

## ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

October 4, 2017 – 3:00 P.M.

Multi-Purpose Room, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

### A. CALL TO ORDER

1. Roll Call
2. Approval of Minutes
3. Approval of Mid Month COAs Granted by Staff

### B. MID MONTH APPROVALS

#### 1. Applicant: MDM, LLC.

- a. Property Address: 126 Government Street
- b. Date of Approval: 9/11/2017
- c. Project: Reroof and replace guttering and drains with sheet metal over parapet walls.

#### 2. Applicant: Carmen Dye

- a. Property Address: 304 N. Claiborne Street
- b. Date of Approval: 9/11/2017
- c. Project: New 10' wide drive way, Old Mobile or Chicago brick borders with five brick dividers and exposed pea gravel, and city standard apron; A new 19' x 14' concrete patio area, with a 10'-7" x 8'-7" slab for a future storage shed located 3'-6" from the rear property line; a new 3'-6" wide brick walkway along edge of concrete patio, from house to 3'-6" from rear property line. (Shed will require both CRC and ARB approval.)

#### 3. Applicant: Laclede

- a. Property Address: 150 Government Street Suite 1001
- b. Date of Approval: 9/11/2017
- c. Project: Powerwash building and paint in existing scheme.

#### 4. Applicant: Dale Short

- a. Property Address: 10 S. Conception Street
- b. Date of Approval: 9/12/2017
- c. Project: Repaint to match existing.

#### 5. Applicant: Dale Short

- a. Property Address: 12 S. Conception Street
- b. Date of Approval: 9/12/2017
- c. Project: Repaint window sashes and frame light blue to match logo of "Sno Dash."

#### 6. Applicant: Bradford Ladd

- a. Property Address: 2301 DeLeon Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 9/12/2017
- c. Project: Install four four or five foot high metal fencing of picket design. Said fence will enclose the side and rear portion of the property (well behind the parcel line). Landscaping will shield said fencing. Repair the driveway with pavers. The same pavers will surface a rear terrace.

- 7. Applicant: Stephen Dolan**  
a. Property Address: 1512 Dauphin Street  
b. Date of Approval: 9/12/2017  
c. Project: Reroof house and garage with slate gray dimension shingle.
- 8. Applicant: David Inge**  
a. Property Address: 254 St. Anthony Street  
b. Date of Approval: 9/14/2017  
c. Project: Remove section of a 1960's brick wall from SW corner of lot to vehicular drive. Bricks will be repurposed on site at a later date.
- 9. Applicant: Becca Shaw**  
a. Property Address: 1323 Old Shell Road  
b. Date of Approval: 9/14/2017  
c. Project: Reroof with GAF architectural shingles in approved color.
- 10. Applicant: Philip McDonald**  
a. Property Address: 300 McDonald Avenue  
b. Date of Approval: 9/14/2017  
c. Project: Repair back porch - deck boards and stairs. Stain to match color of house - Colonial Grey.
- 11. Applicant: Noel Hanley**  
a. Property Address: 10 S. Conception Street  
b. Date of Approval: 9/14/2017  
c. Project: Install one window decal with logo to be a total of 2.8 sq. ft. and 1 hanging blade sign to be 12 sq. ft. total. Hanging blade sign to be metal composite with painted lettering.
- 12. Applicant: Archdiocese of Mobile**  
a. Property Address: 307 Conti Street  
b. Date of Approval: 9/18/2017  
c. Project: Install 4'0" x 2'0" single faced freestanding sign composed of wood composite with painted lettering to say "The Portier House Cathedral Parish Offices" and contact information.
- 13. Applicant: Samuel Reid III**  
a. Property Address: 1569 Dauphin Street  
b. Date of Approval: 9/20/2017  
c. Project: Reroof guest house with asphalt shingles charcoal gray in color.
- 14. Applicant: James Hughes**  
a. Property Address: 207 S. Cedar Street  
b. Date of Approval: 9/21/2017  
c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated wood including lapsiding and tongue and groove to match existing in dimension, profile, and material. Remove later juliette balconies dating from the 1980's. Remove existing canopy on rear deck and install new shed roof over deck in same footprint.
- 15. Applicant: Chris Coletta**  
a. Property Address: 203 Adams Street  
b. Date of Approval: 9/22/2017

c. Project: Remove gutters from main house, repair fascia to match existing, repaint existing color scheme. Reroof two outbuildings with charcoal gray asphalt shingle.

**16. Applicant: Henry Morrissette**

a. Property Address: 164 S. Georgia Avenue

b. Date of Approval: 9/22/2017

c. Project: Repair/replace rotten and damaged wood to match, repaint to match existing.

**C. APPLICATIONS**

**1. 2017-46-CA: 111 Pine Street**

a. Applicant: Gary Jackson with City of Mobile, Municipal Enforcement

b. Project: Demolition-Demolish a building originally listed as a non-contributing structure.

**2. 2017-47-CA: 1164 Fry Street**

a. Applicant: Gary Jackson with City of Mobile, Municipal Enforcement

b. Project: Demolition-Demolish a non-contributing building.

**3. 2017-48-CA: 1170 Fry Street**

a. Applicant: Gary Jackson with City of Mobile, Municipal Enforcement

b. Project: Demolition-Demolish a non-contributing building.

**4. 2017-43-CA: 1012 New St. Francis Street (Previously Withdrawn)**

a. Applicant: City of Mobile Municipal Enforcement, Gary Jackson

b. Project: Demolition - Demolish a contributing building.

**D. OTHER BUSINESS**

1. Blight Initiative
2. 1017 Old Shell Road

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**STAFF REPORT**

**2017-46-CA: 111 N. Pine Street**

**Applicant:** Gary Jackson with the City of Mobile, Municipal Enforcement

**Received:** 9/1/2017

**Meeting:** 9/20/2017

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Initially listed as Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Demolition- Demolish an extremely deteriorated non-contributing building.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This Aesthetics Movement Queen Anne dwelling adopts a typology - porch an bay fronted single-story central passage - format found only in the American South.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 10 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the change...will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the district...”

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. This property has not been known to have appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The City of Mobile proposes the demolition of the deteriorated and fire-damaged structure.
- B. With regards to demolition, the Guidelines read as follows: “Proposed demolition of a building must be brought before the Board for consideration. The Board may deny a demolition request if the building’s loss will impair the historic integrity of the district.” However, our ordinance mirrors the Mobile City Code, see §44-79, which sets forth the following standard of review and required findings for the demolition of historic structures:
  - 1. *Required findings; demolition/relocation.* The Board shall not grant certificates of appropriateness for the demolition or relocation of any property within a historic district unless the Board finds that the removal or relocation of such building will not be detrimental to the historical or architectural character of the district. In making this determination, the Board shall consider:
    - i. The historic or architectural significance of the structure;
      - 1. This property was built circa 1890. This building is listed as a contributing structure in the Old Dauphin Way Historic District.
    - ii. The importance of the structure to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;

1. The dwelling adds to the built density of the Old Dauphin Way Historic District and the rhythmic spacing of Pine Street, it contributed to the architectural integrity of the district.
- iii. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
  1. The building materials are capable of being reproduced or acquired. Almost all of the structural and facing elements would have to be replaced.
- iv. Whether the structure is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood, the county, or the region or is a good example of its type, or is part of an ensemble of historic buildings creating a neighborhood;
  1. This building is an example of the dwelling type that first appeared in the inland portions of the Deep South the 1850s and remained popular into the early 20<sup>th</sup> Century. A traditional center hall with rooms to either side fronted by a porch, albeit with a gallery fronting the hall and one room advanced often with a bay window, the type served to perpetuate traditional living patterns, while responding to changing stylistic currents and technological innovations. Examples can be found as far West as Texas and as far east as Georgia, but Alabama and Mississippi possess the largest concentrations. Mobile, Selma, and Montgomery have particularly notable instances.
- v. Whether there are definite plans for reuse of the property if the proposed demolition is carried out, and what effect such plans will have on the architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological, social, aesthetic, or environmental character of the surrounding area.
  1. If granted demolition approval, the house would be demolished, debris would be removed, the lot would be leveled, seed would be planted, and a lien would be placed on the property.
- vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
  1. The date the current owner acquired the property is circa 2016 for \$7,000 according to Mobile County Tax Assessor Records. .
- vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
  1. The property has stood vacant for a number of years. A previous owner listed the property for sale for six months and received no offers.
- viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
  1. To the City representative's knowledge, the property has been placed for sale for at least six months in recent years.
- ix. Description of the options currently held for the purchase of such property, including the price received for such option, the conditions placed upon such option and the date of expiration of such option;
  1. N.A.
- x. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
  1. N.A.
- xi. Financial proof of the ability to complete the replacement project, which may include but not be limited to a performance bond, a letter of credit, a trust for completion of improvements, or a letter of commitment from a financial institution.
  1. N.A.
- xii. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.
  1. See submitted materials.

2. *Post demolition or relocation plans required.* In no event shall the Board entertain any application for the demolition or relocation of any historic property unless the applicant also presents at the same time the post-demolition or post-relocation plans for the site.”

**C. Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):**

1. Demolish a non-contributing residence.
2. Remove the debris from the site.
3. Stabilize the site.
4. Plant seed.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application concerns the demolition of a deteriorated residential building which is listed as a contributing building in the Old Dauphin Way National Register Historic District. The property has been listed on the City of Mobile’s Nuisance Abatement list. The Nuisance Abatement allows for either the City to repair/secure vacant buildings which are salvageable or remove of vacant buildings that are in such an extreme state of disrepair as to pose a life safety issue.

When reviewing demolition applications, the Board takes into the account the following considerations: the architectural significance of the building; the condition of the building; the impact the demolition will have on the streetscape; and the nature of any proposed redevelopment.

111 N. Pine Street is contributing building located within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The dwelling is an example of a regionally popular housing typology – the bay-windowed and porch-fronted center hall.

This building is in an extremely advanced state of disrepair. Conditions extend far beyond cosmetic concerns. The house was ravaged by fire. Notable instances of extreme disrepair include, but are in no way limited to failures in the roof system and large openings in the siding and walls.

The house contributes to the built density and rhythmic sequencing of the landscape and lends to historic character or physical experience of Pine Street. Additionally, as an corner dwelling, the building anchors two streets.

If granted demolition approval, the building would be demolished, debris would be removed, site would be leveled, ground would be stabilized, and seed would be planted. Work would be done by a firm contracted by the City. A buyer would be obligated to redevelop the site in manner fully in keeping with Mobile’s Historic District Guidelines.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

While recognizing the architectural and historical significance that the house possessed (See B 1-2.), Staff believes the contributing status has been lost due to deferred maintenance and more specifically fire damage. Though the demolition will impair the architectural and historical character of the streetscapes, staff recommends approval of the application for reason of its condition.

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**STAFF REPORT**

**2017-47-CA: 1164 Fry Street**

**Applicant:** Gary Jackson with the City of Mobile, Municipal Enforcement

**Received:** 9/1/2017

**Meeting:** 9/20/2017

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden

Classification: Non-Contributing

Zoning: R-1

Project: Demolition - Demolish a non-contributing building.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This single-story building dating from the 1960s is part of the 2009 local expansion of the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The property is not listed on the National Register.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 10 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the change...will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the district...”

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. This property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The application up for review calls for the demolition of the non-contributing building.
- B. With regards to demolition, the Guidelines read as follows: “Proposed demolition of a building must be brought before the Board for consideration. The Board may deny a demolition request if the building’s loss will impair the historic integrity of the district.” However, our ordinance mirrors the Mobile City Code, see §44-79, which sets forth the following standard of review and required findings for the demolition of historic structures:
  - 1. *Required findings; demolition/relocation.* The Board shall not grant certificates of appropriateness for the demolition or relocation of any property within a historic district unless the Board finds that the removal or relocation of such building will not be detrimental to the historical or architectural character of the district. In making this determination, the Board shall consider:
    - i. The historic or architectural significance of the structure;
      - 1. This property is non-contributing resource in the local expansion of the Oakleigh Garden Historic Districts. The building is not listed on the National Register.
    - ii. The importance of the structure to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
      - 1. Though the building adds to the built density of the larger Oakleigh Garden District Historic District and Caroline Avenue, it does not contribute to the historical and architectural character of either the surrounding district or the immediate streetscape. The building is not oriented to the street and while

possess design features that tie to the architecture of typifying the historical character of the neighborhood (pier foundation and wood frame constructed buildings), the building is so configured and articulated as to not contribute to the integrity of the district.

- iii. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
  1. The building materials are capable of being reproduced or acquired.
- iv. Whether the structure is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood, the county, or the region or is a good example of its type, or is part of an ensemble of historic buildings creating a neighborhood;
  1. The building is neither representative of a particular architectural style nor a historic definitive movement.
- vi. Whether there are definite plans for reuse of the property if the proposed demolition is carried out, and what effect such plans will have on the architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological, social, aesthetic, or environmental character of the surrounding area.
  1. If granted demolition approval, the house would be demolished, debris would be removed, the lot would be leveled, seed would be planted, and a lien would be placed on the property.
- vii. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
  1. The date the current owner acquired the property was not provided.
- viii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
  1. The property has stood vacant for a number of years.
- ix. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
  1. The property has not been listed for sale to the City's knowledge.
- x. Description of the options currently held for the purchase of such property, including the price received for such option, the conditions placed upon such option and the date of expiration of such option;
  1. N.A.
- xi. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
  1. N.A.
- xiii. Financial proof of the ability to complete the replacement project, which may include but not be limited to a performance bond, a letter of credit, a trust for completion of improvements, or a letter of commitment from a financial institution.
  2. N.A.
- xiv. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.
  1. See submitted materials.
  2. *Post demolition or relocation plans required.* In no event shall the Board entertain any application for the demolition or relocation of any historic property unless the applicant also presents at the same time the post-demolition or post-relocation plans for the site."

**C. Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):**

5. Demolish a non-contributing residence.
6. Remove the debris from the site.
7. Stabilize the site.
8. Plant seed.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application concerns the demolition of a deteriorated residential building which is listed as a non-contributing building in the Old Dauphin Way National Register Historic District. The property has been listed on the City of Mobile's Nuisance Abatement list. The Nuisance Abatement allows for either the City to repair/secure vacant buildings which are salvageable or remove of vacant buildings that are in such an extreme state of disrepair as to pose a life safety issue.

When reviewing demolition applications, the Board takes into the account the following considerations: the architectural significance of the building; the condition of the building; the impact the demolition will have on the streetscape; and the nature of any proposed redevelopment.

1164 Fry Street is a non-contributing building located within the southernmost portions of local expansion of the Oakleigh Garden District. Said structure is not listed on the National Register. The dwelling is not an example of any historically significant architectural typology or style.

This brick veneered building is not in a good state of disrepair. Many of its features are non-conforming. The building is not secure and therefore a liability for (continued) crime.

While the building adds to the built density and rhythmic sequencing of the landscape, it does not contribute to the historic al or architectural character of Caroline Avenue. As an inner block dwelling, the building is only viewed from head on or an oblique angle.

If granted demolition approval, the building would be demolished, debris would be removed, site would be leveled, ground would be stabilized, and seed would be planted. Work would be done by a firm contracted by the City. A buyer would be obligated to redevelop the site in manner fully in keeping with Mobile's Historic District Guidelines.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-2), Staff does not believe this application for the demolition of the non-contributing building would impair the property or historic district. Staff recommends approval of the application.

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**STAFF REPORT**

**2017-48-CA: 1170 Fry Street**

**Applicant:** Gary Jackson with the City of Mobile, Municipal Enforcement

**Received:** 9/1/2017

**Meeting:** 9/20/2017

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden

Classification: Non-Contributing

Zoning: R-1

Project: Demolition - Demolish a non-contributing building.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This single-family residence is transitional in style. Neither representative of the Arts and Crafts nor the so-called “Minimal Traditional”, the building, minus its ironwork, constitutes ubiquitous 20th Century construction.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 10 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the change...will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the district...”

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. This property has not appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The application up for review calls for the demolition of the non-contributing building.
- B. With regards to demolition, the Guidelines read as follows: “Proposed demolition of a building must be brought before the Board for consideration. The Board may deny a demolition request if the building’s loss will impair the historic integrity of the district.” However, our ordinance mirrors the Mobile City Code, see §44-79, which sets forth the following standard of review and required findings for the demolition of historic structures:
  - 2. *Required findings; demolition/relocation.* The Board shall not grant certificates of appropriateness for the demolition or relocation of any property within a historic district unless the Board finds that the removal or relocation of such building will not be detrimental to the historical or architectural character of the district. In making this determination, the Board shall consider:
    - v. The historic or architectural significance of the structure:
      - 1. This building is listed as a non-contributing structure in the local expansion of the Oakleigh Garden District. The property is not listed on the National Register of Historic Places individually or as part of the aforementioned district. The structure is not representative of a definable architectural idiom or notable typology. Minus in ironwork, the building comprises an instance unresponsive infill within a historic landscape.

- vi. The importance of the structure to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
    - 1. While the dwelling adds to the built density of the Old Dauphin Way Historic District and Caroline Avenue, it does not contribute to the historical character defining this portion of the districts.
  - vii. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
    - 1. The building materials are capable of being reproduced or acquired.
  - viii. Whether the structure is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood, the county, or the region or is a good example of its type, or is part of an ensemble of historic buildings creating a neighborhood;
    - 1. This building is not an example of a particular style and does contribute to the historic aesthetic of the neighborhood or street.
  - vii. Whether there are definite plans for reuse of the property if the proposed demolition is carried out, and what effect such plans will have on the architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological, social, aesthetic, or environmental character of the surrounding area.
    - 1. If granted demolition approval, the house would be demolished, debris would be removed, the lot would be leveled, seed would be planted, and a lien would be placed on the property.
  - viii. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
    - 1. The year the current owner acquired the property was in 1999 for \$45,000 according to the Mobile County Tax Assessor records.
  - ix. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
    - 1. The property has stood vacant for a number of years.
  - x. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
    - 1. The property has not been listed for sale to the City's knowledge.
  - xi. Description of the options currently held for the purchase of such property, including the price received for such option, the conditions placed upon such option and the date of expiration of such option;
    - 1. N.A.
  - xii. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
    - 1. N.A.
  - xv. Financial proof of the ability to complete the replacement project, which may include but not be limited to a performance bond, a letter of credit, a trust for completion of improvements, or a letter of commitment from a financial institution.
    - 3. N.A.
  - xvi. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.
    - 1. See submitted materials.
2. *Post demolition or relocation plans required.* In no event shall the Board entertain any application for the demolition or relocation of any historic property unless the applicant also presents at the same time the post-demolition or post-relocation plans for the site.”

**C. Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):**

1. Demolish a non-contributing residence.
2. Remove the debris from the site.
3. Stabilize the site.
4. Plant seed.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application concerns the demolition of a deteriorated residential building which is listed as a non-contributing building in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The property has been listed on the City of Mobile's Nuisance Abatement list. The Nuisance Abatement allows for either the City to repair/secure vacant buildings which are salvageable or remove of vacant buildings that are in such an extreme state of disrepair as to pose a life safety issue.

When reviewing demolition applications, the Board takes into the account the following considerations: the architectural significance of the building; the condition of the building; the impact the demolition will have on the streetscape; and the nature of any proposed redevelopment.

With regard to architectural significance, 1070 Fry Street is a non-contributing building located within the local expansion of the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The property is not listed on the National Register as part of the aforementioned district or as individually listed thereon.

This building could be repaired and is mothballed.

While house contributes to the built density of the local district, its placement (setback) and design contribute to the historic character street or surrounding district, As an inner block dwelling, the building is only viewed from head on or an oblique angle.

If granted demolition approval, the building would be demolished, debris would be removed, site would be leveled, ground would be stabilized, and seed would be planted. Work would be done by a firm contracted by the City. A buyer would be obligated to redevelop the site in manner fully in keeping with Mobile's Historic District Guidelines.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-2), Staff does not believe this application for the demolition of the non-contributing building would impair the property or historic district. Staff recommends approval of the application.

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**STAFF REPORT**

**2017-43-CA: 1012 New St. Francis Street- (Withdrawn from review in advance of the 6 September 2017 Meeting)**  
**Applicant:** Gary Jackson with the City of Mobile, Municipal Enforcement,  
**Received:** 9/1/2017 (Originally submitted 8/16/2017; Withdrawn 9/6/2017; and Resubmitted)  
**Meeting:** 9/20/2017

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Demolition - Demolish an extremely deteriorated residence.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This bulk of this building dates circa 1900. Portions of it could be older. The contributing building represents a blending of typologies and aesthetics.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 10 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the change...will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the district...”

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. This property was scheduled to appear before the Architectural Review Board on August 6, 2017, but was withdrawn. According to the MHDC vertical file, it has not appeared before the Board. A Certificate of Appropriateness (CoA) was issued for repairs in July of 2015. The building’s fenestration was mothballed at that date.
- B. With regards to demolition, the Guidelines read as follows: “Proposed demolition of a building must be brought before the Board for consideration. The Board may deny a demolition request if the building’s loss will impair the historic integrity of the district.” However, our ordinance mirrors the Mobile City Code, see §44-79, which sets forth the following standard of review and required findings for the demolition of historic structures:
  - 1. *Required findings; demolition/relocation.* The Board shall not grant certificates of appropriateness for the demolition or relocation of any property within a historic district unless the Board finds that the removal or relocation of such building will not be detrimental to the historical or architectural character of the district. In making this determination, the Board shall consider:
    - i. The historic or architectural significance of the structure;
      - 1. The bulk of this house dates circa 1900. The building is listed as a contributing structure in the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. An eclectic building in terms of typology and styling, the building features a two-tiered gallery supported by turned post, as well as eave level scroll sawn bargeboarding. The building is one of the most architecturally significant houses on New St. Francis Street.

- ii. The importance of the structure to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
    - 1. The dwelling contributes to the built density, rhythmic spacing, and historical character of the surrounding Old Dauphin Way District.
  - iii. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
    - 1. The building materials are capable of being reproduced. Of the exterior facings and elements, many of those which are still in place would have to be replaced. The building's structure is an even more periled condition than the exterior cladding and detailing. The roof has is in danger of collapsing.
  - iv. Whether the structure is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood, the county, or the region or is a good example of its type, or is part of an ensemble of historic buildings creating a neighborhood;
    - 1. Foursquare dwellings are located within all of Mobile's seven locally designated National Register Historic Districts. Old Dauphin Way contains a large number of this uniquely American residential typology. Examples are found across the United States. This one of the earliest examples in the district.
    - 2. Whether there are definite plans for reuse of the property if the proposed demolition is carried out, and what effect such plans will have on the architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological, social, aesthetic, or environmental character of the surrounding area.
    - 3. If granted demolition approval, the house would be demolished, debris would be removed, the lot would be leveled, seed would be planted, and a lien placed on the property.
  - ix. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
    - 1. The date current owners acquired the property via inheritance.
  - x. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
    - 1. The property has been vacant for several years.
  - xi. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
    - 1. The property has been not listed for sale.
  - xii. Description of the options currently held for the purchase of such property, including the price received for such option, the conditions placed upon such option and the date of expiration of such option;
    - 1. N.A.
  - xiii. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
    - 1. Not provided.
  - xvii. Financial proof of the ability to complete the replacement project, which may include but not be limited to a performance bond, a letter of credit, a trust for completion of improvements, or a letter of commitment from a financial institution.
    - 4. N.A.
  - xviii. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.
    - 1. See submitted materials.
2. *Post demolition or relocation plans required.* In no event shall the Board entertain any application for the demolition or relocation of any historic property unless the applicant also presents at the same time the post-demolition or post-relocation plans for the site.”

**C. Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):**

1. Demolish a non-contributing residence.
2. Remove the debris from the site.
3. Stabilize the site.
4. Plant seed.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application concerns the demolition of an extremely deteriorated residential building which is listed as a contributing property in the Old Dauphin Way National Register Historic District. The property has been listed on the City of Mobile's Nuisance Abatement list. The Nuisance Abatement allows for either the City to repair/secure vacant buildings which are salvageable or remove of vacant buildings that are in such an extreme state of disrepair as to pose a life safety issue.

When reviewing demolition applications, the Board takes into the account the following considerations: the architectural significance of the building; the condition of the building; the impact the demolition will have on the streetscape; and the nature of any proposed redevelopment.

1012 New St. Francis Street is a contributing building located within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The dwelling is unique blending of architectural typologies. The massing of the front portion of the building strongly resembles an American Foursquare, while rear portions add a side component to plan and elevation. The initial construction date of the building is not yet determined. Portions of the building could rank among the oldest constructions on New Saint Francis Street.

This building is in an extremely advanced state of disrepair. Conditions extend far beyond cosmetic concerns. The roof structure is beginning to fail. Sizable portions of walls are missing on a later addition.

The house contributes to the built density, rhythmic sequencing, historic character, physical experience of New St. Francis Street. Located on the corner of New St. Francis Street and Pine Street, the building is highly visible. It is anchor to the intersection and streetscape.

If granted demolition approval, the building would be demolished, debris would be removed, site would be leveled, ground would be stabilized, and seed would be planted. Work would be done by a firm contracted by the City. A buyer would be obligated to redevelop the site in manner fully in keeping with Mobile's Historic District Guidelines.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-2), Staff believes this application would impair the property and would impair the architectural and the historical character of the property and historic districts. While realizing the physical condition of the building, Staff encourages other means of addressing the buildings impact on the surrounding landscape other than demolition at this time. At this juncture, Staff recommends denial of the application for reasons of the architectural and historical considerations highlighted herein and articulated in the Design Review Guidelines.