



**REVISED MINUTES OF THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**

Revisions requested at the June 18<sup>th</sup> ARB meeting and for Item #9 are underlined and in bold.

**May 21, 2020**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chairperson Quina

**MEMBERS VIRTUAL:** Board Member Fogarty, Board Member Campbell-Hatler, Board Member Mead, Board Member Salter

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Vice Chairperson Crawford, Board Member Villegas

**STAFF PRESENT:** Historic Preservation Planner Harding, Senior Planner Statler, Board Advisor Pristera (virtual), Assistant City Attorney Lindsay, Network Engineer Chris Johnston

**OTHERS PRESENT VIRTUAL:** Tim Buttell, Christian Voelkel, Jordan Yee, Jim Bozeman, Mr. and Mrs. Scott Holland, Pat Bolster, Thomas Reynolds, Scott Sallis, Steve Mabee, Troy Stackhouse, George Sitton, George Williams, Charles Liberis, Stacy Snowden

**CALL TO ORDER / QUORUM PRESENT**

Chairperson Quina called the Architectural Review Board (ARB) meeting to order at 2:03 p.m. with a quorum present and explained the procedures of the virtual Board meeting.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**Board Member Fogarty made a motion to approve the March 19, 2020 minutes, seconded by Board Member Campbell-Hatler, and it carried unanimously.**

**OPEN FORUM** - None

**NEW BUSINESS**

**Item 1**

**213 E. Wright Street**

**PHBD**

**Contributing Structure**

**C-3**

**Action taken: Approved.**

Tim Buttell is requesting approval to attach the bottom portion of the Pensacola Beach sign onto the east façade of a brick structure. Mr. Buttell addressed the Board and explained the sign would be in the parking lot and on the upper right corner of the building. He

confirmed the sign would be attached and not lit. He advised the next step would be to get engineering drawings. Board Member Salter wanted to make sure the sign was not above the parapet or covering windows. Board Member Campbell-Hatler asked about the signage and mural ordinances, and staff advised this signage did not meet the criteria of a sign, and the opinion of senior staff and legal was that it would meet the classification of art or a mural.

**Board Member Campbell-Hatler made a motion to approve, seconded by Board Member Salter, and it carried unanimously.**

**Item 2  
Contributing Structure &  
New Construction**

**425 & 427 E. Romana**

**PHD/HC-1/  
Brick Structures**

**Action taken: Conceptual approval with comments.**

Christian Voelkel, Irby & Voelkel Engineering, is seeking *CONCEPTUAL* approval for the design of a new residence as well as modifications to an existing contributing structure. The proposed work includes the combination of two lots into one parcel. Chairperson Quina asked since this was his neighbor and both were performing renovations, would this be a conflict of interest, and Assistant City Attorney Lindsay clarified there would be none and unless he would obtain a special gain or loss, it was not necessary for him to recuse himself.

Mr. Voelkel addressed the Board and explained since they had been denied moving the existing structure, it would be retained, and they would build a new two-story structure in the rear for the primary residence. They wanted to combine the lots into one address. It was determined there would be a kitchen on two floors, with one being for visiting family. They planned to have a brick skirt around the existing contributing structure with gingerbread details on the front porch and arches to tie the look into the contributing structure. Board Member Salter did not agree that the modifications to the contributing structure were in the best interest and suggested any skirting accent the existing masonry piers. He also suggested the mullion pattern on the replacement windows should be vertically oriented 2 over 2, maintaining its historical original architecture. It was determined they planned for the existing windows to coordinate with the new structure. Chairperson Quina advised the windows needed to be wood framed since those would have been the original; the applicants preferred a clad product for both. Board Member Salter asked if anyone would have a problem with the two structures not matching. On the new structure, the east elevation windows were a little tight to the chimney, and the grade needed to be at least 18". Chairperson Quina was concerned with all of the arched windows since they were not common to this district. He also pointed out the concrete step which was almost the entire width of the property. Mr. Voelkel indicated they would probably go to a rectangle window with a transom on the two sides, keeping the front and rear with arched windows. Regarding the steps, the idea was for a grand entrance to walk up to either house. He also explained the parking would be on-street only and confirmed this would be a primary residence and not an Air BNB.

Board Member Campbell-Hatler felt the March 2019 drawing was more appropriate with the house not being as massive looking. It was noted the Board's concern was with the earlier concept of moving the smaller building to the rear. Advisor Pristera agreed in

showing the piers, and the gingerbread was not appropriate since the shotgun homes were simple.

**Board Member Campbell-Hatler made a motion to approve conceptually with no gingerbread on the contributing structure; okay with the recessed columns on the contributing structure; the windows being remade; reduce the width of the steps to be more in line with the district; reduce scale and massing to go toward the original March 2019 submittal; to have rectangle windows. Board Member Salter amended the motion that the retaining wall be replaced to what was more typical to this area. The amendment was accepted, and the motion seconded by Board Member Salter, and it carried unanimously.**

(Board Member Mead joined the meeting.)

**Item 3** **100 BLK W. Garden** **PHBD / C-2A**  
**New Construction**

**Action taken: Conceptual Approval with amended site plan.**

Jordan Yee is requesting a second *conceptual review* for a two-story commercial development. This project received conceptual approval in September 2019. 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. Yee addressed the Board and stated the building now faces Garden Street with the mass of the building along the property line with the Bank of American building, and it opens the greenspace to the Spring Street elevation. There will be a restaurant space on the corner of Garden and Spring. Board Member Campbell-Hatler thought this was a better orientation, and Board Member Mead agreed it opened up better to Spring Street. Board Member Fogarty felt it was a great project especially considering working with social distancing. Board Member Salter recused himself from the discussion since he was involved in the development.

**Board Member Fogarty made a motion to approve with amendments to the site plan, seconded by Board Member Mead, and it carried with Board Member Salter abstaining.**

**Item 4** **15 W. Strong St** **NHPD / PC-1**  
**New Construction**

**Action taken: Approved.**

Jim Bozeman is requesting approval for changes to three new single-family residences. Although this project was initially approved in September 2017, revisions to the elevations were denied by the Board in March 2020. Materials from the past 2017 and 2020 packets were provided to the Board.

Mr. Bozeman addressed the Board and stated they placed the gables on the roofline, 2' projected balconies on the side as requested, and the handrails will be pressure treated wood or a composite and no powder coated aluminum. Mr. Liberis withheld comments. Board Member Mead advised the revisions were very responsive to the Board's comments and consistent with the overall plan. Chairperson Quina explained the revisions had addressed the North Hill comments.

**Board Member Mead made a motion to approve the resubmission, seconded by**

**Board Member Salter, and it carried unanimously.**

**Item 5** **800 BLK N. Baylen** **NHPD / PC-1**

**New Construction**

**Action taken: Approved with comments and abbreviated review.**

Jim Bozeman is requesting elevation changes to four new single-family residences. This project was approved by the Board in September 2017. The revised elevations are consistent with those submitted for 15 W. Strong Street. Nearly all of the materials and color scheme has remained consistent as approved by the Board in 2017.

Mr. Bozeman presented to the Board and stated the changes were similar to the previous Building F. The gables were added, and the balconies were at 1.5'. He explained the A/C balcony and location. Board Member Salter addressed the rear elevation A/C units and asked if they could be located on the ground; Mr. Liberis advised he could move them to the side of the building without the mechanical balcony. Board Member Mead agreed the equipment balconies should go with the A/C being placed on the ground. Board Member Salter asked that they keep the rear windows in mind when making the adjustments.

**Board Member Salter made a motion to approve with the modification of the removal of the equipment balconies on the rear elevation and that a revised rear elevation be submitted for abbreviated review, seconded by Board Member Mead, and it carried unanimously.**

**Item 6** **314 S. Alcaniz Street** **PHD / HC-1 / Wood**

**New Construction**

**Cottages District**

**Action taken: Conceptual Approval with comments.**

Scott Holland is seeking *CONCEPTUAL* approval for a new two-story, single-family residence. The demolition of the existing non-contributing structure was approved in December 2019 and a Variance to reduce the required rear yard setback was denied in February 2020. Since then, the applicant has revised the site plan to accommodate the zoning setback requirements.

Mr. Holland addressed the Board and stated without the Variance, the footage of the house increased to 2,042 sq. ft. He had gotten permission to remove the tree at the rear, but he would be replanting oak trees in the area between the property line and the edge of the road. Board Member Mead asked about the west elevation louvers, and Mr. Holland indicated his desire was to make the louvers operable. Mr. Mead's concern was when the shutters were open that they fit within the frame of the façade, and Mr. Holland agreed this was a viable comment. Board Member Salter pointed out the bronze metal railing was not typical with the district, and Board Member Campbell-Halter felt the bronze was more traditional and liked the converging of the two timeframes. Mr. Holland indicated the columns would be either be mahogany or Spanish cedar; since he was trying to meet a 200mph wind load he would be using a steel or structural aluminum core. Staff explained the Streetscape Type 2 features in the LDC, Figure 12-2.1 for the Wood Cottages District. Regarding the extensions on the north and east elevations, Mr. Holland stated he would probably change that from stucco to wood. Chairperson Quina advised the railing type for this district is typically wood. Board Member Salter stated if the bronze material becomes part of the architecture that spreads throughout the house and some of the other detailing,

that concept would probably work.

**Board Member Salter made a motion to approve with the comments noted in discussion for material consideration, seconded by Board Member Campbell-Hatler, and it carried unanimously.**

**Item 7**

**919 N. Baylen Street**

**NHPD / PR-1AAA**

**Contributing Structure**

**Action taken: Denied without prejudice.**

Pat Bolster, Merrill Land Construction, is requesting approval to replace the roofing on a contributing structure. A sample of the existing cement tile shingle, profile and the proposed Terracotta tile were provided to the Board.

Chairperson Quina advised the guidelines from the Secretary of Interior Standards indicate they would request the use of the same material if it is available. Mr. Bolster stated the existing tile had been discontinued. The idea was to go with a product for maintenance in the future in a similar product. He explained this roof had been replaced in 1984 or 1985, with the original being clay tile. Mr. Reynolds stated the roof has leaked since Ivan in 2004, and he felt the concrete tiles were a part of the problem since they were unbelievably heavy. They wanted a product that looked the same but performed better. He also believed the Antique Chestnut was closer to the existing tile, and Mr. Bolster agreed. Advisor Pristera stated he could not find pictures of the original roof. He also found the 200 block of West Lloyd which had this type of roof, but since you could still get Terracotta and concrete, the Secretary of Interior Standards would prefer the more historic material.

Board Member Salter asked about the difference in price, and Mr. Bolster advised metal shingles were 70 percent of the cost of the replacement concrete tiles; there has also been water damage to the roof and having a lighter material would make the actual roof structure last longer. Chairperson Quina stated this was a very unique building in North Hill, and the Board was not supposed to consider cost when analyzing the appropriateness of replacement materials. Board Member Salter stated as unique as this structure was, the primary concern was the aesthetics, and if the profile of the tile and profile of the edge is more dominant in this situation, he would not have a problem with it. Advisor Pristera pointed out you can still get the original materials, and the faux products have to match what the original material was, and he felt this material was not appropriate. Mr. Reynolds stated the reasons they went in this direction was because the concrete tiles were part of the reason the roof was struggling, and they were not interested in replacing the roof with concrete tiles since they were not the original roof anyway. He explained the Decra tile was a substantial product, and his hope was that it would look and perform better than the concrete tile. Chairperson Quina pointed out once you remove the concrete tiles, you would place some sort of single-ply membrane down with flashing which would take care of all the waterproofing. The concrete or clay was a weathering surface which would last if the under layer was properly installed. He proposed the concrete or clay would be more expensive, but would be a more lasting roof than the metal product with asphaltic material. His feeling was that the asphalt would eventually fade away, and you would begin to see a metal roof.

Board Member Mead asked if there as a time pressure for this project. Two points to consider would be how this product had performed in the real world, and terracotta would

be lighter than the concrete tile which was not the original roof. He suggested the item be resubmitted with information on the product performance and comparison to a typical terracotta product or something along those lines. Mr. Reynolds explained the turnaround time would be 12-16 weeks for concrete tile production, with the Decra being significantly less, and hurricane season approaching. Board Member Campbell-Hatler suggested looking a 398 Bayou Boulevard for a new version of the curb tile.

**Board Member Mead made a motion to deny without prejudice for resubmission with information on the performance of the stone-coated metal product for better judgement. The motion was seconded by Board Member Campbell-Hatler and carried unanimously.**

**Item 8** **113 N. Palafox Street** **PHBD / Zone C-2A**  
**Non-Contributing Structure**  
**Action taken: Approved.**

Scott Sallis is requesting approval to modify the front and rear of a non-contributing structure. Mr. Sallis presented to the Board and stated the canopy structure was shared with the adjacent building and would be repaired. Board Member Salter stated he appreciated the old storefronts on this section of Palafox, and this awning was a part of this. He did not think the modern shed awning was a positive impact on this streetscape; the awning was one of the few remaining elements of a period of time. Advisor Pristera advised it was hard to find old pictures of this block. This was not original but represented a period of time. Board Member Campbell-Hatler liked the presentation since it would not look alike, and the change in the rhythm was quite nice. Board Member Fogarty suggested it also helped enhance the pedestrian experience. Board Member Mead stated this has precedent in terms of treatment of the Palafox frontage. He also explained retail spaces are variable, and we don't keep everything from every era since some are not worth keeping. He also appreciated the rear façade detail, and felt the overall presentation would be a great addition to the Palafox Street frontage. Board Member Salter explained it was not the specific canopy, but it was the style of architecture and the streetscape with the continuous canopy. The trend of the storefronts getting their individual canopies would break up the street front, and a bracket-mounted canopy as proposed would not be a positive addition in this area. **Board Member Campbell-Hatler made a motion to approve, seconded by Board Member Mead. The motion carried 4 to 1 with Board Member Salter dissenting.**

**Item 9** **415 N. Alcaniz Street** **OEHPD / OEHC-1**  
**Non-Contributing Structure**  
**Action taken: Approved with comments.**

Scott Sallis is requesting final approval to renovate the 1928 Mount Olive Christian Church. The plans depict an Air BNB-style boarding house with a new restaurant, bar, outdoor dining and event space.

Mr. Mabee presented to the Board and indicated they were excited to be working on this building. Mr. Stackhouse explained he was excited to work with this property as well. Mr. Sallis advised the project had not changed that much, and they hoped to begin demolition in the next few weeks and start the work in June. He stated their intent was to make this

an Air BNB model lodging house as a mixed use with a restaurant and complimentary bar on the ground floor dining plaza which is submerged under the earth at a range of 3 to 4 feet. On the south side, they will create a covered dining plaza connecting to an open plaza for events. Most of the new construction is independent of the building, which allows much of the structure to be retained. They intend to re-stucco and finish all of the existing stucco base and paint the existing brick. To meet energy code, condition the space, and to keep moisture out, and elastomeric paint was the easiest tool to accomplish this. He pointed out the neighborhood association comments embraced this renovation. Since it did not make sense to have windows in the kitchen which are behind kitchen equipment, those windows would be filled with masonry and not really visible. As of now, there are windows in the exit stairs, but it was possible that Inspections would not allow this, however, they will be working with that department.

Board Member Salter was excited for the direction of the project but was still concerned with painting the brick since it had a beautiful pattern. **The pattern of the building was noted to be a Flemish bond with glazed brick headers and is unique for the area.** However, simply painting the brick would not solve the water intrusion problems, and there were methods of addressing this from the interior. Mr. Sallis knew of these methods but there were very few ideas for high humidity areas. **Mr. Salter stated that he has researched and found specific and proven methods to address these issues without the need to paint brick and that are applicable in this climate zone. Mr. Sallis continued to state that the** patterns of the brick are in small portions at the front of the building, and they would remain as they paint the brick. He pointed out the masonry of the building was atrocious with random uses of the brick, clay tile and different sizes of brick; there was nothing standard in the masonry. **Mr. Salter stated that he thought Mr. Sallis was being misleading regarding the extent of the decorative pattern and condition of the brick. Both streetscape elevations (north and east) have the Flemish bond pattern which are in very good condition and all of the headers are glazed. While the other two (west and south) elevations only have a common running bond pattern, they are also in good condition.** Mr. Sallis confirmed in replacing the windows, they were taking out the glazed brick. Mr. Mabee emphasized the paint would protect the building for another 100 years, and it would survive longer by being protected in this fashion. Board Member Mead did not feel he had enough proof that would support the painting.

Advisor Pristera indicated he agreed with Board Member Salter in that the street sides had a nice brick pattern with no major issues, and painting seemed to be a cosmetic concern; he did not see painting it as a solution to water issues. Old Christ Church still has water issues, and it was originally painted.

Board Member Fogarty understood the concerns but felt painting was a nice solution to a somewhat chaotic and neglected façade. Board Member Campbell-Hatler agreed that painting would be a nice facelift and would be amazing for that block but was also concerned about the interior moisture. Board Member Mead agreed with this issue in pushing the moisture from the exterior to the interior. Mr. Sallis explained the inside of the building is chaotic masonry which is exposed, leading to the collapsing of the plaster. He advised they would be installing new structural studs which will allow for new insulation and sheetrock inside. He also stressed he needed the Board to place them in a position to pull a permit.

**Board Member Campbell made a motion to approve assuming the windows in the hall pass the Inspections Department. Board Member Mead proposed a modification that the Board take up the suggestion that the question of painting the brick on the upper portions be submitted to an abbreviated review to study the degree and quantity of deterioration of the brick, of the proposed systems deal with that deterioration whether by repointing and rehabilitation of the existing brick surface as it stands without painting, or if in the opinion of the architect during the abbreviated review, the painting and other systems dealing with the moisture problem is the best solution to preserve the fabric of the structure. The modification was not accepted. The motion was then seconded by Board Member Fogarty. The motion carried 3 to 2 with Board Members Salter and Mead dissenting.**

**Item 10** **1915 N. 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue** **R-1AA**  
**Historic Structures Demolition Review** **Fairnie Hill Place**  
**Action taken: Delayed for 60 days.**

Per the City of Pensacola’s Historic Building Demolition Review Ordinance (Sec. 12-12-5(E)), the above structure has been found to be potentially significant in regards to its architecture. Historic Preservation Planner Harding read the ordinance to the Board.

Mr. Sitton presented to the Board his desire to build on this property. Chairperson Quina advised this structure had some strong visual elements, and this building would be a contributing building if East Hill had a historic district. Advisor Pristera stated the architectural detail on this structure was more than on the surrounding houses, and it represented the 1930s; he felt the Board should review it. Mr. Sitton agreed the outside was neat, but it was really unsafe to walk inside and was in really bad shape; the land value was worth much more than the structure. He felt rebuilding would be more contributing to the neighborhood. Board Member Mead shared a picture of the home in 2013 when it was reasonably maintained. Mr. Sitton pointed out with the interior condition, it had been neglected for more than seven years, and it would take \$100,000 to repair the home and make it right. He planned to build two nice homes on 60’ wide lots. Board Member Mead advised he would have to subdivide to accomplish this, but he had one really nice house with two sidewalks, and if he preserved the house, he would end up with three sellable structures as opposed to two. If the City was going to allow some leeway for preserving a historical structure, he could build two compatible structures, sell the historical home and come out ahead. He also explained variances in the setbacks were available when trying to save a historical structure which might fall within the guidelines as a hardship. He asked that Mr. Sitton explore this possibility within the 60 days to see if there was a better way to preserve the value of the structure and possibly coming out economically ahead.

**Board Member Mead made a motion to deny the request for 60 days, seconded by Board Member Campbell-Hatler, and it carried unanimously.**

**Item 11** **190 W. Government** **GCD / C-2A**  
**Non-Contributing Structure**  
**Action taken: Approved.**

Ben Townes, Townes + architects, is requesting approval for additions to the MC Blanchard Judicial Center. The proposed work includes adding a covered canopy to the main east



entrance and several concrete security planters which will match the existing planters on site. Mr. Townes presented to the Board and stated this structure would give almost 1,000 sq. ft. of coverage to protect citizens from weather elements when the County conducted jury selections.

**Board Member Campbell-Hatler made a motion to approve, seconded by Board Member Fogarty, and it carried unanimously.**

**Item 12**

**804 E. Wright Street**

**OEHPD / OEHC-2**

**New Construction**

**Action taken: Approved with comments.**

George Williams is providing revisions to a new single story retail building. The revisions include changes and clarifications to the landscaping, the storm water layout, details on the front brackets, and the final storefront details. This project came before the Board in March 2020 where it was approved with an Abbreviated Review to follow. That review was referred to the Full Board.

Mr. Williams presented to the Board and provided photos to illustrate the existing retention pond which is barely visible and the final landscape plan which would blend with the old and camouflage the new surface retention swales. The front two columns are now 8"x10" and in developing the engineering plans, they took advantage of the sloping of the side from north to south on the back of the lot toward the street. Now the porch on the front of the building is 30" plus or minus above grade which gives the opportunity to create steps to alleviate the problem of walking underneath the columns. Board Member Salter addressed chain link fencing at the retention ponds, and Mr. Williams stated there would be no chain-link fencing at the swales. He also explained the CMU foundation would be parge coated and concealed with paint.

**Board Member Salter made a motion to approve as submitted with the notation the questions asked would be in the final design as addressed with the parch coating CMU base and no chain link fence around the ponds. The motion was seconded by Board Member Mead and carried unanimously.**

**ADJOURNMENT** – With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:32 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



Historic Preservation Planner Harding  
Secretary to the Board