



City of Pensacola

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

MINUTES

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

January 18, 2024

2:00 PM

Whibbs Conference Room, 1st
floor

CALL TO ORDER / QUORUM

Members Present: Yuri Ramos, Lou Courtney, George R Mead, II,
Jordan Yee, Brian Spencer, Ross Pristera

Members Absent: Derek Salter, Anna Fogarty

Also Present: Assistant Planning & Zoning Division Manager
Harding, Historic Preservation Planner Walker,
Assistant City Attorney Lindsay, Hunter Green, Mark
Shoultz, Matthew Savoie, Katherine Hendricks, Mary
Renee Chrisco, Jennifer Carter, Katie Anderson

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. 24-43 ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES

Board Member Yee made a motion to approve the December 21, 2023, minutes, seconded by Board Member Spencer, and it carried 5-0.

OPEN FORUM

NEW BUSINESS

2. 24-40 306 W. BLOUNT STREET NORTH HILL PRESERVATION DISTRICT / ZONE PR-1AAA / CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT 6 ACCESSORY BUILDING FOR A CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE

Tuff Shed, Inc. is seeking approval to install a prefabricated wood shed on the grass with a shed floor measuring 8 x 10 ft. at a contributing structure. The

accessory structure includes panel siding, a shingle roof, a PVC horizontal sliding window, and a single wood shed door.

Curtis Black presented to the board. Vice Chair Mead noted that the North Hill Preservation Association has no objections to the requests but suggest if there is not a substantial price difference, that horizontal siding be used in lieu of vertical siding to more closely match the gables of the primary residence. Board Member Yee asked if the applicant was agreeable to the horizontal siding suggestion. Mr. Black noted that he would need to consult with the representative at Tuff Shed about the price difference, but he is not opposed to it. Board Member Mead agreed that consistency of the siding is needed and this can be submitted for abbreviated review subject to the price differential.

Board Member Yee made a motion to approve the application as submitted with the condition that the horizontal siding be brought back for abbreviated review after the applicant receives pricing on the change. Board Member Spencer seconded the motion and it carried 5-0.

3. 24-41 718 N. REUS STREET
NORTH HILL PRESERVATION DISTRICT / ZONE PC-1 / CITY COUNCIL
DISTRICT 6
EXTERIOR ALTERATIONS AT A CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE

Matthew Savoie is seeking approval for exterior alterations at a contributing structure including converting the shingle roof to 5-V metal crimp, changing aluminum and vinyl siding to cedar mill Hardie plank lap siding, changing aluminum windows to white PlyGem 1500 single hung vinyl windows, moving the rear door to the north side of the structure, altering the front façade composition, and altering window locations and opening sizes. The structure will receive new exterior lighting and will be painted Benjamin Moore Revere Pewter.

Matthew Savoie and Katherine Hendricks presented to the board. Vice Chair Mead shared that the North Hill Preservation Association has no objections to the request. Board Member Courtney complimented the applicant's efforts and asked that the Hardie siding be spaced 4.5 to 5 inches maximum to maintain historic proportions. Board Member Courtney asked about the proposed window grids. Ms. Hendricks noted that the applicant is proposing vertical two over two windows with no grilles-between-the-glass, so true dividers will be in place. Advisor Pristera noted that this was one of three houses in a row that would have looked the same. The roof had issues at some point which is why it looks different, but it would have looked like the house to the south.

Ms. Hendricks asked about skirting between the piers and what material would be appropriate for the existing brick piers, more recently added block piers, and poured slab at the front of the structure. Vice Chair Mead answered in the past the board has encouraged that existing brick piers are maintained to keep the integrity if they are exposed. If they have been covered already, like with stucco or skirting,

it depends on the original condition. Vice Chair Mead had no particular view on the subject. Board Member Courtney noted if lattice is added, it should be recessed from the piers slightly. Vice Chair Mead noted that if skirting will be added later, it should be submitted for abbreviated review. Board Member Ramos asked if the PlyGem 1500 windows had been used for contributing structures in the past. Historic Preservation Planner Walker answered no, vinyl windows are typically approved on non-contributing and new construction and Assistant Planning and Zoning Division Manager Harding agreed. Board Member Ramos noted the window looks ok and asked the applicant for clarification about the two over two lites with a vertical mullion. Mr. Savoie answered that a vertical mullion is proposed rather than the existing horizontal mullion. Board Member Ramos noted that the window series offers two different grille options and wanted to confirm that the application includes the SDL grilles with the shadow bar between the glass. Mr. Savoie confirmed that the SDL grille with the internal shadow bar option is what will be used.

Vice Chair Mead asked for the depth of reveal for the new Hardie siding. Mr. Savoie was not sure. Advisor Pristera noted the original siding was likely wood. Mr. Savoie noted that the original siding is not beneath the current siding. Board Member Ramos stated the Florida Master Site File indicated aluminum siding at the time of the survey.

Board Member Courtney made a motion to approve so long as the spacing of the Hardie siding at 4.5 to 5 inches maximum, the PlyGem windows have simulated divided lites with the shadow bar, and that the skirting be submitted for abbreviated review. Board Member Spencer second the motion and it carried 5-0.

4. 24-68 914 N. PALAFOX STREET
ZONE R-NC / CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT 6
HISTORIC STRUCTURE DEMOLITION REVIEW

Per the City of Pensacola's Historic Building Demolition Review Ordinance, the referenced structure has been found to be potentially significant in regard to its architecture as well as its association with the lives of persons potentially significant in our local past. Per the ordinance, the Board is tasked with determining whether or not this structure meets the criteria for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. If eligible and deemed historically significant by those criteria, the Board must also determine if the building is subject to a demolition delay of no more than 60 days. To determine that a historically significant building is subject to a demolition delay, the Board must find that in the interest of the public it is preferable that the building be preserved or rehabilitated rather than demolished. Vice Chair Mead went over the criteria for historic structure demolition requests. Renee Chrisco presented to the board, representing Stephen Chrisco, the potential buyer for the property. Ms. Chrisco stated that the applicants are interested in learning more about the history of the property and if the purchase goes through and the structure is deemed unsalvageable, will demolition be permitted. Ms. Chrisco shared it was likely built around 1928 or 29, there are no similar houses in

the vicinity and seems to be stand alone for its architectural style, and the interior has double-sided fireplaces; and that the applicant is here to learn more about the history of the structure that would make demolition not an option in the future in case the structure is found to not be salvageable. Vice Chair Mead asked for clarification on whether the applicant is proposing to demolish or if they want the board to determine if the structure has those features that might bar demolition if found not to be salvageable. Ms. Chrisco confirmed that the board's determination is being sought and does not propose demolition at this time.

Vice Chair Mead asked staff if the board renders this type of advisory findings when there is not an actual application for demolition and how would that be addressed with a future demolition request. Historic Preservation Planner Walker answered that this type of request is fairly frequent when there is a potential buyer of a property who wants to know if the structure can be demolished prior to closing, to decide what to do with the property or if they even want to purchase. There was a formal historic structure demolition application which is in the board packet. Historic Preservation Planner Walker noted communication with quite a few people related to this property and the applicants have been made aware that the board has the ability to delay the demolition 60 days but cannot prohibit it.

Vice Chair Mead asked if the board's findings would be incorporated into an eventual demolition request, or would it forgo a demolition determination as to whether it should be stayed for 60 days or would the board have to make that determination now versus at an actual demolition. Assistant Planning & Zoning Division Manager Harding answered that this should be treated as if the applicant was seeking a demolition permit. There have been cases where someone went through the process and did not pull the demolition permit in the end, but this case should be treated like the applicant is seeking a permit. Assistant Planning & Zoning Division Manager Harding noted this is mandated by code and by the time period the code allows the ARB to provide a judgement and for a possible demolition delay. Vice Chair Mead expressed concern about the abstract nature of the demolition request and the need for public participation. Board Member Ramos pointed out that the packet does include a formal historic structure demolition application and questioned current ownership approval and signature for the request.

Ms. Chrisco noted that her brother is the potential buyer, and the seller does not want demolition while still in ownership of the property. The potential buyer would like to know before purchasing, if demolition is possible, but the buyer is also interested in preserving the historical integrity and knowing the historic value of the home. Vice Chair Mead reiterated his concern over public notification. Assistant Planning & Zoning Division Manager Harding quoted Sec. 12-11-5(5)e. regarding the procedures for historic structure demolition procedures. It was brought to light that the owner's co-signature was not included in the application packet, but the current owner had co-signed the original application form that was dropped off in hard copy format. Theo Barrs addressed the board as one of the listing agents on

the property and noted that the owner signed the form. The original hard copy was obtained and presented to the board.

Board Member Ramos clarified that the property can be demolished no matter what but perhaps with a delay. Vice Chair Mead asked about the timing of the 60-day clock. Assistant Planning & Zoning Division Manager Harding noted per the ordinance the board cannot stop an applicant from applying to demolish a property so long as the owner has co-signed the application. Assistant City Attorney Lindsay noted the ordinance allows for investigation of alternatives and feasibility. This request seems to be more hypothetical than the board is used to, but a permit may never be pulled depending on what the board says and if the purchase goes through. Vice Chair Mead noted the lack of information in the packet regarding the condition of the structure.

Advisor Pristera shared that the original North Hill survey included this structure and the surrounding block and, in this case, there likely was not enough buy-in from homeowners which is why it was not included in the North Hill Preservation District. The structure was deemed contributing at the time and today appears to be in decent condition. Advisor Pristera found evidence that the structure was built at least by 1907 and not the 1920s as the Florida Master Site File indicated. There are only a few surviving structures like this one in the North Hill area. There are better examples of this style, but this structure has been surveyed previously and appears that it could be restored. There are programs and tax incentives for restoration of commercial properties. Vice Chair Mead stated that the structure sounds to be historically significant based on Advisor Pristera's assessment.

Angela Sherrill addressed the board as one of the listing agents. Ms. Sherrill noted that a for sale sign has been posted on the property since September with contact information for the listing agents. An inspection was obtained by a potential buyer and the inspector said the structure is not salvageable due to termite and roof issues among others. Ms. Sherrill noted the public is welcome to see the property. Board Member Spencer asked if this property had ever been reviewed by the board before. Vice Chair Mead answered no. Board Member Spencer noted that throughout the city, regardless of where a property may be located, a demolition permit requires the posting of a demolition sign for a set amount of time.

Ms. Chrisco noted the main issue is the current owner does not want the structure to be demolished unless the property is under contract or has been sold. Ms. Chrisco noted that she thought the current owner would not object to putting forth the 60-day destruction notice knowing the applicant would not pull a permit at the end of it. Assistant City Attorney Lindsay stated that staff does not have the ability to determine historic significance, which is the duty of the board and procedurally there is no other vehicle to accomplish this request. There is no other way to proceed than for the board to make a determination. Assistant City Attorney Lindsay noted these concerns could be relayed to city administration. Board Member Yee echoed this is an unremarkable request that any potential buyer

should be able to make, the application is signed by the current owner and the prospective buyer, and the 60-day clock is in place. A prospective buyer should not be penalized for this circumstance.

Board Member Ramos questioned if the first step would be to determine if the property is historically significant. Vice Chair Mead agreed that is the first step to be taken. Assistant Planning & Zoning Division Manager Harding reminded the board that an application was filed, the board's review is procedural, and the process cannot take more than 120 days per city code. Regardless of the board's determination, on the 121st day a demolition permit can be pulled.

Vice Chair Mead made a motion that the board find the structure historically significant due to its review and survey and inclusion as a contributing structure for the district even if it was not ultimately included because of other concerns like buy in at the time. It is also architecturally significant as a decent example of its kind in this particular area and similarity to other examples of similar architecture elsewhere in the city. On both of those findings, the property is worthy of the demolition delay when and if an actual request to demolish is submitted and the board finds that, at the present time, advisory view would be binding on the board, but the board would defer any question for approval of demolition for the following reason: the board does not have sufficient information about those aspects of feasibility that the code talks about, necessary for the public to be informed about the nature of the structure, its integrity, etcetera and whether they can then evaluate it from the things that have been submitted on the application to make benefit of the 60 days to try and save it if that were the case. For that reason, Vice Chair Mead would defer and bifurcate the question of approval of demolition subject to these findings that the board likely would use that as the 60-day delay. The board would need an application on the feasibility questions with the demolition application with a present intent to demolish.

Vice Chair Mead's motion was not seconded, and the motion failed.

Board Member Spencer referenced a property on Cervantes that looked decent from the outside, but the interior was in poor condition and the demolition permit was issued. Board Member Ramos echoed again the owner has the right per the code to demolish and the public has had the same level of time for input as any other past demolition request. Per the staff's recommendation, the present application is legitimate and must be considered. Vice Chair Mead echoed his concerns again. Historic Preservation Planner Walker noted that support documentation is requested from the applicant when a request is referred to the full board though the turn around time is often fast. Advisor Pristera asked staff if the demolition approval is specific to the property or the owner. Assistant Planning & Zoning Division Manager Harding answered it is specific to the property. If a property goes through the demolition review and is not ultimately demolished, a future property owner would have the previous approval to proceed with pulling a demolition permit. There are no time limits on ARB decisions, though this is being

looked at internally.

Ms. Chrisco addressed the board and requested to remove the hypothetical and have the board review the demolition application as submitted. Assistant City Attorney Lindsay suggested that the board make two motions, one to determine historic significance and the second to address a potential delay and invite the applicant to provide feasibility or alternatives to demolition. The board discussed the procedural complications. Board Member Spencer stated that he is comfortable with the board proceeding with the demolition request.

Vice Chair Mead made a motion that the building is significant in the meaning of the code as to section iii. distinctive characteristics of the time period and method of construction, and that it is historically significant with respect to the creation of the North Hill historic district as a contributing structure even if it was not ultimately included the boundaries of that district. Board Member Ramos seconded the motion to determine the property as historically and architecturally significant. The motion carried 5-0.

Vice Chair Mead asked Assistant City Attorney Lindsay if the demolition approval can be deferred. Assistant City Attorney Lindsay answered no because the application has been submitted so unless the applicant withdraws the request, staff has no procedural control to stop the 60-day clock from ticking. Board Member Yee asked if the request for feasibility would occur during the 60 days. Assistant City Attorney Lindsay answered yes. Board Member Ramos asked who evaluates the property during the 60 days. Assistant Planning & Zoning Division Manager Harding answered it is the applicant's responsibility and staff can follow up to provide resources to the applicant.

Assistant Planning and Zoning Division Manager Harding shared that the historic structure demolition ordinance is the way that it is because of State property rights law that impacted the magnitude of the ordinance. Board Member Courtney shared insights into preserving the historic structure and encouraged the applicant to consider preserving and salvaging the property.

Board Member Yee made a motion to invite the applicant to explore options and alternatives to demolition in the spirit of what the ordinance is meant to accomplish and taking the applicant at their word that they do not intend to demolish, and they do intend to explore options for salvage and restoration.

The board clarified that the motion does not obligate the applicant to do anything.

Board Member Ramos seconded the motion.

Assistant City Attorney Lindsay asked the Vice Chair if the intent of the motion was to include that it is in the public interest to delay for 60 days while this feasibility alternative is explored. Assistant City Attorney Lindsay cited the code on the criteria for determining a demolition delay.

Board Member Ramos proposed to amend Board Member Yee's motion to include that a 60-day demolition delay be imposed on the application. Board Member Yee accepted the amendment.

Ms. Chrisco asked who is responsible for posting the notice of demolition sign. Assistant Planning and Zoning Division Manager Harding answered the applicant or demolition contractor.

The motion carried 5-0.

5. 24-70 1611 E. GADSDEN STREET
EAST HILL / ZONE R-1AA / CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT 6
HISTORIC STRUCTURE DEMOLITION REVIEW

Per the City of Pensacola's Historic Building Demolition Review Ordinance, the referenced structure has been found to be potentially significant in regard to its architecture as well as its association with the lives of persons potentially significant in our local past. Per the ordinance, the Board is tasked with determining whether or not this structure meets the criteria for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. If eligible and deemed historically significant by those criteria, the Board must also determine if the building is subject to a demolition delay of no more than 60 days. To determine that a historically significant building is subject to a demolition delay, the Board must find that in the interest of the public it is preferable that the building be preserved or rehabilitated rather than demolished. Jennfier Carter presented to the board on behalf of the owner who is also the applicant. Ms. Carter shared that the applicant does not plan to divide the lot and will be constructing a 3,000 sq. ft. new residential structure. Advisor Pristera shared that the house was advertised for sale in June 1911 and someone was occupying it by December 1911. A member of an investment company was traveling around the southeast selling Pensacola real estate in other cities. This individual owned a lot of property and was constructing spec houses and was responsible for selling 1500 E. Lakeview Avenue where demolition was delayed by the ARB. This property contributes to the development of East Hill.

Board Member Courtney asked the applicant about the major issues of the building. Ms. Carter answered the foundation needs to be stabilized, the rear sunroom has water leaks, the electrical and plumbing needs updating, and there is no HVAC. The applicant noted the interior doors and staircase are the only salvageable items. Ms. Carter shared elevations of the proposed new construction to replace the historic structure. Board Member Spencer noted that seeing the replacement plan helps for board discussion. Ms. Carter offered to submit additional plans to the board. Board Member Yee suggested maintaining horizontal lap siding throughout and introducing some ornamental elements to the porch. Board Member Yee noted it is a shame that all the ARB can do is delay the demolition but cannot prevent it. The board discussed the architectural design of

the proposed new construction. Board Member Ramos clarified that most of the discussion was conjectural and does not represent requirements from the ARB.

Board Member Ramos made a motion to determine that the property does have historical significance as outlined by Advisor Pristera and the board should impose a 60-day delay on the demolition. Board Member Courtney seconded the motion and it carried 5-0.

6. 24-42 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.

Vice Chair Mead invited Katie Anderson from the audience to address the board, if desired. Ms. Anderson addressed the board and shared that as a real estate agent she has clients interested in restoration and wanted to attend today to learn more about the ARB and appropriate materials for the historic districts.

The board discussed the preservation brief and factors to consider alternative materials. Advisor Pristera shared that the National Park Service first submitted this brief in 1988, so it has been a long time for an update to be available. Advisor Pristera also noted the Pensacola project that was highlighted at the end of the brief representing the potential for replicating certain architectural elements.

Advisor Pristera noted that artificial turf was not included in the brief as an alternative material. Board Member Yee asked how other municipalities are using the document. Advisor Pristera noted the Florida Trust is being consulted on how to implement the use of alternative materials while being considerate of restoration and historically accurate options. Board Member Courtney noted that Hardie siding has become more acceptable on the sides and rear but not on the front of structures. Vice Chair Mead noted that the wood grain option for Hardie siding is not representative of the appearance of original, planed siding. Often historically accurate materials, like wood siding, can be difficult to obtain. The board needs to consider the performance of alternative materials.

Board Member Ramos suggested installation drawings need to be considered for certain materials, such as roofing or siding materials. The board should consider compiling a list of subcontractors who work with substitute materials to assist applicants with their projects. Board Member Ramos noted that windows that are

installed flush with siding are not historically accurate, and the brief did not cover windows. Board Member Ramos noted it would be nice to have supporting documents to share with applicants that assist with standards and reasoning for the board's stance.

Historic Preservation Planner Walker noted the National Park Service is hosting a webinar in February that will be attended and any additional insights can be brought back to the board. Advisor Pristera will also be attending. Vice Chair Mead posed the question of whether the board should continue to operate on a case-by-case basis for alternative materials or adopt standards that would apply to give guidance to applicants or ask for positive legislation and amendment to the code for those points. Vice Chair Mead asked if the board would want to consider, without a specific application, if people want to put forward general types of materials that the board continues to see and give guidance on how the board views them or make suggestions that the city might consider including them in the code, if the board can find them to be a reasonable equivalent.

Assistant Planning & Zoning Division Manager Harding noted that the ARB can adopt policies or change current policies. Assistant City Attorney Lindsay stated the board should give direction and staff can explore the process. Vice Chair Mead noted an agenda item is needed to discuss what processes should be considered in terms of alternative materials. Assistant City Attorney Lindsay noted that if the board's substance deviates too far from the current ordinance, City Council approval is necessary, but if it is within the scope of ARB's authority to create a policy, then that is an option as well. Assistant City Attorney Lindsay and staff need to evaluate the board's consensus on the substance to determine the best process. Assistant Planning & Zoning Division Manager Harding highlighted that the ARB Chair can call special meetings, which must be publicly noticed. A special meeting could be requested to discuss alternative materials. Vice Chair Mead noted input is needed from industry professionals and interested parties and suggested a March time frame to hold a special meeting. Assistant Planning & Zoning Division Manager Harding suggested a standing discussion item for March with a special meeting toward the end of the month. Advisor Pristera noted that the local AIA chapter should get involved and Vice Chair Mead suggested Ashley King with Trapolin Peer Architects. Assistant Planning & Zoning Division Manager Harding reminded the board of the ongoing LDC assessment and the board's input for future code changes.

ADJOURNMENT