



# City of Naples

City Council Chamber  
735 Eighth Street South  
Naples, Florida 34102

**Design Review Board Meeting – February 23, 2005 – 9:00 a.m.**

Chairman Duane called the meeting to order and presided.

**ROLL CALL ..... ITEM 1**

**Present:**

- Franklin Duane, Chairman
- Jonathan Kukk, Vice Chairman
- Carl Kuehner
- Russ Reddick

**Also Present:**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| Robin Singer, Community Development Director  | Ava Keenan                              |
| Brenda Blair, Recording Specialist            | Larry Hernandez                         |
| Steven Moore, Chief, PESD                     | Jack Ullrich                            |
| Ron Wallace, Construction Management Director | Luis Rendon                             |
| Richard Wu                                    | Frank Comeriato                         |
| David Corban                                  | Keith Whipple                           |
| Clay Winfield                                 | Terry Cole                              |
| Homer Brown                                   | Richard Ditter                          |
| Frank Cooper                                  | Other interested citizens and visitors. |

Chairman Duane extended the Board’s condolences upon the recent passing of Vice Chairman Richard Morris, commenting on the many contributions to the community made by Mr. Morris as well as to the architectural community, and the Design Review Board.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES ..... ITEM 2**

***MOTION*** by Kuehner to ***APPROVE*** the January 26, 2005 meeting minutes as amended: (Page 7 - feet or more; Page 8 - Member Kuehner took issue with the proposed architecture, comparing it to the Moorings 1960's-70's design; carports in front of the units; and direct access to the exterior.) This motion was seconded by Duane and carried without objection (all present).

**CHANGES TO THE AGENDA ..... ITEM 3**

None.

**ELECTION OF A VICE CHAIRMAN ..... ITEM 4**

***MOTION*** by Kuehner to ***NOMINATE*** Member Kukk as Vice Chairman; seconded by Reddick and carried without objection (all present).

Community Development Director Robin Singer noted that the design and development regulations for the “D” Downtown District had been provided to members since they are now responsible for reviewing the aesthetics of Downtown projects but do not have the authority to grant waivers. She also expressed regret regarding the lateness of staff reports, attributing this to staffing shortages.

.....**ITEM 5**  
**Petition 04-DRB36 – Consider an application for final design review of a commercial development, Amerivest Realty Building, with a total of 11,849 square feet located at 180 Tamiami Trail South. Architect Richard Wu presenting.**

Community Development Director Robin Singer reported that a revised site plan correctly reflects the sidewalk relative to setback requirements and recommended continuing the sidewalk across and beyond the driveway. With regard to parking, Ms. Singer explained that requirements are exceeded allowing for the possibility of interconnection with adjacent parking lots when those properties redevelop. The petitioner had installed a parallel parking space since a loading space is also not required.

Ms. Singer also said that she assumed a 2.5-foot band sign on the revised plans would be affixed to the building and quoted the minimum first floor elevations as not exceeding 18 inches above the sidewalk grade; the first floor ceiling height must be 12 feet. Although additional landscaping and alleyway connections have been noted, the correct location and screening of mechanical equipment could not be determined.

Staff recommends approval with the following conditions: the applicant must submit a sign plan, a landscape plan that accommodates existing trees, a revised site plan that provides the required sidewalk modifications, building elevations that clarify finished floor elevations and floor-to-ceiling height, and modified elevations compliant with the Board’s recommendations, Director Singer noted. (It is noted for the record that copies of exhibits pertaining to this petition are contained in the file for this meeting in the City Clerk’s Office.) In response to Member Kuehner, Director Singer clarified that the revised plans do in fact reflect Code compliance except that the landscape buffer at the rear must be extended to five feet.

Notary Public Brenda Blair administered an oath to those intending to offer testimony; all responded in the affirmative. This being a quasi-judicial proceeding, Members made the following ex parte disclosures: Member Reddick indicated a site visit and review of the plans; Member Kukk indicated a site visit during the previous review of the petition, and indicated that he was currently reviewing the plans; Chairman Duane noted a site visit and review of the plans submitted that day; and Member Kuehner noted that since there was no submission he had not revisited the site and was currently reviewing the plans.

Architect Richard Wu noted that he, too, had just received the staff report and confirmed that the issues previously discussed with staff had been addressed and enumerated on the revised plans as follows:

1. Building front/back to be 20 feet from right-of-way; building to be moved back approximately 5.8 feet from the previous site plan.
2. The existing sidewalk to be removed and a new 8-foot wide walkway will be provided up against the building.

3. The area from this walkway to the back of the curb to be landscaped per City of Naples Downtown District landscape criteria.
4. Parking areas in Downtown District are not required to have landscape buffers between properties.
5. Cross connections between adjacent properties are to be provided if feasible; the current traffic aisles and parking on adjacent properties do not allow for cross connections.
6. A loading space is not required per Downtown District requirements.

He also confirmed that the first floor elevation will be 18 inches above grade and first floor ceilings will be 12 feet in height.

Chairman Duane asked the petitioner to address the following: property owner certificate, coordination with the City's light standards, sign location, landscaping along the south property line, refuse container screening, and location of adjoining buildings. He also noted that elaborate, fantasy architecture is prohibited in the "D" Downtown and reminded the petitioner that the DRB had previously requested further simplification of the facade. Architect Wu however disagreed with this assessment, noting that Mediterranean-type architecture is commonplace, that the design had already been simplified since the original submission, and that the "D" Downtown regulations had been the focus of the project. Director Singer noted that the owner certificate was available in the file at the Planning Department and Architect Wu noted that existing pine trees would be incorporated into a landscape island.

Clay Winfield, principal in Amerivest Realty and owner of the company designated to construct the building, also took issue with criticism of the design, referring to the Mediterranean-style building at Four Corners (US 41/Fifth Avenue). Mr. Winfield however apologized for failing to submit a full set of drawings and assured the Board that he would follow through with any conditions imposed.

In further response to the Board, Architect Wu explained that ingress/egress to the alley had not been changed and, although signage had not been fully detailed, colors would blend with building color scheme. The veranda in front of the building could be reduced by six inches in order to meet the rear buffer requirement of five feet, but suggested another survey be performed since the dimensions may have been incorrectly noted on the drawings. Landscaping for the bulk of the property has however not been changed with the exception of adding the landscaped island. Concerning sidewalk location, Mr. Wu said he would review how it transitions to adjoining properties as they redevelop.

Although Member Kuehner noted that elevations of adjoining properties had not been included, Architect Wu noted information previously submitted with a digital image of the motel to the south and the flooring company to the north. Mr. Kuehner also requested landscape plans and material samples, but Architect Wu indicated that the bulk of the information had been submitted at the previous meeting. With regard to drainage, building owner Winfield explained that retention would be on-site and that certified engineering plans would be required when the project is submitted for permitting.

**Public Input:** (9:55 a.m.) None.

In further discussion of the exterior design, Chairman Duane noted that the DRB had previously requested that building facades be simplified. Member Kukk also noted that while the DRB had conveyed a list of items to be addressed at the January meeting, a revised drawing had instead been submitted that day. Mr. Kukk then articulated five additional items to be addressed:

1. Provision for the sidewalk to continue across the front of the property;
2. Resolution of the issue involving the five-foot rear setback;
3. The manner of refuse container screening;
4. Indication of the intention of the drainage on the revised landscape plan; and
5. Articulation of the lighting proposed.

Mr. Kukk also took issue with the informal manner in which trees were articulated on the revised drawing, and Chairman Duane noted the requirement for submitting site plan data. Member Kuehner criticized the plans for lack of readability, particularly with reference to the vertical elements. Member Reddick questioned whether the petitioner should be granted any further continuances and proffered a motion to deny; however, the motion failed for lack of a second. After a brief discussion, the Board acceded to Architect Wu's request for a continuance to the March meeting, but with the stipulation that it be the final continuance granted for this particular project.

***MOTION by Kuehner to CONTINUE Petition 04-DRB36 to the March meeting with the understanding that it will be the final continuance granted; request that the applicant specifically address:***

***1) The items enumerated in the January 26, 2005 meeting minutes as follows:***

- *Parking along the south property line;*
- *Lack of interconnection to the adjoining parking lot if required;*
- *Organization of parking with ingress/egress to the alley;*
- *Submission of signage location;*
- *Blending of signage colors with building color scheme;*
- *Identification of the refuse container location;*
- *Retention of two existing pine trees;*
- *Additional lighting at the northern end of the property;*
- *Further simplification of the front elevation; and*
- *Compliance with the Downtown District zoning regulations;*

***2) The following items recommended by Member Kukk:***

- *Provision for the sidewalk to continue across the front of the property;*
- *Resolution of the issue involving the five-foot rear setback;*
- *The manner of refuse container screening;*
- *Indication of the intention of the drainage on the revised landscape plan;*  
*and*
- *Articulation of the lighting proposed;*

***3) The items as quoted from the staff report that are nonconforming to "D" Downtown District regulations:***

- *A reconfiguration and dedication of sidewalk is required. The existing sidewalk should be removed and replaced with landscaping. An additional 10 feet of landscaping is required immediately inside the property line with an 8-foot wide sidewalk provided adjacent to the structure.*

- *The maximum floor elevation permitted is 18 inches above sidewalk grade. Staff was not able to determine if this requirement has been met.*
- *Floor to ceiling height for the first floor must be 12 feet. Staff was not able to confirm compliance.*
- *Location and screening of mechanical equipment is not indicated on the plan.*

**4) Further simplify the facades of the building.**

*This motion was seconded by Kukk and carried 4-0 (Kuehner-yes, Kukk-yes, Reddick-yes, Duane-yes).*

.....**ITEM 6**  
**Petition 05-DRB9 - Consider an application for preliminary design review of a multi-family development consisting of seven units located at 1541-1561 Chesapeake Avenue. Architect Richard Wu presenting.**

Notary Public Brenda Blair administered an oath to those intending to offer testimony; all responded in the affirmative. This being a quasi-judicial proceeding, all members made ex parte disclosures to the effect that they had each reviewed the documents provided and had visited the site.

Community Development Director Robin Singer reported that the project is compliant as submitted. Staff however recommended the following: 1) positioning the east and west wings of the building farther forward so that garage entrances are less prominent and pedestrian access more prominent, thereby enhancing safety; 2) additional fenestration (design and placement of windows) on the east and west facades; 3) additional windows where needed to promote ventilation with necessary shade devices; and 4) modification of the ground floor to accentuate the residential nature of the structure. Staff however finds the building scale and colors to be consistent with the neighborhood, and while a landscaping plan is not required for preliminary review, staff recommends utilization of landscaping wherever possible to shade blank walls and to accentuate pedestrian access areas. (It is noted for the record that copies of exhibits pertaining to this petition are contained in the file for this meeting in the City Clerk's Office.)

Architect Richard Wu reported that the intent is to provide a two-car, ground floor garage for each unit with open parking for guests; this, he said, will create more open/green space. Color choices have been submitted and staff comments will be incorporated into the final submission, Architect Wu concluded. During further discussion, Mr. Wu confirmed that the entrance/exit to the garage area beneath the building would be open without gates, and property owner Frank Cooper indicated on the site plan where windows and doors are located for ventilation and pedestrian access.

Member Kukk suggested the use of grillwork shutters, or louvers, for the openings that are not directly part of a tenant garage in order to increase ventilation, accentuate pedestrian entryways, and to discourage use of garage door openings for access to the building. Mr. Wu confirmed that fire sprinklers would be installed above walkways. Member Kuehner suggested enclosing pedestrian entrances and creating a lobby. He also suggested a separate garage entry on the side where the one townhouse is located and relocating the two garages in the center to the right side. He was critical of the lower level design and recommended against a wall of windows on the stair tower to avoid a nighttime view of the side of stair rungs. He also pointed out that the depth

of the units is significantly greater than their width and noted that there had been no mention of roof materials. Mr. Kuehner said that he concurred with the recommendation to install additional high windows in the two end elevations, but took exception to the building's similarity to the companion project listed in Item 7 (see Page 7).

Chairman Duane noted the following requirements: articulation of adjoining properties on the site plan and indication of royal palms on the site plan, if retained; he also suggested that the petitioner consider relocating balconies to east and west corners of the building to capitalize on canal views, and said he concurred with staff recommendations.

Member Reddick suggested clearly identifying pedestrian entries, expressing dissatisfaction with the two entry doors leading to the garage area and noting that the elevator currently opens into a hallway since there is no lobby. He also took exception to residents having to traverse the garage beneath the building in order to reach the pool area at the rear of the property. Therefore, he suggested the following: incorporating a true entry to the building; creating a lobby or space separate from the garage area for the elevator; and directing pedestrians to the pool around the building, past the landscaped retention area. Mr. Reddick stressed compliance with height and roof requirements and said that he concurred with staff recommendations, particularly with the need for additional ornamentation, windows, and fenestration.

Member Kuehner suggested either removing the detail on the front projections from the left or adding it to both the left and right of the building. He also commented on the relationship to single-family homes across the street relative to ingress and street elevations.

Property owner Cooper explained that this and the building in Item 7 had been similarly designed due to their proximity and similar lot sizes. Landscaping plans have been finalized but not submitted for preliminary review, he said. In further reviewing the site plan, Mr. Cooper explained that an alternate plan is available which changes the ingress/egress to the sides of the building; however, this alternative would create considerably more hardscape and less green space. He indicated that there is sufficient room to enter individual garages, and entrance to the first garage inside the building could easily be accessed by circling the one-way drive. The absence of a lobby is due to the building being below FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Agency) flood elevation; he also noted that many buildings on Marco Island use this same design.

Mr. Cooper further noted that, if desired, sidewalks could be installed along the sides of the building for pool access. The stair tower is however considered a more modern approach, noting that surrounding older properties have open stairways. Royal palms will be located in front and the existing ficus hedge retained; coconut palms will be installed in the rear. He confirmed that windows could be installed on the side elevations, but their location had not yet been determined. Trees will also be installed where blank walls are shown. He also confirmed that a ridge could be added to the roof, the roof could be lowered, or the pitch modified, but that it would address drainage and adhere to Code requirements.

Reiterating prior suggestions, Member Kuehner expressed the view that there is much opportunity for improvement in the product and cited what he described as obvious missing items in terms of fenestration, as well as a significant need for a residential appearance in light of the building's close proximity to single-family homes.

Member Reddick however characterized the architecture in a particular neighborhood as irrelevant, but concurred that the absence of a lobby and the entry conditions are unsatisfactory. Chairman Duane said he would look for diversification in appearance between the two buildings (in Items 6 and 7), particularly due to their close proximity. Member Kukk recommended adjusting the driveway to allow direct entry into the first garage. He also recommended that blind corners be addressed for security reasons and suggested that one of the garages might be relocated for the townhouse unit; he also urged that organization of windows in the stair tower be improved to enhance the view from the outside, particularly at night.

Mr. Cooper explained that side pedestrian doors had not been provided to two of the garages because of the lack of space.

Mr. Kukk then recommended that the cantilevers be reviewed for detail, as well as the 45-degree angles on the roof, and asked that the architect consider installing additional windows on both sides of the building. Member Kuehner further noted that the 90 feet at the rear of the parking area and the 110 feet in the front is sufficient to accommodate three garages in the rear and four in the front, leaving a 30-foot surplus area in the center that could be utilized for another purpose, such as storage. He further contrasted the size of windows on the building, which he deemed inadequate, to the considerable amount of window area in the stair tower, which he said, would not provide a pleasing nighttime view.

**Public Input:** (11:27 a.m.) **Ava Keenan, 1417 Chesapeake Avenue** (oath administered individually), complimented the petitioner for improvements to the site, but said that because the pool is positioned behind the building on the north side of the property, the area would receive little or no sunlight between November and March, and she cited a similar situation adjacent to her property.

Mr. Cooper however asserted that sun does in fact reach the pool area, and Architect Wu noted that he would address the Board's comments at final submittal.

***MOTION by Kuehner to GRANT preliminary design approval of Petition 05-DRB9 with the following conditions: 1) that the applicant modify the garage entry to the sides of the property; 2) that the pedestrian entry be accentuated and study the pedestrian access to the rear of the property; 3) that the stair tower be redesigned to address window locations; 4) that fenestration be added to the east and west elevations as appropriate; 5) that the elevations conform to the floor plans; and 6) that all the required information be provided for final approval. This motion was seconded by Kukk and carried 4-0 (Kuehner-yes, Kukk-yes, Reddick-yes, Duane-yes).***

---

**Recess: 11:36 a.m. – 11:46 a.m. It is noted for the record that the same members were present when the meeting reconvened.**

---

.....**ITEM 7**  
**Petition 05-DRB10 - Consider an application for preliminary design review of a multifamily development consisting of six units located at 1540 Blue Point Avenue. Architect Richard Wu presenting.**

It is noted for the record that all speakers had previously been sworn during Item 6 above. This being a quasi-judicial proceeding, all members made ex parte disclosures to the effect that they had each reviewed the documents provided and had visited the site.

**Design Review Board Meeting – February 23, 2005 - 9:00 a.m.**

---

Community Development Director Robin Singer recommended the following: improving pedestrian access to the building; removing the west entry and moving the stairwell and elevator shaft to provide a double width of pedestrian access, and bringing this access forward in line with the elevator shaft or the eastern portion of the building so as to create a safer and more open environment. Retention areas are scattered throughout the site which interrupts some opportunities for site design, Ms. Singer noted, and suggested additional windows on the east and west elevations as well as providing an additional architectural or screening element on the western elevation for the parking garage beneath the building. The parking area could also be moved forward slightly to allow for additional landscaping and a shade structure for the pool, which would also function as a screen from vehicular entry of adjacent properties. Staff recommends approval subject to the items cited above. (It is noted for the record that copies of exhibits pertaining to this petition are contained in the file for this meeting in the City Clerk's Office.)

Architect Richard Wu explained that the building footprint is smaller than the building in Item 6 (above), and entry to the garage is on the side of the structure. Anticipating similar comments to those contained in the prior building review, he agreed to consider modifying the building entrance, placing emphasis on pedestrian entryways with additional projections, and determining whether two pedestrian entrances are necessary. With regard to fenestration (design and placement of windows) on the east and west elevations, Mr. Wu noted that guidelines call for maximizing privacy to adjacent properties, but that he would consider additional windows placed higher in the structure.

Member Kukk recommended strengthening the pedestrian entry into the lobby, organizing the windows on the stair tower, and possibly eliminating one of the pedestrian entrances to alleviate a restricted turning radius into the first garage. Property owner Frank Cooper also agreed to address some type of enclosure for refuse containers.

Member Reddick noted that most of his comments would be similar to those in Item 6, but also reiterated Mr Kukk's issues. He urged the petitioner to respond architecturally to the various newer buildings depicted on neighboring properties rather than simply repeating the characteristics of the older structures in the immediate area. Chairman Duane suggested minor design changes to the end units such as placing the balconies on the corners of the building, which would result in a larger kitchen while circulation would remain unchanged; living spaces would also be on the more desirable ends of the building, he said, which could also add architectural character. He also recommended additional windows on the east, west, and south sides of the building on the lower level. Member Kuehner recommended connecting master bedrooms to the balconies if the balconies remain in the same location, and changing the front elevation of the previous building in Item 6 rather than the façade of this structure, which he said he preferred.

**Public Input:** (12:09 p.m.) None.

Architect Wu confirmed that some changes will be made to the elevations, however, Chairman Duane noted that the Board expected more extensive revisions, such as altering the design character of one of the buildings (in either Item 6 or 7). Member Kukk observed that good design in fact results in a more marketable product. Member Reddick requested that at final submission the landscape plan contain detail with reference to retention areas; he also extended an invitation



to Messrs. Wu and Cooper to a future DRB workshop where the Board will receive input from the design community to address possible Code changes. Member Reddick noted that the Board is seeking significant responses to its comments on this project.

***MOTION by Kuehner to GRANT preliminary design approval of Petition 05-DRB10, subject to staff conditions: 1) that fenestration be added on the east and west facades; 2) that the pedestrian and vehicular entries be modified to make the pedestrian more prominent and safe and the vehicular entries less prominent; 3) that the design and layout of the front of the building be improved to make it more pedestrian friendly and formal; 4) that one of the pedestrian entryways be omitted and that the remaining entrance be accentuated; 5) that the stair tower be redesigned to address the windows; 6) that fenestration be added to the east and west elevations; 7) that detail be added to the pool fencing; 8) that the petitioner ensure that the project conforms with the height requirement of the zoning district; and 9) that all requirements are met in conjunction with submittal for final approval. This motion was seconded by Reddick and carried 4-0 (Kuehner-yes, Kukk-yes, Reddick-yes, Duane-yes).***

---

**Recess: 12:19 p.m. – 1:30 p.m. It is noted for the record that the same members were present when the meeting reconvened.**

---

.....**ITEM 8**  
**Petition 05-DRB8 – Consider an application for final design review for a multifamily development consisting of four units, located at 865 and 923 Ninth Avenue South. Architect David Corban, Architectural Network, Inc., presenting.**

Notary Public Brenda Blair administered an oath to those intending to offer testimony; all responded in the affirmative. This being a quasi-judicial proceeding, Members made the following ex parte disclosures: Member Reddick noted that he visited the site, had received additional information the previous evening, and had conferred with Architects David Corban and Larry Hernandez; Member Kukk noted a site visit, receipt of additional material, but that he had been unable to schedule a meeting with the petitioner; Chairman Duane noted a conversation with Architect Corban, indicated that he had reviewed the additional material, and said that he had visited the site before the previous submission; and Member Kuehner indicated that he had visited the site, reviewed the additional information, and engaged in a telephone conversation with Architect Corban.

Architect David Corban reviewed the project utilizing digital images (copies of which are contained in the file for this meeting in the City Clerk's Office), noting that the issues raised at the preliminary hearing had been addressed. Roof type and architectural embellishments had also been addressed as noted in the documents submitted the previous day, he added. (Copies of exhibits pertaining to this petition are contained in the file for this meeting in the City Clerk's Office.) Mr. Corban also explained that the mansard roof had been decreased in height to be within the 10% directive for architectural embellishments for roofs.

Community Development Director Robin Singer reported that that the petitioner was asked at the preliminary hearing to address windows, corner conditions, rusticated base, and massing of the site conditions.

During discussion, Member Kukk expressed disappointment in the height, noting that the aforementioned 10% for architectural embellishments significantly affected the finished project.

He, too, extended an invitation to Mr. Corban to attend the aforementioned future DRB workshop to discuss Code changes relative to design. Mr. Corban confirmed that glazing would be impact-resistant, lightly tinted glass in white aluminum casements. Colors shown in the renderings are accurate and color copies of paint chips had been submitted. He also confirmed that maximum buildout was shown on the color renderings of adjoining buildings instead of the actual building coverage, noting that he had been asked to represent the potential development on adjoining properties, particularly since the neighborhood is in transition. He also noted that landscape plans had been submitted. Although in compliance with the Code, Members Kuehner and Reddick nevertheless commented on the extent of building mass relative to existing structures, as well as expressing concerns regarding building height.

**Public Input:** (1:58 p.m.) None.

***MOTION*** by Reddick to ***GRANT*** final design approval of Petition 05-DRB8; seconded by Kukk and carried 4-0 (Kuehner-yes, Kukk-yes, Reddick-yes, Duane-yes).

.....ITEM 9  
**Petition 05-DRB7 – Consider an application for final design review for a commercial development, Naples Community Hospital (NCH) Medical Plaza II, consisting of 84,000 square feet and located at 349 Ninth Street North. Architect Luis Rendon, Dyehouse Comeriato Architects, presenting.**

Notary Public Brenda Blair administered an oath to those intending to offer testimony; all responded in the affirmative. This being a quasi-judicial proceeding, all members made ex parte disclosures to the effect that they had each reviewed the documents provided and had visited the site.

Jack Ullrich, director of real estate for Naples Community Hospital (NCH), explained that the items identified by the DRB at its preliminary review had been addressed and were noted as: signage, pedestrian circulation from the parking garage to the building, enhancement of landscaping in front of the building facing US 41, provision of color samples, and submittal of elevations depicting architectural compatibility with existing structures. He pointed out that the Planning Advisory Board (PAB) had unanimously approved the final General Development and Site Plan (GDSP) in February, with a request that the petitioner submit an enhanced landscape plan to the DRB to show the water retention area in front of the existing garage. This, he said, had also been included in the meeting materials.

Architect Frank Comeriato reviewed the subject building in conjunction with existing structures utilizing site plans and color renderings. (It is noted for the record that copies of exhibits pertaining to this petition are contained in the file for this meeting in the City Clerk's Office.) He confirmed that the retention basin would be an eight-foot deep pond, and that a fountain feature would be added. Lighting will not impact traffic on US 41, he said, and fixtures selected are intended to relate to existing NCH campus lighting and not to the new US 41 street lighting; lights however have not yet been selected for the retention pond area.

In response to Chairman Duane, Mr. Comeriato explained that entrance illumination would include recessed lights in the portico itself and, for security, general lighting higher on the building. He confirmed that there would be no rooftop electrical equipment and that chillers (climate control equipment) would be located on a second floor roof near the pool. The parapet is

two feet high with a top elevation of 42 feet (total building height), and the roof deck will be 40 feet high. Signage will remain unchanged until approval is sought for specific signage on that corner. The refuse container will be enclosed and the area landscaped, and will only be used by the tenants of the subject building, Mr. Comeriato concluded.

Member Kuehner commented that, in contrast to the first phase of the NCH project, the 42 foot height limit for commercial buildings added to the Charter by referendum had resulted in two extremely large buildings positioned just six feet apart. With the exception of the colors, there is no indication that the two buildings are compatible in any way. Although he characterized the corner of the property as being well done, Member Kuehner said that the lighting of the second floor wellness center conveys the appearance of a backlit gym, which is visible from US 41 and an undesirable entrance element for the City. He also questioned the vehicular access to the refuse container. He said he felt there is also an opportunity to provide some type of public view, particularly on the southern end of the structure, and predicted that there would be traffic stacking issues to be addressed.

Member Reddick asked whether the retention pond area would become a grand public gesture as outlined in the DRB Handbook, particularly the broad area next to the sidewalk. Mr. Ullrich agreed, noting that there is a major donor interested in funding such a project, which he said is currently under review. Member Kukuk suggested review of the refuse container location.

During further discussion, Landscape Architect Keith Whipple clarified that the indentation on the east side along the pond was necessary in order to preserve two large banyan trees; the potential shade-type structure noted on the site plan is intended as a small refuge from US 41 traffic noise. Mr. Reddick suggested additional seating and paving, and capitalizing on the space beneath the banyan trees as additional elements of a grand public gesture.

**Public Input:** (2:28 p.m.) None.

During further discussion, Mr. Comeriato clarified that the pond would be eight feet at its deepest and the grade is such that fencing is not required. Member Kuehner expressed the view that the swimming pool, which is unenclosed, appeared to have been forced into the site, and he questioned the relationship to use by physical therapy patients. Architect Comeriato subsequently noted on the site plan the location of an interior therapy pool, noting that the exterior lap pool is primarily for the wellness members that are lap swimmers. Member Kuehner however noted that the property at Grand Central Station where the wellness center is currently located had been under contract for some time, allowing sufficient time to study this use prior to the preliminary submission to the DRB in 2004. Although the project meets the conditions of the Planned Development (PD), it is less desirable from a public standpoint due to the maximum height requirement for commercial buildings.

Mr. Comeriato then reviewed the traffic circulation and levels of the existing parking garage, noting that valet parking will be offered at this building. He also noted on the site plan where the bus stop will be relocated, which will include seating and shading.

Chairman Duane suggested that the petitioner consider creating additional views into the building. Member Kuehner noted that he had been a member of the Planning Advisory Board when this PD had first been reviewed, and the PAB had encouraged the petitioner to consider

other than basic architecture, to increase the setback, and to locate the structure contiguous to the parking garage for direct access. The current submittal, he said, nevertheless appears not to relate in any way to other structures. He also recommended that the bus stop be located on the south side of the entryway to prevent traffic stacking. In response to Member Reddick, Engineer Terry Cole of Hole Montes explained that City review of the refuse container had resulted in conversion from a doublewide unit to a single trash compactor; he confirmed that the space allotted was sufficient for the trash compactor.

***MOTION by Kukk to GRANT final design approval of Petition 05-DRB7 with the conditions that the petitioner create a grand public gesture (as described in the DRB Handbook) at the retention pond, coordinating it with either views, access, or vistas on US 41, and review the pole lighting in conjunction with the City's lighting along US 41. This motion was seconded by Reddick and carried 3-1 (Kuehner-no, Kukk-yes, Reddick-yes, Duane-yes).***

.....ITEM 10  
**Petition 05-DRB11 – Consider an application for final review of public safety facility Fire Station #2, for an additional vehicle bay and façade and signage changes at 977 26<sup>th</sup> Avenue North. Schenkel & Schultz, Inc., presenting.**

Notary Public Brenda Blair administered an oath to those intending to offer testimony; all responded in the affirmative. This being a quasi-judicial proceeding, all members made ex parte disclosures to the effect that they had each reviewed the documents provided and had visited the site.

Construction Management Director Ron Wallace noted that the delay in seeking final approval had been due to funding issues. Following City Council approval, the project is ready for permitting. Issues to be addressed are the roof color, maintenance of existing architectural banding around the structure, and discussion of landscaping. Renovations will include the living quarters and bringing the facility into compliance with wind load requirements in order to accommodate a 24-hour emergency staging and response facility. Since this is a City facility, Mr. Wallace indicated that ongoing discussions with property owners have occurred with regard to landscaping, noise, and operation. In response to Member Kuehner, Director Wallace explained that he, as well as Deputy Chief James McEvoy, had met with the neighbors to discuss this project.

Steven Moore, Chief of Police & Emergency Services, also reported several meetings with neighbors and indicated that Deputy Chief McEvoy had again met with them recently. Chief Moore explained that residents requested that the City maintain the hedges to buffer the residential properties, and, while not required by Code, additional landscaping is also planned. He further explained that relocating two trees is necessary for construction, although the ficus hedge will be maintained, and additional landscaping will be considered on the western side of the property. He confirmed that the extension of the ficus hedge to 26th Avenue North is part of the proposal.

Architect Richard Ditter reported that the banding on the building has been raised and the color changed to green; the roof will be the same shade of green used on other City buildings and stucco will be off-white. In response to Chairman Duane, Architect Ditter confirmed that existing roofs would be replaced as noted on the site plan. (It is noted for the record that copies of exhibits pertaining to this petition are contained in the file for this meeting in the City Clerk's Office.)

During further discussion, Architect Ditter clarified that the cupola will be located on the westerly building and the kitchen exhaust fan will be replaced and relocated to the flat roof. Member Reddick noted that only one elevation had been submitted, and questioned whether material samples had been provided. Mr. Ditter explained that he had overlooked submitting information concerning the stucco, which he said would be sand-textured and off-white in color. Concerning the remaining three elevations, he explained that stucco would be repaired as needed, the banding would continue around the building, and a new thinner stucco finish would be applied over that which is existing. Window configuration will not change, however, existing windows will be replaced with hurricane resistant glazing, and apparatus bay doors are to be replaced in order to meet hurricane requirements. No changes have been proposed to the rear area where picnic tables are located, Mr. Ditter said, and noted that no changes will be made to the fire tower. Director Wallace confirmed that the recent renovations to the fire tower had been addressed in a separate project.

Member Reddick suggested that on future applications the City ensure that the submittal requirements had been met; he nevertheless commended Mr. Wallace on the work that he does for the City.

Member Kuehner asked whether the petitioner considered additional windows to the front façade to interrupt the wall where the day room is located, particularly if no additional landscaping is proposed in that area. Architect Ditter said that since this is a budgetary issue, additional glazing had not been requested in that area. Member Kuehner said that it was regrettable that a community with the level of sophistication and affluence enjoyed by Naples allows budget constraints to result in only minimum improvements; historically, public buildings had been the nicest in town. He therefore recommended that the City consider increasing its budget to accommodate more than minimum improvements to public buildings.

***MOTION*** by Kukk to ***GRANT*** final design approval of Petition 05-DRB11; seconded by Reddick and carried 4-0 (Kuehner-yes, Kukk-yes, Reddick-yes, Duane-yes).

During the vote, Member Kuehner continued to take exception to minimums being requested, considering the location of the structure, particularly the shortage of landscaping along the westerly side. Member Reddick concurred, and Chairman Duane recommended that the ficus hedge be a priority in order to shield the home on the corner.

.....**ITEM 11**  
**DISCUSSION REGARDING WORKSHOP WITH LOCAL ARCHITECTS IN MARCH**

The Board recommended conducting the meeting after 5:00 p.m. in order to include more participants. Community Development Director Robin Singer noted that past applicants to the DRB would also be invited. It was determined that the evening of March 15 would be considered.

The Board then discussed with Director Singer various issues for the agenda:

- Measurement of heights citywide;
- Building lengths;
- Architectural embellishments in relation to the height measurement;
- Roofs and mechanical equipment on roofs;
- Minimum parking requirements;
- Minimum landscaping requirements;
- Establishment of an annual design awards program sponsored by the City; and

- Number of parking spaces required per dwelling unit.

During further discussion, the Board noted that the Community Development Director, as the DRB representative, has the authority to waive full submittal requirements for simple façade renovations, as outlined in the Code. Member Reddick noted that pre-application conferences with City staff, as well as preliminary applications, should be required, except for projects that only require minimal or no review. He also recommended that the City staff, not the applicant, determine whether a petition may proceed directly to final approval without first seeking preliminary approval.

**ADJOURN** .....  
3:33 p.m.

---

Franklin Duane, Chairman

---

Tara A. Norman, City Clerk

Minutes prepared by:

---

Brenda A. Blair, Recording Specialist

Minutes Approved: April 27, 2005