

**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD AGENDA**  
**April 5, 2017 – 3:00 P.M.**  
**Meeting 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:** Jimmie Todd
  - a. Property Address: 912 Elmira Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 3/6/2017
  - c. Project: Mothball to secure existing structure.
2. **Applicant:** Read and Ann Hastings
  - a. Property Address: 1225 Selma Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 3/7/2017
  - c. Project: Repaint house in the following color scheme:
    - i. Body and Piers: Burnt Almond
    - ii. Trim: White
    - iii. Window Sashes, Doors, Lattice: Bellingrath Green
3. **Applicant:** Robert Cooner of Cooner Construction
  - a. Property Address: 1134 Montauk Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 3/8/2017
  - c. Project: Reroof with architectural shingles in charcoal.
4. **Applicant:** Lindsay Burkett
  - a. Property Address: 15 S. Lafayette Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 3/16/2017
  - c. Project: Reroof dwelling in charcoal gray asphalt shingles. Replace deteriorated soffit and eaves to match existing in profile, dimension, and material. Install kneebraces to support sagging eaves on southwest and northwest corners, and rear porch to be historically accurate. Touch up paint to match existing.
5. **Applicant:** Derek Crow
  - a. Property Address: 654 Monroe Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 3/16/2017
  - c. Project: Replace front porch deck boards with tongue and groove, replace newels to match, replace front steps to match, and repaint to match existing.
6. **Applicant:** City of Mobile
  - a. Property Address: 256 N. Joachim Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 3/17/2017
  - c. Project: Repair and replace when necessary nine iron fence sections; ornamental posts; two driveway gates; pedestrian entry gate; porch railing on first floor porch and stairs; ornamental features and columns on first and second floor; and second floor balcony railing. Where replacement is necessary match existing.

- 7. Applicant:** Laura Broadus
- a. Property Address: 960 Augusta St
  - b. Date of Approval: 3/17/2017
  - c. Project: Repaint in the following scheme:
    - i. Body: Oakleigh Garden Peach
    - ii. Trim: White
    - iii. Steps and Lattice: Black or Battleship Gray
    - iv. Ceiling: Haint Blue
- 8. Applicant:** Jonathan Arias
- a. Property Address: 300 Marine Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 3/17/2017
  - c. Project: Construct four feet high wooden fence behind front plane of the house south of the residence.
- 9. Applicant:** 1857 Foundation
- a. Property Address: 607 Government Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 3/17/2017
  - c. Project: Install temporary 6' construction fence with pedestrian gate and vehicular gate along north and west perimeter of the lot for six month duration.
- 10. Applicant:** Nick Catranis
- a. Property Address: 1866 Government Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 3/20/2017
  - c. Project: Install individual storefront channeled letter sign with backlighting for a total of 35 square feet with Pizza Hut logo. Exchange two tenant panels no more than 32 square feet in size with Pizza hut logo.
- 11. Applicant:** Gwen Ledger
- a. Property Address: 304 S. Monterey Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 3/20/2017
  - c. Project: Repoint and install missing bricks with appropriate mortar. Repair front porch screen. Repair lattice door to crawl space. Repaint in the following color scheme:
    - i. Trim: White
    - ii. Stairs and Decking: SW6074 Spalding Gray
    - iii. Body: Ravishing Coral (Peach)
    - iv. Doors: Red Tomato
- 12. Applicant:** Derek Crow on behalf of Derek Crow Builders
- a. Property Address: 200 S. Warren Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 3/22/2017
  - c. Project: Repair/ replace rotten wood.
- 13. Applicant:** Jessica Davis
- a. Property Address: 279 Park Terrace
  - b. Date of Approval: 3/22/2017
  - c. Project: Repair roof to match existing. Replace deteriorated eaves to match in dimension, profile, and material.
- 14. Applicant:** Jessica Davis
- a. Property Address: 1652 Lamar Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 3/22/2017
  - c. Project: Repair roof to match existing. Replace deteriorated eaves to match in dimension, profile, and material.

15. **Applicant:** George Whitlock
  - a. Property Address: 156 S. Monterey Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 3/23/2017
  - c. Project: Reroof with charcoal black architectural shingles.
16. **Applicant:** Jerry Graham
  - a. Property Address: 908 Palmetto Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 3/23/2017
  - c. Project: Reroof to match existing asphalt singles.

**C. APPLICATIONS**

1. **2017-14-CA: 208 S. Catherine Street**
  - a. Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley of DBK Inc. on behalf of 208 S. Catherine LLC
  - b. Project: Addition Related - Construct a small addition off the rear elevation of a contributing residence.
2. **2017-15-CA: 1409 Campbell Street**
  - a. Applicant: Steve Speir, Nejla Harris, and Mary Beth Harris
  - b. Project: Alteration – Remove a chimney stack rising from a side roof slope of a contributing dwelling.
3. **2017-16-CA: 1055 Elmira Street**
  - a. Applicant: Leroy Anderson
  - b. Project: Demolition of a Residence - Demolish a single family residence.
4. **2017-17-CA: 1058 Elmira Street**
  - a. Applicant: Ruth Smith and Pinkie Henderson
  - b. Project: Holdover –Retain twelve (12) unauthorized windows installed without the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.
5. **2017-12-CA: 1452 Brown Street**
  - a. Applicant: Joseph Cortopassi
  - b. Project: Holdover - Install hardieplank siding on a non-contributing residence.

**D. OTHER BUSINESS**

1. Discussion

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

**2017-14-CA: 208 S. Catherine Street**

**Applicant:** Douglas B. Kearley of DBK Inc. on behalf of 208 S. Catherine LLC

**Received:** March 8, 2017

**Meeting:** April 5, 2017

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Addition Related - Construct a small addition off the rear elevation of a contributing residence.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This Colonial Revival dwelling was built circa 1910. As the descriptive conveys, the Colonial Revival Movement is expressive of the renewed interest in the rich design traditions informing Colonial America. It constitutes the most pervasive American aesthetic employed on domestic buildings constructed during the first half of the twentieth century. With its unrivaled colonial trajectory, Mobile proved particularly receptive to the Colonial Revival. Georgian, Spanish, “Southern”, and, while not historically germane to Mobile, Dutch were popular. This house designed by Mobile architect C. L. Hutchisson represents a blending of the Georgian and Spanish veins of the larger Colonial Revival Movement.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 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 last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on March 17, 1988. On the aforementioned date, the Board approved the construction of a one-story addition. The application up for review calls for the construction of a small addition off of the northwest corner of the house.
  
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “Differentiate an addition from a historic structure using changes in material, color, and/ or wall plane.”
  - 2. “Design an addition to be compatible with the character of the property, neighborhood and environment.”
  - 3. “The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”
  - 4. “Design an addition to be compatible in massing or scale to the historic structure.”

5. "Place an addition so that it is subordinate next to the historic residential structure."
6. "Place or design an addition to the rear or side of a historic building, wherever possible."
7. "Design doors and windows to or onto an addition so to be compatible with the existing structure."
8. "Maintain the relationship of solids to voids of an exterior wall as established by the historic building."
9. "Design a window in an addition to be compatible to those in the historic building."

**C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):**

***Option A:***

1. Construct a small one-story addition.
  - a. The rectilinear-shaped addition will be located off the West (rear) elevation of residence.
  - b. The addition will measure 11'10" in width and 9'0" in depth.
  - c. The addition will rest atop a painted brick foundation wall with vent.
  - d. Walls will be clad with lap siding to match existing.
  - e. A six-over-one window will be placed on the West elevation.
  - f. The aforementioned window will be re-purposed from the existing and pertinent portion of the West Elevation.
  - g. Exposed rafter tails will be employed and will match the existing.
  - h. A hipped roof will surmount the building.
  - i. The roof will be sheathed in red asphalt shingles.
2. Paint the work in the existing color scheme found on the body of the house.

**OR**

***Option B:***

1. Construct a small one-story addition.
  - a. The L-shaped addition will be located in rear on West elevation of residence.
  - b. The addition will measure 11'10" in width and 9'0" in depth.
  - c. The addition will rest atop a painted brick foundation wall with vent.
  - d. Walls will be clad with lap siding to match existing.
  - e. A recessed portion will extend four feet from the South elevation.
  - f. The aforementioned recessed portion will shield an air conditioning unit.
  - g. A six-over-one window will be placed on the West elevation.
  - h. The aforementioned window will be from re-purposed from the existing and pertinent portion of the West Elevation.
  - i. Exposed rafter tails will match the existing.
  - j. A hipped roof will surmount the building.
  - k. The roof will be sheathed in red asphalt shingles.
2. Paint in the existing color scheme found on the body of the house.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

The application up for review calls for the construction of a small one-story addition off of the West (rear) Elevation of the property's contributing residence.

Due to the lush landscape setting, setback of the house, and proposed location on the residence, the proposed rear addition in either of the two forms submitted would be situated in such a way as to be in accord with the placement of additions as outlined in the Mobile's Historic Districts Review Guidelines (See B 2,5, & 6). The single-story form of the addition would allow the new construction to experience as subordinate to and differentiated from the body of the house (See B 3 & 5.), while the massing and scale are responsive to the proportions of the existing (See B 2 & 4.). Siding and rafter tails would match the

existing. (See B 1-2) With regard to fenestration, a salvaged and repurposed from the impacted portion of the rear elevation would be reemployed. The use of the historic window would afford both compatibility of type and maintenance of the solid-to-void ratio of fenestration (See 8 & 9.).

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-9), Staff does not believe this application would impair the architectural or historical character of the historic district. Staff recommends approval of the application in either of the two iterations submitted.

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

**2017-15-CA: 1409 Campbell Street**  
**Applicant:** Steve Speir, Nejla Harris, and Mary Beth Harris  
**Received:** March 17, 2017  
**Meeting:** April 5, 2017

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Alteration – Remove a chimney stack rising from a side roof slope of a contributing dwelling.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

Built circa 1900, the detailing of of this center hall one-story double-pile dwelling exemplifies the vernacular Queen Anne style. The Queen Anne dominated the built stock of the larger Anglo-American Aesthetics Movement of the late 19<sup>th</sup> Century and is commonly known as “Victorian.”

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 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 last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on March 17, 1988. On the aforementioned date, the Board approved the construction of a one story-addition. The application up for review calls for removal of an interior (rising through the body of the building) chimney atop the slide slopes of the house’s Room.
  
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “Preserve and repair original masonry materials.” \*Note – specific to wall surfaces.
  - 2. “Retain and repair roof detailing, including gutters and downspouts.”
  - 3. “Preserve historic stylistic and architectural details and ornamentation.”
  
- C. **Scope of Work (per submitted plans):**
  - 1. Remove an interior chimney rising from a side roof slope.
  - 2. Repair roof to match existing with asbestos shingles.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

The application involves the removal of a chimney which rises through the side roof slope of a contributing residential building. The Design Review Guidelines do not specifically address chimneys, but do note that historic stylistic and architectural details and decoration, along with roof detailing, including gutters and downspouts (when historic), should be retained and repaired (See B 2 & 3.). In section on masonry, the Guidelines note that historic masonry elements should be preserved and repaired (See B-1.) The aforementioned directive addressed masonry walls surfaces. The subject chimney is situated internally rather than the perimeter of the house. The chimney stack is in poor condition. Additionally, the interior shaft which supported has been removed. The Board has approved the removal of interior chimneys that rise through the roof slope on numerous occasions. Visibility from the public view was in discussions past a topic of consideration.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the lack of specific directive, condition of the chimney stacks, absence of shafts beneath them, and Board precedent, Staff believes this application would not impair the overall architectural or historical character of the building or historic district. Staff recommends approval of this application.



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

**2017-15-CA: 1055 Elmira Street**

**Applicant:** Leroy Anderson

**Received:** March 17, 2017

**Meeting:** April 5, 2017

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden  
Classification: Non-Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Demolition - Demolish a single family residence.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

While listed as non-contributing in 2007 expansion of the local boundaries of the Oakleigh Garden Historic District, it is said that the core of this dwelling dates circa 1855. The house was altered circa 1925 and reflects in its outward form and motifs a later vein of Arts and Crafts Movement. The core of the dwelling still maintains its antebellum shotgun and with side wing floor plan.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 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 last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on November 5, 2014. On the aforementioned date, the Board denied the application and requested the property be listed on MLS and plans for any redevelopment proposal. The application up for review calls for the demolition of the single family residence.
- 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 defined an expanded shotgun dwelling situated in the local portion of the Oakleigh Garden District. The 19<sup>th</sup>-Century core is comprised

- of a shotgun with wing, a residential typology that was constructed across Mobile's early western suburbs during the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> Century.
- 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, historic character, and architectural integrity of the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. As an early shotgun with wing, the house is one of a half dozen dwellings of the same typology to line the Oakleigh Garden District portion of Elmira Street.
  - 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. While shotgun dwellings represent a sizable percentage of the residential building typology of the southeastern portions of the Oakleigh Garden District, this example ranks among one of the oldest. In addition to its age, the building constitutes a sophisticated variant of the shotgun typology that it possessed a side wing.
  - 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 applicant would demolish the building and level the site. The applicant proposes to build a duplex.
  - vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
    1. The current owner acquired the property in 2014 for a price of \$2060.00.
  - vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
    1. The owner has only considered demolishing the property.
  - viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
    1. The property has been listed for sale.
  - 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. Not provided.
  - 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. Not provided.
  - 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 plans):**

1. Demolish the dwelling.
2. Remove debris.
3. Level the site.
4. Construct duplex.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the demolition of a principle building which is officially listed as a non-contributing structure in the local portion of a larger National Register district. When reviewing demolition applications, the Board takes into 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.

While listed as non-contributing, this dwelling is representative of a distinctive residential typology that is largely restricted to Mobile – the shotgun with wing. The building is much older than the date ascribed to it by the MHDC surveyor who researched the local expansion of the Oakleigh Garden District. The Oakleigh Garden District possesses more extant examples of this architectural type than any other area in Mobile. Though the typological significance is obscured by later changes, the building’s importance should be noted.

This building’s deteriorated condition can be attributed to deferred maintenance over many years. Deterioration of roof shingles and wood has allowed the elements to enter and therefore jeopardize the structure.

Located within a block of historic buildings, this house contributes to the built density, rhythmic spacing, and historic character of the southern portion of the Oakleigh Garden District. Five buildings on the subject block have been restored in the past eight years. The block to the South benefitted from Board approved infill construction. The block to the North is experiencing similar restoration and renovation efforts.

The Board adopted a policy four years ago which requires applicants requesting the demolition of property’s principle building (if it is historic) to list the property on MLS for a period of six months before authorizing the demolition of said structures. The applicant listed the property for sale per the board’s request.

If granted demolition approval, the applicant would demolish the house, remove debris, and level the lot, and build multi-family housing. While a photograph has been submitted of the proposed new construction, one which stood on South Broad Street, no construction plans have been provided.

The house was purchased on tax sale and the title has not been cleared, making future development plans difficult. The proposed housing typology would need a zoning variance to complete the project as well.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-2), Staff believes this application would impair the architectural or historical character of the historic district. Staff does not recommend of the application.

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

**2017-16-CA:** 1058 Elmira Street  
**Applicant:** Ruth Smith and Pinkie Henderson  
**Received:** March 13, 2017  
**Meeting:** April 5, 2017

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: After-the-fact-Approval- Retain unauthorized windows obtained without the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This dwelling dates circa 1891. The westernmost portion of the dwelling constitutes an exemplary instance of a shotgun. The recessed eastern portion of the building has been altered. It has yet to be determined in the latter was original to the building or an early addition. Regardless of the dating of the two parts of the larger whole, the residence comprises a nice instance of shotgun with wing, a notable and largely Mobile specific residential housing typology.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 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. According to materials in this property’s MHDC vertical file, MHDC staff received a SRO report on July 25, 2016 which reported work being performed on the building without the issuance of a building permit. It was at that time that the applicant’s contractor applied for and received a Certificate of Appropriateness by staff to remove rotten wood siding, porch decking, columns and other wood components such as fascia and replace to match existing in profile, dimension, and material. An owner of the property contacted the MHDC office in late September and requested a site visit to assist with the proper framing of windows. Once on site, staff member Paige Largue noticed that windows were installed without the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness. The windows are not in keeping with Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts for reason of their material (vinyl). Ms. Largue contacted the property owner via email when she did not attend the site visit. She and that property owner met on October 5, 2016 to discuss the situation and Architectural Review process so she might put forth an application calling for the retention of the windows. At the November 2, 2016 meeting of the Architectural Review Board several options were discussed, including a phased replacement of windows or an economic hardship. Ultimately, the application was agreeably held over for further investigation into options. Historic and Legal looked into an application for economic hardship. That course of possible redress would require the obtainment of all owners’ tax records. This requirement was

brought to two of the owner's attention at a meeting held on January 17. The two owners attending the meeting properly informed staff the other owners were not agreeable to submitting this tax information. The owners mentioned that the windows could be exchanged for others windows. On January 20, 2016, Ms. Lague conducted a site visit to Southeastern Salvage to see possible exchange options. Southeastern Salvage carried only vinyl windows and therefore said would not conform to the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile Historic Districts Guidelines.

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:

1. "In instances when there is a request to replace a building's windows, the new windows shall match the existing per location, framing, and light configuration."
2. "Acceptable window materials: wood sash, steel if original to structure, custom extruded aluminum, aluminum clad wood, windows approved by NPS."
3. "Unacceptable window materials: Vinyl, mill finished aluminum, interior snap-in muntins (except when used in concert with exterior muntins and intervening dividers)."

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

1. Holdover –Retain twelve (12) unauthorized windows installed without the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application for the after-the-fact-approval involves the retention of windows installed without the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness. The applicant last appeared before the board on November 2, 2016.

According to photos in this property's MHDC vertical file, this dwelling's fenestration was altered prior to 1989 expansion of the Oakleigh Garden National Register District. Metal windows were installed prior to that date. It was those metal windows which were removed. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's state that replacement fenestration should match as closely to original windows as per configuration, profile, and materials (See B-1.). Though the light configurations are appropriate with the style and period of the house, the Guidelines do not allow for the installation of vinyl windows (See B-2.).

Taking into that a Certificate of Economic Hardship is not an option in this situation, another alternative is a phased replacement of windows. Phased replacement approvals of unauthorized work have been employed by the Board on previous occasions to achieve compliance with the Design Review Guidelines.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-2), Staff believes this application impairs the architectural and historical character of the building and the historic district. Staff does not recommend approval of the retention of the unauthorized windows, but recommends that the Board consider a phased replacement campaign of the windows with either wood, aluminum clad wood, or extruded aluminum windows which meet the Guidelines.

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

**2017-12-CA: 1452 Brown Street**  
**Applicant: Joseph Cortopassi**  
**Received: 3/1/2017**  
**Meeting: 3/15/2017**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Non-Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Holdover - Install hardieplank siding on a non-contributing residence.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This one-story dwelling constitutes an assemblage of two buildings. Neither of the buildings was original to the site.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 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 last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on March 15, 2017. At that time, a request was made for retention and application of unapproved hardieplank siding. The application was heldover for purposes of clarifying procedural concerns with regard to the Architectural Review Board’s rules and regulations.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “Design exterior materials and finishes associated with additions and alterations to non-historic/contributing structures to be compatible with the historic district”
  - 2. “Use materials with a character compatible to those used historically and with proven durability.”
  - 3. “Maintain the original material wherever possible provided the material is durable and compatible with the surrounding district.”
- C. **Scope of Work (per application submitted):**
  - 1. Install hardieplank siding.
    - a. The siding faces all elevations.
    - b. The siding matches in profile and dimension that which it replaced.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the approval of installing hardieplank siding on a non-contributing residential building.

The applicant received a Certificate of Appropriateness (CoA) on February 2, 2017 for the repair and replacement of deteriorated materials to match the existing as per profile, dimension and material. On February 16, 2017, Historic Development received a Service Request Order (SRO) or 311 call concerning ongoing work without the display of a CoA. MHDC went to the site and noticed the removal of all wooden siding on the building & the installation of hardieplank siding on the east elevation. The applicant was notified of two options: 1.) to stop work and apply to the Architectural Review Board (ARB); OR 2.) to continue construction by installing wood siding to match the original in dimension, profile, and material.

The portion of the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts addressing non-historic or non-contributing buildings state that alterations to that classification of building should be so designed as to be compatible with the historic district (See B-1.). The Design Review Guidelines go on to state that for materials employed on changes to non-contributing buildings that they should possess a proven durability in addition to compatibility (See B-2.). The Guidelines further clarify that original materials should be maintained wherever possible provided that the material is durable and compatible (See B-3.). While replacement of wood siding with hardieplank siding on a non-contributing is not ruled out by the Design Review Guidelines, compatibility with the surrounding district and possible precedent should be noted.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Taking into account the non-contributing status, but realizing the precedent setting nature of the application, staff defers to Board as to the approval of the application.