



City of Pensacola

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

MINUTES

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

October 17, 2024

2:00 PM

Hagler-Mason Conference Room,
2nd Floor

CALL TO ORDER / QUORUM

Members Present: William Brantley, Yuri Ramos, Jordan Yee, Lou Courtney, Scott Fisher, David Del Gallo

Members Absent: George R Mead II

Also Present: Historic Preservation Planner Walker, Assistant Planning & Zoning Division Manager Harding, Ross Pristera, Renee Borden, Helen Counsell, Rich Wisniewski, Baron Necaie, Larry Northup, Tom Paux, Brenda Cantrell, Tami Harris, Beverly Perry

1. 24-977 SWEARING IN REAPPOINTMENT(S) AND NEW APPOINTMENT(S)

Assistant City Clerk Tice administered the oath for the reappointments of Board Members Ramos and Yee, and new appointments for Board Members Brantley, Fisher, and Del Gallo.

2. 24-978 BOARD ELECTION FOR OFFICERS (CHAIRPERSON AND VICE CHAIRPERSON)

Board Member Brantley was elected as Chairperson, and Board Member Mead was re-elected as Vice Chairperson.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

3. 24-969 APPROVAL OF SEPTEMBER 19, 2024 ARB MINUTES.

Board Member Ramos made a motion to approve the September 19, 2024 ARB minutes. Board Member Yee seconded the motion, and it carried 6-0 with one member absent.

OPEN FORUM

NEW BUSINESS

4. 24-970 704 E. JACKSON STREET
OLD EAST HILL PRESERVATION DISTRICT / ZONE OEHR-2 / CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT 6
NEW ACCESSORY STRUCTURE AT A CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE

Tuff Shed, Inc. is seeking final approval for a new prefabricated shed to be located in the buildable area. The shed measures 8 x 18 ft. with horizontal lap siding in the color Dover Gray with Delicate White trim, a double shed door, two horizontal sliding windows, and dimensional shingles in Pewter Gray.

Savannah Hudson presented to the board. Board Member Courtney shared the sentiments of the Old East Hill Preservation Association and noted the need for horizontal siding. Ms. Hudson clarified that the siding is horizontal to match the primary. Board Member Del Gallo asked if plumbing or electricity was planned. Ms. Hudson answered Tuff Shed was unaware of any electrical or plumbing for the structure.

Board Member Courtney made a motion to approve as submitted. Board Member Yee seconded the motion, and it carried 6-0 with one member absent.

5. 24-971 101 S. PALAFOX STREET
PALAFOX HISTORIC BUSINESS DISTRICT / ZONE C-2A / CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT 6
CONCEPTUAL APPROVAL FOR EXTERIOR ALTERATION AT A NON-CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE

Curtis Reed with Bear General Contractors is seeking conceptual approval to add a 10 x 10 ft. insulated overhead coiling door at the rear of the one-story non-contributing structure that is adjacent to a two-story contributing structure in the Palafox Historic Business District.

Baron Necaise presented to the board. Mr. Necaise noted the overhead door is proposed to assist with loading accessibility for the building to attract a future buyer. Board Member Yee asked for clarification on contributing versus non-contributing. Historic Preservation Planner Walker answered the one-story structure that is proposed for the overhead door is non-contributing. Chair Brantley asked the applicant if they considered more decorative doors for the building. Mr. Necaise answered that the coiling door is the most economical choice since it is for the non-contributing structure. Board Member Ramos asked if the personnel door would remain, Mr. Necaise answered yes. Board Member Ramos asked about color options and Mr. Necaise answered the current color palette would be

complemented.

Board Member Fisher made a motion to approve the conceptual design. Board Member Ramos seconded the motion, and it carried 6-0 with one member absent.

6. 24-972 201 E. ZARRAGOSSA STREET
PENSACOLA HISTORIC DISTRICT & PALAFOX HISTORIC BUSINESS
DISTRICT / ZONE HC-1 / CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT 6
CONCEPTUAL REVIEW FOR LANDSCAPE IMPROVEMENTS AT A
CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE

The UWF Historic Trust is seeking conceptual approval for landscape modifications to the main entrance of the Museum of Commerce in the historic village. The existing concrete sidewalks will be replaced with brick pavers, planter beds, and movable planters.

Ross Pristera presented to the board. Chair Brantley complimented the plan and noted it would be nice if the sidewalk extended down Tarragona Street beside the Museum of Industry and Museum of Commerce. Board Member Yee asked if the sidewalk was a possibility. Mr. Pristera answered that the UWF Historic Trust owns up to the building on the property line and confirmed that the Tarragona Street right-of-way is CSX jurisdiction.

Chair Brantley made a motion to approve. Board Member Fisher seconded the motion, and it carried 6-0 with one member absent.

7. 24-973 1905 E. STRONG STREET
EAST HILL / ZONE R-1AAA / CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT 6
HISTORIC STRUCTURE DEMOLITION APPLICATION

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 association with the lives of persons potentially significant in our local past and the building embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period or method of construction. 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.

No applicant was present for the item. Chair Brantley clarified that the most the board can do is delay the demolition but not prohibit it. Mr. Pristera shared context on the structure and the previous occupants, and noted the structure is built with rusticated concrete block, likely poured on site. Mr. Pristera noted the structure is

eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. Board Member Courtney noted the structure is very durable with many unique details. Board Member Del Gallo echoed Board Member Courtney's comments.

Richard Wisniewski addressed the board as a member of the public. Mr. Wisniewski shared that the structure is very unique with no other examples, and it is a shame for it to be demolished and replaced with new structures that do not fit the neighborhood. It is very common in East Hill for a structure to be demolished and replaced with new construction that does not fit the character. Larry Northup addressed the board as a member of the public. Mr. Northup noted the structure is one of a kind and there are maybe a few examples in North Hill of similar construction. Mr. Northup shared he is eager to learn what can be done to save the structure. The property could be subdivided in a way that the existing structure could be saved. Renee Borden addressed the board as a member of the public. Ms. Borden noted she has lived in East Hill for almost 31 years. The home in question is what attracts people to East Hill and to Pensacola. Ms. Borden echoed Mr. Northup's question of what can be done to save the building.

Board Member Del Gallo noted that the ARB review was triggered because of the building being 50 years or older and not because East Hill is a preservation district. Board Member Del Gallo was in favor of the 60-day delay and shared that he would like to meet with the builder and the city to discuss options. Board Member Courtney noted that homeowners in East Hill must come together to seek options for preserving structures in the neighborhood. Homeowners must start a movement and seek guidance from City Council. Chair Brantley shared he is an East Hill homeowner and is interested in a renewed effort to have a review process for East Hill and is interested in meeting with the applicant. Historic Preservation Planner Walker noted that because the board operates in the Sunshine, a meeting with the applicant must be publicly noticed. Historic Preservation Planner Walker will alert the applicant that the board has requested a discussion item at the November meeting. Assistant Planning & Zoning Division Manager Harding noted that a request can be provided to the applicant for a follow-up meeting, but it cannot be a requirement per the city's code. Board Member Ramos asked if this demolition was proposed in a historic district, would the applicant be required to provide replacement plans? Historic Preservation Planner Walker answered yes, contributing structures in the designated historic districts require replacement plans to accompany a demolition request. The 60-day delay is meant to allow public participation, particularly in instances when a property is for sale and the applicant is a potential buyer, to allow the community to step in. Historic Preservation Planner Walker confirmed the applicant is the current owner. Board Member Yee echoed the board's comments, particularly as an East Hill resident, and implored the community to take action to preserve the neighborhood. Board Member Yee also supported the demolition delay.

Jennifer Glossinger addressed the board as a member of the public. Ms. Glossinger noted the balance between property owner's rights and preserving

culture and shared that she would be happy to help facilitate collaborative efforts. Maria Rosasco addressed the board as a member of the public. Ms. Rosasco noted the potential risks of storm water runoff and how a potential development would impact neighboring properties. Two-story accessory structures are accompanying new construction which impacts the neighborhood. Ms. Rosasco asked if a petition against the demolition would help. Historic Preservation Planner Walker answered that a petition would demonstrate the neighborhood's commitment to preservation, but because of property rights and the ordinance language, the applicant would still be able to apply for a demolition permit in 60 days. Ms. Rosasco asked if it was possible to list the property in the National Register and how long the process could take. Historic Preservation Planner Walker answered that property owner concurrence is required, and the process generally takes one year to complete, depending on the length of the application and the timing for review. Ms. Rosasco noted the potential for tax credits if listed in the National Register and echoed the potential to preserve the home and still build additional structures. Tamala Harris addressed the board as a member of the public. Ms. Harris is a real estate agent and represented buyers who chose the structure in question as their second choice during a recent purchase. The home required one to two years of renovation and the buyers wanted a move-in ready property. Ms. Harris echoed previous comments about decreased property values due to the applicant's new construction in East Hill. Ms. Harris asked if the property in question could be split into four properties. Assistant Planning & Zoning Division Manager Harding answered that the R-1AAA zoning would allow four lots.

Historic Preservation Planner Walker noted the upcoming Land Development Code revision process and keeping the momentum of the East Hill neighborhood to seek opportunities for preservation. Board Member Yee asked if the platting process would be triggered if the property is divided into four lots. Assistant Planning & Zoning Division Manager Harding answered there are ten historical parcels, but the ten parcels would not be feasible under R-1AAA parameters. In the city, if a property is divided into three new parcels without lot history, a subdivision plat is required with Planning Board and City Council approval. Assistant Planning & Zoning Division Manager Harding noted this parcel is in the Bayou Texar Shoreline Protection District, an environmental overlay that requires additional engineering review for storm water management. Any redevelopment of this lot will trigger additional storm water criteria and consideration. Board Member Yee asked for a record of all demolition requests in the East Hill neighborhood and asked about the process for designating a historic district. Assistant Planning & Zoning Division Manager Harding answered there is no set standard and each district is different. The creation of a historic district would require the development of an ordinance that is approved by the City Council. Mr. Pristera pointed to the National Park Service website for the general process. Assistant Planning & Zoning Division Manager Harding pointed to the CRA Urban Design Overlay District as an option, which is a form-based code for new construction and those plans are reviewed by the city's CRA Urban Design Planner. The board further discussed the process of creating a historic district.

Board Member Del Gallo made a motion to delay the demolition for 60 days and asked that staff reach out to the developer to see if he is willing to meet with the board. Board Member Fisher seconded the motion, and it carried 6-0 with one member absent.

8. 24-974 DISCUSSION
SIGN MATERIALS FOR THE PENSACOLA HISTORIC DISTRICT

This item is meant to give the Board an opportunity to discuss sign materials, specifically in the Pensacola Historic District, as it relates to Sec. 12-3-10(1)e.4.ii.(a) that prohibits any sign using plastic materials for lettering or background. The land development code does not specify approved material types for this district but does specifically prohibit using plastic materials, though plastic is not defined in the Definitions in Sec. 12-13. A multi-agency publication, "Uniform System for Official Signs in the Seville Square Historical District", was adopted by the Board in 1973. The publication notes that wood, metal, paint and, in some instances, plastic shall be permitted for lettering. This is contradictory to the current code that specifically prohibits plastic. Over time, composite sign materials have been introduced into the Pensacola Historic District either by lack of specificity in the abbreviated review application or by installation of materials contradictory to what was presented in the application. For example, abbreviated review applications may indicate "wood" but the actual product being used is High Density Urethane, which has been historically viewed as a form of plastic, since it is an expanded polyurethane-based product. This discussion may lead to a policy that the board can adopt regarding specific sign materials that can be incorporated into the larger land development code revisions that are forthcoming.

Ross Pristera presented to the board with the goal of clarity on what is appropriate in the Pensacola Historic District and the goal of preserving the art of sign making. Mr. Pristera passed around examples of different sign materials. Tom Paux of Brix Designs presented to the board and shared that synthetic products are available that appear like wood but can last much longer than traditional wood. Mr. Paux highlighted PVC and polyurethane materials that could be painted, and lighter colors hold up better against the elements. MDF and maxmetal samples were also passed around to the board. Mr. Paux described to the board the different material composition of the samples and shared the history of sign making. Redwood was typically used as a traditional wood, but it is in decline. Board Member Yee asked for clarification on which material types are being proposed to be allowed. Mr. Pristera noted the aesthetic of the sign should be focused on more than the actual material. Board Member Courtney asked about MDO, medium density overlay. Mr. Paux noted that MDO is plywood and not used much anymore, since composite materials have become more desirable. The board discussed the quality of traditional wood and how it is not the same as it once was. Board Member Ramos asked for clarification on what materials should still be prohibited. Mr. Paux answered he would not use composite metal or traditional wood since it

deteriorates faster. Mr. Paux noted that aluminum is now used more often than steel. Board Member Ramos noted that the high density urethane and PVC should be acceptable for use but asked about the other materials including acrylic and modified acrylics, polycarbonate, and vinyl. Mr. Paux stated that vinyl is typical. Board Member Ramos asked for clarity on what is considered polycarbonate and acrylic. Mr. Paux answered that both are standard acrylic; polycarbonate is a lexan, which is a variety of plastic that is made to be more resilient than regular acrylic. Board Member Ramos likened the acrylic to a fast-food signage type and that is what the code was speaking about with the plastic prohibition.

Board Member Yee noted a favor of allowing materials that are indistinguishable from traditional materials and that last longer. Board Member Yee asked for clarification on what was being proposed or requested. Mr. Pristera answered that a variety of materials were provided as examples, but the goal is to avoid the large, plastic-faced signs that should still be prohibited. Mr. Paux referenced the clarification that has been determined in the more recent past for illuminated signage and what has been deemed acceptable per the code. Mr. Pristera shared he would work with city staff to draft a policy. The board discussed the abbreviated review process for signage and the process for clarifying sign material types with a policy. Board Member Yee welcomed a draft policy to address sign materials. Assistant Planning & Zoning Division Manager Harding noted that a policy cannot contradict the code, so the policy will need to demonstrate how the board views plastic materials in terms of the code provision and the ordinance does give the board authority to make small variances in the case of a hardship or need, and there should be a way to justify the clarification on plastic in a policy.

ADJOURNMENT