



City of Pensacola

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

MINUTES

City of Pensacola
222 W. Main Street
Pensacola, FL
32502

March 20, 2025

2:00 PM

Hagler-Mason Conference Room,
2nd Floor

CALL TO ORDER / QUORUM

Members Present: William Brantley, Yuri Ramos, Jordan Yee, Lou Courtney, George R Mead II, David Del Gallo

Members Absent: Scott Fisher

Also Present: Historic Preservation Planner Walker, Assistant Planning & Zoning Division Manager Harding, Ross Pristera, Mario Roberts, Ken Hagan, Lisa Johnson, Bart Hudson, Timothy Dufrain, Chris Carroll, Martin Mullin, Amber & Cade Hoverson, Josh Gleaton, Hal Lovato, Beverly Elliott, Seth Haynes, Diane Dixey, Abi Barnett, Susan Ford, Pat Meusel, Jeff Elbert, Summer Carter, Pedro Adams, Manuel Tannant, Sally Rausa, Kathleen Bellard, Paula Willets, Kevin Smudde, Freddy Draso, Stephanie Draso, Ralph Schofield, Jillian Reggie

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. 25-311 APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 20, 2025 ARB MINUTES.

Board Member Mead made a motion to approve the February 20, 2025 ARB minutes. Board Member Del Gallo seconded the motion, and it passed 6-0 with one member absent.

OPEN FORUM

NEW BUSINESS

2. 25-297 600 BLK E. GOVERNMENT STREET
PENSACOLA HISTORIC DISTRICT / ZONE HC-1 / CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT 6

FINAL REVIEW OF NEW RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION

Christopher Carroll is seeking final review for a new two-story residential structure in the wood cottages district to be addressed as 612 E. Government Street in the Seville Place subdivision. The 2,908 sf. structure will have Hardie lap siding, trim, and columns; a standing seam metal roof; metal railing; and vinyl windows with simulated divided lites.

Summer Carter presented to the board. Board Member Del Gallo made a motion to approve. Board Member Mead seconded the motion, and it passed 6-0 with one board member absent.

3. 25-298 819 E. JACKSON STREET OLD EAST HILL PRESERVATION DISTRICT / ZONE OEHC-1 / CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT 6 FINAL REVIEW OF REPLACEMENT WINDOWS AT A CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE

Highpointe DBR, LLC is seeking final approval to replace 18 existing wood windows with JeldWen aluminum-clad wood windows with simulated divided lites and a roof replacement with GAF Timberline shingles in Pewter Gray. In-kind siding repairs were recently approved through a board-for-board application and the exterior will be painted to match the existing colors.

Hal Lovato with Highpointe DBR presented to the board. Board Member Courtney noted the previous owners added custom storm shutters to each window and that the current windows are in good shape. Board Member Courtney asked for the reasons behind replacing the windows. Mr. Lovato answered that the windows are in poor condition and repairs would cost more than to replace. The windows are out of square and are not insulated, which needs to be addressed. Mr. Lovato noted the windows are in bad shape on the exterior and have been repaired multiple times, but the current windows are not worth fixing. Mr. Lovato noted the windows leak. Chair Brantley noted the clad-wood window product is appropriate and is what the board typically approves for clad windows. Board Member Ramos asked Mr. Pristera if he visited the property. Mr. Pristera answered he saw the outside but without interior photographs, it is hard to know the current condition of the windows. Mr. Pristera asked about the large front porch window. Mr. Lovato said the large window will look the same but will be inoperable and impact-resistant. Board Member Mead encouraged staff to ask applicants to include photographic evidence for window replacements. Board Member Del Gallo noted insurance will be difficult and impact-rated windows will help with insurance premiums. Board Member Yee noted the window quote states the large front window will be double hung, which implies it will be operable, and the lite pattern does not appear to match existing. The divided lite pattern should match the existing 4/6, but the quote shows 6/6. Mr. Lovato noted that a change must have been made without his knowledge. Mr. Pristera asked if there were plans to change the transom over the

front door. Mr. Lovato answered additional design work is being contemplated for the rear and addressing the transom would be a different phase of alterations.

Board Member Yee made a motion to approve with the request that the full height window on the front porch come back for abbreviated review showing the final configuration, whether fixed or operable, matching as close as possible the original lite pattern. Board Member Ramos seconded the motion, and it passed 6-0 with one member absent.

4. 25-299 820 N. BAYLEN STREET
NORTH HILL PRESERVATION DISTRICT / ZONE PR-2 / CITY COUNCIL
DISTRICT 6
FINAL REVIEW OF A REPLACEMENT ACCESSORY GARAGE AT A
CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE

Jared and Paula Willets are seeking final review of a replacement garage structure consisting of a carport with a first floor kitchen and bath with a second-story office space. The structure will be made of brick to match the existing home with a matching shingle roof, a 5V panel awning, Hardie trim, a permeable paver driveway, one Andersen aluminum-clad entry door, and Andersen 100 series vinyl windows with full divided lite per Andersen's definition.

Jared and Paula Willets presented to the board. Board Member Mead noted the carport hip roof line does not speak to the main structure and is more visible than the existing garage structure. Board Member Mead complimented the second story carrying the eave returns like the main house. The lower hip roof needs a gable to mimic the main structure or at least a substantial dormer element that would mimic that detail. The gable element needs to be carried into the carport. Board Member Ramos and Chair Brantley agreed with Board Member Mead's suggestion.

Board Member Ramos made a motion to approve as submitted with the exception that the carport roof be changed from a hip to a gable and be submitted for abbreviated review. Board Member Mead offered an amendment that the form of the gable has the eave returns like the main body of the dwelling unit. Board Member Ramos accepted the amendment. Board Member Mead seconded the motion, and it passed 6-0 with one member absent.

5. 25-300 1015 N. REUS STREET
NORTH HILL PRESERVATION DISTRICT / ZONE PR-1AAA / CITY COUNCIL
DISTRICT 6
FINAL REVIEW OF EXTERIOR ALTERATIONS AT A CONTRIBUTING
STRUCTURE

Martin Mullin is seeking final approval for exterior alterations to a contributing structure. This property received final approval for a different proposal for alterations at the March 2024 ARB. The current plan includes changes to the site

plan and landscaping, changes to the fenestration including new window openings, a reworked addition to the rear, and stucco on the front gable rather than vertical Hardie siding.

Martin Mullin presented to the board. Board Member Mead noted concern about the gable ends with the stucco treatment and how it integrates with the profiles of the windows and brick. Stucco seems out of keeping with the overall structure with the upper portion being lap siding. Mr. Mullin answered the house currently has three materials: original brick, second story stucco, and lap siding. There is existing stucco and the proposal will reduce the materials to just brick and stucco to simplify. Board Member Mead approved of that clarification. Mr. Mullin asked the board for their insights on the front elevation where the sliding door was replaced with operable casement windows. Board Member Mead commended that approach and found it to be appropriate.

Board Member Ramos made a motion to approve as submitted. Board Member Mead seconded the motion, and it passed 6-0 with one member absent.

6. 25-301 33 E. GREGORY STREET
PALAFOX HISTORIC BUSINESS DISTRICT / ZONE C-2A / CITY COUNCIL
DISTRICT 6
FINAL REVIEW OF REPLACEMENT STAIRS AT A NON-CONTRIBUTING
STRUCTURE

Timothy DuFrain is seeking final review for an exterior stair replacement consisting of an aluminum powder-coated stair in the color oil-rubbed bronze on the east side of the Rox Cowley Building.

Timothy DuFrain presented to the board.

Board Member Courtney made a motion to approve as submitted. Board Member Del Gallo seconded the motion, and it passed 6-0 with one member absent.

7. 25-302 10 PALAFOX PLACE
PALAFOX HISTORIC BUSINESS DISTRICT / ZONE C-2A / CITY COUNCIL
DISTRICT 6
FINAL REVIEW OF EXTERIOR MODIFICATIONS AT A CONTRIBUTING
STRUCTURE

Bavaria Pensacola is seeking final review for the installation of a two-sided cover and roof for an existing walk-in cooler and coverage of mechanical units in the rear of 10 Palafox Place. The enclosure was constructed without a permit or ARB approval, resulting in a stop worker order. The cover is designed to portray a faux German cottage.

Pedro Adams presented to the board. The board discussed the process in which

ARB approval must be sought prior to permitting. Board Member Ramos noted that the aesthetic could change based on building code requirements. Chair Brantley asked if the board was tasked with approving what the rendering shows or what was built. The applicant answered that they are seeking approval for what was built with the proposed sort of aesthetic. Board Member Mead asked for clarification on the roof style and if the shed roof would be changed to a gable end like what was shown in the rendering. The applicant answered no, the proposed structure would not change, but an aesthetic treatment would be added. The applicant was amenable to working with the building department to correct any building code requirements. Board Member Courtney asked about the current materials. Mr. Adams answered the frame is pressure-treated lumber, the siding is composite concrete board, and the roof is OSB. Mr. Adams noted the greenery would be removed. Board Member Ramos asked if an abbreviated review must be completed prior to permitting. Historic Preservation Planner Walker answered yes, and city staff can work with the applicant to resolve outstanding issues, so the building permit can be obtained. Board Member Yee noted it would be helpful if the applicant applied the exact treatment on the elevations at the end of the packet for an accurate representation. Board Member Ramos echoed Board Member Yee's comments to simplify the proposal with board and batten siding and less of the faux German cottage elements. Mr. Pristera echoed Board Member Ramos' and Yee's comments.

Board Member Ramos made a motion to approve the application on the condition that final exterior elevations be submitted for abbreviated review. Per Board Member Yee's recommendation, a fiber cement board and batten treatment, painted, with a shingle roof would be the most appropriate finishes for that structure. Board Member Mead seconded the motion, and it passed 6-0 with one board member absent.

8. 25-303 260 S. TARRAGONA STREET
PENSACOLA HISTORIC DISTRICT / ZONE HC-1 / CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT 6
CONCEPTUAL REVIEW OF EXTERIOR ALTERATIONS AT A CONTRIBUTING
STRUCTURE

Brian Spencer is seeking a conceptual review of exterior alterations consisting of replacement stairs and new window openings on the north elevation, new stairs with a metal awning and new window openings on the south elevation, new skylights, and new windows and doors on the front elevation with a second-story balcony.

William Brantley recused himself and presented to the board to represent the applicant. Board Member Ramos complimented the incremental changes and reuse of the structure. Mr. Brantley noted the alcove will still maintain the recess back to the doors on the first and second stories.

Board Member Del Gallo made a motion to approve. Board Member Ramos

seconded the motion, and it passed 5-0 with one member absent and Chair Brantley being recused.

9. 25-304 520 N. 6TH AVENUE
OLD EAST HILL PRESERVATION DISTRICT / ZONE OEHR-2 / CITY COUNCIL
DISTRICT 6
DEMOLITION OF A CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE

aDoor Properties is requesting approval for demolition of a contributing structure and an accessory building. The building in question is the Gates / Daniell house, a Second Empire structure that was built in 1892 by the general manager of the Muscogee Lumber Company. Several nonconforming architectural features were added during a restoration project ca. early 1990s. Since the building is a contributing structure, per Sec. 12-3-10(1)i., the applicant must demonstrate to the board clear and convincing evidence of unreasonable hardship. When the owner fails to prove unreasonable economic hardship, the applicant may provide the board with additional information that may show unusual and compelling circumstances in order to receive board recommendation for demolition of the contributing structure. The board shall be guided in its decision by balancing the historic, architectural, cultural and/or archaeological value of the particular structure against the special merit of the proposed replacement project. The applicant intends to create two new lots with new residential construction on each; conceptual review of the two replacement structures will be considered in the next two agenda items.

Members of the public provided hard copy materials to distribute to the board and Chair Brantley approved of the distribution. Steven Sebold presented to the board. Board Member Courtney encouraged the applicant to consider preserving the structure with examples of successful restoration projects. Chair Brantley referenced the criteria the board must consider, such as the structure being difficult to reproduce today and the structure being one of the last examples of that type of architecture. Board Member Mead asked staff if an engineering report was submitted with the application. Historic Preservation Planner Walker answered no, though the application references the city building official being requested to review the structure. Board Member Mead asked if there was an official finding that determined the building to be unsafe. Historic Preservation Planner Walker answered no. The building official examined the exterior of the building but was not formally requested to provide an official determination. Jonathan Bilby, Building Inspections Director, addressed the board. Mr. Bilby did not walk through the building but viewed the exterior. Mr. Bilby could not determine any unsafe elements per the city's code of ordinances, which directs staff to look at the international property maintenance code. From an exterior standpoint, Mr. Bilby did not determine the building to be unsafe. Mr. Bilby offered to walk through the interior of the property with the applicant, if requested. Mr. Pristera noted he had visited the house one year ago and was amazed at how intact it was. The architectural style and interior elements are unique. Mr. Pristera noted the amount of work needed

and the investment it would require, but there are many examples of structures that have been restored and preserved. There are programs with tax credits for improvements. Mr. Pristera stressed the need to save the house for numerous reasons but also as it relates to maintaining the character of the Old East Hill Preservation District. Chair Brantley noted that the application was insufficient to potentially approve the demolition.

Board Member Mead spoke about the construction methods of older homes and the use of old-growth timber that can withstand the test of time. Board Member Mead stated that the economic feasibility of treating this as an investment property makes it daunting to accomplish with regard to the amount of money that would be invested. Board Member Mead supported the proposal to divide the lot to develop the vacant space adjacent to provide an economic return. Board Member Mead echoed Chair Brantley's comments, requiring more justification, such as an engineering report. Chair Brantley invited public speakers for three minutes each.

Susan Ford addressed the board as a resident of the Old East Hill Preservation District. Ms. Ford noted the average Old East Hill resident cannot easily purchase a historic home and restore it themselves. The neighborhood has a common thread among property owners who were hopeful when potential buyers came forward, but each potential purchase fell through.

Seth Hayes addressed the board as a newer resident of Pensacola from Charleston, South Carolina. Mr. Hayes spoke about the uniqueness of the Old East Hill neighborhood and how it contributes to the city's uniqueness. Demolition of the structure would change the neighborhood and the people and may encourage less emphasis to be placed on preservation. Mr. Hayes referenced the financial opportunity to develop the vacant space if subdivided. Average home prices in the area averaged around 1 million dollars.

Jeff Elbert, 616 E. Belmont Street, addressed the board. Mr. Elbert noted respect for aDoor as a great and profitable company who is a good steward of the community, but it seems like aDoor is asking for forgiveness rather than permission. The purchase has already occurred, and now they are asking for forgiveness. Mr. Hayes referenced his own home that needed a tremendous amount of work as an example of being able to restore a home in disrepair. Mr. Hayes noted it was unforgivable to tear the house down.

Abbie Barnett, owner of the house across the street at 600 E. Jackson Street, addressed the board. The Barnetts purchased and renovated the structure in 2022 and have renovated several other historic structures around Pensacola. In May 2024, the Barnetts went under contract to purchase the structure in question at 520 N. 6th Avenue. Mrs. Barnett met with many contractors to identify a budget for the restoration. The deal fell through due to financing because this type of structure required all cash or a renovation loan consisting of the purchase price and the entire renovation cost at 10 to 12% interest rate. The Barnetts were under contract

for \$400,000 and the renovation would cost \$400,000, and it was too much for one couple to do. Mrs. Barnett shared contractors' names who she met with, including AFS who evaluated the foundation and said it was in amazing shape considering the age of the structure and being exposed to the elements. They quoted \$25,000 to stabilize the foundation and the porch stabilization was quoted at \$28,000. Mrs. Barnett, a professional realtor, comped the property a year ago at \$850,000 for the existing structure and \$150,000 for the subdivided lot.

Beverly Elliott addressed the board and noted the uniqueness of the house. Ms. Elliott has lived in Old East Hill since 1974 and has saved four structures from being demolished. Ms. Elliott shared the history of Lola Daniell, who once owned the home. Ms. Daniell was a philanthropic woman who made many contributions to Pensacola. Ms. Elliott noted she has a client who is interested in purchasing the home from aDoor to restore it.

Board Member Mead asked if the applicant wanted to speak to any of the public comments. Mr. Sebold noted they are open to selling the existing home because aDoor is not interested in restoring the home. Mr. Sebold noted that aDoor experiences the same issues with financing and interest rates that other people have. Mr. Sebold also noted that aDoor is following proper protocols and is not asking for forgiveness. Mr. Sebold noted they will provide the engineering report to the ARB to pursue demolition, but in the meantime, the house is for sale. Board Member Mead asked about the following applications for conceptual review of replacement plans and if those would be reviewed. Mr. Sebold answered the orientation must be altered if aDoor moves forward with only developing the vacant lot and that the application would be reviewed at a later meeting. Mr. Sebold withdrew the next two agenda items.

Board Member Mead made a motion to deny the application for demolition on the grounds that this is a unique architectural and historical structure, dating to the foundation of the Old East Hill neighborhood. It has not been shown to suffer from structural defects or other matters that make it unsafe or unsound or make it unfeasible, other than as a financial matter, to renovate and preserve it in some capacity. Because there is continuing economic viability for the balance of the property and the other lot, this application does not provide a sufficient degree of hardship for the purposes of denying the demolition, as the indication is that there may be buyers and there is an interest in selling the property for that purpose. Board Member Courtney seconded the motion, and it passed 6-0 with one member absent. Historic Preservation Planner Walker clarified the denial was based on code section 12-3-10(1)i.2.

10. 25-305 520 N. 6TH AVENUE
OLD EAST HILL PRESERVATION DISTRICT / ZONE OEHR-2 / CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT
CONCEPTUAL REVIEW OF REPLACEMENT PLANS FOR LOT A

aDoor is seeking conceptual review of replacement plans for Lot A where a contributing currently sits. The applicant is proposing a 2,541 sf. two-story residential structure with a 400 sf. garage accessory dwelling unit in the rear.

This item was removed from the agenda by the applicant.

11. 25-306 520 N. 6TH AVENUE
OLD EAST HILL PRESERVATION DISTRICT / ZONE OEHR-2 / CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT
CONCEPTUAL REVIEW OF REPLACEMENT PLANS FOR LOT B

aDoor is seeking conceptual review of replacement plans for Lot B, a proposed new lot to be created if the existing lot is subdivided. The applicant is proposing a 2,496 sf. two-story residential structure with a 400 sf. garage accessory dwelling unit in the rear

This item was removed from the agenda by the applicant.

12. 25-307 312 E. LA RUA STREET
OLD EAST HILL PRESERVATION DISTRICT / ZONE OEHC-1 / CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT 6
VARIANCE

Nannette Chandler is seeking a variance to reduce the minimum floor area for multifamily developments from 600 sf. per dwelling unit to 500 sf. Per Sec. 12-3-10(3)i. Table 3-10.10, Regulations for new construction in the Old East Hill preservation district, OEHC-1 zoning requires a minimum floor area of 600 sf. per dwelling unit for multifamily developments. The applicant is proposing an apartment complex composed of 24–30 affordable housing units utilizing Florida Statute 166.04151, or the Live Local Act, that provides incentives for the development of affordable housing with statutory parameters for density, height, floor area ratio, and parking. Per the Live Local Act, a municipality must administratively approve increases in density, floor area ratio, and height, changes to land use, and reductions to parking for eligible projects. Administrative approval is limited to those provisions and does not address minimum floor area per dwelling unit per the city's Land Development Code. The proposed site plan depicts a mix of ground-level parking with two residential stories above and three-story residential structures. The board must determine if the proposed variance to reduce the minimum floor area to 500 sf. meets the criteria outlined in Sec. 12-11-2(a)(2) and 12-12-3(5)b.1.i. – ii.

Nannette Chandler presented to the board. Chair Brantley noted a development in Charleston, South Carolina that made an interesting case study for communal balconies. Ms. Chandler noted the site plan shows the property and overall shape of the buildings, but everything is subject to change once the design process takes place. Board Member Mead asked staff about the potential for a site-specific

development. Assistant Planning & Zoning Division Manager Harding answered that site-specific developments are not created anymore because they are considered spot zoning, and the variance is required because the code states that the minimum dwelling unit size is 600 sf. in this zoning district. Development Services Director Morris shared that site-specific zoning still exists in the city code as a zoning category, but it is no longer a legal option. There is a special planned development provision in the code that is specific to only certain zoning districts, and it does not speak to dwelling unit sizes. The Old East Hill provision of 600 sf. minimum dwelling unit size is unique to that district and there is no relief from that provision in any other development processes.

Chair Brantley went through the variance criteria that must be demonstrated. Criteria One is that special conditions and circumstances exist which are peculiar to the land, structure, or building which are not applicable to other lands, structures, or buildings in the same zoning district. Ms. Chandler answered yes, the shape of the lot dictates what can or cannot be done. Within the district, other structures can be less than 600 sf. including single-family residences. Criteria Two is that special conditions and circumstances do not result from the actions of the applicant and Ms. Chandler indicated she had just purchased the lot, and it is zoned commercially. Criteria Three states that granting the variance will not confer on the applicant any special privilege that is denied by the ordinance to other lands, buildings, or structures in the same zoning district. Ms. Chandler noted that no other multifamily developments exist in the neighborhood. Criteria Four notes that a literal interpretation of the provisions of the applicable zoning ordinance would deprive the applicant of rights commonly enjoyed by other properties in the same zoning district under the terms of the ordinance and would cause unnecessary and undue hardship to the applicant. Board Member Mead asked if an administrative variance could be applied. Staff answered no, since that only applies to parking and minor reductions to setbacks. Ms. Chandler noted that all other types of units are allowed below 600 sf. and this only applies to apartments. Criteria Five states that the variance granted is the minimum variance that will make possible the reasonable use of the land. Ms. Chandler answered yes. Criteria Six notes that the grant of the variance will be in harmony with the general intent and purpose of the applicable zoning ordinance and that such a variance will not be injurious to the area involved or otherwise detrimental to the public welfare. Ms. Chandler answered yes, there is nothing else about the request that is outside the scope of what is already allowed on the property. Criteria Seven states that the variance will not constitute any change in the districts shown on the zoning map, will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property, will not materially increase the congestion in public streets, or increase the public danger of fire and safety, will not materially diminish or impair established property values within the surrounding area, and will not otherwise impair the public health, safety, morals and general welfare of the City of Pensacola. Ms. Chandler noted that this project does not affect public welfare. All the buildings will be sprinkled, and an additional hydrant will be placed at the end of the driveway. The height will be below the maximum height.

Ms. Chandler and the board discussed the setbacks, landscaping, and buffer yard requirements. Board Member Yee echoed Chair Brantley's comments about providing affordable housing and missing middle. Board Member Yee asked for clarification on the height requirement based on setbacks. Staff explained that height is not dictated by setbacks for primary structures and this property has a five-foot side yard setback. Board Member Mead noted the adoption of Appendix Q and the existing model for tiny homes on La Rua Street and asked if the adoption of Appendix Q helps to justify the variance. Assistant Planning & Zoning Division Manager Harding noted that the provision is a hardship to the applicant since this would be allowed by right in any other zoning district. Building Services Director Bilby noted that Appendix Q applies to single-family dwellings and not multifamily developments, but under the Florida Building Code, 500 sf. is sufficient for dwelling units in an apartment complex. Board Member Del Gallo asked the applicant about the median income target and what the rent may be. Ms. Chandler noted a correlating rent scale for Live Local which dictates the rent amount that must be maintained. Board Member Del Gallo referenced that the average rent in Pensacola is \$1300 a month and asked if the applicant was going to be 70% of that. Ms. Chandler answered the average one-bedroom rent in Pensacola is \$2250 per month and the proposed rent would be significantly less. Board Member Del Gallo noted he had just sold some apartments and his understanding was the average rent in Pensacola was around \$1400. Ms. Chandler noted it depends on where in Pensacola the apartment is located. Ms. Chandler noted the affordable rental rate is a 25-year commitment that is based on median income each year for the area.

Chair Brantley noted the additional variance criteria per Sec. 12-12-3(5)b. which state that the variance granted will not detract from the architectural integrity and/or historical accuracy of the development and its surroundings and that the grant of the variance will be in harmony with the general intent and purpose of this title and that such variance will not be injurious to the area involved or otherwise detrimental to public welfare. Ms. Chandler noted that the variance has nothing to do with architecture and the second criterion does not involve a variance to square footage or overall development. Ms. Chandler noted the site plan was to demonstrate a conceptual idea of how the space might be utilized, but it was not a requirement for the variance to be heard. Board Member Courtney referenced criterion seven involving congestion on public streets and noted the singular driveway and asked where people would park and how the increased vehicular traffic would be addressed. Ms. Chandler answered that on-site parking is not required, but the development will include 15 spaces on site with parking below on the first floor. Parking will be available across Jackson Street in other off-street parking areas. Ms. Chandler chose not to speak any further about parking options for the future development. Chair Brantley asked the city's Building Inspections Director to speak about any potential issues with dead-end corridors and travel distances based on the site plan submitted with the variance application. Mr. Bilby noted he could not comment since no floor plans or plans had been submitted for review. Mr. Bilby

noted all code compliance would be vetted once the plans are submitted. Board Member Ramos noted the concept is interesting, which could address a housing need, and commended the applicant for working through a challenge. Board Member Ramos noted the issues of congestion but did not see an issue with density for the proposed area.

Kathleen Bellard addressed the board as a member of the public. Ms. Bellard referenced the issues that the board discussed in terms of congestion and the fact that the 300 block of East La Rua is an older brick road that is very narrow. Food delivery trucks cause the road to be one way much of the time. Ms. Bellard felt the proposed driveway is more like 15 feet, which is narrow for cars to swing into. Ms. Bellard noted concern for fire responders and accessibility to the properties along that stretch of East La Rua Street.

Ms. Chandler acknowledged Ms. Bellard's concerns and stated the driveway is 20 feet, which is the required width. Ms. Chandler agreed that the delivery trucks cause congestion on East La Rua Street and stated she planned to speak with the owner of Lily Hall to see if the trucks could back onto the property rather than park them on the street. Chair Brantley shared comments provided by the Old East Hill Preservation Association, who stated they do not support the variance since a hardship was not documented. Ms. Chandler again referenced that other properties such as single-family dwellings are allowed to be less than 600 sf.

With Chair Brantley's approval, Kathleen Bellard represented a neighbor who shared comments via email. Alvaro Velandia, who lives next door to the proposed development, stated opposition to the variance due to the increase in density of the area. Mr. Velandia asked if a traffic study had been conducted, especially with increased traffic from the skate park and other developments. Mr. Velandia also questioned access for first responders and the plans for Alcaniz Street to become a two-way road. Mr. Velandia also noted that the driveway access was only 15 feet wide rather than 20 feet. Mr. Velandia questioned if the development was fitting for the neighborhood per the CRA's recent redevelopment plans. Ms. Chandler restated that the variance request is only focused on the dwelling unit size and that the apartment complex and even larger units are allowed by right. Ms. Chandler noted that what is best for the neighborhood is factored into her plans.

Board Member Mead made a motion to approve the variance and found that the criteria in Sec. 12-11-2(a)(2)a.1–7. had been met in addition to the criteria in Sec. 12-12-3(5)b. of the city code (Board Member Mead read the criteria aloud and addressed each). Board Member Mead suggested that the development activities enter through the Jackson Street access to avoid East La Rua Street. Board Member Ramos seconded the motion, and it passed 4–2 with Board Members Courtney and Yee dissenting and one member absent.

ADJOURNMENT

