



City of Pensacola

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

MINUTES

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

March 21, 2024

2:00 PM

Whibbs Conference Room, 1st
Floor

CALL TO ORDER / QUORUM

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

Members Absent: Lou Courtney

Also Present: Historic Preservation Planner Walker, Assistant
Planning & Zoning Division Manager Harding, City
Attorney Cobb, Ken Torrance, Ashely King, Adrian
and Cheryl Russell, Steve Del Gallo

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. 24-305 ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES

Board Member Ramos made a motion to approve the February 15, 2024, minutes, seconded by Board Member Mead, and it carried 6-0.

OPEN FORUM

NEW BUSINESS

2. 24-283 715 E. LA RUA STREET OLD EAST HILL PRESERVATION DISTRICT / ZONE OEHR-2 / CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT 6 CHIMNEY REMOVAL AND ROOF REPLACEMENT AT A CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE

Josh Oberhausen is seeking approval to remove a chimney prior to replacing the

roof on a contributing structure. The existing chimney stack is non-functional with a cap and was previously repaired with cement on two sides. The chimney stack is compromised on the interior and has no functional fireplaces. The chimney is not visible from the street frontage but is visible from the side since it is on a corner lot.

Mr. Oberhausen presented to the board. Chairperson Salter stated that the chimney appears to not be a primary feature. Advisor Pristera agreed. It appears that the chimney was a part of the boiler and not a primary fireplace. He did not see an issue with its removal – it's not architecturally integral to the historic house and that its use was incidental to the primary use. Board Member Mead added that the nature of the brick work was inconsistent with the brick work of the house, it was a different type and color and appeared far less durable, which makes sense if it was added later. It was clearly eroded, and some areas appeared to be spalling.

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

3. 24-284 109 S. ALCANIZ STREET
PENSACOLA HISTORIC DISTRICT / ZONE HC-1 / CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT 6
EXTERIOR ALTERATIONS AT A CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE

Dalrymple Sallis Architecture is seeking approval for exterior alterations to a contributing structure, including removal of two rear windows and infilling with matching siding, repairing existing siding, painting the exterior, and minor landscaping.

Mr. Sallis presented to the board. Chairperson Salter asked if the windows in question were tucked in on the back side and Mr. Salter responded that they were and they could not be seen from the street. Board Member Mead asked if they were going with 1/1 windows as opposed to 6/6 and Mr. Sallis stated that the project would not use any new windows; they would just be repaired. The present windows are 6/6 and the intent is to keep all existing wood windows.

Board Member Mead made a motion to approve with clarification given the discrepancy in the intent stated in the drawings that it be approved with the refurbishment of the existing six over six and not the four over four as drawn in the elevations. Board Member Ramos seconded the motion, and the motion carried 6-0.

4. 24-285 815 N. BAYLEN STREET
NORTH HILL PRESERVATION DISTRICT / ZONE PR-2 / CITY COUNCIL
DISTRICT 6
NEW ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT FOR A CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE

Scott Sallis is seeking approval for a new single story accessory structure in the rear yard of a contributing structure. The raised structure will be built on brick piers

with composite siding, a fiberglass entry door, Jeld-Wen V-2500 series clad wood windows, a standing seam metal roof in Ash Grey, in addition to limited landscaping. The structure will be painted Rookwood Dark Green from the Sherwin Williams historic palette.

Mr. Sallis presented to the board. Board Member Ramos asked for clarification on the roof and Mr. Sallis stated that it would be shingles. The standing seam material provided in the application packet is an incorrect detail. Board Member Mead asked if the stained-glass window shown in the packet is existing in the primary residence and Mr. Sallis said that it was. A second stained-glass window was found in storage, so the homeowners would like to incorporate it into the accessory. Board Member Spencer recalled that this property used to be an antique store. Chairperson Salter asked if a new fence is included in the packet. Mr. Sallis responded that it was not and pointed out that the new wood fence in the photos is dog-eared and is not compliant with ARB standards. The owners were surprised and found out that their contractor did not pull a fence permit. It's important to the owners that the home respect the historic district, so they are working to add a top rail / cap so that the fence top will be flattened and compliant. Board Member Fogarty asked about the covered deck roofing mentioned in the packet. Mr. Sallis responded that a covered porch was not included in the project and that was a mistake.

Board Member Spencer made a motion to approve the accessory building as submitted. Board Member Mead offered an amendment of approval with the exception of the standing seam roof which was not intended according to the presentation; and include that the stained-glass window be provided for abbreviated review; and the fence top treatment should be handled through abbreviated review. Board Member Spencer accepted the amendment. Board Member Mead seconded the amended motion, and the motion carried 6-0.

5. 24-286 1200 N. BARCELONA STREET
NORTH HILL PRESERVATION DISTRICT / ZONE PR-1AAA / CITY COUNCIL
DISTRICT 6
REAR YARD IMPROVEMENTS AT A CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE

Adrian and Cheryl Russell are seeking approval to replace the existing swimming pool and spa with a new pool and hot tub spa in addition to new landscaping and landscape lighting at a contributing structure.

Adrian and Cheryl Russell presented to the board. Chair Salter noted that North Hill Preservation Association had no objections. Board Member Mead asked if the applicants intended to maintain or replace the native ironstone flag. Mr. Russell answered that the flagstone will likely be relocated to the far side of the house near the generator. Board Member Mead noted it is a native material that should be preserved. Chair Salter asked about the bullet lights proposed for the front of the house. Mr. Russell answered that there are existing lights that do not work, and

older photographs depict uplighting. The lights will shine on the house to provide a dramatic look at night. Board Member Ramos asked about screening for the pool equipment and if it will be visible from the street. Mr. Russell answered the equipment will be screened with a hedge. Board Member Ramos asked for clarification on the visibility from the street. Mr. Russell answered that a wall goes around the perimeter of the rear yard. Mrs. Russell answered the pool equipment will not be visible. Board Member Ramos noted that screening with plantings is not permanent. Mrs. Russell noted the fence is between the street and the pool equipment.

Board Member Mead made a motion to approve as submitted with the notation of the intent to move the native ironstone flag to the other side of the house to support the generator placement. Board Member Spencer seconded, and the motion carried 6-0.

6. 24-287 50 W. BRAINERD STREET
NORTH HILL PRESERVATION DISTRICT / ZONE PR-1AAA / CITY COUNCIL
DISTRICT 6
EXTERIOR ALTERATIONS AT A CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE

Ken Torrance is seeking approval to replace one window, three exterior doors, and two decks at a contributing structure. The window and doors have been installed, resulting in a stop work order issued in late 2023. The applicant is proposing one Andersen 400 series vinyl clad wood casement window with grilles-between-the-glass but is open to adding applied muntins, one Andersen aluminum clad exterior door, and two Andersen 400 series Frenchwood hinged patio doors. The proposed side and rear decks will replace previous deck structures and will be constructed of Trex with black powder coated aluminum preassembled deck railing.

Ken Torrance presented to the board. Chair Salter shared the North Hill Preservation Association's comments. North Hill suggested simulated divided lites for the windows, side lites for the french door labeled D, and a more suitable railing for the proposed decks. Mr. Torrance noted that North Hill's suggestion for the door labeled D could be accomplished, perhaps in the future. The applicants considered converting that space back into a carport, its original function. The former carport / spa area and the door labeled D are not visible from the street. Board Member Spencer suggested keeping the factory finish on the door and painting the infill stucco within the arch to match the same bronze. Mr. Torrance noted that new wood muntins can be made for the windows in question. Assistant Planning and Zoning Division Manager Harding noted that ARB has required applied muntins after the fact for previous applications. Board Member Mead asked about the trim for the door labeled B. Mr. Torrance noted that door B was considered temporary but would be fine with keeping it. Mr. Torrance was unsure of how the door would be trimmed. Board Members Mead and Ramos noted that the existing doors and windows are recessed and there is concern about how the new windows and doors will be installed; they should match the existing recess. Mr. Torrance noted the

stucco replacement will be three-coat Portland stucco. Board Member Spencer suggested trying to maintain a 1.5 inch reveal for the stucco.

Board Member Spencer made a motion to approve. Board Member Mead suggested an amendment to infill paint to match the door labeled D consistent with the factory finish color on the stucco surround per the board's discussion; the siting of the deck and deck material be approved and the rails must come back for abbreviated review for type and site. The windows should go to abbreviated review for placement in the proper recess, consistent with the reapplication of the stucco and abbreviated review of the profile and attachment of exterior muntins on the windows and doors that currently only have interior muntins.

Board Member Ramos offered an amendment that the simulated divided lites be added to the exterior and interior of the window. Board Member Mead inquired if the ARB can require interior muntins since that is on the interior of the structure, but noted that the lack of the interior muntin can impact the exterior view. Board Member Mead accepted the amendment. Chair Salter asked Board Member Mead for clarification on the deck railing and Board Member Mead answered it is up to the reviewer if what is proposed is appropriate and consistent. Board Member Spencer accepted the amendments. Board Member Mead seconded the amended motion, and it carried 6-0.

7. 24-288 1015 N. REUS STREET
NORTH HILL PRESERVATION DISTRICT / ZONE PR-1AAA / CITY COUNCIL
DISTRICT 6
CONCEPTUAL REVIEW FOR EXTERIOR ALTERATIONS AT A CONTRIBUTING
STRUCTURE

Martin Mullin is seeking conceptual approval for exterior alterations of a contributing structure including replacing the roof with new terra cotta tiles, repairing and painting the existing brick and stucco Sherwin Williams Dover White, replacing existing windows, and altering the southwest corner for a new side entry.

Mr. Mullin presented to the board and the North Hill comments were read. Board Member Spencer asked what the review parameters were since this packet was for conceptual consideration and it was clarified that the board is to review the conceptual project, its massing, siting, and basic materials, but final details, plans, and all product materials would be required for final review. Chairperson Salter stated that the existing house had some strange elements, and his understanding of the conceptual packet was that the applicant is trying to normalize and standardize the front façade. Mr. Mullin responded that was correct and that he had a difficult time finding where the original structure was at in relation to the additions and past alterations. Board Member Spencer thought the substitution of the sliding glass doors and the new windows was great. The existing façade is clumsy. The board provided commentary on the front façade and the gable over the front entry. Painting of the brick was also discussed. Chairperson Salter stated that the board

has seen a past version of this project where the brick was to be painted and they did not have issues. The style and pattern of the brick here was not an architectural feature and there will certainly be a significant degree of patching and repairing. As far as the overall design is concerned, Chairperson Salter liked the packet and thought that Mr. Mullin's proposals were appropriate. His major concern was the windows. Mr. Mullin said that many of the existing windows were damaged and that they'd like to replace them all. However, they want to maintain the historic conditions. Board Member Mead recalled the house having a flat roof at one point, perhaps the original roof, but he had questions about the eave on the right side of the front entry gable which overhung a window and likely caused a good amount of water damage. It was obviously an addition and thought that some consideration should be given to it. Mr. Mullins asked if there was any concern with the proposed pool and sunroom. Board Member Mead stated that he had no concerns, but offered that an extension of the main roof, rather than an addition below the eave might work better. The proposed rear entrance worked much better as well.

Board Member Mead made the motion to approve the conceptual application with the comments noted. Board Member Spencer seconded, and the motion carried 6-0.

8. 24-289 226 E. GOVERNMENT STREET
PENSACOLA HISTORIC DISTRICT / ZONE HC-1 / CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT 6
FINAL APPROVAL FOR SITE PLAN AND CARPORT AT A CONTRIBUTING
STRUCTURE

Ashley King is seeking final approval for the site plan and carport for a contributing structure. Changes to the site plan from the previous version include an outdoor restroom and expanded hardscaping. The carport will be translucent solar panels supported by heavy timber columns and beams, connected to the primary structure by a covered walkway with a simplified version of the column style on the primary. The walkway roof will be TPO to match the low slope sections of the main roof material. The applicant is seeking conceptual approval of the pool location, size, and relationship to the structure. Landscaping, fence details, and site lighting will be submitted at a later date.

Ms. King presented to the board. Board Member Spencer thought the solar panel carport was an excellent design and commended the architect. There is zero confusion about what is restored and what is not, and it creates an appropriate juxtaposition. Board Member Spencer added that he and the property owner are friends. The eave lights are not a good way to illuminate a historic structure. No matter how deep the aperture is, the point source of light will inevitably be seen. He wondered if some form of uplighting would work better. Board Member Mead echoed Board Member Spencer's compliments and also agreed that the eave lights were not a good addition. The overall project is great, but lighting was like a dissonant chord. Board Member Ramos agreed with comments on the lighting and offered a solution of landscape lighting. Board Member Mead thought the pergola

style treatment of the carport worked well. Some girder end detail is needed, however. Ms. King clarified that each side will have rafter tails. The board also discussed the connection between the main house and the carport. Board Member Mead was curious about the placement of the storage units since they appeared off-center. Ms. King stated that some may remain portable. Board Member Mead thought it might be better if the openings were filled. Ms. King stated that all wood will be painted, and not left natural. Chairperson Salter asked if there would be a color and Ms. King stated that it was to be determined, but it would be consistent with the other colors of the house. She would like to do a study to see if it should be a gray, or to match the white trim, or a combination; but it would be a color already found on the house. It would not be a departure. Chairperson Salter agreed that the carport was a drastic departure from the historic structure, but it worked, and it did not take away from the primary structure. He did not see any issues with the way it's presented. He didn't have an issue with the sloping connector and did not see the need for modification. He also did not think the soffit lighting was appropriate. It's not something found in historic structures in the district, and it clashes with the style. It does not match the characteristics of the house. Lastly, he did not have any major concerns about the layout of the pool. Board Member Fogarty commented on the balance of the storage pods. Chairperson Salter asked about the new brick driveway and Ms. King stated that the brick will match what is already found on site. The pool and the fence will be done by a landscape architect.

Board Member Spencer made a motion to approve the project as submitted with the exception of the proposed soffit lighting which appears to have a unanimous statement of concern or opposition by the board. Historic Preservation Planner Walker stated that the denial of the soffit light fixture is based on code section 12-30-10(1)d.2.ii.a. Chair Salter offered an amendment that the final color selection come back for abbreviated review in addition to the final location of the pool and landscape plan. Board Member Spencer accepted the amendment. Board Member Yee seconded the motion, and the motion carried 6-0.

9. 24-290 10 S. JEFFERSON STREET
PALAFOX HISTORIC BUSINESS DISTRICT / ZONE C-2A / CITY COUNCIL
DISTRICT 6
FINAL APPROVAL FOR INTERNALLY ILLUMINATED ON-PREMISES MENU
SIGNS FOR A NON-CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE

John Mascia and Steve Del Gallo are seeking final approval for two on-premises digital drive-thru menu signs for a non-contributing structure in the Palafox Historic Business District. The ARB has historically interpreted digital signs to be "internally illuminated" which is prohibited per Sec. 12-3-27(f)(4)a.5. The applicants provided support material suggesting that the proposed on-premises menu signs are direct illumination rather than internal illumination. Neither lighting types are defined in the city's code. Per Sec. 12-1-8 General Interpretive Terms, the code states that for interpretation of undefined terms, "terms not otherwise defined herein shall be

interpreted first by reference to the city's adopted comprehensive plan, if specifically defined therein; secondly, by reference to generally accepted building code, engineering, planning or other professional terminology if technical; and otherwise according to common usage, unless the context clearly indicates otherwise."

The city's comprehensive plan does not define internal or direct illumination. Secondly, the city's building code and the Florida Building code do not define internal or direct illumination.

For generally accepted professional reference material, the National Park Service Sign Manual was developed in 1978, last updated in 1988, and does not define internal or direct illumination. The American Planning Association does not define internal illumination but provides several definitions of direct illumination from varying areas of the country. One such definition, attributed to Inyo County, California states "a sign whose light source is either located in the interior of the sign so that the rays go through the face of the sign, or which is attached to the face of the sign and is perceived as a design element of the sign."

In researching generally accepted professional terminology, contradictory information was often found as well as a general lack of consistent definitions. For example, the American Planning Association provided two additional definitions for direct illumination that are contradictory. One from Peoria, Illinois states, "illumination of a sign that is affected by a source of light contained within the sign itself. Any sign in which light becomes visible by shining through a translucent surface shall be considered a sign in which internal illumination is used." The third definition from Truckee, California states that direct illumination is, "the method of sign illumination using individual bulbs or other lighting elements to form the alphabetic or numeric characters or graphic elements of the sign, or where the sign face or individual letters or numbers are of translucent material through which light from lighting fixtures inside the sign is transmitted." The second definition stated that shining through a translucent surface shall be considered internally illuminated, whereas the third definition stated that shining through a translucent material is direct illumination.

Research also explored other Land Development Codes and how they treat signage illumination with a variety of results. For example, Calhoun Falls, South Carolina's code addresses types of illumination and treats internal and direct as the same type stating, "Internal or direct illumination. A light source which is enclosed within the sign and viewed through a translucent panel." Online resources for professional sign manufacturers also provide a wide variety of information. For example, Tupp Signs in New Castle, Delaware states that, "Electronic message centers and LED readerboards – can be in the form of monument signs, freestanding, or mounted to walls. Like a TV screen, these are usually internally illuminated and will display bright images and other news throughout the day." An example of a similar sign proposal for a newly-renovated McDonald's in Loudon County, Virginia, reviewed by the local Planning Commission, indicated that the

pre-sell and ordering digital menu boards were internally illuminated.

The United States Sign Council Foundation produced Best Practice Recommendations and Standards for On-Premises Sign Lighting in 2017 that differentiates between internal and direct illumination, though it is important to note that the guidelines are focused on nighttime illumination and the USSCF states “there are three principal methods for lighting an on-premises sign at night—internal illumination, external illumination, and direct illumination.”

According to the USSCF, internal illumination is defined as a lighting element or lighting source contained inside a sign cabinet, letter module, or sign body. Typical lighting elements used for internal illumination include fluorescent lighting, neon tubing, and light-emitting diodes (LEDs). An internally illuminated sign requires that some part of the sign or sign face be translucent, so that light can transmit through the translucent material and be visible at night when the sight lighting elements are energized inside. With internal illumination, the viewer never sees the lighting element directly.

The USSCF defines direct illumination as a third method of sign lighting, that may be slightly less common, where nothing stands between the eye of the viewer of the sign and the lighting element. There is no translucent lens or cover or baffle or light being indirectly reflected upon a surface. Direct lighting components include exposed neon tubing, incandescent and LED-based exposed lamp bulbs, and lighting sources used in Electronic Message Centers or EMC signs, where the LED light sources compose the pixels that make up a grid that can display lettering or graphics or both and are controlled via computer.

The applicants submitted an abbreviated review for static or unlit on-premises menu signs that are code compliant, which was referred to the full board for discussion based on it being a new sign type and installation for the district. The abbreviated review is supplied as an attachment. Rather than pursue the static option, the applicants submitted a full board application for the digital on-premises menu signs. The ARB is tasked with determining if the proposed on-premises menu signage is prohibited under code Sec. 12-3-27(f)(4)(a)(5) as an internally illuminated sign, and if the proposed signage is otherwise permissible per code Sec. 12-3-27 for the Palafox Historic Business District.

Ken Bell, Steve Del Gallo, and John Mascia presented to the board. Mr. Bell pointed to the Florida Building code where it speaks to electrical illumination and mentions internally illuminated signs. Mr. Bell noted that in the industry there are three recognized types of signs: internal, external, and direct illumination. Mr. Bell pointed to his research to state his interpretation is that the proposed signage is not internally illuminated. Mr. Bell noted he considers the Jefferson Street Parking Garage monument sign to be internally illuminated. Chairperson Salter shared that the parking garage sign is considered route thru cut thru with an internal light source, but that type of sign is acceptable and is not an exclusion of the City Council's prohibition. Chairperson Salter noted that the city allows certain types of

internally illuminated signage, like route thru cut thru, and the City Council's prohibition of internal illumination is more of an intent restriction rather than a type restriction. The same can be said for reverse channel halo lit signs, that are also acceptable per the ARB. Both types of signs do not require the light source in order to be read during the day. The lighting is only required for night time. It was noted that internal and direct illumination are not specifically defined in the city's land development code. Chairperson Salter noted the entire surface of the proposed sign is lit and the lighting is required for the sign to function. Chairperson Salter asked the applicants if the light is required for the sign to be visible. The applicants answered yes, the light via a power source is required for the information on the sign to be visible. Chairperson Salter compared the previously approved sign types and what is being proposed and highlighted the conflict in the interpretation of how the types are defined.

Board Member Mead asked for more details about the display technology. Mr. Bell answered it is a digital display. The board and applicants discussed differing digital technologies including LED and LCD and other properties within the district that have digital displays that have been approved by the ARB. Mr. Del Gallo referenced parking kiosks and a virtual teller on Baylen Street. The Palafox Historic Business District code section 12-3-27 was discussed. Mr. Del Gallo pointed to the code that implies the signs under review must be attached to a structure. Board Member Mead noted that the code section also points to signs adjacent to a structure. City Attorney Cobb addressed the board and noted that the applicants' support documents were provided ahead of the meeting, there is a clear difference of opinion regarding internal illumination, and the Florida Building Code mentions internal illumination in H106.1.1; however, it is in the context of dimension limitations and electronic configuration limitations. That provision does not provide a definition of what an internally illuminated sign is, which matters in reference to code section 12-1-8 that directs the board on how to look at terms that are not defined in the city's land development code. City Attorney Cobb reminded the board of the two questions outlined in the staff memo that directs their responsibility in reviewing the item.

Mr. Mascia asked if the internal illumination restriction was to reduce light pollution and noted that the proposed signs only illuminate when the guest orders and then turns off and that is only at night. Mr. Mascia referenced other properties downtown that are emitting light and that the proposed sign is self moderated. Mr. Mascia noted the sign will only be lit one to two hours per day. Board Member Mead asked for the distance for the corresponding light level. Mr. Del Gallo answered that light shines 20 inches away. Mr. Mascia noted the light levels can be adjusted. Chairperson Salter asked City Attorney Cobb if because the land development code does not specifically address a direct illuminated sign, does the ARB have the authority to establish a direct illuminated sign as an internally illuminated sign. City Attorney Cobb answered neither types are defined and the board must look to code section 12-1-8. Board Member Spencer noted the board has enough information that a site specific decision can be made. Mr. Mascia noted the light can be 100%

adjusted. Board Member Ramos referenced the appropriateness of the sign for its location and relationship to surroundings, in addition to the previous understanding that this was a drive-thru restaurant. Board Member Ramos noted he does not have an issue with the proposed signage other than the light fixture in the canopy above the order box. Mr. Del Gallo and Mr. Mascia answered the light fixture in the canopy can be removed. Board Member Spencer agreed with Board Member Ramos' comments. The board and applicants continued discussions of the signage. Mr. Del Gallo noted it is important to be able to change the menu daily. Board Member Yee noted that he agrees with Board Members Ramos and Spencer that the proposed signage is appropriate though there is contradictory reference information. Chairperson Salter reiterated his opposition to the signage based on the standards set forth in Sec. 12-3-27 and that the proposed signage is not fitting with the character of the district. Board Member Fogarty thanked the applicants for their efforts and noted that it is an acceptable solution for what the applicants are working with. It does not detract from the district and pointed to the Brew Thru as an example. Historic Preservation Planner Walker noted that the Brew Thru menu signage was not approved by the board.

Board Member Ramos reiterated that the overhead light in the canopy should be removed and that the color of the signage infrastructure should compliment the building and the site needs to be cohesive. Board Member Yee noted that a privacy film might be something to consider to help dim the light from the street view. Board Member Spencer asked Advisor Pristera to share his insights. Advisor Pristera noted there are key properties that are pushing for digital signage, this could be a very site specific approval since it is clearly a drive thru and the signage can turn on and off. This is an opportunity to define this type of use for this type of sign. Board Member Mead noted his opposition to the notion that this will provide control to the ARB and approving this proposal is dangerous to maintaining standards.

Board Member Mead made a motion to deny the application because it is an internally illuminated sign for the reasons that have been discussed and because it does not fit the character of the area and the district, based on Sec. 12-3-27(f). Chairperson Salter noted the requirement for recommendations for compliance. Board Member Mead noted that the applicants provided alternatives including static signage and using paper menus. Chairperson Salter seconded the motion. The motion failed 2-4.

Board Member Spencer made a motion to approve the applicant's submittal with the removal of illumination from the overhead canopy. It was also suggested by Board Member Ramos that some of the previously approved colors be incorporated into the infrastructure of the menu boards and the final colors for the signs must come back for abbreviated review.

Mr. Del Gallo stated the infrastructure is anodized bronze and asked if white would be an appropriate color since the building is white. Board Member Ramos noted

the building is gray and orange.

Chair Salter offered amendments in specific regard to the function of the menu board that has been presented by the applicant such that the menu board has an on off feature as defined and described by the applicant that it is on when a car approaches and turns off when a car leaves due to a sensor in the road; that the lighting levels be set such that they are visible at the appropriate view distance based on the distance from the car to the menu display.

Mr. Bell stated that the light dims but does not turn off. Chair Salter noted that it was described as an on off feature. Mr. Mascia stated it dims so that it cannot be seen, and Mr. Bell noted it does not turn off. Chair Salter asked what distance the applicants are proposing. Mr. Mascia answered you would have to be on top of it.

Chair Salter continued his amendment to state that the on off is a dimmable feature, reviewed under abbreviated review. Chair Salter asked Mr. Pristera for any additional function features. Mr. Pristera added no additional function features, stating so long as the signage is specifically for a drive thru; a drive thru menu board. Board Member Spencer accepted the three amendments.

Board Member Ramos clarified that the abbreviated review is for final color of the infrastructure and specifics and shop drawings for dimming feature, and the removal of the overhead canopy light. Board Member Yee offered an amendment to investigate the privacy film.

Mr. Del Gallo asked who would facilitate the abbreviated review. Chair Salter answered abbreviated reviews are submitted to one of the four architects on the board. Board Member Spencer requested himself for the review. Historic Preservation Planner Walker noted that abbreviated reviews are submitted to one of the two board architects, being Board Member Ramos or Board Member Yee.

Board Member Mead shared that the privacy film needs to be vertically polarized versus horizontally which will not be effective. Board Member Spencer clarified that the motion will not include that granular detail. Board Member Spencer noted that in his motion he proposes Board Member Yee for the abbreviated review. Board Members Ramos and Yee agreed either can review and it is not necessary to assign an architect to the review.

Chair Salter clarified that all amendments were accepted. Board Member Ramos seconded the motion and it passed 4-2.

ADJOURNMENT