



City of Pensacola

Planning Board

Agenda

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

May 12, 2026, 2:00 PM

Hagler-Mason, 2nd Floor

The meeting can be watched via live stream at cityofpensacola.com/video.

CALL TO ORDER / QUORUM

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. 26-551 PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES FROM APRIL 14, 2026

Recommendation:

Sponsors:

Attachments: Planning Board Minutes April 14 2026

REQUESTS

OPEN FORUM

DISCUSSION ITEMS

2. 26-552 UPDATE ON THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE, PHASE 2

Recommendation:

Sponsors:

Attachments: None

ADJOURNMENT

If any person decides to appeal any decision made with respect to any matter considered at such meeting, he will need a record of the proceedings, and that for such purpose he may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is based.

ADA Statement

The City of Pensacola adheres to the Americans with Disabilities Act and will make reasonable accommodations for access to City services, programs and activities. Please call 850-435-1670 (or TDD 850-435-1666) for further information. Request must be made at least 48 hours in advance of the event in order to allow the City time to provide the requested services.



MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD

April 14, 2026

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairperson Ritz, Vice Chairperson Larson, Board Member Finn, Board Member Grundhoefer, Board Member Villegas, Board Member Powell, Board Member Yee

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Planning & Zoning Manager Cannon, Assistant Planning & Zoning Manager Harding, Development Services Coordinator Statler, Development Services Director Morris

STAFF VIRTUAL: Assistant City Attorney Goldsmith

OTHERS PRESENT: Toan Tran, Zac Gibbs, Nannette Chandler, Paul Tamburro, TJ Henriques, Charles Green

AGENDA:

- Quorum/Call to Order
- Approval of Meeting Minutes from March 10, 2026
- **New Business:**
 - Request for Vacation of Alleyway – 2907 E. Blount Street
 - Final Aesthetic Review – 50 S. 9th Avenue – Gateway Redevelopment District
 - Open Forum
 - Discussion
 - Adjournment

Call to Order / Quorum Present

Chairperson Ritz called the meeting to order at 2:00pm with a quorum present and explained the procedures of the Board meeting including requirements for audience participation.

Approval of Meeting Minutes – Board Member Villegas made a motion to approve the March 10, 2026, minutes, seconded by Vice Chairperson Larson, and it carried 7:0.

New Business –

Request for Vacation of Alleyway – 2907 E. Blount Street

A request has been received from Mr. Matthew Montee for the vacation of a partial alleyway directly behind a residential property at 2907 E. Blount Street. In 2020, City Council approved vacation of the subject alleyway except for a 10-foot-wide portion directly abutting 2907 E. Blount Street. At that time, an owner could not be reached, and the property was determined to be abandoned. The property has since been claimed and purchased by Mr. Montee who would like to incorporate the segment of alleyway into his property so that he may properly maintain it. Currently, the segment of alleyway is not used for access, and it does not serve neighbors. Since only Mr. Montee abuts the alleyway portion, a petition form signed by neighbors is not required.

Mr. Montee presented to the board and staff notified the board that the item had been properly noticed. **Board Member Larson made the motion to approve which was seconded by Board Member Villegas, which carried 7-0.**

50 S. 9th Avenue – Final Aesthetic Review – Gateway Redevelopment District

CBA Architects is requesting final approval for a new multi-family residential development consisting of a seven-story main building with two levels of podium parking, and five levels of residential apartments, totaling 227 units. A separate club building is located to the west of the development which will house amenities for residents. The design centers a resort-style pool within the main building's third floor courtyard, offering views overlooking Admiral Mason Veterans Memorial Park and Pensacola Bay. Architectural features include colorful facades, balconies, deep roof overhangs, and decorative shutters, combining traditional coastal elements with modern design. Conceptual review of this project was approved by the board in December 2025.

Applicants Mr. Tran and Gibbs presented to the board. The board discussed site access, the north and east façade of the main building, property easements, the parking deck, and landscaping.

Mr. Charles Green addressed the board with concerns of traffic and road safety. The board responded that traffic and streets were not subject to review as part of this item, but staff let Mr. Green know that they could connect him with Public Works for further discussion.

Dr. Paul Tamburro addressed the board and shared his concerns that the project did not satisfy the Gateway Redevelopment District code. A copy of Dr. Tamburro's written remarks is provided. Dr. Tamburro wanted good development and supported past versions of the Hawkshaw project. Dr. Tamburro's concerns were specific to lot coverage and development guidelines such as site planning, architectural scale, maximum preservation of bay views, and development coordination.

Mr. TJ Henriques addressed the board and thought the 9th Avenue side was attractive, but agreed that the north side of the building was an issue and wanted to see the private street Colfax closed and used as a green space. The north and east side were unattractive, the building's scale was too excessive, and he was concerned about the lack of green space. The board clarified that the height of the proposed was allowable (up to 100'), civil documents as part of the packet and provided by a licensed professional engineer shows 26% pervious area which met code, and that the development guidelines in the Gateway Redevelopment District code were guidelines for the board's consideration rather than development requirements.

Mr. Zac Gibbs responded to the board and public speakers. He understood that the north

and east side was limited with space, but in comparison to the empty parking lots around the property, they felt like they did their best with the design and all bases were covered and in compliance with the zoning district's requirements.

The board further discussed lot coverage, the north and east facades, maximum preservation of bay views, Colfax Street.

After further discussion and consideration, Board Member Finn made a motion to approve the final aesthetic design contingent on an abbreviated review of the north and east facades. The abbreviated review must provide an improved or altered vision for the north and east facades to incorporate the board's discussion items. Board Member Larson seconded the motion. Chairman Ritz clarified that Board Member Grundhoefer agreed to be the reviewer for the abbreviated review application. **Board Member Yee offered an amendment for treatment to be added to the condensers on the south end of the east façade along with some kind of site control and safety between the amenity building and main structure. The amendment was accepted.** Board Member Grundhoefer made the comment that improvements to the north façade could probably be easily achieved. The east façade was a concern, and he wasn't sure if it would be possible to gain more space, understanding that the loss of units impacts the project. Mr. Grundhoefer thought that something dramatic would be needed on the east façade to create enough buffer and softness like the other facades had – sidewalks, landscaping, pedestrian ways, etc. Board Member Yee pointed to a comment made earlier by Board Member Villegas about the possibility of adding climbing jasmine or a green wall which would go a long way to softening the facades, and that could also go a long way in the public's view, and it wouldn't take up too much space. The applicant offered that it may be an issue with providing enough free area around the parking decks. **The motion carried 6-0.**

Open Forum – Ms. Nannette Chandler spoke on further tree protection and preservation for the Land Development Code updates. The board responded with a further discussion which provided a segway to the discussion.

Discussion

The board continued discussion on the Land Development Code update, including the process for topical discussions after code adoption, hot topics such as lot grading and stormwater requirements, missing middle housing, building height, and parking. It was decided that the topic of multifamily parking would be removed which was the consensus from the board, and lot width was worked through and did not need to be carried on as a "hot topic". The board did not have strong feelings about language added to the height of clearstory windows in ADUs. Further discussion would be had on how to measure building height. Lot grading, middle missing housing, and building heights (to be worked on by Board Member Yee) were left as main topics for further discussion.

The board decided that they would like to use the May and June meetings for further discussion with a planned vote for recommendation at the July meeting. The board's recommendation would then be carried to the August City Council meeting for an initial vote.

Adjournment – With no further business, the Board adjourned at 4:08 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Gregg Harding", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Gregg Harding, RPA
Assistant Planning & Zoning Manager
Secretary of the Board

Tamburro Comments: Planning Board Meeting April 14, 2026

Hello Planning Board (Paul Ritz, Kurt Larson, Daniel Grundhoefer, Charletha Powell, Jordan Yee, Matthew Finn).

My name is Paul Tamburro, and I live at 33 South Ninth Avenue across from the Hawkshaw Property and I appreciate the opportunity to make these remarks.

I am representing myself and fact-finding on behalf of the Aragon Homeowners Association.

You might think I am a *NIMBY*, Not in My Backyard type, but I am not. This project is in my front yard which would make me a *NIMFY*. However, I am not a *NIMFY* either.

I want Hawkshaw developed. I love seeing good development in Pensacola and I want the S. Ninth Avenue corridor to continue to fill in and thrive.

As an example, back in 2017 this board recommended, and the City approved the project (pictured) for the Hawkshaw Property. This was great. Four 3-story buildings housing 39 condos + retail and a restaurant. Note the building scale, the design style, the space between buildings and preservation of views. I was excited about the project; my neighbors were excited and it respected City code for the Gateway District where Hawkshaw is located.

So, I am going to read several passages from the City Code as provided in our meeting materials and you can see what I mean and why I do not believe the current proposal achieves the City's intent for the parcel.

City Code Sec. 12-3-12. - Redevelopment land use district.

The regulations in this section shall be applicable to the gateway and waterfront redevelopment zoning districts: GRD and WRD.

Gateway Redevelopment District

a. Purpose of district. The Gateway redevelopment district is established to promote the orderly redevelopment of the southern

gateway to the city in order to enhance its visual appearance, preserve a unique shoreline vista, improve traffic safety, and encourage a high quality of site planning and architectural design. Site specific analysis of each development proposal within the gateway district is intended to ensure that the scenic orientation and open space image of the Bayfront Parkway is maintained, the development character of the Chase-Gregory corridor is upgraded, and the boundary of the adjacent historic district is positively reinforced.

d. Regulations.

9. Lot coverage. The total coverage of all development sites within the gateway redevelopment district, including all structures, parking areas, driveways and all other impervious surfaces, shall not exceed 75 percent.

e. Development Guidelines. The intent of these guidelines is to reduce the level of contrast between buildings and to create a more compatible appearance in architectural design, scale, materials, and colors.

1. Site planning.

i. Maximum preservation of bay views. Considering the bayfront location within the district, the placement of buildings, signs, service areas, parking, and landscaping shall be planned to maximize the preservation of views of the bay and to protect the bayfront's scenic open space character. To prevent the effect of a "wall" of development along the inland edge of the parkway, the long axis of all buildings located on the corridor should be oriented parallel to the inland street grid, rather than parallel to the parkway itself. The preservation of ample open space between buildings, and the creation of a campus-like development pattern, are encouraged especially in the bayfront area. In addition, site planning throughout the district should recognize existing topographical variations and maximize this variation to maintain bay views.

ii. Development coordination. The preservation of bay views and the creation of a campus character development pattern cannot be achieved through the site

planning of any single development; all development efforts within the district must be coordinated to achieve these objectives.

2. Architectural design and building elements.

vi. Proposed development adjacent to the historic district should give special consideration to visual compatibility in scale and architectural design in order to positively reinforce the character of the historic area and provide a buffer and transition.

So, I ask you, the board, to please apply all of what I just pointed out to this 7-story, complex that fills the property and dwarfs every structure in the vicinity including the 4-story Hilton Garden Inn and 4-story Florida Power HQ, not to mention the nearby 3-story IHMC and Southtowne buildings.

There is no significant open space between the buildings in this property, no attempt to preserve Bay views, it does not scale to the neighboring buildings nor blend and reinforce the historic district.

In conclusion, I do not see how the Planning Board can reconcile the ascetics of this proposal with the pertinent City Code for redevelopment and approve this project as its currently proposed.

Thank you for your time.

Paul Tamburro
33 South Ninth Avenue, Pensacola FL 32502
patamburro@gmail.com
850-324-0753

Suggestions to Conform:

1. Decrease the bulk.
2. Increase the setbacks.
3. Make North and Southeastern exposures more appealing.
4. Demolish Colfax Street and turn the space into a mini-park or green belt.

Munksgaard 2017 Proposal





architects • planners
an employee-owned company

THE HELM AT HAWKSHAW



CONCEPTUAL RENDERING



City of Pensacola

222 West Main Street
Pensacola, FL 32502

Memorandum

File #: 26-552

Planning Board

5/12/2026

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

Update on the Land Development Code, Phase 2

ATTACHMENTS:

None