



City of Pensacola

222 West Main Street
Pensacola, FL 32502

Memorandum

File #: 20-00154

Architectural Review Board

3/19/2020

TO: Architectural Review Board Members

FROM: Gregg Harding, RPA, Historic Preservation Planner

DATE: 3/11/2020

SUBJECT:

February 20, 2020 Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes



MINUTES OF THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

February 20, 2020

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairperson Quina, Board Member Fogarty, Board Member Campbell-Hatler, Board Member Mead, Board Member Salter, Board Member Villegas

MEMBERS ABSENT: Vice Chairperson Crawford

STAFF PRESENT: Historic Preservation Planner Harding, Senior Planner Statler, Board Advisor Pristera, Assistant City Attorney Lindsay, Intern Mendillo, Digital Media Coordinator Siedah Rosa, Network Engineer Chris Johnston

OTHERS PRESENT: Steve Fluegge, Kurt Krueger, Randy Hamilton, Jared & Paula Willets, Dio Perera, Angelica Tilton, Rimmer Covington, Jr., David Butler, Rita Kohli, Dennis Kohli, J. Veal, Steven & Elizabeth Steck, Mitchell Hubbell, Hannah Hubbell

CALL TO ORDER / QUORUM PRESENT

Chairperson Quina called the Architectural Review Board (ARB) meeting to order at 1:59 p.m. with a quorum present and explained the Board procedures to the audience.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Board Member Mead made a motion to approve the January 16, 2020 minutes, seconded by Board Member Villegas, and it carried unanimously.

OPEN FORUM - None

NEW BUSINESS

Item 1

607 N. Spring Street

NHPD

Contributing Structure

PR-2

Action taken: Approved.

Patrick and Sarah O'Neill are requesting approval to install Aeratis Heritage flooring on both levels of the front porch and to replace twelve windows located on the rear and sides of a contributing structure. Repairs to the porch with in-kind materials were approved through a Board for Board application in January. Comments from North Hill were

provided.

Mr. Hamilton presented to the Board, and Chairperson Quina noted that North Hill liked the tongue and groove Aeratis in the Battleship Gray color. It was determined the windows would all match, and they were not replacing the front windows. **Board Member Mead made a motion to approve, seconded by Board Member Villegas, and the motion carried unanimously.**

Item 2 **202 Cevallos Street** **PHD**
Contributing Structure **HR-2 / Wood Cottages**

Action taken: Approved with abbreviated review.

Kurt Krueger is requesting approval to replace window shutters on a contributing structure. The existing wood shutters will be replaced with storm-rated colonial-style aluminum shutters.

Mr. Krueger presented to the Board. Mr. Pristera advised the aluminum shutters would look similar to the original historical shutter and would provide protection to the structure without bringing in another system. Chairperson Quina clarified it allowed the resident to protect and save the historic wood windows. Mr. Pristera preferred the louvered over the panel design, and Mr. Krueger felt the louvered design upgraded the appearance. Board Member Salter addressed the bracket elements holding the shutters in position, and Mr. Krueger advised they would be replaced with something more secure. Board Member Salter noticed the property down the street where the moulding around the trim had been cut out for the brackets. He was concerned about the way they would be mounted since they were now mounted to the face of the trim board. Mr. Krueger stated he could not approach this specifically, but advised the moulding would not be damaged. Chairperson Quina explained that sometimes they need spacers where they pull away from the trim, but the blocking might also appear odd. Board Member Salter wanted to make sure where and how the hinges were mounted would not be disruptive to the architecture, and suggested the specific mounting of the hinge be a part of the motion and possibly submitted in an abbreviated review. Board Member Villegas asked about the windows with no space for the double shutters, and Mr. Krueger stated some were bi-fold and would be similar to the existing.

Board Member Salter made a motion to approve with a mounting detail of the hinge to be submitted in an abbreviated review, seconded by Board Member Mead. With no audience speakers, the motion carried unanimously.

Item 3 **122 W. Lloyd Street** **NHPD**
Contributing Structure **PR-1AAA**

Action taken: Approved with abbreviated review.

Mary Bozeman is seeking approval to add 34 solar panels to the roof of a contributing structure. All 34 panels are proposed to be added to the south side of the roof which faces Lloyd Street. Per Florida Statute Sec. 163.04(2), "a property owner may not be denied permission to install solar collectors [...] by any entity." However, "such entity may determine the specific location where solar collectors may be installed on the roof within an orientation to the south or within 45° east or west of due south provided that such determination does not impair the effective operation of the solar collectors."

Ms. Bozeman presented to the Board and stated the panels worked better if installed on the south side facing Lloyd Street. She also felt installing the solar panels would not diminish the structure's attractiveness. Chairperson Quina stated the Board had approved at least two installations of solar panels in North Hill, one on a secondary facade and one on a non-contributing structure. He pointed out they could be added to a home but also taken away; the goal was not to allow them to detract from the architectural character of the house. Board Member Mead suggested it was preferable on a two-story house since it would be more visible on a one-story structure. He was concerned that the layout of the panels would leave gaps on the leading edge of the roof which would draw more attention because of that discontinuity; the lower roof was to be covered with the exception of the corners. Board Member Salter agreed that the front edge would be a distraction and suggested reducing the six panels across the front (A2.12.-A2.17) so the pattern would be more consistent across the front edge. Ms. Bozeman indicated they could ask that the panels be made as unobtrusive as possible. Board Member Villegas believes in harnessing energy but was concerned about setting a precedent moving forward if a house was not two-story, and the panels were more visible. Mr. Pristera felt it should be reviewed on a case-by-case basis, and he looked at the roof material as not character defining. Mr. Partington pointed out the picture of the house from the street view was not an accurate representation, and the home was actually closer to the street with the roof not as visible. Board Member Fogarty offered another option for the bottom row of panels. Chairperson Quina explained the Board wanted to be careful of the placement of the panels, making sure that the visual effect was reduced as much as possible. **Board Member Mead made a motion to approve with an adjustment of the configuration and number of panels to give a consistent line across the front edge of the roof, and that the configuration be submitted as an abbreviated review consistent with those requirements. The motion was seconded by Board Member Fogarty and carried unanimously.**

Item 4 **903 N. Spring Street** **NHPD**
Contributing Structure **PR-2**

Action taken: Approved with abbreviated review.

Dio Perera, Walcott Adams Verneuille Architects, is requesting approval for a detached carriage house. The proposed two-car garage with second-story living space has been designed to complement the primary residence.

Mr. Perera presented to the Board. Chairperson Quina pointed out the North Hill comments addressing the west elevation facing the neighbor. Mr. Perera explained they would be 5' from the property line, and there were no restrictions for fire rating. Board Member Mead agreed with the comment on the long roof line being a concern. Chairperson Quina explained he would not apply a dormer for no reason but suggested maybe another window to the garage; he pointed out there might be 30 houses in North Hill with similar design. He indicated it did pick up the architecture of the house. Mr. Perera explained they wanted to utilize the existing curb cuts. Board Member Mead was concerned that the scale of the structure was different from the scale of the house, riding up too high into the body of the house, diminishing the window/bay feature on the east elevation. The profile of the bay and where the roofline meets it was reading out of proportion, and he suggested it be lower in slope. Mr. Perera stated the roof over the garage was 7:12 with the main house porch

being 9:12. Board Member Mead suggested it might be less significant if the bay was larger. He suggested dropping the skirt roof over the carriage doors to 5:12. **With no audience speakers, Board Member Mead made a motion to approve with the change of the slope on the skirt roof over the carriage doors to 5:12 for submission to an abbreviated review for comparison to what was presented and leave it to the discretion of the reviewer for the actual slope. The motion was seconded by Board Member Villegas and carried unanimously.**

**Item 5
New Construction**

220 W. Gadsden Street

**NHPD
PR-2**

Action taken: Conceptual Approved with comments.

Jim Veal is requesting *CONCEPTUAL* approval for a new single family residence on the east lot of a soon-to-be subdivided parcel. The southwest parcel received final approval for a single family residence in July 2019.

Mr. Veal presented to the Board and stated the owners desired to build on the east side of the property, and the other two parcels were for sale. Chairperson Quina asked about the eave height, and Mr. Veal indicated it was commensurate with the 10' ceilings. He explained the owner's goals were the same for wind mitigation. He also stated the fireplace would be wood and noted other wood chimneys such as 315 W. Jackson. He advised the product submission showed composite materials, and they intended to follow through with those.

Board Member Mead was concerned with the roof and fireplace placement since this had more of a cottage style, and he felt this was the wrong roof for that; the placement of the fireplace and displacement of the front entrance door, and the placement of the fireplace and chimney created a problem. Mr. Veal stated with respect to the design of the home, the fireplaces were in the most desirable locations. He pointed out every house in the neighborhood brings a unique feature where they all blend together. Board Member Mead suggested the chimney and fireplace would look better if pushed to the corner of the house rather than on the front porch and would give a better roof line.

Board Member Villegas thought the chimney stood out because they were not getting the feel of the lap siding in the renderings, and she felt it looked odd. Mr. Veal stated in order to build the chimney in brick presented several structural challenges, and economically it would be a real hit to the budget, but they would be open to exploring a plastered look. Board Member Villegas offered it would be a cheaper solution and appreciated that a masonry chimney could cost \$20,000, but it addressed what's around it. Mr. Pristera asked if this was an actual wood burning fireplace, and Mr. Veal advised it was. Mr. Pristera asked if they explored a different type of flue, and Mr. Veal stated that nobody made a vent less wood burning fireplace.

Board Member Salter asked if they had thought to bring the brick skirting up to the level of the column base, continuing it around which would make the column base more consistent; Mr. Veal advised the skirt would be taller at the rear by approximately 4' above grade. Board Member Villegas asked why the porches were not connected, and Mr. Veal stated they were connected, and there was a security feature to prevent someone from entering the side porch. Board Member Fogarty asked about the rear windows, and Mr. Veal advised their intent was to have a window on the north wall; there had also been an effort

to not impact the trees. **Board Member Mead made a motion for conceptual approval with the following changes as options: 1) Breaking the symmetry of a very symmetrical aspect with a slightly asymmetrical chimney was jarring and suggested moving it to the side wall and move the entrance way commensurate with the front door to the next bay, then the two asymmetries offset each other which gives a more pleasing composition for the overall front of the house; 2) Roofline needs to be broken up with some feature or brought lower; 3) The addition of some sort of fenestration at the back wall of the garage. Board Member Salter seconded the motion, and with no audience speakers, it carried unanimously.**

**Item 6
Variance**

314 S. Alcaniz Street

**PHD
HC-1 / Wood Cottages**

Action taken: Denied

Scott Holland is seeking a Variance to increase the minimum rear yard setback from twenty (20) feet to twelve (12) feet, six (6) inches to accommodate a new two-story single family residence. This item is in consideration with Item 7.

Mr. Holland presented to the Board and advised the existing building is 10' from the rear property line, and after removing the residence, he proposed to pull it back 12.5'. He advised there were no objections to the variance, but the neighbor at the rear wanted to ensure the shortcut to the Dharma Blue would remain. Board Member Mead was concerned that this was a 40% variance and was not sure the other elements of the hardship could be met. Assistant City Attorney Lindsay asked if he had looked at the information provided, and he confirmed he did but was uncertain that this would preclude them from building on this lot. He noted there were buildings being constructed on small lots and was not sure how this presented a hardship. Chairperson Quina pointed out he was only asking for the same consideration as the neighbors on both sides, and he was staying further away from the setback than the neighbors had; it also was not creating a special circumstance. Staff advised the requested variance would not increase the non-conformity of what was already existing; the structure to the north was a contributing structure. It was also clarified that when a structure was torn down, it was replaced with a structure which was up to present day Code and not non-conforming, however it could be repaired or extended, and a variance would not be needed. It was also noted the variance would save two heritage trees.

Mr. Fluegge explained that variances caused him heartburn and where does it stop with variances getting larger and setbacks getting smaller; he and his neighbors were concerned with the larger projects, and granting variances was a slippery slope. He emphasized the downtown area was a prized jewel and needed care and protection at all costs.

Board Member Mead was amenable to the property owner's desire but needed the criteria to be met on evidence presented. This was new construction and not preserving a historical structure or preserving some item of uniqueness which is the function of the Board. Chairperson Quina offered that the applicant was indicating without the setback, the site was unbuildable in the remaining footprint for a marketable house. **With other Board members agreeing, Board Member Villegas made a motion to deny because of a lack of hardship, seconded by Board Member Mead, and it carried unanimously.**

Chairperson Quina informed the applicant that he could approach the Council on this matter.

Item 7 **314 S. Alcaniz Street** **PHD**
New Construction **HC-1 / Wood Cottages**
Action taken: Withdrawn.
Scott Holland is seeking *CONCEPTUAL* approval for a new two-story single family residence.

Item 8 **820 N. Baylen Street** **NHPD**
Variance **PR-2**
Action taken: Approved.

Paula and Jared Willets are seeking two Variances: to decrease the maximum required rear yard setback from 25' to 2' and to decrease the maximum required south side yard setback from 7.5' to 2' to accommodate a detached garage with 2nd-story living quarters. The intention of the requested Variances is to allow the applicants to demolish an existing and dilapidated non-contributing garage and to rebuild within its footprint. This item is under consideration with Item 9.

Mr. and Ms. Willets presented to the Board. Ms. Willets stated the existing garage was collapsing, and they wanted to rebuild within the same footprint. She pointed out with the existing wood rot, the framing no longer touches, and the roof is collapsing on the inside. Staff explained because this was a multi-family development, rear yard coverage was not taken into account, and the rear yard setback must go from 25' to 2'. Board Member Mead noted the duplex and garage predated the zoning. Chairperson Quina advised the North Hill comments were in favor of the variance. Board Member Mead asked if the Board was considering the variance on the main structure. Senior Planner Statler pointed out it was not an accessory structure at this point because you cannot have an accessory dwelling unit unless you are a single-family detached dwelling; their property actually allows multi-family dwelling units, so it would be a third dwelling unit, and the 25' rear setback would apply.

Board Member Salter stated if the proposed garage did not have the living area above it, it would still be classified as an accessory structure, and staff agreed, and the 3' setback would apply. Board Member Salter explained by adding the dwelling unit, it was possible that they were creating a hardship. Board Member Mead pointed out multi-family was allowed in this district, and the question was the placement of the additional dwelling unit; there was an existing structure, and they were adding a dwelling unit to it. Also, the applicant stated it was used as a dwelling in the 40s which gave it a background. All they were being allowed to do was reconfigure and reconstruct what was a failing structure to something consistent with the remainder of the property and diminishing the non-conforming with regard to its closeness to the rear property lines. Staff clarified it would have to be fire rated if built where it is shown, and that had been discussed with the applicants.

Board Member Mead made a motion to approve the variance to the extent that it will not enlarge the proximity to the existing property lines from the existing structure, and on the grounds that there is evidence before the Board that it has been used in some capacity as a dwelling structure and is zoned for multi-family and therefore the 25' should not really apply because it is an existing non-conformity predating the Code and as long as we don't enlarge the non- conformity in regard to its proximity to the

property lines, merely reconfiguring it for dwelling purposes, and its other accessory uses do not in any way enlarge the non-conformity, and the variance is otherwise appropriate for the obviously failing structure which constitutes a hardship. Board Member Fogarty seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.

**Item 9
Demo / New Construction**

820 N. Baylen Street

**NHPD
PR-2**

Action taken: Conceptual Approval with comments.

Paula and Jared Willets are requesting approval to demolish an existing non-contributing garage and *CONCEPTUAL* approval for a new detached garage with second story living quarters.

Ms. Willets presented to the Board and provided plans for the detached garage. Chairperson Quina asked about the stair location, and Ms. Willets stated a door would lead to the stairway which would be out of the elements. Mr. Willets indicated they had repointed one side of the house so far, and some of the brick was replaced, but it closely matched the existing. Board Member Salter noted the house had so many changes in profiles with step-outs and step-ins, and they had the opportunity to do this on the garage as well. Board Member Mead agreed the strong symmetry on the house facing Baylen was important, but thought the 4 gang windows were too much and suggested breaking them up into 2 gangs. He also suggested since they divided the garage doors, placing the stairs up the center of the carriage doors. Chairperson Quina suggested they continue the brick to create a freestanding pier so there is a little bit of a porch that would be covered. **Board Member Campbell-Hatler made a motion for conceptual approval, seconded by Board Member Mead noting the comments of the Board, and it carried unanimously.**

**Item 10
New Construction**

200 BLK S. 9th Avenue

**PHD
HC-1 / Brick Structures**

Action taken: Approved with abbreviated reviews.

Elizabeth and Stephen Steck are seeking *final* approval for a new single family residence. This project received conceptual approval in October 2019. The revised plans still depict a three-level house with a garage, foyer, and storage area on the first floor, primary living space on the second, and a master suite and bedrooms on the third. The exterior, however, has undergone a redesign which reflect the applicants' preferred style and the input from the Board.

Ms. Steck presented to the Board and advised they now have a pergola on the top floor, faux carriage type doors on the front elevation and larger windows; the house is now longer and not as deep so there is more footage on 9th Avenue. The carriage types were carried to the sides, and hardie board was used for the rear since there was a concern with the increased structure to be placed on the building because of the open porch and the floor below. The railing would match the railing on the rear porch – an aluminum bronze color. The stairs would be made of a composite recycled material.

Board Member Mead asked about the lighting, and it was provided. He also suggested board and batten rather than hardie board. He felt the rhythm and fenestration were good and asked about the gutter system. Mr. Steck stated they would leave that to the contractor. Ms. Steck explained the A/C unit would be located on the south side outside the elevator and had

to be 8' up. Chairperson Quina suggested using brackets with the same railing as the porch, and Board Member Mead suggested a batten element to conceal. Ms. Steck stated that ECUA was agreeable to the brick columns along the front fence, but they wanted the additional fencing to be traditional privacy fencing since they required access to the easement area. **Board Member Mead made a motion to approve with the following details submitted in an abbreviated review: 1) Stair and baluster materials and design; 2) placement and treatment of the A/C equipment and supports; 3) detail of the non-masonry covering to change that from lap siding to possibly board and batten; 4) gutter details. Board Member Campbell-Hatler seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.**

Item 11 **36 E. Garden Street** **PHBD**
Contributing Structure **C-2A**

Action taken: Approved with abbreviated review.

Philip Partington is requesting *CONCEPTUAL* approval for exterior modifications to a contributing structure. The proposed plans show "Reynolds Music House" converted into a new restaurant with covered outdoor seating and green wall systems.

Mr. Partington presented to the Board and stated his family had a 100-year historical connection to this structure. He explained they had made a slight adjustment to the elevation to stay with the pre-1950s elevation. **He also asked that the project have final approval and furnished materials to the Board for consideration.** With the approval of staff, Chairperson Quina advised it would be allowed; Senior Planner Statler advised it would be up to the Board on whether or not they received sufficient information. Mr. Partington stated the restaurant owners currently own Iron, and this would be a 150 seat sister restaurant (Cast), and the menu was farm to table. This project would be in partnership with the East Garden District development. Jefferson Street was projected to have a road diet, and they were proposing a 10' covered canopy all along Jefferson Street. The existing canopy on Garden would be re-clad to look more historic. He also explained they were removing the entire east wall. The windows and doors would be a storefront system. The canopy would be cast aluminum and the building would be stucco in a white color. The green wall would be southern facing and basically hide the alley; it is also set back from the face. A planter would be flush with the wall and within the property line.

Board Member Campbell-Hatler stated the project would do a lot for that corner. Board Member Salter asked about the canopy system, and it was determined it would drain through the columns.

Board Member Mead made a motion to approve with an abbreviated review on the plan detail for the window widening, the plan elevation for the south elevation the same as the rendering, and the green wall planters both on the wrap on the rear and the front. The motion was seconded by Board Member Campbell-Hatler, and with no audience speakers, carried unanimously.

Item 12 **18 / 20 E. Garden Street** **PHBD**
Contributing Structure **C-2A**

Action taken: 18 E. Garden denied-20 E. Garden approved.

Scott Sallis is requesting approval to renovate the storefronts of two retail spaces. Mr. Sallis

presented to the Board and stated this project was also a part of the East Garden District. They are under contract to do the shell work for future tenants, and because of that, he expected the colors to change. He explained they wanted to raise the storefronts where they could have rain protection and new lighting. Board Member Salter asked if there were other options for the front door, and Mr. Sallis stated the garage door was an option they put out there because the developer loved it since it was done on other downtown projects. Board Member Salter noted that Perfect Plain was more extensive in their remodeling, but there were plenty of other options available with possibly a collapsible door, and Mr. Sallis was agreeable to consider other options.

Board Member Mead addressed the parapet walls being removed and asked if they were original. Mr. Sallis explained they did not question that because their main goal was to incite great retail with ground to ceiling glass. Board Member Campbell-Hatler asked about the window glazing, and Mr. Sallis advised they would use clear glazing. Board Member Villegas appreciated the garage door but thought it took away the beauty of what was already existing there. Mr. Sallis indicated the collapsible door might be a good compromise. Chairperson Quina explained the Board wanted to be consistent in their opinions and not set a precedent with approving in one location and not in another; garage doors were agreeable because they were open during business hours. Board Member Mead suggested they could open up the space while using the parapet walls as a barrier. Board Member Campbell-Hatler suggested differentiation in how deep the window is to the front of the façade; with everyone moving completely to the front, they needed to pay attention to stepping the façade back to create a rhythm; Mr. Sallis advised this placement was due to the manufacturers' wanting water proofing.

Board Member Mead made a motion to approve on 20 E. Garden as submitted. On 18 E. Garden he wanted to preserve the sill walls for the windows even if the whole area was opened up with garage doors immediately behind them which would preserve that element of the façade. Mr. Sallis was agreeable since that would allow them to move forward with the project; he would return for the signage element and colors, and the tenant might have a different idea for the storefront. **Since the application was determined to be for final approval, the Board could consider the submittals as one or separately. Board Member Mead then moved to deny on 18 E. Garden for resubmittal to preserve the sill walls with the approach to the fenestration entry and was amenable to the opening, and to approve 20 E. Garden as submitted. Board Member Salter seconded the motion.** Mr. Sallis and Mr. Pristera stated they would look further into the history of the walls. **The motion then carried unanimously.**

Item 13

121 S. Palafox Place

PHBD

Contributing Structure

HR-2 / Wood Cottages

Action taken: Approved.

Scott Sallis is seeking approval to remove and modify the front and rear facades. Modifications to the southern rear portion of the building were approved in December 2019. Although the December motion only included details on the southern rear space, a conceptual design of the full building was provided to the Board at that time.

Mr. Sallis presented to the Board and advised his client asked them to move forward with the next phase. They propose to build a new façade and a second floor on the front and rear.

He explained the structural column grid for the building was literally in the middle of the existing corridor; they needed to retain this corridor to access the future B&B unit, future stairwells and elevations going to a new second floor which would consist primarily of residential units. There would also be a rooftop restaurant and beer garden. They were using details to respect the Spanish heritage as well as new products for the outdoors which reflect a Spanish tile. The residential units would have a balcony, and the sleeping units were laid out similar to a boutique hotel.

Board Member Mead questioned the garden canopy which would be cantilevered. Mr. Sallis explained contemporary solutions with Spanish heritage were limited for exterior lighting. If they choose to have alcoves, they must be lit up to minimize the transient traffic. They proposed to return with the lighting choices. Chairperson Quina offered it was a great improvement, and Board Member Salter stated the bold elements were done nicely. **With no audience speakers, Board Member Mead made a motion to approve, seconded by Board Member Villegas, and it carried unanimously.**

Item 14

100 BLK S. Spring Street

GCD

Contributing Structure

C-2

Action taken: Approved.

Rimmer Covington is requesting final approval for a 14-unit townhome development with rooftop terraces. This item received conceptual approval at the February 2018 ARB meeting and final approval at the March 2018 meeting. Since then, there have been several design modifications which require ARB approval to proceed with construction permitting.

Mr. Covington and Mr. Butler presented to the Board. Mr. Butler advised the window packages they had been working from were expensive, and they did some value engineering and changed the design. There were also some additional supports to the outside balconies, and other levels of finishes had changed. They proposed to use Windsor windows which were aluminum clad wood. The colors had not changed. **With no audience speakers, Board Member Salter made a motion to approve, seconded by Board Member Fogarty, and it carried unanimously.**

Item 15

1217 E. Mallory Street 1/2

R-1AA

Demolition

New City Tract

Action taken: 60-day delay for further information.

Per the City of Pensacola's Historic Building Demolition Review Ordinance (Sec. 12-12-5(E)), the above structure has been found to be potentially significant in regards to their architecture and/or its association with persons significant to local, regional or national history.

Chairman Quina recused himself from the discussion since this was his client.

It was determined the Church Diocese of Pensacola had owned this building for 60 years, but it had been unoccupied for one year. They were unable to occupy the structure for the parish and wanted to install 20 new parking spaces. Currently, their parishioners park across 12th Avenue, and two years ago, an elderly handicapped member was struck by an automobile, and they need parking on the same side of the street as the church. The church now uses the school parking lot facilities. It was clarified that the structure also contained asbestos in almost all of the interior, with the highest amount being in the flooring and window sealant.

Mr. Pristera advised on the Florida Master Site File, AV Clubbs developed the two blocks and sold to Mr. Workman who was a principle educator and lived in the house. He wanted to make sure the house tied to Mr. Workman was actually this house and needed to determine if it was 1217 or 1217 1/2. It was determined there were lots of small rooms with no large room, and it would need significant work to be used by any group. Mr. Pristera explained when he and staff visited the home, it looked to be in usable condition. However, the front was confusing with the window and door placement, but the curved porch was unique. The house has character and is in good shape with some names attached to it, and he felt the community should have a chance to salvage parts or pieces of it or see if someone was interested in moving in. He asked for the timeline, and the church was having a groundbreaking ceremony this weekend (Feb. 29-30), but they would be able to move forward with some projects without affecting the house. Historic Preservation Planner Harding explained that an accessory structure could be permitted for demolition with no problem.

Board Member Mead noted the structure was over 50 years old, was tied to historic personages, had no need to be demolished other than it was impeding another use, namely parking, and that was a horrific reason to tear down a historically significant and architecturally interesting structure for that purpose. Staff explained the ordinance did not prohibit the demolition of the structure but had a possibility of applying a demolition delay of 60 days; once the 61st day is met if the Board determines to apply that delay, a demolition permit could be issued. **Board Member Villegas made a motion to apply the 60-day delay until further information could be gathered to determine the true value to the community.** If it was to be torn down, the community would be able to come and retrieve or in some way save pieces of said structure. **Board Member Salter seconded the motion.** It was determined the church had a couple of people who were interested in having a window or a column since they were remodeling their East Hill home, and that was the only interest that had been given on this structure. Board Member Mead explained there was also an opportunity to relocate the home and encouraged the applicant to reach out to other resources for salvaging. **With no speakers from the audience, the motion carried 5 to 1 with Chairperson Quina recusing himself.**

Mr. Pristera reminded the Board of a tour sponsored by AIA at 3:00 pm on Friday for the residence at 423 E. Government.

ADJOURNMENT – With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:04 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



Historic Preservation Planner Harding
Secretary to the Board