



City of Pensacola

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

MINUTES

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

June 20, 2024

2:00 PM

Hagler-Mason Conference Room,
2nd Floor

CALL TO ORDER / QUORUM

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

Members Absent:

Also Present: Ross Pristera, Historic Preservation Planner Walker,
Development Services Coordinator Statler, Paul
Jansen, Aaron Ebent, Ben Townes

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. 24-555 APPROVAL OF MAY 16, 2024 ARB MEETING MINUTES.

Board Member Mead made a motion to approve the May 16, 2024 ARB minutes.
Board Member Fogarty seconded and the motion carried 6-0.

OPEN FORUM

NEW BUSINESS

2. 24-556
514 E. GOVERNMENT STREET
PENSACOLA HISTORIC DISTRICT / ZONE HC-1 / CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT 6
FINAL APPROVAL FOR CARPORT ENCLOSURE AT A NON-CONTRIBUTING
STRUCTURE

Greg Uzdevenes is seeking final approval to enclose an existing carport to create a garage by adding a HAAS 2000 series garage door with a louvered option and a gable to the south and a Hardie siding east wall to match the existing structure. A

garage enclosure of a different design was denied at the April 2024 meeting.

Greg Uzdevenes presented to the board. Note, a technical error occurred during recording; no audio was available for the first 22 minutes of the meeting. The board discussed the plans presented for the enclosed carport. Board Member Yee noted that a product exists to camouflage the garage door to give the appearance of a wall section. Board Member Yee asked Chair Salter if the board could approve the enclosure concept with an abbreviated review to clarify details. Chair Salter answered yes, with a simple majority, the board could approve a motion such as that. Historic Preservation Planner Walker shared the product Board Member Yee mentioned. Board Member Mead echoed that he was envisioning a similar product as a solution. Mr. Uzdevenes noted a Florida product approval number will likely be needed for the permit. Advisor Pristera noted that he supported the proposal to enclose the carport to mimic a side porch with louvers. Using the shed roof and louvers will help make the garage disappear. Advisor Pristera preferred to maintain the shed roof rather than the proposed gable. Board Member Fogarty noted the alteration is an improvement to what exists and what was proposed at the last meeting. Board Member Fogarty leaned toward Option B with the louvers because Option A looked like a standard garage door. Board Member Fogarty asked about the proposed finish of the enclosure. Mr. Uzdevenes answered it would be white to match the existing structure. Board Member Courtney noted she preferred the shed roof design with the shutter effect.

Board Member Ramos made a motion to approve the application as submitted with overhead door option B, painted the same color as the siding of the house. Board Member Fogarty seconded the motion and the motion failed 3-3 with Board Member Mead, Board Member Courtney, and Chair Salter dissenting.

Board Member Yee made a motion to approve the application with door option B without the windows as a fully louvered option and retaining the shed roof as it currently exists. Board Member Ramos seconded the motion. Board Member Yee clarified that the motion removes the divided lites on the garage door and is fully louvered. The motion failed 3-3 with Board Member Mead, Board Member Courtney, and Chair Salter dissenting.

Board Member Mead asked staff for clarification on the requirement to provide recommendations. Historic Preservation Planner Walker noted the code requires recommendations which can be made during discussion and/or be included in the motion. The previous aesthetic review at the April 2024 meeting resulted in the recommendation to explore a louvered option, which was presented today. Chair Salter asked how to handle an item if the majority of the board feels the application is against the code and there is no alternative. Historic Preservation Planner Walker answered that if the board finds the proposed plans to be non-code compliant and there are no reasonable alternatives, the plans could be denied based on Sec. 12-3-10(1)d.2.ii.(a). Board Member Ramos stated that that section of code is a weak reference for denying an application and as a non-contributing

structure, the applicant has provided an improvement to what is there currently. Board Member Ramos noted that the board needs to share a solution and there is nothing in the code strictly prohibiting a front-facing garage door. Board Member Mead shared that what he envisioned for louvered doors does not fit what the applicant has proposed. Board Member Mead noted he could support some version of an enclosure with appropriate treatment, perhaps a different shutter treatment.

Board Member Mead made a motion to deny the application based on Sec. 12-3-10(1)d.2.ii.(a) with a recommendation that the resubmittal include something approaching the application that Board Member Yee indicated that would read as a wall and window treatment appropriate to the fenestration established on the structure so that it will not look like a garage door, as much as feasible.

Board Member Yee noted that the applicant might explore pilaster columns that are applied to the surface of the building and above the door head and add a louver above to trim out the space so it doesn't look like a blank wall. Or alternatively, dress up the area to look like a porch. Mr. Uzdevenes asked about the board's opinion on the gable. Board Member Yee answered that the gable draws more attention and the shed roof is more subdued. Board Member echoed Board Member Yee's comments that some treatment can be added to read properly as something other than a garage.

Board Member Courtney seconded the motion. The motion failed 3-3 with Chair Salter, Board Member Ramos, and Board Member Fogarty dissenting.

Board Member Mead asked staff how to proceed. Historic Preservation Planner Walker noted the board must approve or deny the application.

Board Member Mead made a motion to deny with no recommendations for conditions of resubmittal based on Sec. 12-3-10(1)d.2.ii.(a). Chair Salter seconded the motion. The motion failed 3-3 with Board Member Ramos, Board Member Yee, and Board Member Fogarty dissenting.

Board Member Ramos made a motion to approve based on the recommendations of Board Members Mead and Yee that some sort of treatment be made to mimic an enclosed porch that is submitted for abbreviated review. Board Member Mead noted an abbreviated review is not appropriate since the proposed approach is novel. The motion failed without a second.

Chair Salter noted the majority of the board is open to the concept under certain circumstances, but it needs to be fine-tuned for the majority of board members to be comfortable with it. Board Member Ramos stressed the need to provide a solution for the applicant.

Board Member Mead made a motion to deny. Historic Preservation Planner Walker

shared confirmation from the city's Development Services Director that the application could be tabled to a specific date. The code states that action must be taken within 31 days to avoid automatic approval. The next ARB meeting is July 18, which is within 31 days.

Board Member Mead made a motion to table the application until the July 18, 2024 ARB meeting for modification consistent with the recommendations made and votes made by the board. Board Member Ramos asked if the applicant would incur another fee. Historic Preservation Planner Walker stated no, an additional fee would not be charged. Board Member Ramos seconded the motion and it passed 5-1 with Chair Salter dissenting. Mr. Uzdevenes asked about the next step. Historic Preservation Planner Walker noted she would follow up with the applicant, and it is within the applicant's right to speak with board members individually to discuss the proposed plans. The deadline for the July meeting would be granted a slight extension to accommodate the applicant. Board Members Mead and Ramos shared less concern about the shed roof and more concern about the door treatment.

3. 24-558 100 S. TARRAGONA STREET
PENSACOLA HISTORIC DISTRICT & PALAFOX HISTORIC BUSINESS
DISTRICT / ZONE HC-1 / CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT 6
REPLACEMENT WINDOWS AT NON-CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE

Shawn Lynch is seeking approval to replace 32 wood windows with CWS WindPact vinyl impact windows in dark bronze with no divided lites. The proposed window style will match the neighboring structure on the opposite end of the development at 108 S. Tarragona Street.

Shawn Lynch and Gordon Miles presented to the board. Mr. Miles noted the existing windows are rotting and fogged and the proposed window type will match the opposite end of the development at 108 S. Tarragona Street. Chair Salter asked staff to provide context for previous approvals for 108 S. Tarragona Street. Historic Preservation Planner Walker noted the property was approved in 2005 for new construction but the plans and minutes did not identify the specific type of window. An abbreviated review was approved in 2018 to change from wood to Andersen tilt wash vinyl clad windows. The applicant shared the reason behind proposing vinyl is to avoid additional wood rot. Chair Salter asked staff if vinyl windows had been approved in this district previously. Historic Preservation Planner Walker answered that typically windows are clad at minimum, but in February 2022 the board approved to replace 21 wood windows with PGT vinyl windows at 624 E. Government, a non-contributing structure in the wood cottages district but with a similar two-story architectural style and footprint. Board Member Ramos asked for clarification on the type of windows. Mr. Lynch answered that the proposed windows are fixed and casement vinyl windows. Board Member Yee noted he agreed with Chair Salter that the color is not an issue but the type and profile of the window are of more concern. Advisor Pristera noted that the existing

divided lites are more appropriate and were originally on 108 S. Tarragona Street before it was changed.

Chair Salter made a motion to approve the application as submitted. Board Member Courtney seconded the motion, and it passed 5-1 with Board Member Ramos dissenting.

4. 24-559 223 W. LLOYD STREET
NORTH HILL PRESERVATION DISTRICT / ZONE PR-1AAA / CITY COUNCIL
DISTRICT 6
WINDOW REPLACEMENT AT A CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE

Paul Jansen is seeking approval to replace one second floor wood window with a ViWinTech 3100 series Shoreline single hung vinyl window with a six over one simulated divided lite pattern that matches the existing windows. The window is located in the existing shower tub that will be replaced with a walk-in shower.

Paul Jansen presented to the board. Mr. Jansen noted the window is covered by a storm window on the exterior and is difficult to see from the street. The storm window will be reinstalled, so the exterior will not be exposed to the elements. The proposed window is vinyl to avoid the wet elements of the new shower. North Hill Preservation District expressed concerns about a vinyl window not upholding the standards of the city and the Secretary of the Interior. Mr. Jansen shared that wood windows are not used in shower stalls unless they are outside the water line. Board Member Mead noted his home has a wood window in the shower that works fine.

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

5. 24-573 1015 N. REUS STREET
NORTH HILL PRESERVATION DISTRICT / ZONE PR-1AAA / CITY COUNCIL
DISTRICT 6
FINAL REVIEW FOR EXTERIOR ALTERATIONS AT A CONTRIBUTING
STRUCTURE

Martin Mullin is seeking final approval for exterior alterations to a contributing structure including replacing the existing Terra cotta tile roof with a smooth Snap-Clad metal panel roof in red; repairing existing brick and stucco; replacing existing windows; altering the southwest corner for a new side entry; and adding a new swimming pool, fencing, hardscaping, and landscaping. This project received conceptual approval at the March 2024 ARB meeting.

Martin Mullin presented to the board. Mr. Mullin clarified that the proposed windows are the Marvin Ultimate series aluminum-clad wood windows with simulated divided lites with the internal spacer bar and exterior muntin. Chair Salter shared North Hill Preservation Association's concerns about the window proposed in the

application, but that has been resolved by Mr. Mullin's clarification. North Hill also expressed concerns about the green tinted glass. Mr. Mullin noted the glass will be clear, not green. Mr. Mullin asked the board about being open to vinyl windows. Chair Salter noted contributing structures require replication of original materials, which are typically wood windows, though the board is open to quality clad wood windows. Non-contributing and new construction have less stringent criteria for materials.

Board Member Ramos made a motion to approve the application as submitted and clarified. Board Member Mead seconded the motion, and it passed 5-0 with Board Member Courtney not present to vote.

6. 24-576 903 N. BARCELONA STREET
NORTH HILL PRESERVATION DISTRICT / ZONE PR-2 / CITY COUNCIL
DISTRICT 6
VARIANCE

Townes Plus Architects are seeking approval to reduce the rear yard setback from the required 25 feet to 20 feet and to reduce the interior side yard setback from 7.5 feet to 4 ft. 3 in. to accommodate a garage addition on the rear of the primary structure. An existing enclosed porch and deck will be removed to accommodate the addition which will align with the plane of the primary structure on the north side. The next agenda item is conceptual review of the proposed addition.

Ben Townes presented to the board. Chair Salter asked staff if the variance is required because the proposed work is an addition to the existing structure. If this was considered an accessory structure, would a variance be required? Historic Preservation Planner Walker answered no, an accessory structure would not require a variance. Mr. Townes stated that the height of an accessory would be restricted to 14 ft. Board Member Yee noted that an accessory dwelling unit is allowed above a garage so long as the structure is 5 ft. from the rear property line and meets the side yard setback of the primary. Historic Preservation Planner Walker noted an accessory dwelling unit above a garage can be up to 30 ft. in height if it meets the setbacks outlined by Board Member Yee. Mr. Townes shared that the applicant preferred to seek a variance for an addition rather than build an accessory in the rear that would take up the entire backyard. Board Member Ramos noted that either option would be appropriate but questioned the proposal to maintain the existing driveway in addition to a new driveway. Historic Preservation Planner Walker noted that the applicant was instructed to coordinate with engineering about the proposed curb cut and make sure hardscaping is code compliant.

Board Member Mead noted that of the variance criteria, the encroachment on the rear yard setback is due to the configuration of the stairs. Mr. Townes noted the placement of the a/c units dictated the configuration. Board Member Mead asked if the layout could be adjusted to avoid the encroachment on the rear yard setback.

Mr. Townes answered the layout is efficient and cannot be adjusted. Board Member Ramos noted that there is plenty of space for an accessory dwelling unit and a variance is needed when there is an imposition or unfair situation. Board Member Ramos noted that since it is a contributing structure, it would be better to add a detached structure rather than add on to the existing structure. Lisa Gibson, homeowner, noted that the neighboring property owners preferred that the addition be on the primary rather than a detached structure. Ms. Gibson also preferred the interior stairs as a safety measure. Mr. Townes noted the proposed driveway will be studied and addressed before returning to the board if the variance is approved. Chair Salter noted that the North Hill Preservation Association did not have any objections to the variance request.

Chair Salter summarized that both setback requests were exclusively the result of the desired layout. A detached structure could be accomplished without a variance. Mr. Townes shared the precedent has been set by neighboring properties and the request is nothing unusual for North Hill. Mr. Townes noted that a detached structure would leave little to no yard. Chair Salter noted the precedent examples are mainly detached garages, and they demonstrate that a code-compliant structure might have to sacrifice yard space. Board Member Mead echoed the Chair's remarks. Mr. Townes requested the board to separate the motion into two, one for the reduction of the side yard setback and one for the reduction of the rear yard setback. Staff shared that if the existing addition is demolished and rebuilt, a variance is still required to incorporate current code requirements, but the addition can be repaired as-is. Board Member Courtney shared an example from Belmont Street in Old East Hill and Chair Salter shared an example from Alcaniz Street in the Pensacola Historic District. Chair Salter noted he does not see justification for either setback reduction seeking a variance and does not see an advantage to separating the motions.

The board deliberated. Chair Salter noted the board has offered alternatives that do not require a variance. Board Member Mead referenced the variance criteria and noted the proposed scope of work does not satisfy the variance criteria that must be met.

Board Member Mead made a motion to deny the variance request based on the failure to satisfy the variance criteria outlined in Sec. 12-11-2(a)(2). Board Member Ramos seconded the motion and it carried 6-0.

7. 24-577 903 N. BARCELONA STREET
NORTH HILL PRESERVATION DISTRICT / ZONE PR-2 / CITY COUNCIL
DISTRICT 6
CONCEPTUAL REVIEW FOR ADDITION TO A CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE

Townes Plus Architects are seeking conceptual approval for an addition to a

contributing structure. An existing enclosed porch and deck will be removed to accommodate a new two-story garage addition on the rear of the primary structure. The addition will include cement fiber siding and a brick foundation both painted to match the primary, one over one windows, an asphalt shingle roof, exterior stair, and two garage doors. In addition, one window on the primary structure will be infilled with matching shake siding.

This item was withdrawn from the agenda.

8. 24-574 39 E. CHASE STREET
PALAFOX HISTORIC BUSINESS DISTRICT / ZONE C-2A / CITY COUNCIL
DISTRICT 6
FINAL REVIEW FOR MODIFICATIONS TO HOTEL DEVELOPMENT

EGD Hotel, LLC is seeking final approval for design changes to the Tristan Hotel in the East Garden District development. This project received final approval in August 2022 for a nine-story hotel and the applicants are seeking approval to reduce the structure to seven stories with changes to the fenestration. The site and footprint remain unchanged.

Aaron Ebent presented to the board. Board Member Mead asked about retaining the porch area on the south facade to provide variation and more substance to the courtyard. Chair Salter echoed Board Member Mead's comments about the covered porch that was removed from the south facade. The proposed lean-to roof does not contribute to the courtyard. Chair Salter suggested a decorative element such as a faux balcony to serve as a substantial element for the south facade and courtyard area. Mr. Ebent noted a horizontal element could be added, though it may not be occupiable. Alex Stacy addressed the board and agreed that a faux decorative element is feasible versus changing the room types to make the space occupiable. Board Member Ramos agreed the second-floor balconies helped to activate the courtyard and ideally, accessible balconies could be added back or at least change the canopy from a lean-to to a flat roof. Board Member Yee agreed with Board Member Ramos and suggested a balcony feature without a covering. Board Member Fogarty noted the previously approved plans had symmetry on the front facade with the centered canopy and asked for the rationale for asymmetry in the proposed plans. Mr. Ebent noted efforts were made to maintain symmetry, but the proposed changes hindered the ability to center the facade. Board Member Mead echoed Board Member Fogarty's comments.

Board Member Mead made a motion to approve as submitted with a request to address the treatment of the courtyard canopy area in a manner consistent with the board's comments, maximizing the potential amenity of the second level, to be submitted for abbreviated review. Board Member Ramos seconded the motion and it carried 6-0.

ADJOURNMENT