

***Architectural Review Board***

**MINUTES OF THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**

**December 19, 2019**

**Item 6  
Demolition / Non-  
Contributing**

**314 S. Alcaniz Street**

**PHD  
HC-1/Wood Cottages  
District**

**Action taken: Approved with comments.**

Scott Holland is requesting approval to demolish a non-contributing structure. According to the Escambia County property appraiser website, the existing structure was built in 1960 and is believed to have been used as a one-car garage. In its place, the applicant plans to construct a code-compliant single-family residence that will complement the historic district. Per the project description (provided), the applicant is wishing to relocate the existing structure to the Lee House B&B.

Mr. Holland presented to the Board and stated his plans for restoration were just not working out, but they had talked to several individuals who might like to have the house and possibly move it. He also explained the home was slab on grade and built as a one-car garage, and rising water was an issue. They were concerned with future storms; the elevation was determined to be right at 10'. He preferred returning with another conceptual presentation to make sure all the concerns were addressed. He stated they were 12' – 18' from the rear setback line. He advised they were not at the required 20' and would need to re-plot the two lots and get a common easement. He explained he would eventually sell his office building.

Advisor Pristera did not see the cottage as contributing. Mr. Holland stated they had an agreement with the Lee House who rented the "Pi cottage" for three years, and they would like to have the structure. He also wanted the Board's opinion on granting a variance, and Board Member Mead explained the variance requirements; Mr. Holland stated he would like to be at 13' instead of the 20' requirement. Chairperson Quina suggested the variance could be hardship since they were living on a small lot in a historic district.

Board Member Salter advised this structure was unique and deemed non-contributing, however, now it was some 60 years old and incredibly maintained and renovated. He felt even though it was not designated contributing, it contributed to the atmosphere of the area. He felt if it could be moved, it would depend on the location; its real importance was on the square. Board Member Mead asked if the Board approved the demolition, what would the procedures be to determine whether or not the structure could be salvaged or moved. Historic Preservation Planner Harding advised if the demolition was approved today, the structure would not be able to be demolished until final approval for what would take its place. Chairperson Quina stated although charming, the site was underutilized and was not consistent with other buildings around it. It was determined it was built as an accessory structure and through the Escambia County Property Appraiser that it had been a carport, with other information coming from the applicant. Board Member Villegas asked if it could be raised and moved to a different property, why couldn't that apply to raise and renovate. Board Member Mead explained that the current structure might not meet current codes structurally, and if moved intact, it might be saved under different guidelines. Advisor Pristera stated he could not establish the structure older than the

'60s. He pointed out it had great detail and was good on that square, but other structures around it were two-story, and he loved the option of moving it. **Board Member Mead made a motion to approve the demolition with the condition that the applicant continues to seek opportunities for removal and salvaging the existing structure and demolition only be approved if applicant doesn't find any practicable offers to take the building. Board Member Crawford seconded the motion. With no speakers, the motion carried 4 to 1 with Board Member Salter dissenting.**

**Item 7**

**314 S. Alcaniz Street**

**PHD**

**Conceptual Approval**

**HC-1/Wood Cottages**

**Action taken: Denied without prejudice.**

**District**

Scott Holland is seeking *CONCEPTUAL* approval for a new two-story, single-family residence.

Mr. Holland presented to the Board and stated he intended to use reinforced concrete walls to achieve his 200mph wind load. It would be a net zero home with geothermal insulation with solar panels on the roof. He explained he had not really detailed out all the materials and was expecting to return with a revised version of his plans.

Board Member Salter stated it was a nice modern interpretation especially with the streetscape which would fit in that area nicely. However, he felt the back carport area with the pyramid up to a point did not relate to the style of the building. Board Member Crawford stated the form was traditional and gives visual separation from the office. It had a nice scale on the sidewalk, but he expected the evaluation to be in the details and how they would be treated. He agreed the garage opening was curious. Board Member Mead was less concerned with the garage since it would be behind the stair tower. He was not keen on the window canopies with the legs on the struts being quite long and thought they should be shorter and be brought up to the body of the house with a more bracket feature. He pointed out the asymmetric rhythm that would fight with the asymmetry of the materials; he was not clear on the stair tower and how it functioned in the overall composition.

Advisor Pristera wanted the return presentation to show the elevation with the office to see the relationship; he was fine with the main façade, but materials were important, and he did not want it to be heavy and overpowering. Board Member Crawford explained there was a fine line between looking residential and commercial, but it would develop in how all those details interfaced. Mr. Mead addressed the upstairs terrace mimicking the porch profile; he felt they could make the balcony look more loggia with it attached to the house. **Board Member Mead made a motion to deny without prejudice with the comments provided and looked forward to the next presentation. Board Member Villegas seconded the motion, and with no speakers, the motion carried unanimously.**