



City of Pensacola

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

MINUTES

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

December 21, 2023

2:00 PM

Whibbs Conference Room, 1st
Floor

CALL TO ORDER / QUORUM

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

Members Absent: Lou Courtney, Yuri Ramos, Brian Spencer

Also Present: Assistant Planning & Zoning Division Manager
Harding, Digital Media Specialist Russo, Historic
Preservation Planner Walker, IT Specialist Green,
Arthur Davis, Matt Markham, Jeff Cutter, Winford
Lindsay

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. 23-1079 ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES

Board Member Mead made a motion to approve the November 16, 2023, minutes, seconded by Board Member Fogarty, and it carried 4-0.

OPEN FORUM

NEW BUSINESS

2. 23-1080 610 E. GOVERNMENT STREET PENSACOLA HISTORIC DISTRICT / ZONE HC-1 / CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT 6 EXTERIOR IMPROVEMENTS AT A NONCONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE

Jeff Cutter is seeking approval for exterior improvements at a non-contributing structure including a new gunite pool with a raised wall with two fire bowls and a

six-foot waterfall, landscaping, a new paver driveway, and replacing the existing grass in the front with artificial turf. Historic Preservation Planner Walker noted that city engineering was consulted regarding work depicted in the city right of way, which is outside the purview of the ARB. The artificial turf will not be permitted in city right of way and the curb cut must be inset one foot from the property line.

Jeff Cutter and Matt Markham presented to the board. Board Member Yee asked for clarification about the work in city right of way. Historic Preservation Planner Walker answered that the artificial turf is not allowed in the city right of way and the curb cut has requirements that will be handled during the permitting phase. Mr. Markham noted that there is an existing curb cut.

Board Member Mead asked for clarification on the standard in this district with regard to artificial turf. Historic Preservation Planner Walker answered that Pensacola Historic District has a landscaping section, Sec. 12-3-10(1)e.6., within the front yard setback the use of grass, ground cover, or shrubs is required. This code has been interpreted in the past that those should be living elements and natural plantings versus artificial. Chairperson Salter asked for clarification on the general height of the sabal palms that will be up lighted. Mr. Markham answered 8-10 feet is the overall height of the palms and the 3,000 kelvin lights are adjustable and will be shining into just the canopy and will not shine on neighbors. Chairperson Salter asked about the SL04 mini flood light and if it would be installed. Mr. Markham noted it is a possibility depending on the size of the trees. Chairperson Salter noted based on the ordinance cited by staff, the use of artificial turf in the front of the house would not be allowed and is not supported by the Chairman.

Mr. Markham noted there are two houses, identified by the applicant as 414 Zarragossa, one has artificial turf and in the right of way and the other side has it too and it is currently being installed. The applicant's customer's only request was artificial turf, which cuts down on maintenance and noise from lawn equipment. Chairperson Salter noted that during his time on the board, the board has never approved artificial turf as a yard material in a residence or the primary. Historic Preservation Planner Walker noted that there is no record of ARB approval for artificial turf at the neighboring properties mentioned by the applicant. One of the properties in question requested artificial turf for an accessory structure but during an abbreviated review the turf was changed to sod so there was never an approval for artificial turf even in the rear of the property. Mr. Markham asked if that unapproved artificial turf will have to be removed. Historic Preservation Planner Walker answered that since it has been brought to the attention of city staff, code enforcement can be alerted to investigate.

Chairperson Salter noted that the ARB has no way to enforce unapproved work and that is up to the city. The ARB has not approved the use of artificial turf on a residential property and certainly not on street view, though it has been approved in very specific circumstances in regard to commercial, limited use for very specific

purposes. The task of the board is to maintain the character of the historic district and artificial turf did not exist historically. Board Member Fogarty echoed Chairperson Salter's opinion on the appropriateness of artificial turf and asked if another type of ground cover was available with minimum maintenance needs. Mr. Markham answered grass is the only other option and noted that the customer is from out of town and will see the properties that did not ask for permission and wonder why they cannot also have artificial turf. A driveway is being poured with no footer. Everyone should be fair. Mr. Markham does not love artificial turf, but the board might want to rethink the quietness of artificial turf and it is being installed in a lot of places. It will look green year-round. Mr. Markham noted his customer will question why they didn't receive approval but there is turf installed down the street, and this should be addressed. Assistant Planning and Zoning Division Manager Harding noted that he sent an email to the Deputy Building Official and Inspections Services to send someone by to investigate.

Board Member Mead made a motion to approve the submittal with the exception of the artificial turf in the front and immediate side yard and that be submitted for alternative ground cover for abbreviated review. Board Member Fogarty seconded the motion and it carried 4-0.

3. 23-1081 433 E. ZARRAGOSSA STREET
PENSACOLA HISTORIC DISTRICT / ZONE HC-1 / CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT 6
CHANGE OF WINDOWS ON ACCESSORY BUILDING AT A CONTRIBUTING
STRUCTURE

Arthus Davis is seeking approval to replace five windows on an accessory building at a contributing structure. Five existing wood windows are to be replaced with vinyl windows that match the sides and rear of the primary structure with six over six grilles-between-the-glass. The proposed vinyl windows have already been purchased.

Mr. Davis presented to the board and noted that the property has since been sold. Mr. Davis also noted that he was under the impression the windows would have exterior grilles but after purchasing, they arrived and had grilles-between-the-glass. The accessory structure is in the rear and cannot be seen. The windows are vinyl and match what was placed on the primary structure during a modification in 2015. The proposed windows are also more durable for hurricanes.

Chairperson Salter asked staff if there is a record of the 2015 approval for the primary. Historic Preservation Planner Walker answered there are several different applications and minutes for this property but no materials were identified for the primary or accessory structure. Chairperson Salter asked when the guest cottage was constructed. Mr. Davis answered to the best of his knowledge the primary structure was built around 1896 and underwent an extensive renovation in 2015 by Nina Campbell. The accessory structure has had very little done to it and Mr. Davis assumes it was built around the same time as the primary. The fence was installed

in 2015. Mr. Pristera noted that he also could not find an exact date, but it was similar to when the house was built or shortly thereafter, so the early 1900s. Board Member Mead noted the accessory structure is likely a contributing structure based on the presumed dates and it is in keeping with the overall architectural design elements for a building of this period. Board Member Mead is concerned about allowing an exception to the requirements for the historic district and the board has been very careful with questions regarding windows on contributing structures. Board Member Mead might feel differently if it was a non-contributing structure, given its position, but it is visible to other surrounding properties even if it is not necessarily as visible from the street. Depending on what happens with those other properties it could become visible from other vantage points and Board Member Mead is inclined not to approve it based on those factors.

Chairperson Salter clarified that based on the information the board has, the accessory structure would be as contributing as the main structure and therefore the use of the proposed vinyl window in the historic district on a contributing structure would not be appropriate. Board Member Mead concurred and stated that the accessory appears to be a contributing structure based on its position and would predate the establishment of the district and therefore likely to be a contributing structure in and of itself. Mr. Davis asked if it would be acceptable to add grilles on the outside of the window and reminded the board there are vinyl windows on the main house. Board Member Mead asked staff how the vinyl was used on the main house. Historic Preservation Planner Walker answered that the records from the 2015 renovation include only elevations and do not include material information. Mr. Pristera noted he checked the UWF Historic Trust records and the application and plans were lacking.

Assistant Planning and Zoning Division Manager Harding noted there a handful of houses on Zarragossa over a two-to-three-year period that there was a considerable amount of unpermitted work done. The city found out because homeowners or neighbors were reporting materials such as Hardi board and there were no records of ARB approval. Board Member Mead stated his concern is that approving the proposed vinyl windows sets a precedent for this property. Chairperson Salter noted that 12-3-10(1)f.6. states that windows on contributing structures should be fabricated of wood and must, in the judgment of the architectural review board, closely approximate the scale and configuration of the original window designs. The board's interpretation of that in the past has been that the primary structure of the window should be wood and the board has allowed clad windows where the cladding is considered like a painted surface. The code also states that all windows shall have true divided lites. The board in the past has interpreted that simulated divided lites can meet the visual aesthetic of a full divided lite. Based on the criteria set forth in the code and what we know about this structure, in agreement with Board Member Mead, Chairperson Salter does not think that the proposed product meets the requirements set forth in the code. Mr. Davis noted he is out \$10,000.

Board Member Mead made a motion to deny the application. Chairperson Salter clarified the motion was based on the discussion of the requirements of 12-3-10(1)f.6.3. Board Member Mead concurred, stating the status of his comments with respect to the contributing structure and lack of true divided lites and the fact the windows are vinyl would not be consistent with that portion of the code cited. Board Member Fogarty seconded the motion and it carried 4-0.

4. 23-1082 517 E. GOVERNMENT STREET
PENSACOLA HISTORIC DISTRICT / ZONE HC-1 / CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT 6
EXTERIOR ALTERATION AT A CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE

Ronald Nelson is seeking approval to add a 46 x 76 inch window opening on the rear of a contributing structure. The proposed window is a Jeld Wen double hung siteline clad Auralast pine window in the color Hartford green with six over six simulated divided lites to match the existing windows. The shutters will be made of red cedar and will be painted green to match the existing and the hinges and tiebacks will match existing.

Mr. Nelson presented to the board. Chairperson Salter asked for clarification about the 5/8" putty SDL on the quote sheet and confirm it is correct. Mr. Nelson answered correct and it matches the existing windows. Board Member Mead asked for clarification about the side facades and Mr. Nelson clarified the photograph in question was the viewpoint taken from the house looking toward the neighbor. Both sides of the structure match with the ornate head casements above the windows. Board Member Mead asked about the shutter treatments and ornate header components. Mr. Nelson answered that the shutters and ornate header components will match the existing.

Board Member Fogarty made a motion to approve. Chairperson Salter seconded the motion and it carried 4-0.

5. 23-1083 600 S. PALAFOX STREET
PALAFOX HISTORIC BUSINESS DISTRICT / ZONE C-2A / CITY COUNCIL
DISTRICT 6
FINAL REVIEW FOR A NEW HOTEL DEVELOPMENT

Buck Lindsay is seeking final 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 received conceptual approval at the November 2023 meeting.

Winford Buck Lindsay presented to the board. Chairperson Salter asked about the west and east elevation through-the-wall mechanical units are identified but there is nothing for the north and south elevations. Mr. Lindsay answered that a vertical thin blade louver is depicted on the north and south elevations to service two rooms and the louver becomes an architectural feature itself. The north and south rooms

are Tempo rooms, which is more upscale than the Home 2 Suites rooms with louvers under the window. Chairperson Salter asked if there is information on the louver in the application package. Mr. Lindsay answered no, but there is information for the decorative, below the window louver. The vertical thin blade louvers will be painted to match the color of the wall surface to minimize their visual impact. Board Member Mead asked about the blade signage on the Palafox Street side. Mr. Lindsay noted a separate application for signage will be submitted and Historic Preservation Planner Walker answered that signage will be handled through an abbreviated review. Board Member Mead and Chairperson Salter complimented the application and efforts made by the applicant.

Board Member Yee made a motion to approve the application as submitted. Chairperson Salter offered an amendment that the product information for the thin blade louver come through for abbreviated review. Board Member Yee accepted the amendment. Board Member Fogarty seconded the motion and it carried 4-0.

6. 23-1084 DISCUSSION

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE PRESERVATION BRIEF NO. 16: THE USE OF SUBSTITUTE MATERIALS ON HISTORIC BUILDING EXTERIORS

This item is meant to give the Board an opportunity to discuss a recently released preservation brief from the National Park Service regarding substitute materials for historic building exteriors. The term substitute materials is used to describe building materials that have the potential to match the appearance, physical properties, and related attributes of historic materials well enough to make them alternatives for use in current preservation practice when historic materials require replacement. The Board adopted a policy on June 17, 2021 regarding alternative materials for siding and decking, railings, and other architectural details to be considered on a case-by-case basis.

Historic Preservation Planner provided context to the board regarding the preservation brief. Board Member Mead proposed to defer the discussion to the January meeting and suggested that staff publicize the discussion for more fruitful, public input. Chairperson Salter agreed that the topic comes up frequently and it would benefit from a full board discussion and public input. Board Member Mead strongly urged staff to publicize the discussion with neighborhood preservation associations, contractors, and previous applicants. Assistant Planning and Zoning Division Manager Harding noted this information can be provided with the new year meeting calendar that is sent out.

Board Member Mead made motion to move the discussion item to the January meeting. Board Member Fogarty seconded the motion and it carried 4-0.

ADJOURNMENT

