ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

November 19, 2008 – 3:00 P.M.

Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER - Chair

- 1. Roll Call
- 2. Approval of Minutes
- 3. Approval of Mid-Month Requests Approved by Staff

B. MID-MONTH APPROVALS

- 1. Applicant's Name: Charles Bowen
 - a. Property Address: 8 North Lafayette St
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/28/08
 - c. Project: Repair fire and smoke damage to units 3,4,9 and 10;Replace doors to match existing.

2. Applicant's Name: Kathleen Miller

- a. Property Address: 14 North Monterey
- b. Date of Approval: 10/29/08
- c. Project: Repair rotten sill and replace with like material; Repaint to match existing

3. Applicant's Name: Chris Clarke

- a. Property Address: 20 Macy Place
- b. Date of Approval: 11/05/08
- c. Project: Repair porch; paint per submitted colors.

4. Applicant's Name: Pitzios Family Limited Partnership

- d. Property Address: 57 Bradford Avee. Date of Approval: October 28, 2008
- f. Project: Exterior repairs; repair roof.

5. Applicant's Name: Alvin Presnell

- a. Property Address: 118 Michael Donald
- b. Date of Approval: 10/19/08
- c. Project: Reroof using dimensional shingles gray or black in color.

6. Applicant's Name: Paul Morris

- a. Property Address: 123 Houston Streetb. Date of Approval: November 7, 2008
- c. Project: Install fence per submitted plan.

7. Applicant's Name: David Blunt for American Legion

- a. Property Address: 607 Government Street
- b. Date of Approval: October 31, 2008
- c. Project: Exterior repairs; temporary COA for ramp for Veteran@s Day Parade

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 170-08-CA: 260 North Jackson

a. Applicant: Tom Karwinskib. Request: Parking lot

2. 171-08-CA: 68 North Monterey

a. Applicant: Douglas Kearleyb. Request: Rear addition

3. 172-08-CA: 1616 Government St

a. Applicant: World Gymb. Request: Sign approval

4. 173-08-CA: 100 Michael Donald Avenue

a. Applicant: Juanita Owens

b. Request: Repairs and renovation to porches, front and back

5. 174-08-CA: 109-111 S. Conception Street

a. Applicant: Holmes and Holmes Architectsb. Request: Install fiber glass porch railings

6. 175-08-CA: 517 Dauphin Street

a. Applicant: Glenn Jones

b. Request: Construct balcony/rear-raised deck.

7. 176-08-CA: 162 Dauphin Street

a. Applicant: FMS Engineering, LLCb. Request: Install west wall windows

8. **177-08-CA: 3 Dauphin Street**

a. Applicant: Walcott Adams Verneuille Architects

b. Request: Demolition; parking lot plan.

9. 178-08-CA: 109 Bradford Avenue

a. Applicant: Manticore Properties, Inc.

b. Request: Retain non-conforming windows; construct rear staircase

170-08-CA: 260 North Jackson Street

Applicant: Lowerline Properties LLC/Tom Karwinski

<u>Received</u>: 11/03/08 <u>Meeting</u>: 11/19/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

<u>Historic District</u>: DeTonti Square <u>Classification</u>: Non-Contributing

Zoning: R-B

<u>Project</u>: Alter parking lot plan submitted in March.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this two-story masonry building was constructed in 1964.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that õthe Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed changeí 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 historic districtí ö

- A. This building is currently undergoing renovation. A COA was granted in March, 2008 for the following site work: (1) Leave all existing walls and repair as needed with materials to match; (2)Install a new concrete walk to the new shared entrance; (3)Create an area for garbage cans with a 6ø0ø fence on three sides; (4) Install a 6ø0ö metal picket fence on top of the existing block wall; (5) Install a 6ø0ö metal picket fence with capped stucco columns along the front and north sides of the parking area; (6) Install an 8ø0ö wood privacy fence at the corner of the building by the trash cans; (7) Create a new parking area to the north of the building using concrete parking pads and bumpers, concrete curbs; (8) Install a grasscrete driving field; (9)Landscape around parking area. The applicant proposes changing item #8 and seeks approval for a concrete driving field.
- B. The Mobile Historic District Design Review Guidelines read, in pertinent part:
 - 1. õModern paving materials are acceptable in the historic districts. However, it is important that the design, location and materials be compatible with the property.
 - 2. Landscaping can often assist in creating an appropriate setting. Asphalt is inappropriate for walkways. Gravel or shell are preferred paving material, however, a variance from the Board of Zoning Adjustment is required for commercial applications. Hard surface materials may also be acceptable.
 - 3. The appearance of parking areas should be minimized through good site planning and design. New materials such as grasspave or grasscrete, which provides a solid parking surface while still allowing grass to grow giving the appearance of a continuance of a front lawn, may be a feasible alternative.
 - 4. Parking areas should be screened from view by the use of low masonry walls, wood or iron

fences or landscaping.ö

- C. The proposed work on the site includes the following:
 - 1. install a concrete driving field.

RECOMMENDATION

The applicants received a COA in March to allow for the construction of a parking lot in a vacant parcel of land just north of this building. The applicants submitted a proposal for and received approval for a concrete parking lot with a grass crete driving field. The applicants would now like to use concrete, instead of grass crete, for the driving field. Staff is concerned over the amount of proposed concrete for the parking lot and would recommend the applicants install an alternative material or scale back their use of concrete. Staff would also like to see a more detailed landscaping plan.

171-08-CA: 68 North Monterey Applicant: Douglas Kearley

Received: 11/03/08 Meeting: 11/19/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Classification: Contributing Property

Zoning: R-1

Project: Changes to approved plans for rear renovation.

BUILDING HISTORY

This building is a large, two-story neo-classical revival residence constructed about 1909.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states õthe Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the changeí 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 districtí ö

- A. The applicants have a current COA to do a porch addition and renovation to the rear of the house. The applicants have decided to change their plans and now return to the ARB for approval.
- B. The Mobile Historic Guidelines, state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. õA 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 colorí .Accessory roof elements not original to the structure, such as vents, skylights, satellite dishes, etc. shall be located inconspicuously.ö
 - 2. õThe 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.ö
 - 3. "The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. Historic porches should be maintained and repaired to reflect their period. Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/ columns, proportions and decorative details. The balustrade of the stairs should match the design and materials of the porch."
 - **4.** The Secretary of the Interior Standards state: õNew additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. 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.ö
- C. The applicants propose:
 - 1. adding a 14ø6ö by 20ø addition to 1st floor, northeast corner
 - 2. enclosing 2nd story porch
 - 3. adding approximately 10øto the 2nd floor rear wall

- 4. adding a rear porch to the 1st floor south east corner
 - a. approximately 10øby 18ø
 - b. balustrade to match existing
 - c. 10ö by 10ö box columns
 - d. Wood steps and hand rails
- 5. all materials to be wood
 - a. siding to match existing
 - b. rafter tails to match existing
 - c. corner boards to match existing
- 6. windows to match existing
- 7. exposed brick piers with lattice panels

STAFF ANALYSIS

Staff recommends approval. This plan deviates only slightly from the plans approved in March as it relates to the first floor. The porch proposed for the northeast corner has been moved to the south east corner and the northeast corner will be enclosed to accommodate another bedroom. Though additional square footage will be added, above and beyond what was originally planned, it is not so much as to impair the historic integrity of the house or neighborhood.

172-08-CA: 1616 Government Street
Applicant: Harry Dodich for World Gym

Received: 08/25/08

Meeting: 09/17/08 (Tabled); 11/19/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way District

Classification: Non-contributing

Zoning: B-3

Project: Install signage.

BUILDING HISTORY

This applicant is a tenant in part of a multi-tenant, non-contributing building adjacent to the Old Dauphin Way District.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states õthe Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the changeí 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 districtí ö

STAFF REPORT

- A. This is a non-contributing building located outside the Old Dauphin Way District, but falls within the ordinance for signage along government street.
- B. The Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile & Historic Districts and Government Street read, in pertinent part:
 - 1. õFor buildings without a recognizable style, the sign shall adopt the decorative features of the building, utilizing the same materials and colors. . .
 - 2. Owner shall submit an overall sign plan addressing placement, materials, and design. Signage for the building and for the tenants shall be consistent. . .
 - 3. The total maximum allowable sign area for all signs is one and one half square feet per linear front foot of the principal building, not to exceed 64 square feet.
 - 4. Internally lit signs are prohibited.ö
- C. Applicant proposes:
 - a. Installed a 4øby 15øbö aluminum sign
 - b. Aluminum face
 - c. External lights to be approved at a later date.
 - d. Approximately 60 sq. ft. total

STAFF ANALYSIS

The applicants appeared at the September 17, 2008 ARB meeting seeking approval for a non-conforming sign. The Board recommended the applicants take some time to figure out if they could make the existing sign conform to the Sign Design Guidelines. The applicants have returned with an aluminum faced sign.

Because this sign conforms to the Design Guidelines, staff recommends ap be allowed.	pproval. No other signage shall

173-08-CA: 100 Michael Donald Avenue

Applicant: Juanita Owens

Received: 10/10/08

Meeting: 11/05/08 (Tabled); 11/19/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing Property

Zoning: R-1

Project: Repair 2nd story porch railing; install new back porch and steps; approve changes

to rear of house.

BUILDING HISTORY

This two-story house with a hip roof and exposed rafters was once a 1-1/2 story gabled, Victorian, similar to others in the neighborhood.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states õthe Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the changeí 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 districtí ö

- A. The applicant has a current COA to do in-kind repairs. Staff has been working with the applicant; however, the applicant had already installed the windows and siding to the back of the home before applying for the COA. Staff advised the applicants to refrain from making any more significant changes to the exterior of the home and to apply for a COA. The applicants would like to retain the changes made to the back of the house as well receive approval for a new back door landing, repairs to the 2nd story porch and repainting. Per Urban Development, the rear porch was enclosed when the applicants acquired the property. The applicants did total replacement of the rear siding.
- B. The Mobile Historic Guidelines, state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. õA 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 colorí .Accessory roof elements not original to the structure, such as vents, skylights, satellite dishes, etc. shall be located inconspicuously.ö
 - 2. õThe 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.ö
 - 3. "The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. Historic porches should be maintained and repaired to reflect their period. Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/ columns, proportions and decorative details. The balustrade of the stairs should match the design and materials of the porch."
 - **4.** The Secretary of the Interior Standards state: õNew additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. 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.ö

C. Applicants intend to:

- 1. Retain two non-conforming new windows and skylight placed in rear of home;
- 2. Reroof with brown, 3-tab shingles;
- 3. Repair 2nd story porch identical to existing;
- 4. Replace back door landing and steps;
- 5. Paint the home per submitted colors.

STAFF ANALYSIS

At the stafføs request, this application was tabled at the last ARB meeting since the applicants did not appear.

Staff recommends approval for:

- the 2nd story porch, as long as Urban Development approves the work;
- the reroofing work;
- the skylight.

Staff does not recommend approval for the windows. The windows chosen by the applicants do not conform to the Architectural Review Board Guidelines. One of the non-conforming windows is a 2/2, tan vinyl window and the other window is a rectangular window with a single pane of decorative glass. Staff recommends replacing the two non-conforming windows with either 3/1 or 2/2 wood windows to match the historic windows on the rear of the home.

The applicant intends to supply Staff with a plan for the back door landing and steps. In discussion with the applicant, it appears the applicant intends to construct something similar to the existing landing. Staff will continue to work with the applicants to acquire an appropriate design for the landing to bring back before the ARB.

The applicants will be bringing paint samples to the ARB meeting.

174-08-CA: 109-111 S. Conception Street Applicant: Holmes and Holmes Architects

Received: 10/21/08 Meeting: 11/19/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East Classification: Contributing Property

Zoning: R-1

Project: Install fiber glass railing.

BUILDING HISTORY

Constructed in 1857, The Bowers-Huger house is one of three remaining double townhouses in Mobile.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states õthe Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the changeí 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 districtí ö

STAFF REPORT

- A. According to MHDC records, the existing rear balustrade was installed in 1990. In order to alleviate maintenance concerns, the applicants seek approval for the installation of fiberglass balustrade.
- B. The Mobile Historic Guidelines, state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. "The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. Historic porches should be maintained and repaired to reflect their period. Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/ columns, proportions and decorative details. The balustrade of the stairs should match the design and materials of the porch."
 - 2. õThe materials should blend with the style of the building.ö
- C. Applicant propose:
 - 1. installing fiberglass materials for the rear porch railings
 - a. 3ö rounded strongrail system
 - b. Square pickets
 - c. White finish

STAFF ANALYSIS

The applicants intend to bring a sample of the fiber glass railing to the ARB meeting. The ARB does not typically allow modern replacement materials, such as HardiePlank, on historic buildings. Given the significance of this property, Staff believes a modern replacement material would be inappropriate as it would be difficult to replicate the proper reveal and details. Therefore, Staff recommends denial.

175-08-CA: 517 Dauphin Street

Applicant: Glenn Jones Received: 10/31/08 Meeting: 11/19/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street
Classification: Non-contributing Property

Zoning: R-1

Project: Construct rear balcony.

BUILDING HISTORY

This townhome was newly constructed on Dauphin Street in 2007.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states õthe Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the changeí 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 districtí ö

STAFF REPORT

- A. The applicant proposes installing a rear deck over his parking area, with a staircase providing access to the roof of the deck.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior Standards state:
 - 1. õNew additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. 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.ö
- C. The applicant proposes:
 - 1. constructing a deck with sheet metal
 - 2. situated above existing masonry walls
 - 3. deck to be 23ø wide
 - 4. install handrails on roof of deck
 - 5. install stair case to roof of deck
- D. Clarification needed:
 - 1. visibility of structure from street
 - 2. proposed height
 - 3. elevations

SAFF ANALYSIS

Staff has been working with this applicant and has requested more information from the applicant. The applicant intends to provide more complete drawings prior to the ARB meeting.

176-08-CA: 462 Dauphin Street Applicant: FMS Engineering, LLC.

Received: 10/29/08 Meeting: 11/19/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Classification: Contributing Property

Zoning: R-1

Project: Install windows along west wall.

BUILDING HISTORY

This building was constructed in 1866 for Louis Monin. The Monin building is one of 4 identical row buildings with cast iron storefronts. Originally, the first floor housed a business while the second floor was an apartment. It is now being renovated to be used as office spaces. The Mobile Historic Development Commission holds a façade easement on the property.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states õthe Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the changeí 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 districtí ö

- A. The applicants are seeking approval to install 4 windows on the second floor, west façade of the building. The lot adjacent to the west wall of the building is vacant. The west wall of the building is now exposed where historically it would have been an interior party wall. There are no windows currently along the west wall. The applicants also seek approval for a new fence and sign.
- B. The Mobile Historic Guidelines, state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. õThe 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.ö
 - 2. õFences should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District. The height of solid fences in historic districts is generally restricted to six feet, however, if a commercial property or multi-family housing adjoins the subject property, an eight foot fence may be considered.ö
 - a. While the current guidelines do not address the height of picket fences across the front yard, the Board has determined that 3ø open fences are appropriate for historic districts.
 - 3. The Sign Design Guidelines provide for the following:
 - a. The overall design of all signage including the mounting framework shall relate to the design of the principal building on the property. Buildings with a recognizable style such as Greek Revival, Italianate, Victorian, Queen Anne, Neo-classic, Craftsman, et al., should use

signage of the same style. This can be done through the use of similar decorative features such as columns or brackets.

- b. The structural materials of the sign should match the historic materials of the building. Wood, metal, stucco, stone or brick, is allowed.
- c. The total maximum allowable sign area for all signs is one and one half square feet per linear front foot of the principal building, not to exceed 64 square feet.
- d. Internally lit signs are prohibited.
- e. Lighted signs shall use focused, low intensity illumination.

C. Applicants propose:

- 1. installing 4 windows along the west wall
 - a. second floor only
 - b. wood windows to match existing 6/6 windows on the front of the façade
- 2. repaint exterior front façade per submitted colors
- 3. installing 6ø iron fence along south property line along vacant lot (460 Dauphin Street)
- 4. install sign
 - a. 10øsq. ft.
 - b. Wood sign
 - c. Hung from iron bracket

D. Clarifications:

- 1. West elevation drawing needed
- 2. treatment of deteriorated chimney stacks
- 3. materials used for any masonry repairs needed
- 4. plan for courtyard/vacant lot

STAFF ANALYSIS

As discussed above, the Mobile Historic Development Commission holds a façade easement on the property. While the applicants submitted a plan, they did not submit an elevation drawing of the west wall. Members of the Properties Committee have been contacted and intend to meet once the additional drawings are received. Staff is also waiting for additional drawings to be received and the Properties Committee to meet prior to making a staff recommendation.

177-08-CA: 3 Dauphin Street

Applicant: Walcott Adams Verneuille, Architects

Received: 10/28/08 Meeting: 11/19/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street
Classification: Non-Contributing Property

Zoning: B-4

Project: Demolition; construct parking lot.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous research, this two-story masonry commercial building received its current façade in 1970. There is evidence the historic, mid-nineteenth century masonry building is beneath the current building, though more research needs to take place.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states õthe Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the changeí 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 districtí ö

- A. The applicants have a current COA to make improvements to the front of this building; however, they now return to the Board for approval to demolish the building and use the lot as a parking lot. The owners of the building also own the property next door ó the Elgin Building, which is currently under renovation. The Elgin Building, with its ornate facade, is the city last remaining cast iron commercial building. Situated on a corner of the historical commercial corridor for the city, the Elgin Building would not have been freestanding.
- B. Regarding demolitions, the Guidelines read as follows: õProposed demolition of a building must be brought before the Board for consideration. The Board may deny a demolition request if the building 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:
 - a. The historic or architectural significance of the structure;
 - 1. Since the façade was changed in the 1970s, this building is considered a non-contributing property within the historic district; however, until more research is conducted, it will be difficult to assess the buildings historic significance.

- b. 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 building façade is not historic, the building position at the front of the property line and its alignment with the two adjacent buildings does allow the historic character of the streetscape to be reflected today. The removal of this building will create a vacant space and further impair the historic character of the street.
- c. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
 - 1. Not applicable.
- d. 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. Not applicable.
- e. 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. The owners intend to use this lot as parking for the adjacent property, which is currently undergoing renovation and will be used as office space.
 - 2. Staff is concerned that yet another vacant lot will impair the historic integrity of the district. This building does correctly reflect the historic streetscape. There would not have been a vacant lot between these two buildings. Therefore, Staff believes a building is more appropriate for this space than a parking lot.
- 2. *Content of applications*. All applications to demolish or remove a structure in a historic district shall contain the following minimum information:
 - a. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 - 1. 1979; \$110,000.
 - b. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 - 1. Leasing the property for office space.
 - c. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 - 1. The owner stated that he has listed the property for sale but did not specify the price.
 - d. <u>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;</u>
 - 1. Not applicable.
 - e. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
 - 1. The owner intends to provide parking on this lot for the building next door; costs were not submitted with the application.
 - f. 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. None submitted.
 - g. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.
 - 1. None submitted.

- 3. *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.ö
- C. Applicants intend to:
 - 1. Demolish the existing building;
 - 2. Level and pave lot for parking;
 - 3. Install decorative stucco piers at driveway/entrance to parking lot;
 - 4. Install low stucco wall along north property line;
 - 5. Install ornamental iron fencing along north property line above wall;
 - 6. Install new lighting.
 - 7. Color of stucco to be Sherwin Williams 6157, ofavorite tan.ö
- D. Clarifications needed:
 - 1. height of fence

STAFF ANALYSIS

As discussed above, the façade of the existing building underwent changes in the 1970s and lost its historic character. However, there is some evidence that the historic building remains beneath the current façade. Because the building aligns with the adjacent buildings, it does contribute to the historic character of the streetscape. Retaining a building at this location would be more appropriate than a vacant lot. Therefore, Staff recommends denial of the demolition.

Any new construction should respect the building plane along the street. Staff has consulted with the applicants and recommended a wall or false façade be used to shield the parking lot from the street. While the present application aspires to provide some continuity to the streetscape, it does not provide enough shielding of the parking lot. If the demolition is to be approved, Staff would like to see a better plan for the parking lot.

178-08-CA: 109 Bradford Avenue Applicant: Manicore Properties, LLC

Received: 10/28/08 Meeting: 11/19/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing Property

Zoning: R-1

Project: Construct rear staircase and porch; retain non-conforming windows.

BUILDING HISTORY

This is a 4-plex in the Old Dauphin Way district constructed in the 1920s.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states õthe Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the changeí 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 districtí ö

- A. The applicants are seeking approval for non-conforming windows installed without a COA. The applicants removed steel casement windows without approval from the ARB. Staff cited the applicants and issued a stop work order. The applicants are also seeking approval for a two-story landing and staircase on the rear of the building to allow for rear egress. The original back porches were removed without ARB approval in 2005.
- B. The Mobile Historic District Guidelines read, in pertinent part:
 - 1. õThe 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.ö
 - 2. "The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. Historic porches should be maintained and repaired to reflect their period. Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/ columns, proportions and decorative details. The balustrade of the stairs should match the design and materials of the porch."
 - 3. õThe materials should blend with the style of the building.ö
 - **4.** õNew additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. 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.ö
- C. Applicants propose:
 - 1. retaining 32-1/1, double-hung, insulated vinyl windows
 - a. multi-lite, steel casement windows were removed
 - 2. constructing a rear staircase and landing
 - a. two-story, 3ø-4ö x 18ø structure

- b. situated on concrete pad
- c. shed roof with 3-tab shingles
- d. all pressure treated wood materials
- D. Clarifications needed:
 - 1. Color of shingles
 - 2. design for columns
 - 3. exterior doors

STAFF ANALYSIS

Vinyl replacement windows are not appropriate for historic buildings. It appears there was a mixture of windows on the building prior to the removal of the steel casement windows. The steel casement windows were most likely original to the structure. Staff recommends the applicants not be allowed to retain the new windows.

The rear staircase and landing lacks the necessary architectural detailing appropriate for a historic district. Staff recommends denial.