

**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD AGENDA**  
**January 2, 2013 – 3:00 P.M.**  
**Pre-Council Chambers, 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: American Contracting**

- a. Property Address: 1162 New Saint Francis Street
- b. Date of Approval: 12/12/12
- c. Project: Reroof with 50 squares and repair any rotten rafters, charcoal gray.

**2. Applicant: Chris Bailey**

- a. Property Address: 255 Adams Street
- b. Date of Approval: 12/13/12
- c. Project: Install 4 foot high aluminum fence per the submitted plans. Double gate on east side of house in line with front of house and fence to extend to front of fence surrounding pool. The fence will be painted black.

**3. Applicant: Michael Lord**

- a. Property Address: 1352 Old Shell Road
- b. Date of Approval: 12/19/12
- c. Project: Repair windows to match the original in profile, dimension and materials.

**1. Applicant: Pura Vida Ventures**

- a. Property Address: 454 South Broad Street
- b. Date of Approval: 12/19/12
- c. Project: Demolish the fire gutted remains of a house. This staff level approval was authorized by the Architectural Review Board on 19 December 2012. Debris will be removed, the site will be leveled, and sod will be planted.

**B. APPLICATIONS**

**1. 2014-01-CA: 1114 ½ Dauphin Street**

- a. Applicant: LTS Development for Mr. Mayer Perloff
- b. Project: Demolition – Demolish an ancillary building.

**2. 2015-02-CA: 261 South Georgia Avenue**

- a. Applicant: Lucy Barr with Lucy Barr Designs for Nicole Youell and Spencer Johnson
- b. Project: Alterations – Heighten a side gable and alter façade fenestration.

**3. 2016-03-CA: 50-52 South Georgia Avenue**

- a. Applicant: Jennifer Bexley for WB, LLC
- b. Project: After-the-Fact-Approval – Retain front doors.

**4. 2016-04-CA: 26 North Royal Street**

- a. Applicant: Carrie Day and Tracy Bassett with Goodwyn, Mills and Cawood for the the Retirement Systems of Alabama (RSA)
- b. Project: Fenestration – Replace windows.

D. **OTHER BUSINESS**

1. Discussion

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

**2013-01-CA: 1114 ½ Dauphin Street**  
**Applicant: LTS Development for Mr. Mayer Perloff**  
**Received: 12/18/12**  
**Meeting: 1/02/12**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Contributing (Main Dwelling)  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Demolition – Demolish an ancillary building.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This property features one-story Craftsman-like “bungalow” dating from the 1920s and a two-story garage apartment dating from 1955.

**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 was last up for review on January 9, 1985. At that time the Old Dauphin Way Review Board approved a free-standing sign. The application presented before the Board calls for the demolition of an ancillary building.
- B. The 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 two-story garage apartment located within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District stands behind a contributing residential building. The garage apartment was constructed in 1955. The structure has been added over the course of the past half century.
    - ii. The importance of the structures to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
      - 1. During the 1940s and 1950s many garage apartments were constructed in the area between downtown and Spring Hill. These buildings provided

shelter for an increasing mobile war time and then baby boom population.

- 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.
- 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. Garage apartments of this period and style are found across the United States. Several examples are located on the subject property's block.
- 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 applicants would salvage the few remaining materials from the building, demolish the building, level the site, and plant grass.
- vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
  1. None given. Calls made by Staff were not picked up.
- vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
  1. After examining the costs of reconstructing the second floor, the applicant did not consider any other alternatives with regard to repairing the ancillary building.
- viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
  1. The larger property has not 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. Not applicable.
- x. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
  1. Not given.
- 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; and
  1. Application submitted.
- 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 application):

1. Demolish a garage apartment.
2. Salvage any usable materials.
3. Remove the debris.
4. Level the lot.
5. Plant sod.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the demolition of an ancillary building. When reviewing demolition applications, the following criteria are taken into account: the architectural significance of the building; the physical condition of the building; the impact the demolition will have on the historic district; and the nature of any proposed redevelopment.

The building proposed for demolition is a garage apartment. The two-story structure was constructed in 1955. With regard to materials and construction, the building is representative of many similar ancillary structures located across the country. Several examples can be found on the subject property's block.

A recent fire gutted the interior and structural impaired the structure of the ancillary building. The building materials are capable of being reproduced. The damage was extensive.

Located to the rear of the principle residence, the fire-damaged garage apartment is partially visible from the street, but not a vital component of the streetscape. Though constructed over fifty years ago, the building is not of the same construction quality and architectural distinction as the contributing residential building located on the property.

If granted demolition approval, the applicants would demolish the fire damaged building, remove any debris, level the site, and plant sod.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-2), Staff does not believe the demolition of the property's garage apartment would impair the architectural or the historical character of the property or the district. Staff recommends approval of the application.

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

**2013-02-CA: 251 South Georgia Avenue**  
**Applicant: Lucy Barr for Nicole Youell and Spencer Johnson**  
**Received: 12/17/12**  
**Meeting: 1/2/13**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Alterations - heighten a side gable and alter fenestration.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This Arts and Crafts inspired “bungalow” was completed in 1913.

**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 has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The application up for review calls for the heightening of a side gable and the alteration of front elevation fenestration.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation and the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy the historic materials that characterized the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old but compatible with the size, scale, and architectural integrity of the property and its environment.”
  - 2. “New additions and related adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.”
  - 3. “A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Original or historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof should be maintained. Materials should be appropriate to the form and pitch and color.”
  - 4. “The type, size, and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building. Original window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing.”
  - 5. “Where windows cannot be repaired, new windows must be compatible to the existing. The size and placement of new windows for additions and alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
- C. **Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):**
  - 1. Heighten the North (Side) Elevation’s gable.

- a. The heightened side gable will not rise above the height of the residence's principle east-west gable roof.
  - b. Taking the form of a wall dormer, the heightened dormer will feature a frieze like band of boarding located between the lower and upper story floors.
  - c. The gable's siding will match that employed on the house.
  - d. The existing roof pitch will be replicated.
  - e. Eave brackets will either be salvaged and reinstalled or replicated to match the existing.
  - f. The raked fascia board will match the existing.
  - g. The gable will feature a six-over-one wooden window matching those found elsewhere on the house.
2. Alter fenestration on the façade.
    - a. Remove the house's existing casement windows.
    - b. Install full-length casement windows.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the heightening of a side gable and the alteration of fenestration located on the façade.

The gable proposed for heightening is located on the house's North Elevation. Located on the northeast corner of South Georgia Avenue and Texas Street, the North Elevation is an inner lot elevation. Visible from, but not facing the street, the existing projecting gable would be heightened. While the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that historic roof forms and pitches should be maintained, the Board has approved alterations to side elevation roof constructions (See B-3). The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation state additions and alterations should be differentiated from yet compatible with the historic fabric (See B-1). A frieze like band would be located between the existing and proposed upper story area. The provision of this visual break would allow the addition to "read" as a later alteration. Matching siding, window types, eave brackets, roof brackets, and roofing shingles will be provide a sense of continuity between the old and the new.

The façade features half-length casement windows. The application calls for full-length casement windows of the same design. With regard to fenestration, the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that the type, size, and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building. Original window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing (See B-4). In addition, the Board does not normally allow changes to the facades of buildings.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval in part and denial in part.

Based on B (1-3), Staff does not believe the heightening of the side gable would impair the architectural and historical character of the building. Staff recommends approval of that portion of the application.

Based on B (4-5), Staff does believe the alteration of the façade's fenestration would impair the architectural and the historical character of the building. Staff does not recommend approval of that portion of the application.

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

**2013-03-CA: 50-52 S North Georgia Avenue**  
**Applicant: Jennifer Bexley**  
**Received: 12/10/12**  
**Meeting: 1/2/13**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Non-Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: After-the-Fact-Approval – Retain two doors.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This brick duplex was constructed in 1937.

**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 has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The application up for review calls for the after-the-fact-approval of two doors. The doors were installed without the issuance of Certificate of Appropriateness. A 311 call was made and Staff responded. The applicants appear before the Board with a request to retain the doors.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “Often one of the most important decorative features of a house, doorways reflect the age and style of a building. Original doors and openings should be retained along with any moldings, transoms or sidelights. Replacements should respect the age and style of the building.”
  - 2. With regard to materials, metal is listed as inappropriate.
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):
  - 1. Retain two metal doors located on the duplex’s west-facing façade.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the after-the-fact-approval of two doors. The doors were installed without the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state that original doors should be retained and that replacement doors should respect the age and style of the building (See B-1).The wooden doors featured a chamfered vertical treatment and a staggered light treatment. The replacement doors are metal in composition. The Design Review Guidelines list metal as an inappropriate material. (See B-2). Staff recommends that the applicant install doors that are



more in keeping the historic character of the building, one that if the area were resurveyed would be listed as a contributing structure.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-2), Staff believes this application impairs the architectural and historical character of the district. Staff does not recommend approval of this application.

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

**2013-04-CA: 26 North Royal Street**  
**Applicant: Tracy Bassett and Carrie Day with Goodwyn, Mills & Cawood for the Retirement Systems of Alabama**  
**Received: 12/7/12**  
**Meeting: 3/2/12**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: B-4  
Project: Fenestration – Replace windows.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

The Battle House has occupied this site since 1851. The originally 1850s buildings by Isaiah Rogers burned in 1905. The present building was constructed between 1906 and 1908. Designed by Frank M. Andrews, the construction and decoration of the building cost \$1,500,000. The reconstructed Battle House Hotel joined the Bienville Hotel (1900) and the Cawthon Hotel (1906) in affording visitors to the last words in luxury and comfort.

**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 July 2, 2004. At that time, the Board approved the construction the building’s rear annex. The application up for review calls for the wholesale replacement of the building’s wood windows with clad wood windows.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of the deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture other visual qualities and where possible materials.”
  - 2. “The type, size, and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building. Original window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing.”
  - 3. “Where windows cannot be repaired, new windows must be compatible to the existing. The size and placement of new windows for additions and alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”

C. Scope of Work:

1. Remove all existing wooden windows units.
2. Replace the aforementioned windows with aluminum clad wooden windows.
  - a. The light configuration will remain the same.
  - b. Moldings and casings will match the existing.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the removal of historic wooden windows and later replacement wooden windows and their replacement with aluminum clad wooden windows. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation calls for repair as opposed to the replacement of historic fabric. In cases where historic fabric has deteriorated beyond repair, the Secretary of the Interior's Standards require that replacements match the old in design, color, texture other visual qualities and where possible materials (See B-1). The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that original window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing. In cases where windows cannot be repaired, new windows must be compatible to the existing (See B-2 and B-3).

It is difficult to understand how all the windows in the newly renovated building are completely rotten. It is the policy of the ARB that windows should be repaired rather than replaced where possible. The fenestration in the building is rather extensive and the removal of the windows would result in a large percentage of historic fabric being removed from the building. Considering the building has managed to survive over a hundred years with its historic windows, staff suggests the owners consult with an engineer to discover the cause of the deterioration and that it be fixed.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-3), Staff believes this application will impair the architectural and historical character of the building and the district. Staff does not recommend approval of the application.