



City of Pensacola

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

MINUTES

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

February 15, 2024

2:00 PM

Hagler-Mason Conference Room,
2nd Floor

CALL TO ORDER / QUORUM

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

Members Absent: Brian Spencer

Also Present: Assistant Planning & Zoning Division Manager
Harding, Historic Preservation Planner Walker

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. 24-161 ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES

Board Member Mead made a motion to approve the January 18, 2024, minutes, seconded by Board Member Ramos, and it carried 6-0.

OPEN FORUM

NEW BUSINESS

2. 24-148 129 CALLE DE SANTIAGO COURT PENSACOLA HISTORIC DISTRICT / ZONE SSD / CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT 6 EXTERIOR ALTERATIONS AT A NON-CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE

Brooks and Nicole Endacott are seeking approval for exterior alterations at a non-contributing structure including painting the brick façade with Benjamin Moore Edgecomb Gray and trim in Simply White, refinishing the front door and garage doors, painting the shutters to match the front and garage doors, replacing exterior light fixtures, replacing an exterior fiberglass side entry door, and installing three PVC or wood window boxes under the front windows.

Nicole Endacott presented to the board. Chairperson Salter asked the applicant which garden box is preferred. Ms. Endacott answered she is indifferent but would prefer a self-watering box.

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

3. 24-149 115 W. BRAINERD STREET
NORTH HILL PRESERVATION DISTRICT / ZONE PR-1AAA / CITY COUNCIL
DISTRICT 6
REAR YARD IMPROVEMENTS AT A CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE

Lisa and Mike Bradley are seeking approval for rear yard improvements at a contributing structure including of a gunite swimming pool, replacing existing walkways with pavers, adding a paver patio, adding a retractable awning, repositioning an existing fence, and landscaping.

Lisa Bradley presented to the board. Board Member Mead noted that the North Hill Preservation Association has no objections to the request.

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

4. 24-150 609 N. SPRING STREET
NORTH HILL PRESERVATION DISTRICT / ZONE PR-2 / CITY COUNCIL
DISTRICT 6
EXTERIOR PAINT AND REAR IMPROVEMENTS AT A CONTRIBUTING
STRUCTURE

Highpointe DBR LLC on behalf of William and Karen Goldsmith is seeking approval to paint the exterior of a contributing structure Benjamin Moore Amherst Gray with Monterey White for the railings and window trim and Essex Green for the trim and accents. The proposed rear alterations include a new attached pergola, closing one window with a permanent shutter, removal of one door to be replaced with three windows, moving and replacing one exterior door, a new deck, hardscaping, an outdoor kitchen, and reconfiguration of the exterior staircase.

Damian Schrey presented to the board. Chairperson Salter noted the North Hill Preservation Association had no objections other than matching the new aluminum railing to the existing, adjacent stair railing. Mr. Schrey answered there is no objection to matching the new railing to the existing. Board Member Yee asked if the new window to be permanently closed via a shutter will remain intact. Mr. Schrey answered yes, the window will remain with the shutter permanently closed, and the interior will receive sheetrock. Board Member Fogarty asked about the existing stairs and if the new stair configuration would keep the stained stair tread.

Mr. Schrey answered the stairs will be the same as the deck, in a beige color. Board Member Fogarty asked the same about the top rail. Mr. Schrey answered that the rails will also match the deck boards. If it is appealing, the green trim color might be used as an accent, but the current intent is to make the stairs entirely the deck board material. Board Member Ramos asked if the stair railings were to remain the same. Mr. Schrey answered yes. Chairperson Salter noted he has no objection to the proposed stairs but the preferred option is to match the existing stair rail since North Hill requested it.

Board Member Yee made a motion to approve as submitted with the change of the railings, but if the homeowner has an issue it must come back for abbreviated review. Board Member Fogarty seconded the motion and it carried 6-0.

5. 24-151 309 S. REUS STREET
GOVERNMENTAL CENTER DISTRICT / ZONE C-2 / CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT 6
CHANGE OF WINDOWS AT A NON-CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE

Sarah Groeger is seeking approval to replace six windows with Custom Window Systems Series 8300I vinyl picture windows.

Sarah Groeger presented to the board. Chairperson Salter noted the existing windows are steel. Ms. Groeger noted the insurance company is requiring replacement. Chairperson Salter asked if the proposal is for a single picture window or what is existing with a mullion in the middle. Ms. Groeger noted a mullion or vertical element will be there but no horizontal elements. Chairperson Salter noted Governmental Center District Sec. 12-3-28(b)(2) stating the review should be in accordance with 12-3-10(1)d.1-3. and specifically section 2.ii.a. that in the case of a proposed alteration or addition to an existing building, that such alteration or addition will not impair the architectural or historical value of the building. Chairperson Salter stated that the review is subject to that section of the code and while the structure is not deemed contributing, it has been there since 1970 and is an iconic structure. Chairperson Salter pointed to the existing aluminum entrance door and aluminum roll down doors on the street frontage and around the side the entrances have been replaced with aluminum storefronts, which are commercial products. Vinyl products like what is being proposed are primarily residential in nature and using them on the building with the existing storefronts will compromise the architecture and character of the building. Chairperson Salter noted that an aluminum storefront system is more appropriate and will maintain the character of the building. The horizontal elements are not as important as the mullion in the center.

Board Member Mead agreed with Chairperson Salter's comments. Ms. Groeger asked the board if it would be acceptable to just replace the glass. Board Member Mead supported that proposition but noted there is often additional repair work needed. Advisor Pristera noted he can share a contact for metal sash work and/or could visit to inspect the windows. Advisor Pristera preferred to maintain the

horizontal elements. Board Member Yee echoed Board Member Mead and Chairperson Salter's comments. Board Member Fogarty also echoed the board's comments and preferred that the horizontal elements be maintained. Chairperson Salter asked Board Member Yee if an applied muntin would suffice. Board Member Yee answered yes. Board Member Ramos asked about the door or window on the west elevation. Ms. Groeger answered it is a garage door. Board Member Ramos noted the pattern on the garage door is appropriate and new windows should match that pattern.

Board Member Mead made a motion to deny the vinyl windows but approve for abbreviated review for commercial storefront with horizontal treatment consistent with the existing or the roll up door treatment or preferably a refurbishing of the existing sash and reglazing to preserve the windows at the applicant's option and those be submitted for abbreviated review. Board Member Yee seconded the motion and it carried 6-0.

6. 24-152 706 E. LA RUA STREET
OLD EAST HILL PRESERVATION DISTRICT / ZONE OEHR-2 / CITY COUNCIL
DISTRICT 6
NEW CONSTRUCTION OF LODGING HOUSE AND ACCESSORY
STRUCTURES AT A CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE

Dalrymple Sallis Architecture is seeking conceptual approval for a new 2.5 story multifamily lodging house and accessory structures to accompany a contributing structure. The lodging house will connect to the existing contributing structure by a covered walkway and site improvements will include a swimming pool, a small accessory structure, and screened parking. Please note the use of the attic space must be changed to meet the building code since the attic floor cannot be occupiable with a kitchen and restroom, which will be adjusted before returning for final review.

Nannette Chandler and Scott Sallis presented to the board. Ms. Chandler shared the history of the property and efforts to match the proposed structure to the existing contributing structure. Ms. Chandler noted that stormwater requirements will be addressed in the parking area and the third story is proposed for staff use for cooking, office space, and restroom use. Chairperson Salter shared the East Hill Neighborhood Association's comments including that the proposed structure should be built with a finished floor elevation of a minimum of 24 inches and the submitted plans propose that the structure be built on grade like other carriage homes. East Hill strongly disagrees with the characterization of the proposed structure as a "carriage house" among other supporting comments, to that point. East Hill had concerns about the aesthetic of the proposed parking lot in front of the proposed structure and would prefer parking to be to the side or rear. East Hill expressed that the applicant had not conformed to Preservation District standards and ARB approved plans on previous projects in Old East Hill. East Hill members

expressed additional concerns regarding two boutique hotels next to each other, traffic impacts, and loss of the sense of community.

Chairperson Salter invited the applicant to discuss the reason the building is at grade level. Ms. Chandler answered that the lot slopes down roughly 14 feet from front to back. The back of the structure will be at grade and the front will be at or exceed 24 inches. The other concern is meeting ADA requirements. Mr. Sallis noted that to meet city regulations, like being classified as R1, the building had to be lowered to meet ADA and also have an elevator. Chairperson Salter noted that this property sits on the corner of La Rua Street and 7th Avenue and the view from La Rua Street will be obstructed by the CMU wall between the parking lot and pool. The most visible street elevation, in concern to the 24 inch height, will be the 7th Avenue side. Chairperson Salter asked the applicants to discuss the view of the elevation change from the 7th Avenue view. Ms. Chandler answered there is not a porch on that side to have a 24 inch height and that the siding will go all the way down. Mr. Sallis noted many firewalls are required and what is shown in the packet is an accurate depiction. Chairperson Salter noted the exposed foundation on a street facing elevation is what typically requires the 18-24 inch height. Ms. Chandler noted there is an 8 foot hedge around the entire property and Chairperson Salter noted that hedges are less permanent.

Board Member Yee asked the applicants about the ADA strategy and pathway. Mr. Sallis answered the path is through a gate in the fence on a paved path to a ramp at the end of the covered porch to enter into Room 100 or office area on the ground floor. The path goes up and to the side. Board Member Mead agreed with the comments from East Hill, that if this is to read as a lodging structure, which it does in its current stylistic interpretation, it does not read as a carriage house which is the functional site relationship that is being sought. Board Member Mead noted he does not have a problem with a level transition, if it does not read as a lodging house and if it doesn't genuinely read as a carriage house. The overall massing and form that is proposed could do that. If the structure was simplified and all the Queen Anne details were removed, it would read more like a carriage house especially with added carriage doors. Board Member Mead noted that what is proposed does not accomplish the carriage house objective. Ms. Chandler noted there was once a carriage house in that location that has since been torn down and the intent is not to make the new structure look like a carriage house but just reuse the location. Ms. Chandler noted it is important to her to have all the Queen Anne details. Board Member Mead noted that it will then read like a second main house and that is part of the objection. The lack of footer highlights that this is a modern structure. Mr. Sallis noted that there was never intent to reflect a carriage house and this structure has always been planned to be a lodging house. Board Member Mead pointed to East Hill's comment quoting the term carriage house. Mr. Sallis noted that complying with all regulations and requirements on a historic property in a historic district is difficult. Mr. Sallis noted work will be done to the bell tower to make it more attractive.

Board Member Ramos noted that the new structure should match the existing structure if it will be lower than 24 inches. The ADA parking spot will need to connect to the entrance and there is opportunity to create a ramp. Board Member Ramos complimented the retention pond being handled in the parking lot. Board Member Ramos noted landscaping strategies could be employed to screen the parking area. For the final application, Board Member Ramos wants to see how the new addition relates to the existing structure in terms of massing and height, particularly the turret. Board Member Ramos noted that his preference is for the addition to match the floor levels of the existing structure and the turret could extend beyond. Ms. Chandler reiterated that the rear of the new structure will be slab on grade but the front will have height above grade due to the slope and noted that the floor levels are going to be closely matched to the existing. Ms. Chandler also noted, in relation to East Hill's comments, that the parking is in the rear where the existing driveway is located. Board Member Courtney noted the traffic increases in the neighborhood and the appearance of the structure as a hotel. Mr. Sallis noted that there are some options to work with the height of the foundation and ramp requirements.

Ms. Chandler noted the new construction is positioned where it is so that the existing structure is the primary focus and parking requirements dictated the site layout. Board Member Mead asked staff for the board's scope for review of the application. Historic Preservation Planner Walker answered the board is tasked with aesthetic review of the exterior in keeping with the historic character of the district and if the proposal meets the aesthetic requirements of the Old East Hill district code. Board Member Yee asked if the proposed structure is accessory or a second primary structure. Assistant Planning and Zoning Division Manager Harding noted as this moves forward it becomes a commercial property and it is considered a primary structure. Board Member Ramos asked the current use. Assistant Planning and Zoning Division Manager Harding answered the use code on the Escambia County Property Appraiser is currently single family and the use would change to a lodging house which is allowed in OEHR-2 which is residential/office district. This zoning is transitional and fashioned after R-2. Board Member Yee echoed Board Member Ramos' request for the relationship between the existing and proposed structures and the elevation of the property. Board Member Mead asked the applicants for the design thought behind making the proposed construction a continuation of the existing structure. Ms. Chandler answered that a covered walkway is needed to move from one structure to the other, avoiding the elements. Board Member Mead reworded his question to be why must the new structure read like the existing structure because the new construction will end up looking like a new wing of the existing structure. It is not going to read like the original structure and the new wing appearance will compete. Mr. Sallis noted that the design team has never viewed the new construction as an addition or wing of the existing structure. Board Member Mead noted two local examples, one at 401 E. La Rua Street fronting on 6th Avenue and the other 105 W. Jackson Street, of new developments that fit the existing context.

Chairperson Salter noted he does not have a major issue with incorporating the style and elements of the existing structure into the proposed structure. The 7th Avenue elevation is important because it is the high side and will be a very visible presence. The juncture of the two structures is important and the current west elevation is unfinished. Chairperson Salter noted the tower is the biggest issue and that the west elevation looks like church architecture. By leaning toward church architecture, it will detract from the rest of the district's character. Chairperson Salter echoed the need for a visual depiction of the relationship between the two structures. The compromise needs to be found to address the design challenges. Chairperson Salter noted that the proposed dog-ear fence is not allowable in the district and asked Advisor Pristera about the appropriateness of the waddle fencing. Advisor Pristera noted the board has not seen examples of waddle fencing. Board Member Mead noted a historic photograph potentially shows a waddle fence in the Tanyard area of town. Chairperson Salter noted it is interesting and does not detract but wanted to bring it up for discussion. Mr. Sallis answered it is a creative way to screen the parking lot. Ms. Chandler noted the waddle is time period appropriate and is proposing it to screen vehicles with associated landscaping.

Board Member Ramos made a motion to not approve the application without prejudice. Board Member Ramos asked staff for the procedure to follow a rejection of the application. Historic Preservation Planner Walker answered that the applicants can return for a second conceptual review or bypass conceptual to return for final. Board Member Ramos noted that good discussion occurred that will lead to changes. Board Member Mead seconded the motion. Chairperson Salter clarified the rejection was based on the discussion topics and apparent lack of conformance with the characteristics of the neighborhood based on the floor elevation, heights, and architectural characteristic tie-in to the existing building. Board Member Ramos agreed to amend the motion and Board Member Mead seconded the motion. Chairperson Salter quoted Sec. 12-3-10(3)e.3.ii.b. relating to the character of the district. The motion carried 6-0.

Chairperson Salter noted that based on the discussion, the board is not against the development and look forward to the changes based on the discussion.

ADJOURNMENT