

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD AGENDA
September 18, 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: Archdiocese of Mobile

- a. Property Address: 2 (or 4 according some listings) South Claiborne Street
- b. Date of Approval: 8/28/13
- c. Project: Reroof the building to match the existing

2. Applicant: Clyde Roland

- a. Property Address: 201 South Catherine Street
- b. Date of Approval: 8/29/13
- c. Project: Repair deteriorated decking and woodwork to match the existing in type, material, and dimension. Touch up the work per the existing.

3. Applicant: George Baird for John Klotz

- a. Property Address: 959 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 8/29/13
- c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint per the existing color scheme.

4. Applicant: Russ Pritchard

- a. Property Address: 1011 Church Street
- b. Date of Approval: 9/3/13
- c. Project: This COA clarifies COA of 2 August. Owners have approval to remove rot wooden on shed and replace studs and tin roof.

5. Applicant: Arby's

- a. Property Address: 659 Government Street
- b. Date of Approval: 9/3/13
- c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork and wall facings to match the existing. Repaint the building per the submitted Sherwin Williams color scheme. The body will be dark tan, trim will be red, other portions of the trim will be off white and light tan.

6. Applicant: Joseph E. Ringhoffer

- a. Property Address: 1211 Government Street
- b. Date of Approval: 9/4/13
- c. Project: Install an aluminum vehicular gate accessing the property's rear lot.

7. Applicant: Marcio Simao

- a. Property Address: 251 Roper Street
- b. Date of Approval: 9/5/13
- c. Project: Reroof the house with architectural shingles. Replace decking if necessary.

8. Applicant: Nathaniel Walker, Jr.

- a. Property Address: 162 South Warren Street
- b. Date of Approval: 9/5/13
- c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Touch up the paint per the existing color scheme.

9. Applicant: Belinda Bodie with Neel-Schaffer

- a. Property Address: 301 Conti Street
- b. Date of Approval: 9/9/13
- c. Project: Install three additional antenna and on mechanical box atop the existing mechanical platform.

10. Applicant: Keith Jarvis

- a. Property Address: 1060 Caroline Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 9/9/13
- c. Project: Repaint the trim, etc... white. Repaint the rear woodwork and windows to match the brick.

11. Applicant: ArtCraft for the A & M Peanut Shop

- a. Property Address: 209 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 9/9/13
- c. Project: Replace a canvas awning. The existing awning armature will be reused.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2013-CA-70: 101 Dauphin Street and 16 South Royal Street

- a. Applicant: Tracy Bassett with Goodwyn, Mills & Cawood for the Retirement Systems of Alabama
- b. Project: Restoration and New Construction -Reconstruct the historic cornice atop 101 Dauphin Street. Construct infill at the site of 16 South Royal Street

2. 2013-CA-71: 1058 Texas Street

- a. Applicant: City of Mobile, Architectural Engineering for Mooring Tax Asset Group
- b. Project: Demolition – Demolish a condemned residential building.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

- 1. Discussion

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2013-70-CA: 101 Dauphin Street and 16 South Royal Street
Applicant: Tracy Bassett with Goodwyn, Mills & Cawood for the Retirement Systems of Alabama
Received: 9/3/13
Meeting: 9/18/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Contributing and Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Restoration and New Construction - Reconstruct the historic cornice atop 101 Dauphin Street. Construct infill at the site of 16 South Royal Street.

BUILDING HISTORY

The Van Antwerp Building (101 Dauphin Street) is Mobile's first skyscraper. The building was built between 1904 and 1906 according to the designs of George B. Rogers. The three part division of the building demarcated by the commercial ground floor mezzanine, the office stack above, and the cornice-capped (removed) utility floor is indicative of Rogers' awareness of contemporary theories on the design of tall office buildings.

The northern portion of 16 South Royal Street was occupied by the remains of the Festorazzi Building. The building was remodeled several times over the course of the 20th Century. The inner lot buildings and their appendages dated from 1901 or later. All the buildings comprised the rear portions of the Van Antwerp complex. The site is vacant.

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. 101 Dauphin Street last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on May 1, 2013. At that time, the Board approved the replacement of windows. 16 South Royal Street last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on February 20, 2013. At that time, the Board approved the demolition of the deteriorated buildings occupying the site. The application up for review calls for the reconstruction of the cornice atop 101 Dauphin Street and construction of infill on the site of 16 South Royal Street.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation and the Guidelines for New Commercial Construction in Mobile's Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 1. "Replacement of existing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence."

2. “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 building or the district.”
3. “New construction should reference the massing of forms of nearby buildings.
4. “The choice of materials and ornamentation for new construction is a good way for a new building to exert its own identity. By using historic examples as a point of departure, it is impossible for new construction to use new materials and ornamentation and still fit into the historic district.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

1. Reconstruct the cornice atop 101 Dauphin Street based on surviving pieces and photographs.
2. Construct metal screen wall at 16 South Royal Street.
 - a. The two-story screen wall will feature a centrally located vehicular entrance accessed by way of curbcut.
 - b. The perforated screen wall will feature two bands of imagery. One band will depict the Mobile skyline in 1909 and the second will picture the skyline as of the present year.
 - c. A cornice will surmount the façade.
 - d. The screen will front upper-story meeting room.
 - e. The meeting room will feature a glazed east-facing wall with two doors accessing the balcony.
 - f. The aforementioned balcony will be located by the screen wall.
 - g. An exterior staircase (located behind the screen wall), parking spaces, and other service related fixtures will be located within the rear portion of the lot.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application concerns the ongoing restoration and renovation of the Van Antwerp Building complex. Comprised of 101 Dauphin Street (the Van Antwerp Tower) and 16 South Royal Street (the site of the feed store and warehouse), the two part application concerns the reconstruction of a historic cornice atop the former and the construction of infill at the later.

In accord with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation, the reconstruction of the historic cornice is substantiated by physical, documentary, and physical evidence (See B-1). Following the removal of the cornice by City order in the 1950s, the remains were removed to a family property and used to infill a gulley. The RSA’s architects accessed the gulley and borrowed pieces possessed by Van Antwerp descendants, in order to rec sample sections of the cornice. Accurate reconstruction of the cornice was aided by precise photographs made shortly after the completion of the building.

As per the construction at the site of 16 South Royal Street, the demolition approval of the earlier buildings required either the reconstruction of the street front façade or the construction of a board approved alternative. This application, a proposal calling for the construction of a screen wall, adopts the latter form of redevelopment. Taking the form of a planar façade overlaid with imagery, the screen wall would be perforated stainless steel in construction and surmounted by a cornice. Serving to shield the service areas required by the renovated skyscraper from public view, the ground level behind the screen wall will be accessed by way of a centrally located vehicular entrance. An upper level balcony, located behind an operable portion of the screen wall, will front a meeting room. In accord with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, the placement, height, and cornice of the screen wall complement nearby historic buildings, while the materials and treatment serve to differentiate the old from the new (See B-2-4).

The imagery on the screen wall is permanent in nature and integral to the design of the proposed new construction. It neither obscures architectural features, nor requires repainting.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1), Staff does not believe the reconstruction of the historic cornice will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district. Staff recommends approval of the aforementioned portion of the application.

Based on B (2-4), Staff does not believe construction of the screen wall and service area will impair the architectural or the historical character of the district. Staff recommends approval of the infill construction.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2013-71-CA: 1058 Texas Street
Applicant: City of Mobile (Architectural Engineering) for Mooring Asset Group
Received: 9/3/13
Meeting: 9/18/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Demolition – Demolish a condemned residential building.

BUILDING HISTORY

958 and its twin 956 Texas Street were constructed in 1912. Both houses feature rafter tails, all encompassing hipped roofs, and other Arts & Crafts inspired elements.

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 house was set afire by arson in 2008. Since that time the house has been boarded up and mothballed. Condemned by the City, the house is proposed for demolition.
- 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 Arts & Crafts inspired house is a contributing building in the Oakleigh Garden District. The dwelling and the adjoining property to the east (its twin) were constructed for rental purposes in 1912.
 - ii. The importance of the structures to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;

1. The fire-damaged dwelling contributes to the built density, rhythmic spacing, and traditional façade line, of the streetscape and overall integrity of the district.
 - iii. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
 1. The building materials are capable of being reproduced.
 - iv. Whether the structure is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood, the county, or the region or is a good example of its type, or is part of an ensemble of historic buildings creating a neighborhood;
 1. This house type, a rectangular block with a corner porch and all encompassing hipped roof, can be found in and around several of Mobile’s historic districts.
 - 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 fire damaged house would be demolished, debris would be removed, and the site would be leveled.
 - vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 1. Not provided. The house is being proposed for demolition by the City of Mobile. The property has been condemned by the City and marketed for sale by the Neighborhood Renewal Project.
 - vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 1. The property has not been maintained by the owners. It has been condemned by the City of Mobile. Despite efforts to sell the property, no alternative options have proved feasible.
 - viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 1. The Neighborhood Renewal Project marketed the property. No offers ensued.
 - ix. Description of the options currently held for the purchase of such property, including the price received for such option, the conditions placed upon such option and the date of expiration of such option;
 1. N.A.
 - x. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
 1. N.A.
 - xi. Financial proof of the ability to complete the replacement project, which may include but not be limited to a performance bond, a letter of credit, a trust for completion of improvements, or a letter of commitment from a financial institution.
 1. 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 plan):
1. Demolish a contributing residential building.
 2. Level the lot.

3. Plant grass.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the demolition of a fire damaged residential building. Demolition applications entail the review of the following concerns: the architectural significance of the building; the effect of the demolition on the streetscape and surrounding district; the condition of the building; and the nature of the proposed development.

The building is a contributing residential structure located within the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. Constructed as a rental dwelling, the house has a twin on the adjacent property to the east. Other examples of the building typology, a rectangular dwelling with a corner porch and Arts & Crafts details, are located in and around the historic districts.

Situated in plan with the traditional façade line (to the east), this building contributes to the architectural character, built density, and rhythmic spacing that typify the historic integrity of the historic district.

A 2011 fire gutted the interior and rear elevation of this house.

The property has been listed for sale. No offers ensued. If granted demolition approval, the City of Mobile would demolish the deteriorating building, remove the debris, and level the lot.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff believes this application will impair the architectural and historical character of the building and the district, but taking into account the condition of the building, the effect the continued deterioration of the building is having on the district, and the efforts to sell the property, Staff recommends approval of the demolition request.