

**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMISSION (ARC) MINUTES  
MONDAY, AUGUST 24, 2020 - 2:00 P.M.  
CITY HALL, COUNCIL CHAMBER, VERO BEACH, FLORIDA**

**PRESENT:** Chairman, Richard Bialosky; Vice Chairman, Alice Johnson (joined the meeting via GoToMeeting at 2:10 p.m.) Members: Peter Bernholz, Chris Crawford, Alternate Member #1, Walter Geiger and Alternate Member #2, Sherri Hernandez (joined the meeting via GoToMeeting at 2:10 p.m.) **Also Present:** Planning and Development Director, Jason Jeffries; City Attorney, John Turner and Deputy City Clerk, Sherri Philo

**Excused Absence:** Duane Weise

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Today's meeting was called to order at 2:08 p.m.

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**A) April 13, 2017**

**Mr. Bernholz made a motion to approve the minutes of the April 13, 2017 Architectural Review Commission (ARC) meeting. Mr. Crawford seconded the motion and it passed 4-0 (vote taken prior to Ms. Johnson and Ms. Hernandez joining the meeting due to technical difficulties).**

**3. PUBLIC COMMENT**

None

**4. ELECTION OF OFFICERS**

**A) Chairman**

**Mr. Bernholz nominated Mr. Richard Bialosky as Chairman of the Architectural Review Commission. Mr. Crawford seconded the nomination. There were no other nominations.**

**Mr. Richard Bialosky was appointed Chairman of the Architectural Review Commission.**

**B) Vice Chairman**

**Mr. Crawford nominated Mr. Peter Bernholz as Vice Chairman of the Architectural Review Commission. Mr. Bialosky seconded the nomination. There were no other nominations.**

**Mr. Peter Bernholz was appointed Vice Chairman of the Architectural Review Commission.**

## 5. DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED DESIGN STANDARDS FOR CULTURAL ARTS VILLAGE

At this time, Mrs. Johnson and Ms. Hernandez joined today's meeting via GoToMeeting.

\*Please note that discussion took place throughout staff's presentation.

Mr. Jason Jeffries, Planning and Development Director, briefly went over staff's correspondence accompanied by a Power Point presentation with the Commission members (attached to the original minutes).

Mr. Bialosky said remodeling is not mentioned and there has been some concern about the ability to change the character of the neighborhood through remodeling. He said they have listed all the forms of art in the document, but what was left out was architecture. He said they need to allow for some creativity, but he thinks it is going to be up to the sensitivity of the ARC. He said that this Commission has never been constituted to do anything but make comments and recommendations on projects. They have never actually approved or disapproved anything in a way that if they disapproved something then the applicant would be obligated to come back before them with a revision.

Mr. Jeffries explained that there are projects that staff reviewed and approved and there are projects that require approval of the Planning and Zoning Board. He said is if someone disagrees with staff or the Planning and Zoning Board as to the application of these design standards, they would be able to appeal that decision to the ARC.

Mr. Bernholz asked if someone appeals to the ARC and are denied for some reason, what happens.

Mr. Jeffries said they would then appeal to the City Council and if they don't like City Council's answer then they could go to the Circuit Court.

Mr. Crawford referred to page 21, Section 3) - Entry Feature, item b) – *The minimum area of a porch, stoop landing, or courtyard shall be 20 square feet.* He said that he could not imagine anyone building anything smaller than that. He did not know if that is a necessary standard.

Mr. Jeffries explained that he is trying to develop something as objective as possible.

Mr. Crawford referred to Section 4) – Roof Design, item a) – *A minimum roof pitch of 6:12 shall apply to gable, hip, or shed roofs.* He said that he understands this probably originated from the vernacular characteristics, but he doesn't think they were trying to go for all vernacular, although it is probably the leading style in this neighborhood. He felt this could be a bone of contention.

Mr. Bialosky agreed. He said that he would rather see terms like neighborhood compatibility.

Mr. Crawford referred to Section 6 – Prohibited facade materials, item a) – *Aluminum siding or cladding.*

Mr. Jeffries noted that the City already prohibits the use of metal exterior.

Mr. Bialosky referred to the 2016 Cultural Arts Village Report (attached to the original minutes). He questioned if there was a way to strongly reference the report as part of the standards. He said the report has pictorial references that gives people a feel for what they are trying to do.

The Chairman opened public comment at 3:03 p.m.

Mrs. Barbara Hoffman read a prepared statement (attached to the original minutes).

Mr. Ken Daige read a poem that the Arts Village adopted when this project first began (attached to the original minutes).

Mr. Linwood Fuller thanked the Commission members for spending the time to work through the details of what they are trying to accomplish.

Mr. Crawford said that he is very excited about the Cultural Arts Village and thinks it is a fantastic positive step. He said that he is not sure that parking off of the alleyways for non-residential developments is something that they want to encourage because they are dirt and are difficult to maintain. Another thing is there is a large mechanical unit at the apartment complex that is screened by a vinyl fence, which is very noisy and there are historical homes next to it so when they discuss screening and buffering they should talk about acoustical and not just visual. He said maybe the fences should be concrete block and not vinyl.

Mr. Bernholz said they could use trees and shrubs.

Mr. Bialosky said that there are a few points made by the Commission, which were to have a stronger reference to the Charette (Cultural Arts Village Report); to possibly emphasize neighborhood compatibility, mass, bulk, scale, and character; to have some provisions to include major remodeling to meet the requirements; to consider architecture review at some point; to have a little more flexibility on the roof pitch; and to consider screens for aesthetic and acoustic requirements.

Mr. Jeffries said that he has a note to revise the purpose statement, to create more connection to the Cultural Arts Village Report, under applicability he will look at the 50% substantial, to look at adding graphics, to update the roof pitch, and regarding the prohibited façade materials they will probably relate back to the general prohibition on metals rather than being specific.

## **6. OLD BUSINESS**

None

## **7. NEW BUSINESS**

None

**8. PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR'S MATTERS**

None

**9. CHAIRMAN'S MATTERS**

None

**10. MEMBER'S MATTERS**

None

**11. ADJOURNMENT**

Today's meeting adjourned at 3:38 p.m.

/sp