



MINUTES OF THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

June 18, 2020

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairperson Quina, Board Member Mead

MEMBERS VIRTUAL: Vice Chairperson Crawford, Board Member Fogarty, Board Member Salter, Board Member Villegas

MEMBERS ABSENT: Board Member Campbell-Hatler

STAFF PRESENT: Historic Preservation Planner Harding, Board Advisor Pristera (virtual), Assistant Planning Director Cannon, Network Engineer Chris Johnston

OTHERS PRESENT VIRTUAL: Fredrick and Julia Hoeschler, Scott Sallis, Christy Cabassa, Bobby Switzer, Kimberly Thompson, Brian Spencer, Jim Veal

CALL TO ORDER / QUORUM PRESENT

Chairperson Quina called the Architectural Review Board (ARB) meeting to order at 2:02 p.m. with a quorum present and explained the procedures of the virtual Board meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Board Member Villegas made a motion to approve the May 21, 2020 minutes, seconded by Board Member Mead, and it carried unanimously.

OPEN FORUM - None

NEW BUSINESS

Item 1

905 N. Barcelona Street

NHPD

Contributing Structure

PR-2

Action taken: Approved with Abbreviated Review

Fredrick and Julia Hoeschler are requesting approval to re-install the screen on their side porch. Photographs from the 1960's and 1990's show the side porch as screened in. The new porch will have a white aluminum frame and charcoal inset screening.

Mr. Hoeschler addressed the Board and stated he had planned to install the screen on the outside of the columns to keep the columns from being seen from the street and to match the historical pictures. His builder had suggested using aluminum framing instead of wood.

One of the ideas was to try to mimic the railing on the apartment. Chairperson Quina mentioned North Hill's comments stating no frame materials are listed but screen framework and the door should be wood, not aluminum, and they recommended the framework elements and door be painted black or another darker color. Mr. Hoeschler advised they were intending to match the framework to the trim of the house which he pointed out in other homes. Chairperson Quina explained the color was not a problem, but he was concerned with the materials being used. Board Member Mead agreed with North Hill in that making the color dark would basically let the screening element go away as an architectural feature; if it were to be white, he did not feel it appropriate to take a high classical looking column arrangement and tie it to the much more mundane manner of the accessory building. It would make more sense to take elements from the main structure, and he recommended sticking to the suggestions from North Hill and let the screening be behind the columns in a dark color and let the bones of the exterior house show pretty much as they are. Board Member Crawford agreed with making the screening element disappear as much as possible. Mr. Hoeschler advised they could place the screening behind the vertical porch columns without the vertical uprights.

Board Member Mead made a motion to approve the addition of the screening on the conditions that the screen and framing be installed behind the column line and as the applicant has described, the vertical uprights be conjoined behind the existing columns without the intervening vertical uprights between the main columns of the porch, and that it be made in a bronze or black or similar material to come close to the same tones of the screening material and that it not have the "X" features in the banding below the horizontal support. Board Member Crawford amended the motion to select the screening material which is more transparent. Mr. Hoeschler agreed to this suggestion, and it was accepted by Board Member Mead, and he suggested that the upright supports, metal and screening colors be submitted for abbreviated review. The motion was seconded by Board Member Fogarty. The motion then carried unanimously.

**Item 2
Contributing Structure**

226 E. Government St

**PHD / HC-1
Wood Cottages**

Action taken: Denied Conceptual Approval

Christy Cabassa is requesting conceptual approval to modify and add on to a contributing structure. This packet addresses three primary requests. The first is for the design, window locations, and additions to the primary structure and rear yard. The second is for the consideration to use Hardi Roughsawn siding. The third is for the consideration to use either Fypon or Azek for the trim and window surrounds and a custom synthetic trim for the corbels, porch trim and details to replicate the existing.

Ms. Cabassa presented to the Board and stated they were asking for aesthetic approval for the placement of windows, additional porches and balconies since this structure would be turned into a single family home for the Switzers. She explained the structure was originally on Gregory Street and moved to the present location in the 1970s. She stated they wanted to bring the house up to Code and use Hardi siding with synthetic material for the trim and corbels which would be more enduring. Windows and doors would be replaced with impact resistant windows and doors. Chairperson Quina asked if they were aware of

the guidelines for building in the historic district of Seville where like materials should be matched with like materials if available; he did see this structure as a historic home. Mr. Switzer stated one of the reasons it might be contributing was because of its Italianate design and one of two in the district which made it contributing, however, what did not make it contributing was moving it there before the historic district existed, and viable products which surpassed the quality of wood were not available at that time. He wanted to discuss the design changes first.

Chairperson Quina stated typically when the Board reviewed this, the focus was on the primary façade which faced south, and there was a fairly major change with the two-story balcony in adding a balcony to the structure which had never had one, and he felt it added to the façade. Formerly being used as an office, the relationship to the street was not as important as it would be as a residence. Board Member Mead felt that attention to the balusters would be critical to making it fit the Italianate language. His main concern was with the windows – 4 over 4 and 6 over 6 fit more appropriately with the typical Italian styles, and the French doors and transoms did not fit the house as a whole and what Italianate would be. He was not opposed to the 1 over 1 since there were a lot of them in this particular style, but the muntins fit better to the Italianate form than the much simpler fenestration details.

Board Member Salter felt the proposed revision of the more flat pediment over the windows took away from the architectural styling of the home. Ms. Cabassa stated the reason they went from the sloped pediment to the flat was for flashing reasons with the water; the sloped pediments became a water intrusion problem. Board Member Crawford agreed with Board Member Salter and suggested the front should remain with the original design to maintain its integrity. Board Member Villegas was not as concerned with the other sides of the structure, but with the difference in windows on the front, there were architectural details which were important and details that mattered. She believed this structure was contributing to this area even though it had been relocated. Mr. Switzer stated the home was remodeled in 1978, and the porch was not with the original house – this was a 1978 porch, and the windows were 1978 and not original. Advisor Pristera had no pictures of the structure pre-1978. Mr. Switzer stated the addition in the 1980s mimicked the windows on the front, but they were trying to stay true to the Italianate design.

Regarding the blank wall on the west elevation, Board Member Mead felt it was not appropriate to rely on something as transient as vegetation or landscaping which may or may not obscure part of a building for a particular period of time and be done away with when it was not in the applicant's control (tree belongs to neighbor), then the blank wall would be exposed. He felt there were other ways to address that area and minimize the light. He found the rhythm established in the existing structure more appropriate to the style than the more rationalized single gangs being proposed. Ms. Cabassa advised on the front elevation, the existing office building did have a 1 over 1 window. Mr. Switzer pointed out there were different sized windows on the west façade.

Regarding the second request, Board Member Mead stated he was much more minimal to changes in materials but also sensitive to the desire to keep traditional materials for traditional reasons; if the architectural needs could be met, if visual distinctions are not apparent to any significant observation, they would be meeting the architectural requirements. Board Member Crawford wanted to make sure that not everything was being

replaced and all that remained was the studs. Chairperson Quina explained there were materials available, but technology had also given new ways of treating the wood that we have; there are products which deep treat wood and give a guarantee as long as the Hardi product would be. He also clarified that this building was constructed in the 1800s, and any building over 50 years old was considered contributing and historic property. Mr. Switzer explained he wanted to replace the existing structure with materials which would last for a long time without driving the costs of maintenance through the roof. Chairperson Quina advised Hardi had not been used on a contributing or historical property. Board Member Crawford stated it was the wood which made the structure historic, and that was the reason for the conversation and what made this different from a house in Aragon. Staff advised the Board had approved Hardi on additions as well as some areas of infill but not for entire projects or additions to street fronts. Board Member Mead stated he would want to see comparisons of specific materials and proposed alternatives which are available before he would approve something that would establish some precedent in this regard even though he was friendly to the idea of finding equivalent materials that architecturally speaking are indistinguishable but may have better performance characteristics which the applicant was seeking.

Ms. Cabassa asked about wood clad windows, and Chairperson Quina stated it was in the guidelines that wood was to be used on the exterior of a wood structure. Ms. Cabassa wanted to introduce the Board to a new material where someone from the street would not know it was not wood.

Regarding the third request for trim, Chairperson Quina advised there had been exceptions where places close to the ground or where a trim is at a high point on an elevation where you cannot reach it; he would allow exceptions for those sorts of things. The Board then reviewed the original and synthetic brackets. Board Member Salter explained one of the reasons the Board exists was to try to maintain the original character, which includes materials, as much as it can on structures deemed to be contributing. The modifications being proposed made this structure more of a modern infill. Board Member Crawford pointed out it was how much of the structure could be preserved, not how much do we replicate in that style.

Board Member Mead made a motion to deny the first element in regard to the proposed conceptual plan because of the comments expressed which still need to be addressed; deny the second element and ask that it be resubmitted with materials that can be seen and compared with regard to the siding including any advanced wood product materials for their visual impact and performance; and deny the third element regarding treatment of the ornaments. Board Member Salter seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously. Staff offered to send the link to this meeting as well as minutes to Mr. Switzer for clarification.

Item 3

611 E. Belmont Street

OEHPD / OEHR-2

Contributing Structure

Action taken: Approved

Kimberly Thompson is requesting approval to install a small storage shed. Staff explained Ms. Thompson was willing to match the roof pitch of the main house.

Ms. Thompson addressed the Board. There were no comments from Old East Hill,

however, Christian Wagley advised there was no objection to this project.

Board Member Salter advised it did appear the applicant had spent a lot of time matching the main structure as much as possible and made a motion to approve, seconded by Board Member Fogarty, and it carried unanimously.

Item 4

435 E. Government St

**PHD / HC-1
Wood Cottages**

Contributing Structure

Action taken: Approved with comments

Brian Spencer is requesting approval for exterior modifications to a contributing structure. Mr. Spencer addressed the Board. Chairperson Quina stated the shed dormer on the west elevation seemed close to the back side of the primary roof shed and might be a difficult flashing detail. Mr. Spencer pointed out the shed dormer face was pushed back slightly in anticipation of that problematic flashing detail. Board Member Salter addressed the east elevation gable dormer and pointed out those portions were very different from the gable dormers on the front of the building. Mr. Spencer stated he was responsible for choosing the gable on the east side using the same roof slope of the narrower dormers facing East Government and thought it would be more acceptable by the ARB and would be a better solution in order to bring natural light into the new stairwell and natural light for needed head room in a bathroom. Chairperson Quina agreed the gabled dormer was more appropriate at that location. Mr. Spencer indicated he would be very flexible concerning Hardie siding and the use of Kiln Dried After Treatment wood siding was discussed as an appropriate substitute. He also stated there would be vertical trim matching the existing dormer. Staff read 12-2-10(A)(6) PHD, Restoration, rehabilitation, alterations or additions to existing contributing structures which cover materials which shall be duplicated when making repairs, alterations and/or additions to contributing structures. Also, any variance from the original materials, styles, etc., shall be approved only if circumstances unique to each project are found to warrant such variances. It was determined the new windows would be fixed – Windsor Window System.

Board Member Crawford made a motion to approve as submitted, seconded by Board Member Mead. Board Member Salter amended the motion to clarify that the new gabled dormers would have trim similar to the existing dormers on the front of the building. It was accepted, and the motion carried unanimously.

Item 5

220 W. Gadsden St

NHPD / PR-2

New Construction

Action taken: Approved with Abbreviated Review

Jim Veal is requesting *final* approval for a new single family residence on the east lot of a soon-to-be subdivided parcel. This project received conceptual approval in February 2020 and revisions have been made according to the Board's input.

Mr. Veal presented to the Board and confirmed they were in agreement with North Hill's comments to use wood composite railings. Board Member Mead indicated the applicant had taken the Board's suggestions and applied them in an appropriate and responsive way. Board Member Villegas wanted to see the composite railing materials. She did like the way the chimney was addressed and appreciated the landscaping.

Board Member Mead made a motion to approve as submitted with the submission

of composite material and detailing for abbreviated review as well as a landscape plan that shows appropriate detailing. It was seconded by Board Member Villegas and carried unanimously.

Item 6

700 S. Palafox Street

PHBD / C-2A

New Construction

Action taken: Approved with Abbreviated Review

The UWF Historic Trust is requesting approval to install a large building wallscape on the south side of a contributing structure. The mural will consist of three large panels with an invisible frame system and will not be lit.

Advisor Pristera presented to the Board and stated the mural depicted an actual painting of the south end of Palafox in the 1960s. He proposed to use an interpretive panel to explain the story behind the painting, but that would be brought to the Board. Board Member Mead found this to be appropriate since it would appear down the Palafox peninsula and felt it was a really good approach and a valuable addition to the public's perception of the history and perspective of where this is located. Board Member Salter explained the information provided about the origin of the painting and its ties to the buildings actually enforced the intent of these murals. He felt some sort of information plaque would tie it to downtown and explain why it is there. He was concerned with installation on the wall since there was a difference in relief from the white band at the top; maybe it should be scaled down to fit below the flashing. Mr. Pristera noted the change in the trim line and thought the painting could be applied to the wall. He stated he could work with the frame manufacturer to see what their detail would be. Board Member Mead offered that the presence of the wing wall, which is shrouding the ability to see from street level up into that exposed rear portion of the framing, might shroud the flashing protection.

Board Member Salter made a motion to approve with the specific detailing and explanation addressing the change in plane of the wall with relationship to how it is used to be returned for an abbreviated review. The motion was seconded by Board Member Mead/Fogarty. Board Member Salter asked if the intent was for the Trust to place their name on the proposed mural. Advisor Pristera stated if it did, it would be in one of the corners, probably lower left corner; Board Member Salter explained the placement of the name of the entity would constitute an off-premise sign; Advisor Pristera advised an interpretive panel would be appropriate. Board Member Mead explained where we have historical images for which the Trust is custodian, it is appropriate to place a marking consistent with an artist's signature to signify the custodial character and its prominence. But in this case, it was an actual painting with an actual artist's signature on it, and that would not apply. **Board Member Salter amended the motion to clarify that this approval does not allow the Historic Trust name or logo to appear on the mural; the amendment was accepted. The motion carried unanimously.**

Board Member Salter asked to revise the May 21, 2020 minutes regarding Item 9, 415 N. Alcaniz Street to include important points. Staff explained those revisions would be made and brought back to next month's Board meeting.

Staff also advised the Board would be kept updated on the COVID requirements for future

meetings.

ADJOURNMENT – With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "G. Hardy". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a prominent initial "G" and a long, sweeping tail.

Historic Preservation Planner Harding
Secretary to the Board