



City of Pensacola

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

MINUTES

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

November 16, 2023

2:00 PM

Hagler-Mason Conference Room,
2nd Floor

CALL TO ORDER / QUORUM

Members Present: Derek Salter, George R Mead, II, Anna Fogarty, Brian Spencer, Jordan Yee, Yuri Ramos, Ross Pristera

Members Absent: Lou Courtney

Also Present: Ken Niemeyer, Tony Patel, Robert Landers, Lynsey Hatch, Jeff Fernandez, Tosh Belsinger, Alex Grace, Ashley King, Assistant Planning & Zoning Division Manager Harding, Digital Media Specialist Russo, Historic Preservation Planner Walker

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Board Member Spencer made a motion to approve the October 19, 2023, minutes, seconded by Board Member Mead, and it carried 6-0.

1. 23-929 ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES

OPEN FORUM

NEW BUSINESS

2. 23-930 255 W. BRAINERD STREET
NORTH HILL PRESERVATION DISTRICT / ZONE PR-1AAA / CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT 6
EXTERIOR ALTERATIONS AT A NON-CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE

Dr. Daniel Hohman is seeking approval to replace two existing windows with Jeld-Wen Premium Atlantic Vinyl single hung windows to match existing, replace one door with a Jeld-Wen Gladiator Steel Door to match existing, and construct a brick wall and patio to match the existing structure. The work was undertaken without a permit or ARB approval resulting in a stop work order in October 2023.

Mr. Ken Niemeyer, representing Dr. Hohman, presented to the board. Chairperson Salter shared comments from the North Hill Preservation Association that ARB approval is needed for the changes; there are no objections to the style of the windows or doors as submitted; a more detailed plan for the stairs should be submitted; from the height of the new door the stairs may require a longer run than what is depicted; and railings, should they be required, should be submitted for approval. There is concern on the dirt slope shown in the pictures to the south of the patio. Mr. Niemeyer clarified that the slope is natural and was scraped for the patio, and it is typically covered in grass and will be sodded once the project is complete. North Hill Preservation Association also questioned the requirement of a silt fence, but that is not under the ARB jurisdiction.

Chairperson Salter noted the main concern appears to be the proposed steps coming off the back of the house from the new door. Mr. Niemeyer noted there is an existing patio, and this would be a continuation of the existing. The previous steps were steep and narrow, it is preferred to not match the rear steps and attempt to match the front steps that are less steep. Chairperson Salter asked if the stairs leading from the landing outside the new door will require railings or if a rail will be provided. Mr. Niemeyer answered that a rail was to be provided once the steps are chosen and the application does not include the railings.

Board Member Spencer asked Chairperson Salter for clarification on the board's current stance on how to move forward and does the applicant need to provide drawings to be approved. Mr. Niemeyer noted that rough drawings were included. Board Member Spencer noted that drawings with dimensions would help the board make a decision. Mr. Niemeyer noted that the drawing depicts what is proposed but is lacking the railing detail. Board Member Yee clarified that dimensions and details are required. Chairperson Salter noted that the application has two parts, the window replacement which includes sufficient information that is clear and the expanded patio with drawings including materials. In Chairperson Salter's opinion the item that is lacking is the specifics on the stairs and railing, but there is enough to discuss. The windows and doors are appropriate, the brick is a good match, and the only question is the size and dimension of the stair and railing which could be handled through an abbreviated review. Mr. Niemeyer asked if the drawing was to scale with dimensions and Chairperson Salter answered it does not have sufficient detail.

Board Member Ramos echoed Chairperson Salter's statement and noted that the stair material must be identified. Mr. Niemeyer answered the steps will be made of brick and they will match the existing. Board Member Ramos agreed that an

abbreviated review is needed for the steps and railing. Mr. Niemeyer noted the existing steps are narrow and steep and should that be matched. Board Member Ramos answered that the new steps should meet current codes and complement the existing, but proportions do not have to be matched exactly. Board Member Fogarty asked for clarification on property lines and setbacks which are not clear on the provided documents. Mr. Niemeyer answered the house is 35-40 feet away from the property line and 25-30 feet away to the east at the existing driveway. The patio is 35 feet or more from the rear property line.

Board Member Spencer made a motion the applicant provide necessary dimensions and other information that is maybe missing, certainly someone can add to the motion, sufficient for abbreviated or administrative review. Board Member Spencer's goal with the motion is to not bring this back to the full Architectural Review Board.

Chairperson Salter noted he did not hear a motion to approve or deny, based on Board Member Spencer's further comment was that it intended to be a motion to approve with the specifically discussed items regarding the steps and railing to be brought back for abbreviated review.

Board Member Spencer stated his motion is to reflect for the record that the ARB today has been presented and does approve the insertion of windows and French doors, that existing unpermitted work has been reviewed and approved by the ARB; the future contemplated work that has been presented in sketch form by the applicant be resubmitted with clear dimensions as well as a guard rail if needed and handrail designs for abbreviated review.

Board Member Yee seconded the motion. Board Member Ramos asked if he could amend the motion. Assistant Planning and Zoning Division Manager Harding noted that the board could entertain an amendment since it has not been voted on yet. Board Member Ramos suggested the applicant provide a site plan showing the proper, required setbacks for the alteration.

Board Members Spencer and Yee accepted the amendment. The amended motion carried 6-0.

Mr. Niemeyer asked for clarification on how the drawings will be submitted. Historic Preservation Planner Walker noted that instructions will be provided to the applicant following the meeting.

3. 23-931 521 N. ALCANIZ STREET
OLD EAST HILL PRESERVATION DISTRICT / ZONE PR-1AAA / CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT 6
CHANGE OF WINDOWS AT A NON-CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE

Robert Landers is seeking approval to replace eighteen (18) wood windows with

Jeld-Wen W-5500 series auralast pine aluminum-clad double hung windows with impact glass at a non-contributing structure. The exterior color will be bronze or black with four over four simulated divided lites. The applicant is proposing to infill one west-facing double window with original, matching brick from a partially dismantled chimney. A new front door is depicted in the packet but is not a part of this application.

Mr. Landers presented to the board. Board Member Mead asked if a subsequent review would be provided for the front door. Historic Preservation Planner Walker answered that the door can be handled through an abbreviated review. Board Member Mead asked the applicant for clarification on the covered porch. Mr. Landers answered it was lattice but is now covered up. Chairperson Salter noted there were no comments from Old East Hill.

Board Member Mead made a motion to approve. Board Member Ramos seconded the motion and it carried 6-0.

4. 23-932 9 W. DE SOTO STREET
NORTH HILL PRESERVATION DISTRICT / ZONE PR-2 & PR-1AAA / CITY
COUNCIL DISTRICT 6
EXTERIOR ALTERATIONS AT A CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE

Lynsey and Neal Hatch are seeking approval to remove painted plywood over four former window openings. There are no frames, sashes, or glazing behind the plywood and the interior has drywall. The applicants are proposing to remove the existing trim and infill the openings with KDAT pressure treated lumber milled with a specialty saw blade to match the two different existing, narrow novelty wood siding types and will be painted to match existing. The transom window will remain with infilled siding below.

Ms. Hatch presented to the board. Chairperson Salter asked if the intent was to remove all traces of the windows and infill with the two different, matching siding types that are present. Ms. Hatch answered yes. Board Member Mead asked if there were bookcases inside where the windows are located. Ms. Hatch answered no. Chairperson Salter noted the North Hill Preservation Association had no objection to the request.

Board Member Fogarty made a motion to approve the application as submitted. Board Member Spencer seconded the motion and the motion carried 6-0.

5. 23-933 600 E. BELMONT STREET
OLD EAST HILL PRESERVATION DISTRICT / ZONE OEHR-2 / CITY COUNCIL
DISTRICT 6
CHANGE OF WINDOWS AT A CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE

Godinez Construction is seeking approval to replace five (5) existing wood windows with Andersen 400 series vinyl-clad wood double hung windows with two over two full divided lites to match existing Andersen windows.

Jeff Fernandez, homeowner, presented to the board. Chairperson Salter clarified that the proposed windows will match newer windows that were previously installed. Board Member Ramos asked if the new windows would match the existing green color. Mr. Fernandez answered yes, Andersen's Forest Green is the color. Chairperson Salter noted there no comments from the Old East Hill Preservation Association.

Board Member Mead made a motion to approve as submitted. Board Member Ramos seconded, and it carried 6-0.

6. 23-934 600 S. PALAFOX STREET
PALAFOX HISTORIC BUSINESS DISTRICT / ZONE C-2A / CITY COUNCIL
DISTRICT 6
CONCEPTUAL REVIEW FOR A NEW HOTEL DEVELOPMENT

Buck Lindsay is seeking conceptual approval for a new eight-story Tempo by Hilton hotel with 213 guest rooms, lobby area, dining, a meeting space, fitness area, swimming pool, and surface parking. This project was denied for conceptual approval at the September 2023 meeting; a final review will be required a later date.

Alex Grace presented to the board. Chairperson Salter noted that a lot of positive progress has been made and opening the rooms to the south works well, while keeping windows on the Palafox Street side. The colonnade along Palafox continues what the street has and that is a positive step forward. Board Member Mead echoed the Chairperson's comments and that the rhythm around the structure is much better, the gallery is nice and the attention to detail on the panels at the top of the gallery area will have a nice street effect, and looks forward to seeing activation of that area. Board Member Spencer appreciated the modifications from the previous design.

Board Member Spencer asked for clarification if the project was still conceptual. Mr. Grace answered yes. Board Member Spencer noted that Palafox is depicted as a three-lane street in the rendering, which is inaccurate. Mr. Grace noted that nothing is changing on Palafox Street from a civil perspective and the development is solely within the property boundaries. Board Member Spencer noted for the record that there is almost 16 feet wide, inlaid brick pavers and a cadence of trees and sidewalk on Palafox Street and the renderings depict a four to six foot wide sidewalk to the face of the building, with the columns shown in the two-dimensional site plan as abutting the street curb as opposed to being set back. Mr. Grace answered that working with city staff, the applicants are aware they must maintain the sidewalk, brick, and tree wells and that Cedar Street may be redesigned toward

the baseball field and the applicants are waiting to see the progress on that. Board Member Spencer noted the current site plan indicates a three-lane Palafox Street and parallel parking. Mr. Grace answered that currently the applicants are graphically showing Cedar Street and are not paying particular attention to that area. It is Mr. Grace's understanding that Cedar Street may become one directional and more pedestrian friendly and the applicants stepped the building back from the property line to accommodate those changes. Board Member Spencer noted it is vitally important that promenades with tree wells continue.

Board Member Spencer asked staff about landscaping buffers for hotels and is there an exception. Assistant Planning and Zoning Division Manager Harding answered that Palafox Historic Business District provides an exception and any work in the right of way that shows parking where there is not currently will fall under the parking lease agreement with the Parking Services Department and that will be contingent on the design of this building. Conversations with additional staff will occur after conceptual review and input from the board. Board Member Spencer asked about Gateway Development District requiring screening for surface parking and does Gimble Street require landscaping? Assistant Planning and Zoning Division Manager Harding answered that zoning district C-2A is a little different and things like parking lots are not required to be screened, but other districts do have stricter landscape requirements. Board Member Spencer encouraged the applicant to consider screening on the south side, like a vertical low wall, though not required. Mr. Grace noted that they could look into screening the parking area from pedestrians.

Assistant Planning and Zoning Division Manager Harding noted those exceptions are part of Chapter 12-6 Tree and Landscape Regulations, and the C-2A downtown retail commercial district is exempt from the provisions of that chapter. Board Member Spencer noted that areas of Jefferson Street are permeable and for the license to use, the applicants will need to find some way to replace the square footage, but that is not under the board's purview. Board Member Fogarty thanked the applicants for listening to the board's previous feedback and making those changes. Board Member Yee agreed the improvements are great and the south facing façade particularly with the views. Board Member Yee suggested the arcades along Palafox and Cedar Streets could provide an opportunity for the hotel rooms at that level to also take advantage of the top of the arcade, like conditions north on Palafox. It may increase the scale and height of that gallery. Mr. Grace noted they will consult with the architect about that potential. Board Member Yee echoed Board Member Spencer's comments about being clear about property lines and rights of way and the relationship of the arcade gallery to the existing sidewalks.

Board Member Spencer made a motion to approve the 600 S. Palafox hotel as submitted with an understanding the applicant will be returning for final approval. Board Member Fogarty second the motion and it carried 6-0.

7. 23-935 18 E. GARDEN STREET
PALAFOX HISTORIC BUSINESS DISTRICT / ZONE C-2A / CITY COUNCIL
DISTRICT 6
DEMOLITION OF A CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE

SMP Architecture is seeking approval to demolish one (1) contributing structure at 18 E. Garden Street. The application includes a narrative which advocates unusual and compelling circumstances and six considerations the board should consider to justify approval of the demolitions. These criteria are required when economic hardship cannot be shown. As part of the demolition request, the applicants must also seek at least conceptual review of replacement plans. Final review of the new development will follow as the next agenda item. Board Member Spencer signed a recusal form for Items 7 and 8.

Philip Partington and William Brantley presented to the board. Mr. Partington noted that the structure is built of CMU and does not retain the historical nature it once had. Advisor Pristera noted that he provided historic photographs for the application and the façade has changed since the 1930s. The Jefferson Street extension was done in 1981-82 and had to shore up some of the walls of the building when the road was cut through. Advisor Pristera noted it has been heavily modified and the section that is proposed to be demolished has lost all significance in Advisor Pristera's opinion.

Board Member Mead asked Advisor Pristera if a different structure was present in the 1930s. Advisor Pristera answered it is the same building, but it changed post-1930. Board Member Mead asked staff for the standards of consideration for a contributing structure. Historic Preservation Planner Walker answered since economic hardship is not being demonstrated, the six criteria for unusual and compelling circumstances are outlined in Sec. 12-3-10i.2. Assistant Planning and Zoning Division Manager Harding noted that the board does have the power to alter contributing statuses if it is going from contributing to noncontributing since it is supported evidence that wasn't available before. But when altering from noncontributing to contributing, the decision must go to City Council.

Board Member Mead asked the applicant if the west wall is the abutting wall of the inboard of the two units. Mr. Partington answered that the adjacent or demising wall is partially brick and the other three walls are just CMU. Board Member Yee asked if it is known how much building was removed when Jefferson was cut through. Advisor Pristera answered that an entire bay of the building was removed and other buildings to the east were taken out. Board Member Mead asked if the demolition proposal and replacement plans must be taken in any particular order. Assistant Planning and Zoning Division Manager Harding answered no, contributing structures need approval for replacement plans for the permit. Typically, with contributing structures final approval of replacement plans is necessary before the demolition permit can be issued. Board Member Yee asked if the contributing status is removed, does that still apply. Assistant Planning and

Zoning Division Manager Harding answered that if the contributing status was removed and the replacement plans were not approved, the applicants could still pull the demolition permit since the building is now noncontributing. The board typically handles the demolition application separately, knowing that the applicant has provided replacement plans. The ordinance reads that the applicants must immediately seek approval or review of the replacement plans.

Chairperson Salter stated the applicant has made the case that compelling circumstances are present that the building is not as historically significant as it may have been considered and this makes it a candidate for demolition for a better and higher use of the property. Board Member Mead complimented the application demonstrating the history of the building and history of its modification and structural changes. For that reason, the board can use this as an example of altering a contributing structure to noncontributing status. Board Member Mead noted he would support a motion to change the structure to noncontributing.

Board Member Mead made a motion to make finding based upon the package submitted and the representations of the applicant as to the nature of the existing construction and modification from the historical evidence that the board has seen that this no longer is a contributing structure within the meaning of the code and that the board approve the demolition as submitted. Board Member Ramos seconded the motion and it carried 6-0.

8. 23-936 18 E. GARDEN STREET
PALAFOX HISTORIC BUSINESS DISTRICT / ZONE C-2A / CITY COUNCIL
DISTRICT 6
FINAL REVIEW FOR NEW COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT

SMP Architecture is seeking final approval for a new commercial development to replace the contributing structure and private parking lot at 18 E. Garden Street. The current plans depict a one-story restaurant establishment with primary façade elements being brick and cast stone with a metal roof, metal canopies, and a metal railing system. This development is part of the East Garden District project, constructed through a public-private partnership, with the streetscape partially funded by the city's Community Redevelopment Agency.

Philip Partington and William Brantley presented to the board. Chairperson Salter noted that the new package adds distinction to the building and presence on the street and how it will define the corner. Chairperson Salter asked about the two gable sides, if the lighting below the signage was bar lighting. Mr. Brantley answered yes and the lighting and signage will be submitted through an abbreviated review. Board Member Ramos asked the applicant why the alley is there and that the proposed building is separated from the building next door. Mr. Partington answered there is an existing easement for the adjacent buildings that is currently a parking lot. Tosh Belsinger addressed the board and shared that there is an existing alley easement that connects Garden Street to the back of 2 N.

Palafox and the Wade Palmer law office, Rock Hard Jewelry, and Rex Theatre. There is an existing 9-foot alley easement. As the easement is described legally, it can be moved along Garden Street but must be maintained to the back of the properties. It is being moved next to Papa's Pizza and is being widened to 12 feet.

Board Member Ramos noted on the site plan there is a parking lot on the rear of the building, but later renderings show a building mass. Board Member Ramos noted the rear of the building will be highly visible coming down Jefferson Street and there is a harsh transition between the brick and stucco material. Mr. Partington noted the mass is a future residential development so the parking lot is a place holder as the development is phased over time. Board Member Ramos questioned if there is something that can be done to the north elevation to be more intentional. Mr. Brantley answered that area is the kitchen and cold storage on those walls, so every opportunity was taken to place an opening. There is a window in the receiving office. Board Member Ramos noted he is speaking more to materiality. The brick turns the corner and becomes stucco and similar discussions took place with Union Public House. Board Member Ramos noted the face of the building is brick but it abruptly stops when the corner is turned and it looks unfinished. Mr. Belsinger questioned how this was handled with Union Public House. Board Member Ramos and Assistant Planning and Zoning Division Manager Harding noted Union Public House was approved largely, but the rear treatment was required to be addressed through an abbreviated review. Mr. Partington asked if the brick pier could wrap the corner and could have a stucco band. The applicants discussed possibilities to address Board Member Ramos' concerns.

Chairperson Salter asked about the grout color. Mr. Partington answered grey to complement the brick. Assistant Planning and Zoning Division Manager Harding shared the abbreviated review from 2022 for Union Public House. The original proposal had a brick north façade with a small stucco addition that jutted out. The board felt it was too contrasting. Through an abbreviated review, the full façade of the rear was approved to be stucco. Board Member Yee noted it is not as much the materials, but how they join together and Board Member Yee agrees with Board Member Ramos' comments. Board Member Mead agreed that the rear façade needs a treatment to make it more balanced.

Board Member Ramos made a motion to approve the application as submitted with the exception that the rear or north elevation come back for abbreviated review based on the comments given by the board. Chairperson Salter provided an amendment for clarification that the signage indicated and lighting indicated for the signage is not a part of the approval. Board Member Ramos accepted the amendment. Board Member Mead seconded the motion and it carried 6-0.

9. 23-937 1301 N. PALAFOX STREET
NORTH HILL PRESERVATION DISTRICT / ZONE PC-1 & PR-2 / CITY COUNCIL

DISTRICT 6

NEW WINDOWS AT A CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE

Ashley King is seeking approval to add seventeen (17) new storefront windows, varying between four and six lites, within existing brick surrounds and four (4) new skylights at a contributing structure.

Ashley King presented to the board. Chairperson Salter noted that what is being proposed is appropriate and the North Hill Preservation Association had no objections. Board Member Mead complimented the package. Ms. King noted the interior needs more daylighting which is why skylights are being proposed.

Board Member Ramos made a motion to approve the package as submitted. Board Member Fogarty seconded, and the motion carried 6-0.

10. 23-938 400 S. JEFFERSON STREET
PENSACOLA HISTORIC DISTRICT / ZONE HC-2 / CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT 6
FINAL REVIEW FOR A NEW ROOFTOP VENUE AT A CONTRIBUTING
STRUCTURE

Carter Quina is seeking final approval for a rooftop venue at the Clark Family Cultural Center, a contributing structure in the Pensacola Historic District. This project received conceptual approval at the October 2022 ARB meeting.

Andrew Guarisco and Mohammad Mahasneh presented to the board. Chairperson Salter noted not much had changed from the conceptual review and Board Member Mead complimented the application.

Board Member Mead made a motion to approve as submitted. Board Member Spencer seconded the motion and it carried 6-0.

ADJOURNMENT