



MINUTES OF THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

June 16, 2022

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairperson Salter, Vice Chairperson Mead, Board Member Courtney, Board Member Fogarty, Board Member McCorvey, Board Member Yee, Advisor Pristera

MEMBERS ABSENT: Board Member Ramos

STAFF PRESENT: Historic Preservation Planner Harding, Senior Planner Statler, Digital Media Specialist Johnston, Help Desk Technician Russo, Assistant City Attorney Lindsay

STAFF VIRTUAL: Development Services Director Morris, Assistant Planning and Zoning Manager Cannon

OTHERS PRESENT: Michael and Anita Williams, Tim Daniel, Bill and Kathy Winter, Sarah Sisson, Steven Steck, Tosh Belsinger, Aaron Ebent Chad Henderson

CALL TO ORDER / QUORUM PRESENT

Chairperson Salter called the meeting to order at 2:03 p.m. with a quorum present.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Board Member Fogarty made a motion to approve the May 19, 2022, minutes, seconded by Board Member Courtney, and it carried 5-0.

OPEN FORUM - None

NEW BUSINESS

Item 2

221 S. 9th Avenue

PHD / HC-1

New Accessory Structure

Action Taken: Approved.

Elizabeth and Stephen Steck are requesting approval for a 12' x 17' garden shed which will be in the far rear yard of the property and behind the primary structure. Overall, the shed will be visibly screened by fencing and trees and should not be visible from the street. Materials include Hardi lap siding, vinyl windows with simulated divided lites, a 5v-crimp metal roof, and Hardi panel

double doors. Since the shed will be set on of skids, a row of monkey grass will be planted along the base to hide any gap. Colors will be from Benjamin Moore's historic collection and include a Plymouth Brown body with Branch-Port Brown trim.

Historic Preservation Planner Harding clarified that the siding had been changed to board and batten Hardie and distributed images of what the final product would look like.

Mr. Steck presented to the Board and added that board and batten is being used since that is what is on the back of the primary structure. They wanted to tie in the shed as much as possible. The color palette is also very similar. Board Member Fogarty liked the changes and asked in the colors were directly related to the house. Mr. Steck stated that they were very similar and related to the brick but was a bit different from the trim. **With no further questions Board Member Fogarty moved to approve the application as submitted. Board Member Courtney seconded the motion and it carried 5-0.**

Item 3

114 E. Gregory Street

PHBD / C-3

Addition of a window at a contributing structure.

Action taken: Approved.

Kevin and Cheri Hogan are requesting approval to install a new window on the south side of a contributing structure. The work will open a past filled in space and the new window will be one over one bronze aluminum to match the existing.

Ms. Sisson presented to the Board and stated that the owners wanted to reopen a window which had been previously bricked over and tried to match the other windows. There may be some corbeling that may appear as the brick is being removed. If so, the width of the window may change. Chairperson Salter stated that the packet shows a lot of care to open the window and that the architect had done a wonderful job in the application. **Board Member Courtney made a motion to approve as submitted. Board Member Yee seconded the motion and it carried 5-0.**

Item 4

226 N. Spring Street

PHBD / C-2A

Conceptual review for an addition to a contributing structure.

Action Taken: Conceptually approved.

Tim Daniels is requesting conceptual review for a proposed rear addition to a contributing structure. The addition has been designed to communicate with existing shed roofs on the rear and front, and in a way that does not detract from the elevation on West Wright Street. The project will have siding with a matching profile, a brick veneer base with recessed sections, matching windows and shutters, and a matching shingle roof. Since this is for conceptual review, final plans showing any changes and all new materials will follow at a future meeting.

Mr. Daniels presented to the Board and provided hardcopies shows clarifications to the stonework on the front porch and some to the back to match. Everything else will match the main house with brick. While designing the project, he did not want to impact the main house and wanted to design an additional that could be easily added or later removed without much impact to the historic home. Chairperson Salter thought the approach of the addition was very respectful to the existing structure. He questioned the roof pitch which appeared to be between the two existing shed roofs (front and rear) in slope. Mr. Daniels stated that was correct so there would not be able issues with water intrusion, and it fit well with the rear windows. It was 2.5/12 though he was open to changed in the final draft if need be. Chairperson Salter did not think a change was necessary after hearing the reasoning. Board Member Yee thought the applicant had done

a good job and that the addition looked as if it was always there. Board Member Yee confirmed that the roofing would match, and Mr. Daniels said that the intent was for it to match the existing dimensional shingles.

Board Member Fogarty made a motion to conceptually approve as submitted. Board Member McCorvey seconded the motion and it carried 5-0.

Item 5

312 E. Intendencia Street

PHD / HC-1

Conceptual review for new construction.

Action taken: Conceptually approved with comments.

Bill and Kathy Winter are requesting conceptual review for a new single-story single-family residence with an accessory structure attached by an open breezeway. This project received a Variance in February to increase the maximum allowable rear yard coverage and to reduce the required west side yard setback. The conceptual site plans comply with that board order. The drawings depict a board and batten home on slab foundation and covered with a standing seam metal roof. The foundation shows false brick piers set between a recessed stucco-finished background to give the appearance of a historic cottage. Hardie-trimmed columns frame the front porch and windows are 2/1 with operable shutters. Since this item is for conceptual review, the application will return with final plans, materials, and colors.

Mr. and Mrs. Winter presented to the Board. Chairperson Salter thought the massing of the home was appropriate for the area. There were a few items he wanted to discuss for consideration in the final drawings. From the street presence, one difference in this house was that the front door was set back as opposed to being on the street. There are a couple of instances where this exists, so it is not unprecedented. In looking at the plans, he understood why it was designed in this way. These comments were just for consideration though and were not a requirement to be addressed. Chairperson Salter also pointed out the horizontal trim along the bottom of the house appeared thicker in some areas, and thinner in some. He would like some consideration in how that is treated. On historic homes, sometimes there is no trim band and terminates at the foundation wall and the thinner trim is just at the porches. Or when there is trim, sometimes the corner trim comes down and breaks the two. There is also the option of having a thinner profile of horizontal trim that goes all the way around the house for consistency. Advisor Pristera said that having the door set back so far was a little odd, but the floor plan clearly showed why. Having the front porch up front helped and worked well. He liked the front porch feeling. He asked that the design of the garage door be looked at and that it blends in with the house since it will be seen. Perhaps a carriage door style would work. Board Member Yee added to Chairperson Salter's comments on the lower trim band would be to change the porches to concrete slab since that is seen on a lot of historic homes. There is already the block stem wall and the brick piers so if the edge of a concrete slab porch was brought out to overhang the stem wall conditions, he thought it would look appropriate. It was also relatively maintenance free. Board Member Fogarty suggested that the front door could be brought up one bay, but overall, everything was very nice. Board Member Yee suggested that a window may be missing from the plans but that could be addressed in the final review. **Board Member Yee made a motion to conceptually approve making note of the comments that were made during the review. Board Member Courtney seconded the motion and it carried 5-0.**

Item 6

209 S. Alcaniz Street

PHD / HC-1

Conceptual review for new construction.

Action taken: Conceptual approval with comments.

Michael and Anita Williams are seeking final review and approval for a new single-family residence. The new Victorian-style home will have finished floor elevation of 2'-8" and will be two-story with a maximum height of around 30'. Materials include a brick veneer base, fiber cement lap siding and shake siding, vinyl double hung windows, wood handrails with turned spindles, and a paver ribbon drive. The applicant would like to use either custom or antique wood doors and exterior lighting fixtures and is requesting that those products follow in an abbreviated review once found. The existing fence is planned to remain, and the existing curb cut will be reused.

Historic Preservation Planner Harding stated that he had received a written notice requesting that the review be changed from final review to conceptual review. Mr. Williams confirmed that was correct.

Mr. and Mrs. Williams presented to the Board. Mr. Williams asked to have some preliminary clarifications on window patterns and final review requirements. Chairman Salter stated that a one over one window for this style of house would be appropriate and addressed the level of detail required for a complete final packet regarding materials. He believed there were some proportional issues with the front of the house and the turret element since it was not a true turret. In his opinion, it was combining two traditional elements of a folk Victorian to create one that was unique. Mr. Williams stated that was correct. Chairperson Salter stated that a lot of Victorians have a bay window element that sit on the edge and even go up two stories, but they often stop at the main roof line. The turret reads as being too skinny. This district does not have many original Victorians. If the turret were to remain, he thought there should be some adjustments to its proportion so that it's a little wider or that it might be made into an octagonal element once it's wrapped around the side. Mr. Williams understood and agreed. He asked with the width constraints of the lot, could the turret come out from the side another foot and a half? Chairperson thought it would be possible to bring the turret out a little bit. Looking at the site plan, he wondered if it could be brought out of the corner a little bit, to stick out and wrap back into the house, it may help. Having a hipped roof behind the turret may help as well and would keep with a folk Victorian style. In taking that back to the architect, he is more than welcome to contact Advisor Pristera or Chairperson Salter to work through it to get something that Mr. Williams is happy with and something that fits in with the district. Chairperson Salter also commented on the second-floor cantilevered extension. On a house like this, there would typically be brackets. There is also a decorative element applied to the fascia that could have some form a decorative bracket or corbel to tie in with the house.

Advisor Pristera stated that he met with the applicant and architect and brought up several examples of existing Victorians with turrets. He suggested a bigger bay with a gable on it. One of one window was appropriate in Victorians. Several Victorians are within the district, but most of them had been moved into the district from elsewhere. The original house was a Creole Cottage. The existing iron fence was not original.

Mr. Williams could see how the bay window would be less challenging and could fit in well with the district. He also wanted to find an old door to use on the front and stained glass to hang on the inside of the windows. Board Member Courtney stated that there were several ways to attach stained glass to interior of windows. Advisor Pristera and staff commented that the use of an antique door would be a call by the Building Official since a Florida product approval number or engineering report will be needed.

Board Member Mead arrived.

Board Member mead stated that he had a chance to review the packet very carefully. He found the cupola on top of the tower is difficult and it appear more of an Italianate style. Overall, eclectic is widely used in this area, so mixtures of styles can be done. However, this has more of a Victorian-Italianate style, but that does not carry to the rest of the elevations. It should be more incorporated into the roof forms. Overall, the front façade should work. The cupola is too flat and should be more pointed, a little more gothic if the Victorian theme is to be used. The shingle siding treatment is appropriate for a Victorian.

Item 7	39 E. Chase Street	PHBD / C-2A
Demolition of a noncontributing structure		
Action taken: Approved		

Mr. Henderson provided an overview of the East Garden District plan. Board Member Mead pointed out that it was a noncontributing structure, and its review was not contingent on replacement plans per Sec. 12-3-10(1)j. He found that the building did not have any historical significance per the section of ordinance.

Item 7 **39 E. Chase Street** **PHBD / C-2A**
Conceptual review for new construction.

Chad Henderson and Tosh Belsinger are requesting conceptual review of a new hotel. The proposed new construction will be a Hilton Tapestry and will consist of nine stories. The first floor will be a lobby, restaurant, and kitchen, and the second floor will consist of two ballrooms, a meeting room, and fitness room. Floors two through eight will be guest rooms, and the ninth floor will have a rooftop restaurant and bar. This review includes a conceptual site plan, floor plans and building elevations along with detailed renderings. Although the renderings show the greater East Garden District plan, this review is only for the hotel building and site. Façade materials were chosen to complement the historic commercial district with precast stone and brick being the primary elements. Since this is for conceptual review, a final review with more information on specific materials will follow.

Mr. Ebent presented to the Board and provided an architectural overview of the proposed hotel building. Chairman Salter stated that this is a very exciting project and that this section of town needed an addition like this. In regards to the hotel design, he had several comments. Since the building sits on the corner (Jefferson and Chase), and since the front of the building is identified as being on Jefferson, the Chase Street side appears to be a service elevation with mechanical screening on the second floor. Chase Street is one-way and is somewhat of an exit street out of Pensacola as opposed to an entrance. Keeping that in mind, he didn't have an issue with how it is laid out but would like to see further consideration on how the mechanical screening and the Chase Street elements are addressed since much of it will be visible, both from the street level and from the elevated roadways. He wanted this elevation to have a lot of care. Chairperson Salter also spoke to the middle masonry sections. He appreciated the masonry element and wanted to know if there was any thought into having some additional brick detailing such as recesses or on exaggerating the details a bit. The building is not trying to be historic which is ok. But the detail elements in our existing historic buildings are not minor so the exaggerated details give our existing historic buildings a monumental feel. Chairperson Salter asked if consideration could be given to these thoughts going forward so that the mass and monumentality of the masonry middle section could relate in a way to nearby historic buildings.

Board Member Mead echoed Chairperson Salter's comments. The south side of the building spoke to and feels like Pensacola. The Jefferson Street side with the large awning did not so much. It was clear that the building was opening from the inside out in terms of the fenestration. From the ARB perspective, he was looking for a way to open the building up from the outside in so that it can be appreciated and be an amenity to the city. He also echoed comments about the treatment of the service areas but turning the corner with the limestone and with the strong vertical elements spoke to the federal courthouse building. We need to make sure we're relating the building to how citizens would want to experience the building from the outside looking in. Board Member Mead stated that he would almost like to see more balcony treatment than awning on the Jefferson Street side. Having walkout areas, especially in the meeting areas, would be an amenity from the standpoint of the use of those areas from the inside out. It may not make sense to wrap it around the corner on the Chase side but recessed in from the corners will provide an amenity to the use and to the streetscape. The building is a little too monumental at the low level. Monumental works up high, but not so much at the lower level. On the height – Board Member Mead asked if there were exceptions and staff clarified that there were, but only for non-occupiable spaces and Sec. 12-3-62 was referenced. Mr. Ebent clarified that most of the height exceeding 100 feet was mechanical space. Board Member Mead was amenable to the height, especially if it were for service areas. He liked the top as it was an interesting juxtaposition. Advisor Pristera really like the building and looked forward to seeing development on this block. For once, it wasn't an entire block being developed at once and was nice to see individual buildings being built on separate parcels. He echoed the Board's comments and emphasized that the north and east elevations were the weakest sides. They would be seen from Chase Street and other areas, and they should be considered. There was originally planned to be a parking garage on the east side. Mr. Belsinger addressed the Board and clarified the parking solutions for the project. They are advancing a surface parking lot behind this building which will be heavily landscaped. There are also conversations with the city regarding off-site parking. Advisor Pristera recommended some treatment to the east wall; maybe recessed areas which will provide an aesthetic in the meantime. Mr. Ebent clarified that the east side was situated along a zero-lot line, so windows were not an option. Board Member Yee echoed the comments of the Board and was excited for this project. Board Member Mead agreed that Chase Street was an exit corridor and understood the north elevation being sparser. However, the top of

the building above the street level is very visible from the Interstate 110 flyover. From that perspective, it would be very helpful to have a rendering of what people will see as they're driving into Pensacola. Advisor Pristera mentioned that this building will be one of the main things that people see, so we don't want the two weakest sides hurting the project.

Board Member Mead moved to approve with the comments to be addressed in the final submission. Board Member Yee seconded the motion and it carried 6-0.

ADJOURNMENT – With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:44 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Sarah", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Historic Preservation Planner Harding
Secretary to the Board