September 14, 2010

The meeting was called to order at 3:01 p.m. with the following members and staff present:
· Mr. Greg Fountain, Chairman
· Mr. Gaius Bruce, ViceChairman
· Ms. Joanne Connor, Committee Member
· Mr. Kenneth Walters, Committee Member
· Ms. Kathi Martin, Committee Member
· Ms. Lisa Epstein, Committee Member
· Ms. Sarah Hernandez, Architectural Advisor to the Committee
· Mr. Leslie Statler, Planner I, Staff to the Committee

Mr. Greg Fountain opened the meeting by asking the committee to review the minutes from the August 10, 2010, meeting and asked if there was discussion of the minutes. Ms. Joanne Connor noted a text change to the third line in the second paragraph; the text "her interpretation of" was added. Mr. Gaius Bruce moved to approve the minutes as changed; Ms. Lisa Epstein seconded the motion. The Board unanimously approved the motion.

Mr. Fountain introduced the case, 2010┼NAARB┼003, "American Legion Post 382" located within the Town Center Core district at 1850 Luneta Street. The applicant explained that the previously approved roofing material is not durable and they would like to replace it with Owens Corning architectural shingles in "Amber" although "Desert Tan" was the color cited on the application. After a brief discussion, Ms. Kathi Martin made a motion to approve the new material in either color ("Amber" or "Desert Tan"). Mr. Bruce seconded the motion and the Board unanimously approved the new material.

Mr. Fountain introduced the case, 2010┼NAARB┼005, "JDL Leasing" located within the Heart of Navarre overlay district at 2178 Highway 87 South. Mr. William Goulet presented the case explaining that the proposed building is a storage building behind an existing building and referenced the bingo hall previously approved by the Board as a similar treatment. Ms. Sarah Hernandez asked if the finish was ribbed; Mr. Goulet confirmed that it is. Ms. Hernandez explained that the proposed finish is not a panel like that on the bingo hall. The Board then discussed stucco panels and their construction as well as the application of architectural standards to accessory buildings.

Mr. Goulet again referenced the bingo hall exterior and lack of architectural style. Ms. Hernandez explained that elements were added to the bingo hall to provide some architectural compliance. Ms. Statler noted that the building is still under construction and many of those elements are not in place at this time. Mr. Goulet expressed his frustration of the acceptance of the metal façade at the bingo hall as compared to his building. The Board then focused their discussion on the façade treatment. Ms. Statler explained that although the metal panels used at the bingo hall are in fact metal, they have a finish which resembles stucco. She explained that since Article 4 of the Land Development Code requires buildings within HCD zoning districts have a façade of stone, brick, stucco, wood or vinyl, the County's policy has been to review façade panels constructed of metal on a case┼by┼case basis to assess their compatibility with the intent of the Ordinance. Mr. Goulet stated that he has to have the product approved by the County. Ms. Statler clarified that it would need a Variance since it is a metal building. Ms. Epstein asked if the variance should have been granted prior to the applicant coming before this Board. Ms. Statler stated that the sequence would be to seek architectural approval first since this Board might not approve the aesthetic. The Zoning Board would then consider the performance standard if this Board approved the building style.

Ms. Connor expressed her concerns that the building does not have an architectural style. Mr. Goulet stated that he thought the accessory building was supposed to match the building in front. Ms. Connor replied that that would be the case if the existing building had an approved architectural style; however since the existing building does not, the new building should meet the requirements. She further explained that if the main structure was destroyed, it would be required to conform to the architectural requirements.

Ms. Hernandez and Ms. Statler concurred. Mr. Fountain asked Ms. Hernandez for suggestions of architectural elements which could be added to enhance the building. Ms. Hernandez suggested a finish on all sides with a brick base on one side and a portico over the main entryway. Ms. Kathi Martin asked the applicant if there was anything he could do to help. Mr. Goulet stated that he did not want to add a façade that might affect the building's stability from hurricanes. Mr. Ken Walters stated his concern over the dilemma is that the proposed use is an accessory building which will be located behind a fence and not a public commercial building located directly on the road. The Board discussed the differences between what they might be compelled to do and what they might be bound to do by the architectural standards. Mr. Fountain stated that he felt when the Board approved the bingo hall it was setting the minimum acceptable standard for commercial development. The Board agreed and discussed the future impact of approving the project. Staff advised them that each case is to be reviewed on its own merits and none are to set a precedent. She advised them that they could include the reasons for approval within the motion to distinguish the reasons for their decision.

Ms. Connor made a motion to approve the project with (1) stucco panels comparable to those used at the bingo hall, (2) a base around the building, and (3) a portico over the north facing door with columns designed with a base and capital. Mr. Walters said he wasn't sure about making them do all four sides since the building is concealed. Mr. Walters asked if they would still have to seek a variance if the Board approved the building with a façade on 2 sides; staff confirmed that they would. Mr. Bruce made a motion to approve the building as presented with the stipulation that it remains behind a 6' tall privacy fence at all times. He specified that he was making the motion on the basis that the proposed building is an accessory building which is located behind the main building, it will be for private use only (not public), it is behind a fence, and he does not view this as setting a precedent for future cases. Mr. Walters seconded the motion. Mr. Fountain asked for discussion. Ms. Epstein asked the applicant how tall the building would be. Mr. Goulet stated it would be 17'2" at the peak. Mr. Daryl Lynchard responded that the new building would be shorter than the existing building. Mr. Fountain asked the Board to vote. The request was approved with 5 members supporting the motion and one in opposition. Ms. Connor was the dissenting vote.

Mr. Bruce informed the Board that he had to leave to attend a prior obligation.

Mr. Fountain introduced the last case, 2010┼NAARB┼006, "Broxson Outdoors" located within the Heart of Navarre overlay district at 2209 Highway 87 South. Mr. Walters commented that he liked the sign. Ms. Connor asked if it will have landscaping. Staff advised that the landscaping complies. Ms. Martin made a motion to approve as submitted; Mr. Walters seconded the motion. Ms. Epstein asked if the owners were aware of the sign and NAARB request; staff confirmed that they were notified. She asked why the sign was installed the sign contractors within the area are aware of the NAARB requirements. Mr. Broxson stated that he was made aware of the review

requirements days before the sign was to be installed and the grand opening for his business was scheduled. He stated that the sign company would not install the sign without NAARB approval and the applicants installed the sign themselves so that it would be in place for the grand opening. Ms. Epstein asked if the application has been under staff review since the time the sign was installed months ago. Ms. Statler stated that the sign application was received the week of the deadline for this meeting and confirmed that the applicant was made aware of the NAARB review only days before their sign was to be installed. The Board then voted unanimously to approve the sign as presented.

The Board then discussed other business. Ms. Statler advised the Board that the County was following up on the signs mentioned at the previous meetings. She also advised the Board that several positions have expired terms and that she hopes the County will begin taking applications for those seats within the next few weeks.

Mr. Fountain asked for a motion to adjourn. Ms. Martin made the motion and Ms. Connor seconded. The meeting adjourned at 4:06 p.m.

Minutes approved by the Board

Project Specification Sheet
Minutes Addendum

2010┼NAARB┼003, "American Legion Post 382"

The roof material is approved as follows:
· Owens Corning "Oakridge Pro 30 AR" shingles
· Colors options discussed by the Board:
· "Desert Tan"
· "Amber"

2010┼NAARB┼005, JDL Leasing

The new accessory building, as attached, is approved as follows:
· Steel building with stucco embossed metal panels;
· Roof will be 3┼panel max ribbed roofing material;
· Colors:
· Structure: Brown which is comparable to Sherwin Williams "Bateau Brown" (SW 6033)
· Roof: Silver
· Conditions of the Board require that the building remain behind a 6' privacy fence at all times.
· The Board approved the project, as presented, based on the following:
(1) it is an accessory building located directly behind the principle building;
(2) it is for private use only; and
(3) it is located behind a privacy fence.

2010┼NAARB┼006, "Broxson Outdoors"
· Wall signage: "Broxson Outdoors", "Hunting" & "Fishing"
· Architectural Style: Compatible with existing building style
· Materials: 1/8" thick, polymetal (aluminum) substrate with digitally printed/laminated overlay
· Colors: Varying shades of tan, brown, red and green, all of which are comparable to colors within the approved Sherwin Williams color palette
· Sign face is 47.5 square feet in size
· Freestanding signage: "Broxson Outdoors" & sign face with interchangeable letters
· Architectural Style: Compatible with existing building style
· Materials: 1/8" thick, polymetal (aluminum) substrate with digitally printed/laminated overlay
· Colors:
· Sign face:
· "Broxson Outdoors": Varying shades of tan, brown, red and green, all of which are comparable to colors within the approved Sherwin Williams color palette
· Interchangeable face: existing component; light color (either white or cream)
· Sign Frame: Tan
· Sign face is 74.7 square feet in size;
· Sign height is 5 feet 4 inches;
· Base landscaping is approved as indicated on the proposed site plan;

Sign Requirements:

	Allowed by Code	Proposed Sign
Sign Face Size:		
Wall Signage	79.8 square feet	47.5 square feet
Freestanding	100 square feet	74.7 square feet
Freestanding Sign Height	20 feet	5 feet 4 inches
Exposed Pole Height	10 feet	none

Lighting: None
Pole covering: Not applicable; monument style sign
Base Landscaping: Landscaping is indicated on the proposed site plan.