

**CITY OF MELBOURNE, FLORIDA
MINUTES-REGULAR MEETING OF THE
HISTORIC AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
FEBRUARY 21, 2018 ♦ 6:00 P.M.**



-
1. Chairman Runte called the meeting of the Historic and Architectural Review Board to order at 6:00 p.m.
 2. All present said the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.
 3. Roll Call:

PRESENT: Corey Runte, Chairman
 Jeff Anderson, Vice-Chairman (arrived late)
 Joyce Miller, Member
 Randy Thron, Member
 Nilda Stellpflug, Member
 Angelina Wheeler-Chong, Member
 David Godwin, Member (arrived late)
 Betsy McGuire, Alternate Member

ABSENT: None

ALSO PRESENT: Sandy Ramseth, AICP, Planner
 Adam Conley, Assistant City Attorney
 Samantha Buck, Recording Secretary

4. Ms. Ramseth outlined the purpose and procedures of the board meeting to attendees, explaining that additional requirements may be involved after the Historic and Architectural Review Board application.

5. Approval of Minutes – January 17, 2018

Moved Thron/Miller to approve the minutes of the regular meeting held on January 17, 2018 as presented.

Motion carried unanimously.

6. Declaration of Conflict of Interest from Previous Meeting

There were no Conflicts of Interest to be read into record from the January 17, 2018 meeting, nor any Conflicts of Interest declared for items being heard at this meeting.

NEW ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BUSINESS

7. **A-2018-004** **Backstreet Bar, Inc. / 1841 Avocado Ave**
(Eau Gallie CRA)
Building Color and Signage

Ms. Ramseth explained that this is an after-the-fact approval request. The applicant seeks approval to paint the building a bright shade of green, as presented. In addition the applicant has changed out the face plate of the existing wall sign. The sign frame is existing and has not been moved.

The applicants, Leah Sullivan, and George Waterman, both of Melbourne, were available to answer questions from the Board.

Mr. Waterman explained he and Ms. Sullivan were new to the area and believed they were able to use bold colors on their property in the Eau Gallie Arts District.

Chairman Runte understood confusion, explaining that the area which allowed bolder colors was the Eau Gallie Art Overlay Zone, which lay across the road from the applicant's property. The applicant's property is situated in the Eau Gallie CRA District.

A brief discussion ensued on the boundaries of the two districts and the existing building color, after which Chairman Runte suggested it may be better if the Board denied the application, and the applicant resubmit after meeting with City staff to discuss their options.

Mr. Waterman said he would be happy to work with City staff, and that he did not necessarily want approval of the color; he merely wanted to know what he needed to do to rectify the problem.

Chairman Runte then opened the floor for public comment. As there was no public comment, the item was brought back to the Board.

Moved Wheeler-Chong/Miller that the Board find that application A-2018-004 is inconsistent with the Eau Gallie District Architectural Guidelines, and recommended the applicant resubmit their application after speaking to City staff.

Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Anderson arrived.

8. **A-2018-005** **Executive Cigar / 843 E. New Haven Ave.**
(Downtown CRA)
Façade Improvements

The applicant seeks approval to do a complete façade renovation to include new lighting, railings, and paint. The renovation will also create an outdoor seating area.

Ms. Ramseth showed the Board renderings of the new façade summarizing the changes that the applicant would like to make.

The business owner, Tony Nardone, 843 E. New Haven Ave, was available to answer questions from the Board.

Chairman Runte asked Mr. Nardone if he had anything further to add following Ms. Ramseth's presentation.

Mr. Nardone replied that he did not.

Chairman Runte said the proposed work would be a great improvement to the property and asked if the angled cornice at the top of the building would be replaced.

Mr. Nardone confirmed it would be staying.

A brief discussion took place between the Board members concerning the proposed changes.

Mr. Godwin arrived.

Mr. Godwin apologized for arriving late. He agreed with the other Board members who liked the rendering and thought the faux boxwood was a great design feature.

As there were no further comments from the Board, Chairman Runte opened the floor for public comment.

Patricia Nichols, Melbourne, approached the podium and commented that she did not understand why the Board was reviewing this application as the proposed changes had already been reviewed and approved by the Downtown CRA Committee.

Chairman Runte told Ms. Nichols that approval by the Historic and Architectural Review Board was an additional step in the permitting process.

Ms. Nichols then commented that the proposed design looked like it had been changed since the CRA voted on the property, and Chairman Runte asked Ms. Ramseth to confirm if the design had changed.

Ms. Ramseth said she did not attend the Downtown CRA meeting and could not confirm what the CRA had reviewed.

Ms. Nichols said that this is the problem; Ms. Ramseth did not seem to know what is going on. If she were paying attention, she would know what the CRA does.

The item was brought back to the Board for a vote.

Moved Anderson/Wheeler-Chong that the Board find that application A-2018-005 is consistent with the Downtown District Architectural Guidelines as presented, and that the Board approve the application as presented.

Motion carried unanimously.

(Note: Ms. Nichols' reference to approval by the Downtown Melbourne CRA was related to an approval by the Board in 2014 at the applicant's current address, 837 E. New Haven Avenue. The applicant is moving to a new location at 843 E. New Haven Avenue and is applying for a Façade Improvement Grant for his new location; the Downtown Melbourne CRA has not yet reviewed this application.)

**9. A-2018-006 Florida Eye Associates /509 E. New Haven Ave.
(Downtown CRA)
Signage**

The applicant seeks approval to install two internally illuminated wall signs and one non-illuminated monument sign. The first wall sign on the front of the building has 4" deep reverse channel letters with black semi-gloss acrylic enamel faces, and a white LED illuminated with light defusing Lexan background. The sign measures 30' wide x 3'-2" in height overall. The letters are 2' in height.

The second sign on the east wall has 4" deep reverse channel letters with black semi-gloss acrylic enamel faces with blue logo details, and a white LED illuminated with light defusing Lexan background. This sign measures 13-4" wide x 5' high overall. The primary letters measure 1' in height.

The monument sign is a non-illuminated freestanding double sided sign measuring 8' tall x 6' wide x 1' deep in the colors of black, white and blue with the roof detail to match the previously approved façade improvement HARB application (#2017-062) at the October 2017 meeting.

The applicant, Amanda Armstrong, Art Kraft Sign Company Inc., was available to answer questions from the Board. She had nothing to add following on from Ms. Ramseth's presentation.

A discussion took place between the Board and the applicant concerning the fabrication and materials that will be used in the signs. During this discussion, Ms. Armstrong explained that the signage had been designed to tie in with the client's building.

Chairman Runte made a comment that the building was looking great and he felt the signage was in proportion to the building and the fonts were consistent throughout the signs.

Vice-Chairman Anderson agreed with him.

Patricia Nichols returned to the podium again. She said that the Board seems to be asking questions but not making motions on any of the items and had not heard a motion made all night.

Chairman Runte replied that a motion is made following public comment. He assured Ms. Nichols that the Board had made a motion on every item heard so far and asked her to return to her seat unless she had any further comment to make on this item.

As there was no further public comment, Mr. Thron said that he would like to make a motion on the item.

Moved Thron/Miller that the Board find that application A-2018-006 is consistent with the Downtown District Architectural Guidelines, and that the Board approve the application as presented.

Motion carried unanimously.

10. **A-2018-007** **Property Renovations & Construction / 2490 S. Harbor City Blvd.**
(Downtown CRA)
Renovate Existing Building

The applicant seeks approval to renovate an existing 2,440 square foot building. The renovated building will utilize the same architectural features and details as the previous approved buildings (A-2016-053 & A-2017-078) located at 2500 S. Harbor City Blvd and 1201 W.H. Jackson St. These details include exterior lights, awnings over the doorways, existing columns wrapped in stacked stone and new paint. In addition, the applicant would like to install a chain link fence with privacy slats along W H Jackson Street as presented.

Ms. Ramseth said that staff recommends that the Board find the application not consistent with the Downtown District Architectural Guidelines in that the north and south building elevations show no enhancement to either facade to avoid the appearance of a blank wall, while visible from US 1 and W H Jackson Street. In addition, a chain link fence is not allowed as it would be visible from US 1.

Ms. Ramseth then showed the Board several slides illustrating the proposed work to each elevation and pointed out windows and doors that have been enclosed and covered with a stucco coating. She also referenced the design features on a nearby building that the Board reviewed in November. Finally, she showed the Board recent photographs showing that construction is almost complete on the building. The photos did not show any design features on the south side of the building at all.

The applicant, Mike Livingston, Melbourne, was available to answer questions from the Board.

Mr. Livingston told the Board that the drip edge for the roofing is in the permitting process, and the building will have an 8-inch trim which will match a nearby building.

Chairman Runte asked if the application was an “after-the-fact” approval, and Mr. Livingston confirmed that was correct. Work had already started on the building.

Chairman Runte asked Ms. Ramseth to clarify what part of the building did not meet the architectural guidelines, and Ms. Ramseth replied that various design features should be incorporated into a design to avoid the appearance of a blank wall. Also, chain link fences are not permitted along properties visible from US 1.

A brief discussion ensued about the pre-existing chain link fence on the property, and during this conversation, Ms. Ramseth confirmed that a pre-existing fence is allowable.

Mr. Livingston told the Board that the fence was necessary in this neighborhood as people walk through the property all the time. He intended to plant a hedge next to the fence in an attempt to beautify it.

Chairman Runte asked Ms. Ramseth to confirm which sides of the property were inconsistent with the architectural guidelines, and Ms. Ramseth replied the north side, and possibly the south side of the property, as she was unable to see that side of the property in the photographs.

Chairman Runte asked the Board if they had any comments.

Ms. McGuire felt the building had some nice design elements such as the stacked stone, top and entry, however she agreed that she did not like the blank wall. She noted that the 2500 building had an additional trim color which helped.

Mr. Livingston said he would be happy to add a band to the building. He reiterated that the main reason for closing in the door and windows was because it is a non-public building that will be used as a workshop and storage area. Access to the property will be through the 2500 building, with ADA compliant access to the west side of this building.

Chairman Runte asked Mr. Livingston if he would be willing to add some additional finishes to the blank facades, and Mr. Livingston replied he would if it meant getting the application approved.

Mr. Godwin stated his preference would be to deny this application and see the application resubmitted showing stone wrapped columns on the north and south elevations, or at least a stone feature to match the exterior of the other two facades.

Chairman Runte also recommended the addition of an EIFS trim band around the building painted black to match the drip edge. He added that ultimately, he wanted to see the same façade style and elements shown on the applicant's other buildings carried through to this new building. He would also prefer to see the application resubmitted as he felt the recommended changes were not minor changes.

Mr. Livingston pointed out to the Board that the south side of this building (2490) and the north side of the 2500 building are pretty consistent, other than the

structural columns on the 2500 building which this building did not have. He confirmed the windows and doors were closed for safety reasons. They were boarded and barred and were very unattractive.

Chairman Runte suggested that Mr. Livingston meet with staff to discuss his options prior to resubmitting his application.

Assistant City Attorney Conley reminded the Board that they should incorporate the basis for their denial into the motion.

As there were no further comments from the Board, Chairman Runte opened the floor for public comment. There was no public comment, so the item was brought back to the Board for a motion

Moved Anderson/Thron that the Board find that application A-2018-007 is inconsistent with the Downtown District Architectural Guidelines, and that the Board deny the application.

Chairman Runte confirmed that the Board would like to see the application resubmitted with the continuation of the stone veneer, an EFIS band, the addition of some trim colors, and possibly adding an opening if it did not interfere with the function and security of the building.

Mr. Thron agreed that the items Mr. Runte listed covered everything that the Board had discussed and said he would like to second the motion.

Motion carried unanimously.

11. **A-2018-008** **Sign Rebuild / 772 Orange St.**
(Eau Gallie CRA)
Signage

The applicant seeks approval to replace an existing pole sign that was damaged by Hurricane Irma. The new sign will be updated, improved, and reconfigured in size. The new sign will measure 16' wide by 4' high and 1' deep, in the colors Black, white, red, blue, and yellow, with an enclosing border in blue.

The applicant, Michael Odom, Melbourne, was available to answer questions from the Board.

Chairman Runte asked Mr. Odom had anything further to add, and Mr. Odom replied that he did not.

Chairman Runte said the new application was a great improvement on the previous sign and he hoped it would work well for his business. Several Board members agreed with him, commenting that the new design incorporated many of the features that were requested when the last application was reviewed.

As there were no further comments from the Board, Chairman Runte opened the floor for public comment. There was no public comment, so the item was brought back to the Board for a motion.

Moved Runte/Godwin that the Board find that application A-2018-008 is consistent with the Eau Gallie District Architectural Guidelines, and that the Board approve the application as presented.

Motion carried unanimously.

**12. A-2018-009 Ace Blueprinters / 121 E. Hibiscus Blvd.
(Babcock Street CRA)
Signage**

The applicant seeks approval to replace a double-sided face on an existing ground sign as presented. The non-illuminated face measures 6' wide x 4' tall in the colors red, white, blue, and black. The face will be digitally printed vinyl copy applied directly to the existing faces. In addition, the applicant would like to install an internally illuminated wall sign. The 11' wide x 4' tall aluminum sign cabinet will have sign copy in red and blue vinyl on a white background.

The applicant, Amanda Armstrong, from Art Kraft Sign Company, Inc., was available to answer questions from the Board.

The Board discussed the design and material used in the sign, and during this conversation, Ms. McGuire expressed her concerns that an illuminated sign may become a problem for neighboring businesses.

Ms. Armstrong did not think this would be an issue as a large parking lot lay between the sign and the neighboring business.

Chairman Runte said it was an attractive and he felt it was proportional for the building and area.

As there were no further comments from the Board, Chairman Runte opened the floor for public comment. There was no public comment, so the item was

brought back to the Board.

Moved Godwin/Miller that the Board find that application A-2018-009 is consistent with the Babcock Street District Architectural Guidelines, and that the Board approve the application as presented.

Motion carried unanimously.

**13. A-2018-010 American Legion Post 163 / 1795 N. Harbor City Blvd.
(Eau Gallie CRA)
Re-roof and Signage**

The applicant seeks approval to re-roof the existing American Legion building. The roof will be a 5V Crimp metal roof in natural steel color. In addition, the applicant would like to replace an illuminated sign that was damaged by Hurricane Irma with a similarly illuminated sign, only with the ability to have colored illumination instead of just white.

The applicant, Robert Hughes, Melbourne, was available to answer questions from the Board.

The Board started by reviewing the signage, and Mr. Hughes confirmed that the new sign would be exactly the same as the previous sign destroyed in the hurricane. The only difference would be that the new sign would have an internal LED illumination that could be changed to various colors.

The discussion then moved on to the roof which would be in a Galvalume material to match the roof on the recently extended back porch.

Mr. Anderson commented that the roof looked perfect, and Ms. Wheeler-Chong concurred with his comment.

Mr. Thron felt that the American Legion was missing a great opportunity to do something great with the new sign, and urged Mr. Hughes to look at other types of electronic signage.

Mr. Hughes agreed, and commented that he would love to have a better sign, however, the cost of a changeable LED sign was prohibitive.

Mr. Godwin suggested the Board approve the application, as all Mr. Hughes was trying to do was get a functioning sign again after the previous one was destroyed in last year's hurricane. In addition, the new sign was, for the most part, what he had prior to the storm.

Ms. McGuire said she was not keen on the idea of a color-changing sign.

Chairman Runte understood her concerns, however the main colors that The American Legion would be using would be patriotic red, white, and blue.

As there were no further comments from the Board, Chairman Runte opened the floor for public comment. There was no public comment, so the item was brought back to the Board.

Moved Godwin/Stellpflug that the Board find that application A-2018-010 is consistent with the Eau Gallie District Architectural Guidelines, and that the Board approve the application as presented.

Motion carried unanimously.

NEW HISTORICAL REVIEW BUSINESS

14. Historical Review Business

There was no historical review business to discuss.

15. Additional Business

Assistant City Attorney Conley referenced an upcoming appeal on an item that had been reviewed by the Board at a previous meeting. The appeal will be heard by the Planning and Zoning Board in the next few months. There is a possibility that this item may come back to the Board at some point, so he advised the Board to avoid outside conversations about this particular item as it is important to try to be as impartial as possible. Disclosures will be dealt with at a future date, but for now he recommends trying to avoid having ex-parte communications with others about this item.

16. Adjournment

Chairman Runte adjourned the meeting at 6:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Samantha Buck
Recording Secretary

Minutes Approved by the Historic and Architectural Review Board on: 3/21/2018