

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD AGENDA
September 19th 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 5, 2018.
3. Approval of MidMonth COAs Granted by Staff

B. MIDMONTH APPROVALS

1. **Applicant: Stimrad Investments, LLC**
 - a. Property Address: 959 Elmira Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/26/2018
 - c. Project: Replace and repair deteriorated wood to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Repair deteriorated wooden windows to match in dimension, profile and material. Repaint in the following color scheme: Body: Fort Conde Gray Beige; Columns, railing, window, brackets and door casing: Detonti Off White; Window Sashes: Summerville Red; Brick, Porch, Cheek Walls: Conti Street Beige; Caps on brick porch and cheek walls: Fort conde Gray/ Beige; and Porch Floor: either Conti Street Beige or Summerville Red.
2. **Applicant: C Coast Management, LLC**
 - a. Property Address: 220 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/28/2018
 - c. Project: Replace deteriorated tongue and groove on gallery to match. Repaint to match.
3. **Applicant: Atchison Properties**
 - a. Property Address: 1054 New St. Francis Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/30/2018
 - c. Project: Reroof with three tab shingles, repair rotten wood as necessary.
4. **Applicant: Golero, LLC**
 - a. Property Address: 1751 Old Shell Road
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/5/2018
 - c. Project: Install wooden wall sign to be painted bronze on northern wall.
5. **Applicant: Melissa Kyle**
 - a. Property Address: 906 Church Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/5/2018
 - c. Project: Repair/replace rotten wood to match original in materials, profile and dimension. Repaint body white, trim light green, replace front door per original (wood), reroof with tin 5 v-crimp.
6. **Applicant: Mario Saybe Construction**
 - a. Property Address: 261 Houston Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/6/2018
 - c. Project: Replace deteriorated wood around door to match in dimension, profile and material. Replace damaged window panes to match. Repaint to match existing.
7. **Applicant: Brenda Stanton**
 - a. Property Address: 7 N. Jackson Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/6/2018
 - c. Project: Repair dormer windows to match existing in dimension, profile and material. Repair gallery decking and support beams to match. Repaint all to match existing.

C. APPLICATIONS

- 1. 2018-27-CA: 705 Springhill Avenue (bound by Washington Avenue and Dauphin Street)**
 - a. Applicant: Douglas Kearley of DBK, Inc. on behalf of Wendell Quimby
 - b. Project: Renovation Related: Removal of wall to create courtyard; minor repairs; and installation of fence.
- 2. 2018-28-CA: 1004 Government Street**
 - a. Applicant: Ms. Kristin Granade and Ms. Nancy Granade
 - b. Project: Fenestration Related: Re-side over an existing window.
- 3. 2018-29-CA: 52 S. Julia Street**
 - a. Applicant: Mr. Kenneth O'Hanlon
 - b. Project: Construct fence 7' in height.
- 4. 2018-30-CA: 456 Chatham Street**
 - a. Applicant: Mr. Douglas Kearley of DBK, Inc. on behalf of Mr. Mike Rogers
 - b. Project: Rehabilitation Related: Repair/ replace to match existing; construct new rear deck; remove concrete steps and construct wooden steps.
- 5. 2018-31-CA: 1551 Springhill Avenue**
 - a. Applicant: Mark Colgazier of Colgazier Builders, Inc. on behalf of BSM, LLC
 - b. Project: Demolish a non-contributing building.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Next meeting will be held on October 3rd 2018.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2018-27-CA: 701-705 Springhill Avenue (bound by Washington Avenue, Springhill Avenue, and Dauphin Street)

Applicant: Mr. Douglas B. Kearley of DBK, Inc. on behalf of Mr. Wendell Quimby

Received: 8/29/2018

Meeting: 9/19/2018

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial
Classification: Contributing)
Zoning: T5.1
Project: Renovation Related: Removal of secondary wall to create courtyard; minor repairs; installation of fence.

BUILDING HISTORY

This multi-building complex occupies a triangular block. The building dates from 1946, with streamlined features.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the change...will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the district.”

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on November 19th, 2014 according to the MHDC vertical files. At that time approval for an ancillary deck was obtained. The proposed scope of work includes removal of a wall and creation of a courtyard.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Preserve elements, both structural and decorative, that contribute to a building’s historic character.” (Chapter 7)
 - 2. “Do not use theme designs that do not reflect the original character of the building or the district.”
 - 3. “Do not alter a building to appear older or younger than it is. Alter buildings to reflect the building’s period of significance.”
 - 4. “Preserve the key character-defining features of a historic commercial façade.” (Section 7.1)
 - 5. “If replacement of some material is required, use a material that is similar to that of the original.” (Section 7.8)
 - 6. “Preserve and repair the key character-defining features of a historic commercial roof.” (Section 7.9)
 - 7. “Preserve and repair an original detail or ornamentation on a historic commercial building.” (Section 7.18)

8. "Preserve the size and shape of an upper story window."
9. "Design a fence to be compatible with the architectural style of the house and existing fences in the neighborhood." (Section 10.2)
10. "Install a cast-iron or other metal fence not exceeding 48" in height if located in the front yard."
11. "Design a fence located behind the front building plane to not exceed 72" in height. If the subject property abuts a multi-family residential or commercial property, a fence up to 96" will be considered."
12. "Based on the chosen fence material, use proportions, heights, elements and levels of opacity similar to those of similar material and style seen in the historic district."

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

1. Conduct partial demolition (see demolition plan.)
 - a. Remove portion of roof.
 - b. Demolish wall constructed of plywood and overhead door on the South elevation perimeter parcel line. .
 - c. High roof, windows, and columns will remain as indicated.
2. Conduct repairs.
 - a. Apply sand finished stucco to walls.
 - b. Repair existing clerestory windows.
 - c. Remove concrete slab and install pavers.
3. South (façade) Elevation (facing Dauphin Street)
 - a. Construct 5' 0" high metal picketed fence along the perimeter of the Southern lot line, beginning at a western wall and terminating at an eastern wall.
 - b. A pair of 5'0" in width gates will access the courtyard.
 - c. The wall on the eastern portion of the elevation will be punctuated by one multi-paned steel casement window.
 - d. The upperstory of the eastern portion of the elevation will be punctuated by new aluminum clad windows to match existing clerestory windows in configuration and dimension.
 - e. A set of three wooden French doors with single lite transom will be installed along a new wall.
 - i. The doors will be equidistant from one another.
 - ii. The doors will measure 2'6" in width by 7'0" in height.
 - iii. The doors will match those existing on the East courtyard elevation.
 - f. West (a side, courtyard) Elevation
 - i. The West Elevation will feature two French doors with transoms.
 - ii. Existing clerestory windows will remain.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The application proposes minor repairs, removing a later wall, and construction of courtyard. The wall being proposed to be removed is constructed of plywood with an overhead door. It is not original to the building nor does it fall within the period of significance of the Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District. The Design Review Guidelines state that elements which contribute to the historic integrity of the building be preserved (See B-1). A roof will also be removed to allow for construction of an open courtyard. The roof is not visible from the street and does not lend to the character of the building (See B-6).

Materials and elements including clerestory windows will be repaired (See B-8). Although not seen from public view currently, the clerestory windows are a defining feature of this 1940's building. The walls will be stuccoed with a sand finish.

New elements will be constructed. Upper story aluminum clad windows will be installed on the eastern portion of the South elevation. These windows will match the configuration of the existing clerestory windows. Aluminum clad is an acceptable material for new windows in historic districts. Below the upper story windows will be a re-purposed steel casement window. French doors will be installed along the South elevation on the interior courtyard wall. Doors are compatible with the district (See B-2) and constructed of approvable materials. A set of French doors will also be installed on the West elevation in the courtyard.

A metal picketed fence will be installed on the southern perimeter of the parcel and allow views into the courtyard. The fence will be 5'0" in height as is allowed behind the primary façade of the building (See B-11). It will feature a pair of gates to allow for access into the courtyard. Metal fences are utilized though out the Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District to screen lots (See B-12).

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

2018-28-CA: 1004 Government Street
Applicant: Ms. Kristin Granade and Ms. Nancy Grenade
Received: 8/31/2018
Meeting: 9/19/2018

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing (Main Building)
Zoning: B-1
Project: Fenestration Related: Reside over an existing window.

BUILDING HISTORY

This house is known as the Kearney House. This residence dates to 1869, with significant changes circa 1910 designed by George B. Rogers. . The original building was rectangular in plan with an extended rear wing. The alterations were constructed in the Neo-Classical style, as evident by the full height Corinthian columns.

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 siding over a window on a secondary elevation.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Deteriorated architectural features shall be repaired rather than replaced, wherever possible. In the event replacement is necessary, the new material should match the material being replaced in physical character and durability. Composition, design, color, texture, and other visual qualities should appear similar to the original material. Repair or replacement of missing architectural features should be based on accurate duplications of features, substantiated by historic, physical or pictorial evidence.” (Chapter 5)
 - 2. “Preserve the key historic walls of a building.”
 - 3. “Maintain significant historic façades in their original form.”
 - 4. “Maintain historic façade elements.”
 - 5. “Pay special attention to maintaining the historic appearance of building walls of corner buildings.”
 - 6. “Repair deteriorated building materials by patching, piecing-in, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing the material.” (Section 5.4)
 - 7. “Remove only those materials which are deteriorated, and beyond reasonable repair.”
 - 8. “Use original materials to replace damaged materials on primary surfaces where possible.”(Section 5.6)

9. "The type, size, framing, and dividing lights of windows, as well as their location and configuration (rhythm), help establish the historic character of a building. Original window components should be retained to the extent possible. The character-defining features of a window should be preserved. Historic windows can be repaired through re-glazing and patching and splicing wood elements such as muntins, frame sill and casing. Repair and weatherization is generally more energy efficient and less expensive than replacement. Windows should be in character with the historic building."
10. "For most contributing properties in historic districts, the windows that are on the front elevation and those on the sidewalls that are visible from the street will be the most important to preserve. Windows in other locations that have distinctive designs and that represent fine craftsmanship may also be important to preserve."
11. "Where historic (wooden or metal) windows are intact and in repairable condition, retain and repair them to match the existing as per location, light configuration, detail and material." (Section 5.20)
12. "Preserve historic window features, including the frame, sash, muntins, mullions, glazing, sills, heads, jambs, moldings, operation, and groupings of windows."
13. "Repair, rather than replace, frames and sashes, wherever possible."
14. "For repair of window components, epoxies and related products may serve as effective solutions to material deterioration and operational malfunction."
15. "When historic windows are not in a repairable condition, match the replacement window design to the original." (Section 5.21)
16. "In instances where there is a request to replace a building's windows, the new windows shall match the existing as per location, framing, and light configuration."
17. "Use any salvageable window components on a primary elevation."
18. "ACCEPTABLE WINDOW MATERIALS: 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. Remove rectangular diamond pane window on a secondary façade facing Common Street. .
2. Feather in lapsiding to match existing.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application concerns the removal of a rectangular diamond pane window on a façade elevation of a corner lot. The window is not being utilized in the interior space of the building, and the owners would like feather in siding to match the house. When reviewing alterations to fenestration historic significance and location of the feature are taken into account. .

The house dates back to the mid-19th century with major alterations occurring in 1910-1914. Alterations over those years transformed the house from antebellum, to Victorian, and into the turn of the century Neo-Classical revival style present today. The diamond shape of the window panes was widely used in the Revival architectural styles such as Tudor Revival and Dutch Colonial, which spanned from the late 1800's until the early 1940's (See B-10). These styles were most popular from 1900-1930.

For contributing properties, those elements on the visible primary and side walls are most important to preserve (See B-10). The window is located on the upperstory of a secondary façade which abuts

Common Street. The window is in a deteriorated state. Wood has rotted and panes need to be replaced. The window has an intricate design and is constructed of materials that can be repaired or replaced (See B-10 and See B-1). Other preservation tools can be employed to repair the window, such as epoxy (See B-13).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B(1-10), Staff does believe the application as proposed will impair either the architectural or the historical character of the property or district. Staff recommends denial of the application as proposed but welcomes any recommendations from the Board.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2018-29-CA: 52 S. Julia Street
Applicant: Mr. Kenneth O’Hanlon
Received: 9/4/2018
Meeting: 9/19/2018

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct a fence 7’ in height.

BUILDING HISTORY

This church on this property dates to 1953. Previously it had been located on St. Francis Street from 1862-1953. The ancillary building dates from the 1950’s. The ancillary building has undergone several alterations and renovations in the 1980’s and 1990’s.

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 on October 4, 1998 according to the MHDC vertical files. At that time the Board denied a request to modify previously approved plans to which that was under construction per the submitted sketches. The proposed scope of work includes constructing a fence 7’ in height.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Fences and low walls are character-defining features of many properties in Mobile’s historic districts. A historic fence, wall or gate should be preserved. A new fence, wall or gate should be compatible with the architectural style of the primary building and these same elements on other properties in the district.” (Section 10)
 - 2. “Design a fence to be compatible with the architectural style of the house and existing fences in the neighborhood.” (Section 10.2)
 - 3. Pertaining to rear and non-corner side fences behind the front building plane “Design a fence located behind the front building plane to not exceed 72” in height. If the subject property abuts a multi-family residential or commercial property, a fence up to 96” will be considered.”
 - 4. “An alternative fence material with proven durability, matte finish and an accurate scale and proportion of components is acceptable. A simple wood-and-wire fence is acceptable provided it is appropriate to the style of the house.”

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

1. Construct wooden dogeared fence 7' in height.
 - a. Fence will be stained a dark color to match wrought iron fence.
 - b. Fence will run along the southern and northern perimeter of the property.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application entails the installation of fencing. The Design Review Guidelines state that fencing should be compatible with the character of the house and existing fences in the district (See B-1). Several examples of stained wooden fences can be cited within the district and have been approved in recent years.

In regards to the height of the fence, as proposed it exceeds the Design Review Guidelines which state fences behind of the front plane of residential properties can be up to 6' in height. The Guidelines go on further to state if the property abuts a multi-family or commercial property, a fence can be constructed up to 8' in height (See B-3). The property is located in a residential area and does not abut a multi-family or commercial property on either the north or south perimeter lot lines.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B(1-3), Staff does believe the application will impair either the architectural or the historical character of the property or district. Staff recommends denial of the application and notes in July 2017 a similar application for a fence was denied by the Board.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2018-30-CA: 456 Chatham Street
Applicant: Mr. Douglas B. Kearley of DBK, Inc. on behalf of Mr. Mike Rogers
Received: 9/5/2018
Meeting: 9/19/2018

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Rehabilitation Related: Repair/replace to match existing; construct new deck; remove concrete steps and construct wooden steps.

BUILDING HISTORY

This Victorian house was constructed by Charles Griffin, a carpenter, in 1874. He also constructed the two properties adjacent to 456 Chatham. This wood frame dwelling features a recessed porch with turned posts and brackets.

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 relates to the rehabilitation of the building, including repair and replacement to match materials in kind; construction of a new rear deck; and constructing wooden steps.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Deteriorated architectural features shall be repaired rather than replaced, wherever possible. In the event replacement is necessary, the new material should match the material being replaced in physical character and durability. Composition, design, color, texture, and other visual qualities should appear similar to the original material. Repair or replacement of missing architectural features should be based on accurate duplications of features, substantiated by historic, physical or pictorial evidence.” (Chapter 5)
 - 2. “Remove only those materials which are deteriorated, and beyond reasonable repair.”
 - 3. “Use original materials to replace damaged materials on primary surfaces where possible.”(Section 5.6)
 - 4. “Use new roof materials that convey a scale and texture similar to those used traditionally.” (Section 5.13)
 - 5. Pertaining to roofs: “Muted grays and black are generally acceptable shingle colors.”
 - 6. “The type, size, framing, and dividing lights of windows, as well as their location and configuration (rhythm), help establish the historic character of a building. Original window components should be retained to the extent possible. The character-defining

features of a window should be preserved. Historic windows can be repaired through re-glazing and patching and splicing wood elements such as muntins, frame sill and casing. Repair and weatherization is generally more energy efficient and less expensive than replacement. Windows should be in character with the historic building.”

7. “For most contributing properties in historic districts, the windows that are on the front elevation and those on the sidewalls that are visible from the street will be the most important to preserve. Windows in other locations that have distinctive designs and that represent fine craftsmanship may also be important to preserve.”
8. “Original doors and openings, including their dimensions, should be retained along with any moldings, transoms or sidelights.” (Section 5.14)
9. “Preserve historic stylistic and architectural details and ornamentation.” (Section 5.17)
10. “Preserve storefronts, cornices, turned columns, brackets, exposed rafter tails, jigsaw ornaments and other key architectural features that are in good condition.”
11. “Where historic (wooden or metal) windows are intact and in repairable condition, retain and repair them to match the existing as per location, light configuration, detail and material. “ (Section 5.20)
12. “Preserve historic window features, including the frame, sash, muntins, mullions, glazing, sills, heads, jambs, moldings, operation, and groupings of windows.”
13. “Repair, rather than replace, frames and sashes, wherever possible.”
14. “For repair of window components, epoxies and related products may serve as effective solutions to material deterioration and operational malfunction.”
15. “When historic windows are not in a repairable condition, match the replacement window design to the original.” (Section 5.21)
16. “In instances where there is a request to replace a building’s windows, the new windows shall match the existing as per location, framing, and light configuration.”
17. “Match the foundation height of a porch addition to that of the existing historic structure.” (Section 6.18)
18. “Do not use a contemporary deck railing for a porch addition placed at a location visible from the public street.”
19. “Maintain or install a walkway leading directly from the sidewalk to the main building entry.” (Section 10.5)
20. “Maintain the existing width of neighboring sidewalks.” (Section 10.6)

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

1. Conduct repairs to the residence.
 - a. Reroof the house with asphalt shingles in neutral color.
 - b. Install metal drip edge. .
 - c. Repair existing gable shingles to match in dimension, profile, and material.
 - d. Repair and replace wood elements including turned posts, brackets, siding, fascia, soffits, and decking to match as per profile, dimension and material.
 - e. Repair when necessary wooden windows to match existing as per material, light configurations and moldings.
 - f. Repair foundation piers and install new fill between piers.
 - g. Wood framed lattice fill between piers will match that existing.
 - h. East (Front Façade) Elevation
 - i. Remove existing concrete steps.
 - ii. Install wooden step and handrail.
 - iii. Install new handrail.
 - i. South (Side) Elevation

- i. Remove existing six-over-six window and feather in siding. Window will be repurposed on rear elevation.
 - j. West (rear) Elevation
 - i. Remove concrete steps.
 - ii. On southern portion of elevation remove an existing six-over-six window and install a six-over-six window relocated from the South elevation.
- 2. Construct a wooden deck.
 - a. The deck will extend from the rear elevation.
 - b. The deck will be constructed of wood.
 - c. The deck will take the form of a platform.
 - d. A set of wooden steps will access the deck.
- 3. Conduct site improvements.
 - a. Install a gravel drive 8' in width on the northern portion of the lot accessing the street.
 - b. Remove previous sidewalk.
 - c. Pour new concrete sidewalk to access the front entrance.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The application calls for the rehabilitation of an existing residence. Repair and replacement of in kind materials also informs the scope of work. Fenestration would be modified and site conditions minimally altered. All of the aforementioned alterations would not impair the historical integrity of the residence.

In accordance with the Design Review Guidelines, all repair and replacement work will match the original in profile, dimension and material (See B-1.) The roof will be re-sheathed with asphalt shingles in a neutral hue (See B-4). Wooden elements will be replaced to match in dimension, profile and material (See B 6 and B-10). Brick piers will be re-pointed and repaired rather than replaced.

Fenestration changes are minimal to the building and are located on either a secondary elevation or at the rear of the residence. One window located on the South (side) elevation will be relocated and siding will be feathered in (See B-6). The West (Rear) Elevation will have an existing window removed and replaced by the aforementioned window. The fenestration pattern will still maintain the rhythm established on the elevations.

As per the site improvements, a new deck, sidewalk and driveway will be constructed. The deck will take form of a wooden platform with steps. The deck will be located off the rear elevation and out of public view (See B- 18). The concrete sidewalk will be installed and connect the front entrance to the right of way (See B-19). A gravel drive will be installed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B(1-6) 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 as proposed.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2018-31-CA: 1551 Springhill Avenue
Applicant: Mr. Mark Colgazier of Colgazier Builders, Inc. on behalf of BSM, LLC
Received: 8/28/2018
Meeting: 9/19/2018

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-contributing
Zoning: B-2
Project: Demolish a non-contributing building.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this building was constructed in the latter half of the 20th century.

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 August 27, 2007 according to the MHDC vertical files. At that time the Board denied an application to install pipe railings on the property. However, the Board and applicant agreed to the installation of bollards at the front of the building. The proposed scope of work includes demolition of the non-contributing building.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part: With regards to demolition, the Guidelines read as follows: “Proposed demolition of a building must be brought before the Board for consideration. The Board may deny a demolition request if the building’s loss will impair the historic integrity of the district.” However, our ordinance mirrors the Mobile City Code, see §44-79, which sets forth the following standard of review and required findings for the demolition of historic structures:
 - 1. *Required findings; demolition/relocation.* The Board shall not grant certificates of appropriateness for the demolition or relocation of any property within a historic district unless the Board finds that the removal or relocation of such building will not be detrimental to the historical or architectural character of the district. In making this determination, the Board shall consider:
 - i. The historic or architectural significance of the structure;
 - 1. This property was built in the latter half of the 20th century. This building is listed as a non-contributing structure in the Old Dauphin Way District. It holds neither architectural merit nor historical significance.
 - ii. 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 adds to the built density of the Old Dauphin Way Historic District and Springhill Avenue, it does not contribute to either the architectural or historical character of neighborhood or streetscape.
 - iii. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
 1. The building materials are capable of being reproduced or acquired.
 - iv. Whether the structure is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood, the county, or the region or is a good example of its type, or is part of an ensemble of historic buildings creating a neighborhood;
 1. This building is not an example of a particular style and does contribute to the historic aesthetic of the neighborhood or street.
 - 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 building would be demolished, and debris would be removed.
 - vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 1. The date the current owner acquired the property is 1970.
 - vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 1. N.A.
 - viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 1. The property has been for sale since January of 2013 with an asking price of \$250,000.
 - 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. N.A.
 - 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 site plan):

1. Demolish a non-contributing building.
2. Remove debris.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application concerns the demolition of an building which is listed as a non-contributing building in the Old Dauphin Way National Register Historic District. When reviewing demolition applications, the Board takes into the account the following considerations: the architectural significance of the building; the condition of the building; the impact the demolition will have on the streetscape; and the nature of any proposed redevelopment.

The building at 1551 Springhill Avenue is a non-contributing building located within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The building is not an example of any notable architectural typology or style.

This brick building which formerly housed a radio station is currently in a deteriorated state. Some of the buildings components are in repairable condition. However, there are issues with mold and the site.

While building contributes to the built density and rhythmic sequencing of the landscape, it does not lend to historic character or physical experience of Springhill Avenue. Located on corner lot, the building is viewed from both Catherine Street and .Springhill Avenue.

If granted demolition approval, the building would be demolished and debris would be removedso that the lot could be sold.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B(1-iii) and B(1-x), Staff does believe the application will impair either the architectural or the historical character of the property or district. Staff recommends holding over the application until redevelopment plans are presented, or denial.