

**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD AGENDA**  
**October 3<sup>rd</sup> 2018 – 3:00 P.M.**  
**Multi-Purpose Room, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street**

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

1. Roll Call
2. Approval of Minutes from September 19, 2018.
3. Approval of MidMonth COAs Granted by Staff

**B. MIDMONTH APPROVALS**

- 1. Applicant: Curran Foose**
  - a. Property Address: 112 Ryan Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 9/11/2018
  - c. Project: Reroof with GAF in slate.
- 2. Applicant: Felecia Place**
  - a. Property Address: 1460 Brown Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 9/11/2018
  - c. Project: Repair windows; skim coat piers and install framed lattice; chamfer columns or boxed out. Replace damaged wood to match in dimension, profile, and material including shakes in gable. Replace non-historic door with period appropriate glazed and paneled door. Replace and install handrail. Repaint based on Mobile BLP historic colors.
- 3. Applicant: Donald Scholebo**
  - a. Property Address: 1558 West Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 9/11/2018
  - c. Project: Replace concrete strips with concrete drive.
- 4. Applicant: Mark Mhalsky**
  - a. Property Address: 8 Houston Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 9/12/2018
  - c. Project: Install gunite pool and surrounding pavers in approved design at rear of lot.
- 5. Applicant: H and Y Home Improvement, LLC**
  - a. Property Address: 57 N. Ann Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 9/13/2018
  - c. Project: Repair and replace when necessary deteriorated wood to match existing in dimension, profile and material. Repair wooden windows and replace broken glass panes to match. Repair damaged deck in rear of house and extend platform. Then replace railings to match stock design. Repaint Body in SW Alabaster White, and Trim in White and door in SW green.
- 6. Applicant: Walter Ernest on behalf of Pelican Coast Conservancy**
  - a. Property Address: 403 Conti Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 9/14/2018
  - c. Project: Install double sided, hanging blade sign constructed of painted wood composite to say "Pelican Coast Conservancy."
- 7. Applicant: BJE Properties**
  - a. Property Address: 503 St. Francis Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 9/11/2018
  - c. Project: Repaint exterior body in Sherwin Williams - Colonial Revival Gray - #2832. Repaint trim in white. Replace deteriorated wood to match that found on the front elevation of the building in dimension, profile and material.

8. **Applicant: N & D Properties, LLC**
  - a. Property Address: 55 N. Ann Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 9/19/2018
  - c. Project: Reglaze windows and exterior painting to match existing.
9. **Applicant: Michael Stephens**
  - a. Property Address: 1114 Caroline Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 9/20/2018
  - c. Project: Reconstruct front porch same dimensions as original; add additional brick piers for support; add four 8-10 inch Tuscan tapered columns with capital and base; add brick steps with plain wrought iron railing; replace wood siding on house as necessary to match original in profile, dimension, and material; prep and repaint exterior body-sage, trim-white, shutters-black.
10. **Applicant: Matthew Griffith**
  - a. Property Address: 206 George Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 9/21/2018
  - c. Project: Redeck porch, repair/replace rot on columns and on floor joists, all to match in materials, profile and dimension.
11. **Applicant: Laura Harris**
  - a. Property Address: 1706 Laurel Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 9/21/2018
  - c. Project: Repaint in the following color scheme: Trim-white; Body-SW7664 Steely Gray; Door- SW7604 Smoky Blue.
12. **Applicant: Clay Rucker**
  - a. Property Address: 1310 Brown Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 9/24/2018
  - c. Project: Redeck with treated tongue and groove, repair/replace rotten wood as necessary, touch up painting. Repair masonry cheeks.
13. **Applicant: Angela Odom of Odom Architects**
  - a. Property Address: 250 State Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 9/24/2018
  - c. Project: Construct 32'0" x 16'0" wooden pergola in rear of property, setback from side street. Install grill and bench seating. Repair to match existing stucco and wood. Repaint to match. Install new light feature in existing location.

## C. APPLICATIONS

1. **2018-33-CA: 12 Straight Street**
  - a. Applicant: Mr. Robert Owen
  - b. Project: Renovation Related: Remove siding on non-contributing house and replace with hardiplank to look like lapsiding.
2. **2018-34-CA: 208 Levert Avenue**
  - a. Applicant: Ms. Lucy Barr of Lucy Barr Designs on behalf of Mr. Mike Windom
  - b. Project: Ancillary Related: Demolish existing one story ancillary building and construct two story ancillary building.
3. **2018-35-CA: 310-312 Broad Street**
  - a. Applicant: Mr. Douglas B. Kearley of DBK, Inc. on behalf of Mr. Mike Rogers
  - b. Project: Rehabilitation Related: Removal of fenestration, installation of new fenestration, installation of canopy and/or awning.

**4. 2018-36-CA: Lot at corner of Common Street and Caroline Avenue**

- a. Applicant: Mr. Steve May
- b. Project: Relocation of residence currently located at 1107 Springhill Avenue into the Old Dauphin Way historic district.

**D. OTHER BUSINESS**

- 1. Next meeting will be held on October 17, 2018.

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

**2018-33-CA: 12 Straight Street**  
**Applicant: Mr. Robert Owen**  
**Received: 9/7/2018**  
**Meeting: 10/3/2018**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden  
Classification: Non-Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Renovation Related: Remove siding on non-contributing building and replace with cement fiber board siding.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This residence has had alterations executed over the years including new siding and infill of porch.

**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 not appeared before the Architectural Review Board according to the MHDC vertical files. The proposed scope of work includes removal of a existing siding and installation of hardiplank siding.
- 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 submitted site plan):**

- 1. Remove existing siding.
- 2. Install hardiplank siding.
  - a. Siding will match existing wood siding found on house in dimension and profile.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

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

The applicant has received a Certificate of Appropriateness (CoA) for the repair and replacement of deteriorated materials to match the existing as per profile, dimension and material, and replacement of windows on the north elevation and east elevation where deteriorated. .

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. The east elevation of the house has a minimal amount of wood siding exposed. The hardiplank will match the what is left of the existing wood siding in profile and dimension.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-2), Staff does not believe this application would impair either the architectural or the historical significance of the building or the district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

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

**2018-34-CA: 208 Levert Avenue**  
**Applicant: Ms. Lucy Barr of Lucy Barr Designs on behalf of Mr. Mike Windom**  
**Received: 9/14/2018**  
**Meeting: 10/3/2018**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Ashland Place  
Classification: Contributing (Main Building), Non-contributing (Ancillary)  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Ancillary Related: Demolish existing one story ancillary building and construct two-story ancillary building.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

The ancillary building is located behind a Mediterranean-Revival residence built in 1927. The ancillary building, a single story garage, postdates the construction of the main house.

**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 June 6, 2016 according to the MHDC vertical files. At that time, the construction of a second story on an existing ancillary building was approved. The proposed scope of work includes demolishing an existing ancillary building and the construction of a new building on the same footprint.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  1. “When reviewing applications calling for the demolition of ancillary structures, the following criteria are taken into account “architectural significance of the building, physical condition of the structure, impact on the street & the district, and nature of any proposed development.”
  2. “Historic accessory structures should be preserved.”
  3. “Ancillary construction should be compatible with those in the district. “
  4. “Design an accessory structure to be subordinate in scale to that of the primary structure.
    - a. If a proposed accessory structure is larger than the size of typical historic accessory structures in the district, break up the mass of the larger structure into smaller modules that reflect traditional accessory structures.”
  5. “Locate a new accessory structure in line with other visible accessory structures in the district. “
    - a. “These are traditionally located at the rear of a lot.”

6. “Materials (for doors) that are the same as the original, or that appear similar in texture and finish to the original are acceptable. These often include: wood panel; wood panel with glass lights; leaded glass with lead comes; and metal with a painted finish.”
7. “Design a garage door to be simple and compatible with the primary building.”
8. Materials (cladding) that are compatible with the historic district in scale and character are acceptable. These often include: Wood frame, Masonry and Cement-based fiber siding.
9. “Materials that are the same as the original, or that appear similar in texture, profile and finish to the original are acceptable. These often include: Wood sash; Steel, if original to structure; Custom extruded aluminum; Aluminum clad wood; Windows approved by the National Park Service.”

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

1. Demolish an existing non-contributing ancillary building.
  - a. Clear debris from site.
2. Construct a new ancillary building (a garage)
  - a. The ancillary building will be constructed on the footprint of the existing one story garage, and setback 3’0” from the eastern lot line and 8’0” from the northern lot line.
  - b. The garage will be 28’0” x 14’0” in size and will be two-stories in height.
  - c. The walls will be clad with hardiplank-siding.
  - d. Exterior will be painted to match the main dwelling.
  - e. Hipped roofs will surmount the garage.
  - f. The roof will be sheathed in architectural shingles to match the principle building.
3. West (facing street) Elevation
  - a. The northern portion of the elevation (28’0” in width) will be in advance of the southern portion (7’0” in width).
  - b. A “potting shed” (room) will be in advance the northern portion. It will be centrally located on the advanced portion of the elevation.
  - c. The aforementioned potting shed will feature a shed roof sheathed in either 5V crimp or standing seam metal.
  - d. A rolling, wood or aluminum clad barn door will access the potting shed.
  - e. The upper story on the northern portion will feature a group of three six-over-six aluminum clad windows.
  - f. The recessed portion of the elevation will feature a gallery 7’0” wide supported by wooden columns.
  - g. The first floor of the aforementioned portion will employ a paneled wooden, clad or metal door to access the first floor and stairwell. The second story will feature a wooden and glazed panel door to access the balcony.
4. South (side) Elevation
  - a. The potting shed (4’6” in depth) will inform the westernmost portion of the elevation.
  - b. A gallery (6’6” deep) will be constructed to access the first floor and stairwell.
  - c. A centrally located wall with no fenestration will be 14’0” in width.
  - d. A recessed portion measuring 5’0” will be on the eastern portion of the elevation.
  - e. The aforementioned portion will feature a six-over-six window on the upper story.
5. East (rear) Elevation
  - a. The southern portion of the rear elevation will be recessed from the remaining parts of the elevation. This portion measures 7’0” in width.

- b. The aforementioned portion will feature a six-over-six window.
  - c. The remaining portion of the elevation will feature an overhead garage door in aluminum clad or metal on the first story.
  - d. The upper story's fenestration is as follows from a southerly to northerly progression: one six-over-six window; one smaller sized six-over six window.
6. North (side) Elevation
- a. The potting shed will inform the westernmost portion of the north elevation and will be recessed from the remaining portions.
  - b. No fenestration will be employed on this elevation.

## STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the demolition of a later non-contributing ancillary structure and the construction of a new ancillary (garage).

With regard to the removal of the existing ancillary building, the same criteria by which Board reviews the demolition of principle buildings are taken into account. According to the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts, the considerations taken into account are as follows: architectural significance of the building, condition of the structure, impact on the street & the district, and nature of any proposed development (See B-1.). With regard to significance, the ancillary building is not of the same architectural importance and construction quality. Based on Sanborn Maps, the building was not constructed contemporaneously with the main building. In addition to the age, the detailing and materials caused it to not contribute to the architectural significance of the property and district. As to condition, the building is in need of repair. With regard to the impact on the streetscape and district, the building is located behind the main dwelling at the very rear of the lot. The building is not visible from the street and would not adversely impact the streetscape. If authorized demolition approval, a new ancillary building would be constructed. See the ensuing paragraph for the nature of the proposed redevelopment of the subject portion of the property.

The Design Review Guidelines state that new ancillary construction should be compatible with those in the district (See B-3.). New ancillary construction involves review of considerations: placement, scale, massing, façade elements, and materials so as to obtain compatibility between the new and the existing.

As to placement, the proposed new construction, a two story garage, would occupy a rear portion of the lot and would be located behind the main house on the existing footprint. Garages were constructed behind the front plane of residential buildings in general and for the subject property (See B-5.). The side setback of the garage will be inset from the existing garage's current setback and is permissible by the Historic District Overlay. The Historic District Overlay is a planning regulation authorizing (in certain cases) the employment of traditional setbacks within Midtown's four locally designated National Register Districts (Ashland Place being one). The aforementioned taken into account, the proposed building's placement is compatible with traditional ancillary construction.

Regarding scale and massing, the Design Review Guidelines state that new ancillary construction should be subordinate to the main building (See B - 4.). The proposed building's placement and footprint behind the main residence makes the building subordinate to the historic body of the main house (See B-2.). While the garage is two-story, the elevation (on grade construction), secondary use of the building, and location on the lot cause for the overall design to be compatible with the context. Many ancillary building of the period and style of the main residences construction featured two-story garage buildings.

Façade elements are crucial to compatibility of compatible ancillary construction. Box-like/rectilinear massing and hipped roof forms lend compatibility between the main house and the garage. With regard to



materials to be employed on ancillary construction, the Design Review Guidelines allow for composite materials if said materials appear similar in texture and finish of the original (See B-6.). Hardiplank siding will be employed on the walls. Roofing shingles will similarly match those surmounting the body of the house. The doors on the garage, both vehicular and pedestrian, would be metal or wood. In accord the Design Review Guidelines for ancillary construction, said doors would be painted and finished.

### **SUGGESTIONS**

1. Employ matching eaves and rafters on building to match those of the main house.
2. Sheath potting shed in architectural shingles.
3. Adjust fenestration sequence on rear elevation.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B(1-4), Staff does not believe the application as proposed will impair either the architectural or the historical character of the property or district. Staff recommends approval of the application.

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

**2018-34-CA: 310 and 312 South Broad Street**  
**Applicant: Mr. Douglas B. Kearley of DBK, Inc. on behalf of Mr. Mike Rogers**  
**Received: 9/14/2018**  
**Meeting: 10/3/2018**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden  
Classification: Non-Contributing  
Zoning: B-3  
Project: Rehabilitation Related: Alter fenestration and install canopy/awning.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to the 1904 Sanborn Maps, the site at 310 S. Broad was previously a one story residence and the site at 312 S. Broad was home to a two-story corner store. According to the nomination for the Oakleigh Garden historic district, the buildings date to circa 1970.

**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 appeared before the Architectural Review Board according to the MHDC vertical files. The proposed scope of work includes altering fenestration and façade changes.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “Locate a new storefront in the same plane as it was historically.”
  - 2. “Design a wall to be compatible with the architectural style of the house/building and existing walls in the district.”
  - 3. “When building a solid wall, use a finish and material that is similar in texture, mass, and durability to historic walls in the neighborhood.”
  - 4. “Visually connect the street and building.”
  - 5. “Where evidence does not exist, use a contemporary interpretation of a traditional storefront.”

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

- 1. Remove a later storefront on both 310 and 312 S. Broad Street.
  - a. 310 S. Broad Street
    - i. Remove cladding, door, windows, brick planter, and canopy.
  - b. 312 S. Broad Street
    - i. Remove windows and door.
- 2. Install new storefront and other façade improvements.
  - a. 310 S. Broad Street

- i. Install new storefront windows.
  - ii. Windows will flank new aluminum door centrally located on elevation.
  - iii. Install new metal awning using existing framing. Metal will be 5V crimp or standing seam.
  - iv. Refinish walls with synthetic stucco.
- b. 312 S. Broad Street
  - i. Install new storefront windows.
  - ii. Windows will flank centrally located double door.
  - iii. The aforementioned doors will be glazed and paneled wooden doors.
  - iv. Windows and doors will feature transom above.
  - v. Construct aluminum canopy over windows and doors. Canopy will be installed 10'0" above the sidewalk.
  - vi. Walls will be repaired with synthetic stucco.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the alteration of non-contributing ground floor storefronts. With regard to the work proposed to the storefront, the subject storefronts date from after the 1970's. Existing storefront, doors and windows will be removed. On 310 S. Broad Street, cladding would also be removed. The new storefront would be located in a same plan as historic examples (See B-3.). In terms of composition, windows will flank centrally located door or doors. Metal canopy would be installed over 312 S. Broad Street and a metal awning over 310 S. Broad Street. Both canopies and abat vents were historically used on commercial buildings. Said work would be complementary to historic patterns and not remove historic fabric. (See B-7).

**SUGGESTIONS**

- 1. Extend metal roof on 310 S. Broad and eliminate metal fascia.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B(1-3), Staff does not believe the application will impair either the architectural or the historical character of the property or district. Staff recommends approval of the application.

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

**2018-35-CA: Lot at corner of Caroline Avenue and Common Street**  
**Applicant: Mr. Steve May**  
**Received: 9/14/2018**  
**Meeting: 10/3/2018**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Relocation to the Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: N/A  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Relocation Related: Relocate historic residence from outside district to lot.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

The proposed location for single family residence located in a residential area of the Old Dauphin Way historic district. The building currently is in situ right outside of the district’s boundaries.

**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 not appeared before the Architectural Review Board according to the MHDC vertical files. The proposed scope of work is relocating a historic home located outside the district onto the property.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “Consider whether or not a structure will be relocated within the same district and in a similar context.”
  - 2. “Relocation may be more appropriate when the receiving site is in the district. Relocated buildings shall be placed in situations that do not impair the architecture of the historical character of the surround.”
  - 3. “When relocating a building, maintain its general placement and orientation on the new site so as to maintain the architectural and the historical character of the streetscape and district.”

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

- 1. Deconstruct and dismantle residence at 1107 Spring Hill Avenue outside a historic district.
  - A. Property would be carefully moved and relocated to Old Dauphin Way historic district.
  - B. Reassemble residence at lot bound by Caroline Avenue, Common Street, and Conti Street.
    - i. Building will be orientated to Common Street situated on corner lot.
    - ii. Applicant will return to apply for repairs to home.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

The application calls for the relocation of an existing residence into a historic district. The relocation would not impair the historical integrity of the residence. The applicant will appear at a later date with site plan showing the placement of the house on the subdivided lot and elevations to gain further approval.

A residence located at 1107 Springhill Avenue is threatened by demolition. The existing location is just outside of purview of the Architectural Review Board. The applicant would like to move the residence to a lot located in a mostly residential area of the Old Dauphin Way historic district. The residence is a wooden framed sidehall shotgun with wing. Original portions of the home would be relocated to the proposed site. The applicant would like to subdivide the lot and orient the house to face Common Street. The house would be adjacent to similar residential sidehall shotguns as seen on Caroline Avenue and Common Street, therefore blending in with the district (See B-2).

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B(1-2) Staff does not believe the application will impair either the architectural or the historical character of the property or district. Staff recommends conceptual approval of the application and for the applicant to return with site plan and construction drawings.