

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
VENICE, FLORIDA

May 13, 2010

A Regular Meeting of the Architectural Review Board was held this date in Council Chambers. Chair David Sherman called the meeting to order at 8:58 a.m.

I. ROLL CALL

The following Board members were present: Chair David Sherman, Vice Chair Jon Steketee, Jon Barrick, Mark Beebe, Robert Brooke, Morgan Skoegard, and Ex-Officio Council Member Jim Bennett. Ruth Ann Dearybury was absent.

Also present: City Attorney Wayne Hall, Permit Supervisor Karen Butterworth and Recording Secretary Susan Schult.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Steketee **moved** that the Minutes of the Regular Meeting held on April 8, 2010, be approved with a correction on page two, paragraph one “~~recently approved by the board~~” to “recently determined unreviewable by the board”. **Seconded** by Mr. Skoegard. MOTION CARRIED ON VOICE VOTE UNANIMOUSLY.

III. NEW BUSINESS

- 1. Application No. 10-01, 303-305 W. Venice Avenue - Owner: Elizabeth Ehik Trust, Elizabeth Vitany Trust and Michael Ehik - Agents: Nick Pepper, Beebe Design Studios, Architect, Inc. - Scope: Addition and Renovation of a Commercial Building - District: Historic**

Mr. Beebe declared a conflict of interest and left the dais at 9:02 a.m.

Presentation

Mr. Pepper, being duly sworn, explained the current structure features, displayed site photos and conceptual elevations of the property, talked about the ten foot wide balcony supported by five columns on the Venice Avenue side, reviewed the composition of the columns, stated the windows will be replaced with impact resistant windows, noted some of the window sizes will change, described the windows and doors on the second level, replacement of the roof tile, architectural trim, and touched on the light fixtures. He displayed the samples of the building, trim and accent colors, along with the roof tile to be used, reviewed the location of the proposed windows and doors, and made himself available to answer questions.

Discussion followed regarding the positioning of the handrail on the second floor, whether there is lighting under the walkway for pedestrian safety, the upper units being residential, and the new stucco matching the existing stucco.

Mr. Hall reviewed the door and window requirements as it relates to the guidelines.

Chair Sherman queried the board on ex-parte communications, noting there were none.

(9:26) Mr. Brooke **moved** the Architectural Review Board approve Application No. 10-01, 303 – 305 W. Venice Avenue, renovation of a commercial building as presented. **Seconded** by Mr. Barrick.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Skoegard, YES; Mr. Beebe, ABSTAIN; Mr. Brooke, YES; Mr. Sherman, YES; Mr. Barrick, YES; Mr. Steketee, YES. MOTION CARRIED.

2. Application No. 10-02, 243 W. Venice Avenue - Owner: David Macrae - Agents: Keith Olson Construction, Inc. - Scope: Renovation of a Commercial Building - District: Historic

Presentation

Mr. Olson, being duly sworn, displayed photos of the building, stated the awnings will be removed, and the back of the building will be stuccoed and painted.

Mr. Beebe returned to the dais at 9:28 a.m.

Mr. Olson displayed the front elevation, and a sample of the roof tile and stone trim for the building, along with the floor plan. In response to questions, he stated the front façade will have mahogany doors and windows, showed a paint sample for the building, and made himself available to answer questions.

Chair Sherman queried the board on ex-parte communications, noting there were none.

Discussion followed regarding the building having two units, the façade improvements for one unit only, type of stucco to be used, paint color, columns, view of the roof from Venice Avenue, the façade being similar to 124 W. Venice Avenue, return on the roof, no outside lighting, and the stucco and stone finishes on the building.

(9:38) Mr. Steketee **moved** the Architectural Review Board approve Application No. 10-02, 243 W. Venice Avenue, renovation of a commercial building as presented. **Seconded** by Mr. Skoegard.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Skoegard, YES; Mr. Sherman, YES; Mr. Barrick, YES; Mr. Steketee, YES; Mr. Brooke, Yes; Mr. Beebe, YES. MOTION CARRIED.

3. Application No. 10-03, 312 W. Miami Avenue - Owner: First Baptist Church of Venice - Agents: Jeff Gates, Beechwood Builders, Inc. - Scope: Renovation of a Commercial Building: Church Door Enclosure - District: Historic

Presentation

Mr. Gates, being duly sworn, summarized the application, noted the maintenance issues with the existing center door and window, displayed photos of the existing front facade, stated the center door and window will be completely removed, the church does not utilize the door, displayed a conceptual drawing of the front elevation, and samples of the trim and color of the building.

Discussion followed regarding the existing doors, the lack of architectural features on the building, original drawings for the building, and the side doors being replaced ten years ago due to leaking issues.

Tom Hodge, First Baptist Church of Venice, being duly sworn, answered questions concerning the existing doors and stained glass windows.

Discussion followed on the functionality of the center door, whether the building is non-conforming and should be reviewed by the board, the application being a fair resolution to the maintenance problems, the original intent of the building to be conforming, the original doors being more in keeping with the structure, and the new stucco matching the existing stucco and paint.

(9:57) Mr. Beebe **moved** the Architectural Review Board approve Application No. 10-03, 312 W. Miami Avenue, renovation of a commercial building as presented. **Seconded** by Mr. Barrick.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Brooke, YES; Mr. Barrick, YES; Mr. Skoegard, YES; Mr. Steketee, YES; Mr. Sherman, YES; Mr. Beebe, YES. MOTION CARRIED.

Discussion took place regarding the massing of the building.

IV. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Mr. Hall referred to his April 27 memorandum concerning changes to the ARB ordinance and regulations, specifically the 50 percent of the façade trigger, talked about the Venetian Urban Design (VUD) district having a 50 percent trigger, and queried the board on a possible change to the standards for triggers, windows and doors.

Discussion followed regarding implementing the guidelines on non-conforming buildings, the 50 percent rule, the building approved today being non-conforming, the applicant's intent, the economic factor consideration on renovations in the Historic and Venetian Theme districts, standard differences between buildings in the Historic and Venetian Theme districts, separating Venice Avenue because of its high visibility, trim on the cases heard by the board today, the window and door requirements in the guidelines, awnings, encouraging window proportion and type, and requirements for the replacement of an individual window.

Ms. Butterworth answered questions regarding code requirements for hurricane impact components for window replacements.

Discussion continued regarding window replacements after a catastrophic event, the 50 percent rule, the aesthetics of a building, the ease in circumventing guideline requirements, having a variance available for non-conforming structures, balconies not being in the guidelines, roof alterations being heard by the board, whether a roof should trigger compliance, recent changes to the roofing permit requirements, changing the verbiage from façade to elevation, adding visible from a major street, encouraging alleyway or rear facades improvements and compliance, compliance on second floor windows over storefronts, code changes pertaining to store front window walls, window walls being multiple panels, encouraging punched openings, visible alley facades in the city, and the board reviewing decorative trim at a future meeting.

(10:42) There was a **consensus** of the board to revise the ARB ordinance and regulations to change the term “façade” to “elevation”, adding language “major street front elevations”, encouraging rear or alleyway façade compliance, and requiring store front glass be multiple panels.

Mr. Hall stated he would incorporate these suggestions for board review at the next meeting.

Mr. Barrick left the dais at 10:51 a.m. and returned at 10:53 a.m.

Discussion followed on a previous case heard by the board where the completed project is different from what was approved, whether the applicant should reappear before the board, this being the second property where the applicant has deviated from the approved plans, and holding another hearing on the case.

(10:55) There was a **consensus** of the board to hold a follow-up hearing on Application No. 09-02, 241 South Harbor Drive, Susan Reed, owner.

V. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before this Board, the meeting was adjourned at 10:56 a.m.

(Approved by the Chairman and the Recording Secretary at the June 24, 2010 regular meeting.)