. She also indicated the corbels would be used on the columns. Advisor Pristera stated they should have been shown on the drawings or at least in an abbreviated review. Board Member Ramos asked if the window pattern could be 2:1 rather than the 6:6, and Ms. Carter stated it could. She asked for clarification on the roof, and Board Member Courtney advised it would look better with a steeper pitch. Board Member Fogarty thought the dormer could be eliminated, a transom over the front door would be nice, and stated the 6:6 windows might be too busy for that neighborhood; she wanted the project to return with revisions to the window mullion pattern.

Board Member Yee suggested removing the dormer for this location, and the transom over the front door was good but wanted them to consider raising the front door height to 8' to match the other side and rear doors; Ms. Carter suggested one door having a transom and one being 8' to differentiate. Board Member Yee suggested increasing the roof pitch to 8:12 which would satisfy Old East Hill. Staff advised while the roof pitch was not specifically discussed, all new construction should complement and reflect the historic district. Board Member Courtney explained there was no CRA overlay in Old East Hill, and this house would appear peculiar. Advisor Pristera explained the typical roof pitch in Old East Hill was usually steeper and 8:12 would be appropriate. Board Member Ramos asked if the roof pitch was too much for an abbreviated review, and staff advised it would be an elevation drawing review, and the Board would determine whether or not it was appropriate. Advisor Pristera explained as an abbreviated reviewer, this house was small enough and as long as the changes were listed clearly, he would be comfortable with that process.

Board Member Yee made a motion to approve with the conditions that 1) the elevation be modified, 2) remove the dormer above the porch, 3) the front door be modified to either include a transom above it or be enlarged to 8' to align with the windows, 4) the porch corbels or brackets be included or eliminated, and 5) the window mullion pattern be 2:1. Chairperson Salter clarified that the approval was based on the revised elevations provided at the meeting. Board Member Ramos seconded the motion with the amendment that the roof pitch be 8:12. The amendment was accepted. Board Member Courtney seconded the motion, and it carried 6 to 0.

Item 7

515 N. Davis Hwy

**OEHPD
OEHC-1**

New Construction

Action taken: Approved with Abbreviated Review.

Summer Carter (Northwest Florida Investment Group LLC) is requesting *FINAL* review of a new single-family residence.

Board Member Courtney indicated the gable vent should be rectangular and not oval, and Chairperson Salter agreed. Ms. Carter advised placing a transom on one door and increasing elevation to 8' on the other would eliminate it looking similar. Board Member Ramos explained the goal was to align the top of the door with the head height of the windows. Chairperson Salter asked if the horizontal windows would be changed like those in 513, and Ms. Carter advised they would. **Board Member Mead explained in light of the prior motion, he would make a motion to approve addressing window mullions consistent with the discussion, adjusting the door head height either by transom or by extending the doorframe upward to match window height, and that it be submitted for abbreviated review. Chairperson Salter amended the motion to include that the front gable be changed to rectangular and considered under the abbreviated review. It was accepted. Board Member Yee amended the motion to increase the roof pitch from 6:12 to 8:12 which was accepted. The motion was seconded by Board Member Fogarty and carried 6 to 0.**

Item 8

18 N. Palafox Street

PHBD

Contributing Structure

C-2A

Action taken: Approved with Abbreviated Review.

Carter Quina is seeking approval to replace the front entry doors at the Rex Theater. The existing wood doors will be replaced with new painted aluminum doors with impact rated glass and applied trim matching the exiting elements.

Mr. Quina presented to the Board and stated they were trying to replicate the look with an aluminum frame, painted shiny red, with yellow trim over the impact glass. They were dealing with a flood proof door company who would create an interior astragal removable door to truly seal the entry in a flooding event. Chairperson Salter explained this building was a defining piece of architecture on Palafox with the doors being that defining characteristic. He understood the doors were wood and a maintenance issue and also understood a change in material of the core of the door, but he could not see the justification for changing exposed and visible design features and characteristics. He felt a door could be constructed that maintained those characteristics and could satisfy the maintenance conditions as well; he could not justify changing the doors to full glass with applied mullions. Board Member Courtney asked if the door could be designed in steel. Mr. Quina explained the exterior of the doors was wood with chrome trim and a high gloss paint. Chairperson Salter pointed out so much of the building was acrylic, plastic or metal, and a steel door would keep the characteristics of the building as long as the style and shape were maintained. Mr. Carter thought it could be replicated in painted hollow metal, but that would represent other maintenance issues, but they could not replicate the door using aluminum frames. The clients had suggested opening up more glass to the street since that was the intention of the retailers along Palafox, creating more relation to the sidewalk, and this was also their main entrance. Chairperson Salter did not believe in the sacrifice of a historical element of the building for the maintenance issue and suggested there were ways to still maintain the architectural feature to be a compromise on both ends, the aesthetics for the history as well as the maintenance.

Board Member Mead pointed out the elevations had changed significantly over the years; the light entry was to minimize the light in the lobby, making its function adaptive to its current use. Board Member Courtney asked if the lighting could be changed in the lobby, and Board Member Mead pointed out it was a church relating to people coming by on the street, and how it is perceived is important. He indicated it was an unconventional view of a church in terms of its origin, but bringing light in dark spaces was not only an architectural point but also a theological point of a church. Mr. Quina advised they looked at the options of saving the old doors, rebuilding them exactly the same, or making them better. Board Member Fogarty asked if they had considered less glass as a

compromise; Mr. Quina suggested red glass, and Board Member Mead pointed out varied colors in glass were also common in churches. Board Member Ramos pointed out the Secretary of Interiors standard for rehabilitation would want the door to be replaced with another identical wood door. For the sake of the flooding issue, location of the building, and the overall preservation, it would be acceptable to change the material of the door but to maintain the same look. Advisor Pristera had an issue with the applied pattern as presented. He did like the compromise with the red film blocking out the corners, keeping the long rectangle of glass and octagon glass which would be a good middle ground for him, but the glass with the applied muntin pattern was too modern for this door. He explained it was a very iconic building, and the doors were a key piece. Mr. Quina advised the church would like a door with as much glass as the Board would allow. **Board Member Fogarty made a motion to approve the door with the modifications: red painted aluminum to infill the top left and right corners and two lower side panels so the only exposed glass is the center vertical column and the octagon. Board Member Mead offered an amendment to include the applied red interior infill at the top glass, and it was accepted. Board Member Mead seconded the motion.** Board Member Fogarty clarified that the colored glass would be more cost effective than the metal, and she was open to either of the options, and Board Member Mead was agreeable. **Chairperson Salter explained the motion was for either metal or glass infill panels of red on the two side vertical pieces and upper corners and applied red infill. The motion failed with Board Members Yee, Fogarty and Mead voting in favor, and Board Members Ramos, Courtney, and Salter dissenting.** Chairperson Salter confirmed that he could make a motion to approve a replacement door matching the same exact criteria of the existing using a different material, and staff agreed. Mr. Quina asked if it would be appropriate for them to request an approval for a replica made in hollow aluminum or an alternative material at this time. **Chairperson Salter made a motion to approve replacement doors for this project under the circumstances and criteria that those replacement doors match the existing in size, shape, window size and applied decoration same profile, but the door materials themselves due to maintenance issues may be of a hollow metal or other wood should that be decided. Regarding fiberglass, he clarified any material that maintains the solid flat visual of the existing, and that the final door returns with material and applied mullion for an abbreviated review. Board Member Courtney seconded the motion, and it carried 6 to 0.**

Item 9

400 S. Jefferson Street

PHD

Contributing Structure - Conceptual

HR-2

Action taken: Denied Without Prejudice.

Carter Quina is seeking conceptual approval for a new rooftop venue and new entry stoop to the existing courtyard and banner replacements on the south façade. Since this is for conceptual review, final review of the proposed alterations and additions will follow at a later date. Additional information and a virtual flyover presentation were provided to the Board.

Mr. Quina presented to the Board and explained the building had been studied for adding a fourth floor. Since the building had magnificent views of Pensacola and the bay, there needed to be access to it. The only stairway was in the southwest corner, which looked like it was designed to proceed to another level; the building was allowed four stories with Type 2A construction and already had a penthouse above the theater. They planned to replace a bottom floor window with a door and a matching stoop and enliven the existing courtyard which would include a new wrought iron gated fence around the patio. They had done some feasibility and construction estimates, an unveiling, and they had a million-dollar donor. He explained with all the use, the building required interior renovations as well.

Chairperson Salter asked about the new proposed rooftop venue and the floor level element – was that as low as it could be. Mr. Quina advised it was since those were structural beams with the ceiling of the theater below. He explained the grid which held up all the stage operations. He also explained the service bar against the wall and the trellis and advised this would not be seen from the ground. Board Member Mead pointed out the banner posts preserved the balance; the penthouse was painted out to minimize its impact, but now we had something different. It was now differing from the established above parapet language; it was radically altering the sense of symmetry as between this element and that element above parapet, but more importantly, the façade on Jefferson Street. He did not know if there was any way to accomplish this without extending something further north to give that balance and catching some element of the ornament in the façade to pick up what was going to be seen in the rooflines. Breaking the symmetry on that prominent corner was problematic. Mr. Quina explained the key place was the stairs in the corner and the elevator opposite of the arch – both of those were already in place down to the foundation of the building. He also explained the building code considered this the 4th floor. He agreed glass could be a consideration. Board Member Ramos advised glass was used in Europe where the rooftop structure was lighter and more modern; if they went more modern, they could mimic the volume of the penthouse on the other side, creating a better balance. He felt the mansard in the corner threw off the balance on multiple facades. Mr. Quina considered the presentation more respectful and more fitting to the location.

Advisor Pristera had seen other buildings with the mansard roof, but if it continued to the corner, he would be more receptive to it. But, if it was glass, that would be more modern, and he felt downtown was going in a new direction with new development. It being a cultural center, the building could pull off the modern design. Most people would be approaching from the north, and symmetry might not be a problem. Mansard was more traditional, but modern glass could possibly make it read as a special feature. Board Member Fogarty wanted to consider something more modern which does not look like it was trying to match the existing – something that contrasts unlike something which disappears. She suggested something resembling the penthouse or plant material surrounding the exterior wall. She did not think the Board should be opposed to moving in a non-traditional direction. Mr. Quina agreed glass would be more expensive than metal but was glad to pursue a more contemporary design. Board Member Mead pointed out they would need to pull out an existing element such as the barrel vault on the Jefferson side.

Board Member Ramos was happy there was a client willing to develop a space like this; the challenge was for the architect to bring back something that addressed the balance and maybe more modern; the presentation today takes away from the existing contributing structure. Board Member Mead had no problem with changing the window to a door on the north side. Chairperson Salter's only concern was the introduction of the podiums and the new lights at the same level and suggested minimizing how they introduced the lights and the steps to not have them compete with the two corner elements. Regarding the rooftop, the cornice line of the building was such a strong and dominant element, he did not see the asymmetry as an issue. He agreed the proposed materials were appropriate for the current presentation but was intrigued by the possibility of introducing a totally different material and maybe something asymmetrical about this mass on the top as well. Mr. Quina asked if this item could be tabled, and Chairperson Salter advised the Board was not allowed to table an item and staff confirmed. Staff explained this was a conceptual review and could return as a conceptual review. **Board Member Mead made a motion to deny without prejudice for resubmission, seconded by Board Member Courtney. The motion then carried 5 to 1 with Chairperson Salter dissenting.**

Item 10

36 E. Garden Street

PHBD

New Construction

C-2A

Action taken: Approved with Abbreviated Review.

Philip Partington is requesting *FINAL* approval for a new single-story commercial building. The proposed plans show a rebuild of the existing building which were conceptually approved in August 2021.

Mr. Partington presented to the Board and provided additional information on the screening of mechanical equipment which was placed in the center of the roof. Since there was a concern about the utilitarian elements (grease traps, etc.), instead of a shed, they provided an alternate elevation, basically pulling the elevation around the back. The living wall is made up of stainless-steel wiring with large 72" aluminum planters on the west wall to soften both elevations. They also have a cast stone base which recesses back to the windows. Chairperson Salter asked about the brick coursing, and Mr. Partington stated it was intentional. Board Member Yee addressed the line that carries across the lower parapet to the higher parapet corner. Mr. Partington confirmed it was brick, and there would be more detail for that brick on the lower portion, and the coping would be aluminum. He indicated each of the bays on the west elevation would have wall sconces with fans in each bay to be selected by an interior design firm. Board Member Mead addressed the rear of the building and the shed roof being exposed to the street. Mr. Partington advised he could not do anything about the doors, but since it was on the west wall, they could wrap the northwest corner with a green wall to soften the elements. Board Member Ramos felt the original treatment at the rear was more appropriate. Mr. Partington was agreeable with the pleasure of the Board. Chairperson Salter advised he did not mind the height or the roof but did mind the material; the original massing of the lower roof was painted brick to match the building and would be more appropriate. The finish is the problem because it looks to be a stucco attachment. Board Member Yee advised another option would be to keep the brick and drop the parapet down. **Board Member Ramos made a motion to approve the design as submitted with the stipulation that the application return for an abbreviated review with the exterior lighting scheme and the revised rear service entrance per the comments discussed. Board Member Mead amended the motion to include putting the service doors under cover or some form of green wall treatment to appropriately treat that façade at the option of the applicant - also for an abbreviated review. Board Member Mead then seconded the motion, and it carried 6 to 0.**

Item 11

200 E. Zaragoza Street

PHD

Conceptual Review

HC-1

Action taken: Conceptually Approved.

The UWF Historic Trust is seeking conceptual review for a structure to cover a locomotive, flatcar, and restored caboose along the side of the Museum of Industry. This covering will help protect three of the largest collection items on display. Being mindful of the historic building and sensitive archaeological site, the proposed design minimizes ground disturbance and physical connections to the brick building. A row of metal columns between the train and the building wall will support a translucent panel system used as roofing. The design takes inspiration for the industrial nature of railroads, historic train sheds, and the adjacent historic commercial buildings.

Mr. Pristera presented to the Board and stated the train was donated in 1968, and since that time had undergone numerous renovations and repairs. It was moved to the current location in 1989. Since he has been at the Trust, he has tried to do more with the train; in 2016 they received a donation for the exterior restoration of the caboose, which is a rare wooden cupola caboose from 1921, and only one other caboose was preserved in a museum. They would like the visitors to be able to engage with it more and celebrate the train. He explained the ideal place would be

inside a climate-controlled building, but the next best option would be to place a solid covering over it. After researching solutions, he saw the majority of structures had an industrial structural feel to them; this is not a passenger train but a logging train and should have an industrial feel to it. The museum was a cold storage warehouse with a dry grocery warehouse across the street. He explained it is hard to see the location of the entrance to the building since it is a warehouse with solid doors, and the ramp is not ADA accessible. Bringing everything to the same level would make it easier to access. Also, this is an archaeological site which requires minimal ground disturbance, and they did not want to rely on the historic brick building for support.

Mr. Spencer advised this was his firm's first opportunity to be professionally engaged with the Historic Trust, and they were honored to have the opportunity. He explained the building was a historic warehouse and somewhat unscathed. As noted, the entrance was clumsy with no architectural signaling for direction, and the one ADA ramp is the same exit ramp for exiting the museum after visiting the trains. With the donation, there was an opportunity to not only address the sheltering of the railcars but to also make an ADA entrance in a plaza where many of the visitors have the opportunity to be in an area where they could prepare for a tour inside the museum. They would then come out the south-facing doors where they see a reader board and the railcars. He explained the strategy was to create a reliable protection for the railcars. He indicated that as they studied it, the kalwall was the light transmitting material which prevented the features to be lost in the shadows. They felt it was appropriate by allowing a structure that minimizes impact on an archaeological site, and they liked the cadence of the grid.

Board Member Mead was impressed with making a train platform out of this display, and it was well thought out. He pointed out the columns inboard of the platform and asked if there was a way they could be moved outboard or integrated with the wall for a more effective area. Mr. Spencer stated he would like to explore the distance between the north edge of the cars and that brick face. Board Member Ramos addressed the curbed ADA ramp and hoped it was accessible. Mr. Spencer explained it was determined on how tight the radius would be. **Board Member Yee advised the design was great and made a motion to approve the conceptual application as submitted, seconded by Board Member Courtney. The motion carried 6 to 0.** Mr. Pristera explained that the project was made possible by a donation from Barbara Goggins who had been a longtime supporter of the Trust but had unexpectedly passed away.

Item 12

200 BLK W. Garden St

PHBD / GCD

New Construction

C-2 / C-2A

Action taken: Approved with Abbreviated Review.

Bearing Point Properties is seeking *FINAL* review of a new mixed-use, multi-family property located at the corner of Garden Street and Spring Street. The proposed mixed-use project includes approximately 329 residential units offered for rent, 53 condominium units offered for sale, and approximately 37,000 square feet of grocery retail space. The conceptual package for this project was approved in August 2021, and the final plans have incorporated the Board's previous comments.

Mr. Buzzell presented to the Board and stated he appreciated the Board's review of the project. Danny Baldassaro advised the project was still 329 residential units with seven levels of parking and ground retail space. The condominium building had not changed.

Mr. Wyatt indicated in August, comments were made that they were too whimsical on the number of materials and material transitions on the north elevation on West Garden. They tried to create more of a central downtown building with masonry structure on the corner. They played down the cornice and cleaned up the lines and brought the masonry up above the grocery and parking element. They adjusted the canopies and awnings on the ground floor to a pedestrian scale. Along

Spring Street, they adjusted the plinth, addressed the exterior windows on the corners, and removed the balconies on those units, treating the windows as more industrial; all the window trims are dark. The openings to the parking about the retail are treated in a similar manner with dark metal and screening. With the existing arch elements on Spring and Garden, they carried the arch theme on the upper floor windows. They also reduced the number of material transitions and increased the masonry for a much cleaner look.

Concerning the line-of-sight study, the garage would not be visible. Even though the garage is seven levels, it does not have a cover on the 7th level and does not project above the sight lines. The prefabricated steel system screening of the condensers above the multi-family structure was added.

Historic Preservation Planner Harding stated in comparing what was conceptually approved to this presentation, the Board's concerns had been addressed. Board Member Mead indicated he liked the changes; he had suggested pulling from the School Board arches as opportunities but explained they did not have to use those arches if they didn't want to. He did point out the historic paver patterns taking elements from the historic school wall as an excellent design choice and a great opportunity and hoped they would be used in some prominent locations to tie things together. Chairperson Salter thought the comments from the Board had been incorporated very well and thought they had balanced some of Pensacola into this building. He really appreciated what had been done at the corner in creating that corner anchor.

Brent Guilbeau addressed the Board concerning the 54 condo units at Romana and Spring. They developed the lobby and amenity space on the first floor; he presented condo elevation development with the materials palate; the typical floor has three 3-bedroom condos and six 2-bedroom condos; they addressed roof top and material changes. Chairperson Salter asked for the stucco colors, and it was clarified that the white stucco would be used in the horizontal balcony areas, and the tan was the large vertical pieces. The brick color was determined to be cherry wood which was the same brick on the apartment complex. The vertical LED lighting on the southeast corner was pointed out. Staff indicated there were no strict lighting requirements in the Palafox Historic Business District. Chairperson Salter was concerned that the vertical lighting to some extent would be going beyond their boundaries. Mr. Guilbeau advised in this case it was more of an accent and not lighting the streetscape. Board Member Yee thought it could be a nice accent. They indicated they would be mindful to any intrusion on the residents. Board Member Mead suggested if it had something that made it wash the building rather than project the light, it would meet the architectural intent. Board Member Ramos asked about the color of the glazing, and Mr. Guilbeau advised that had not been determined. Board Member Mead advised he was not a fan of modern architecture, but he thought they had done a lot to bring the appropriate balance and liked the changes to incorporate the curb on Spring to the north and on the corner of Romana; they read well for those in the building as well as for those on the street. He urged them to keep in the same color palate as the stucco.

Mr. Dana stated they were trying to improve the streetscape and the streetscape experience, with the building being a nice anchor to downtown; connectivity would be improved with wider sidewalks. The paver patterns taken from the historic wall would provide more interest. They had also further developed the amenity courtyards and the rooftop elements on the condo building and a pool deck on top of the garage. Mr. Alexander stated the historic elements they took from the art deco wall on Garden Street was incorporated along Garden, Spring and Romana, repeating the paver patterns. The paver colors were provided. Chairperson Salter stated the introduction to the paver pattern relates to the remnant of the wall, and these elements tie this building to Pensacola. He pointed out regarding the landscape plan, it was generally appropriate except for the palm tree. Because this project was in the historic district, maintaining the fabric in the building

as well as the landscaping was important, and the palm tree represented a tropical environment; for this project, that one element was not appropriate. Board Member Mead agreed with that comment. Mr. Dana was happy to change that on the streetscape. He did feel that they worked in the courtyards since there was underground stormwater storage, and they were limited in tree canopies. Chairperson Salter stated with the courtyards, they were creating an environment for the residents, and he did not have an issue with them in that location but not on the public streets. Board Member Courtney asked that they use native plants to make everyone's life easier. Advisor Pristera asked if Public Works would review the right-of-way, and staff advised they would. Mr. Dana advised they bumped Garden Street out to the DOT right-of-way to allow enough room for the sidewalk and to get up to the new building finished floor; they did the same on the northern half of Spring Street. Board Member Ramos pointed out the need for more work on the condo entrance side and landscaping, but he felt the project was going in the right direction. Board Member Mead clarified the Board had approved demolition contingent on this final approval, and staff stated the demolition had been approved, but what had not been approved was the allowance to pull the demolition permit.

Board Member Mead made a motion for final approval and gave appreciative thanks for the effort put into the rework. Chairperson Salter made an amendment that the palm trees were not approved and would need to be substituted with a more appropriate tree, and it was accepted. Board Member Fogarty amended the motion to require that the final finish selections for the condo unit be submitted for an abbreviated review, and it was accepted. Staff confirmed any changes would be submitted for an abbreviated review. Advisor Pristera noted on other large projects, the Board required physical samples of the brick, and this was agreed to by the applicants. Staff explained the abbreviated review process would take 7 to 10 days and would be presented to an architect on the Board to review internally and then presented to Mr. Pristera as the ARB Advisor. Board Member Mead amended the motion to include samples. Chairperson Salter wanted an amendment to clarify that the building signage was not included in the approval, and it was accepted. Board Member Yee seconded the motion, and it carried 6 to 0.

ADJOURNMENT – With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:48 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

11.30.2021

Historic Preservation Planner Harding
Secretary to the Board