

CITY OF MOBILE
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

Minutes of the Meeting
July 25, 2005

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. by Chair Cindy Klotz.

Ed Hooker, MHDC Architectural Engineer, called the roll as follows:

Members Present: Douglas Kearley, David Tharp, Bunky Ralph, Harris Oswalt, Cindy Klotz, Tilmon Brown, Cameron Pfeiffer.

Members Absent: Lynda Burkett, Michael Mayberry, Robert Brown, Joe Sackett.

Staff Members Present: Ed Hooker, Anne Crutcher, Devereaux Bemis, Wanda Cochran.

<u>In Attendance</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Item Number</u>
Lucy Barr	109 Levert Ave.	060-04/05-CA
Dennis Carlisle	1119 Church St.	073-04/05-CA
Joe Basenberg	207 Rapier Ave.	071-04/05-CA
Hubert H. Stokes	2201 O'Connor	072-04/05-CA
Robin Roach	1119 Church St.	073-04/05-CA

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Douglas Kearley moved that the minutes of the June 27, 2005 meeting be approved as emailed with the following correction: Jim Wagoner was present as a Board participant. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and approved.

APPROVAL OF THE MID-MONTH CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS

Douglas Kearley moved to approve the mid-month Certificates of Appropriateness. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and approved.

MID-MONTH APPROVALS

1. Applicant's Name: Doty Lowe/Joe Arrington Construction
Property Address: 263 Stocking Street
Date of Approval: 6/13/05 asc
Work Approved: repair fire damage at rear of house. New wood to match existing in dimension and profile; paint new materials to match existing.
2. Applicant's Name: Jamie and Sydney Betbeze
Property Address: 304 North Claiborne Street
Date of Approval: 6/14/05 weh
Work Approved: Repaint house in existing color scheme. Repair/replace rotten wood with materials matching existing in profile and dimension.
3. Applicant's Name: Tuan Titlestad
Property Address: 1506 Old Shell Road

- Date of Approval: 6/14/05 weh
Work Approved: Repaint house in following Sherwin Williams colors:
Body – Birdseye Maple
Trim – Weathered Shingle
Accent – Roycroft Vellum
Replace rotten wood as necessary with materials matching existing in profile and dimension.
4. Applicant's Name: Rob Wallace
Property Address: 1562 Blair Avenue
Date of Approval: 6/14/05 weh
Work Approved: Install intermediate piers under porch. Repair rotten wood on front porch with materials matching existing in profile and dimension.
5. Applicant's Name: Forrest Raley and Penny Pickering
Property Address: 1556 Blair Avenue
Date of Approval: 6/14/05 weh
Work Approved: Construct low wood deck at rear of house as per submitted plans. Railing to match front porch of residence. Wood left natural to weather.
6. Applicant's Name: Historic Mobile Preservation Society
Property Address: 1115 Palmetto Street
Date of Approval: 6/15/05 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof Cox-Deasy House with 5 v-crimp metal roofing, silver in color.
7. Applicant's Name: Ralph Reynolds Roofing
Property Address: 559 Church Street
Date of Approval: 6/16/05 weh
Work Approved: Repair roof with materials matching existing in profile, dimension and color.
8. Applicant's Name: Thomas Home Repair and Construction
Property Address: 1400 Church Street
Date of Approval: 6/16/05 asc
Work Approved: Re-roof building with 3 tab fiberglass shingles, gray in color.
9. Applicant's Name: Chateau Oaks Apartments
Property Address: 1621 Springhill Avenue
Date of Approval: 6/16/05 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof building with 3 tab fiberglass shingles, gray in color.
10. Applicant's Name: Lafayette Plaza Hotel
Property Address: 301 Government Street
Date of Approval: 6/16/05 weh
Work Approved: repair building to match existing in materials, profile and dimension. Paint the building in the following Sherwin Williams Colors: lower 3 story section to be painted

Interactive Cream, SW6113; paint the tower Biscuit SW 6112; paint trim off-white.

11. Applicant's Name: Michael J. Brown
Property Address: 351 McDonald Avenue
Date of Approval: 6/17/05 weh
Work Approved: replace roof with dimensional asphalt shingles, charcoal in color.
12. Applicant's Name: Bill Majure
Property Address: 1107 Savannah Street
Date of Approval: 6/17/05 jdb
Work Approved: Repair rotten wood matching the existing in materials, profile and dimension. Paint in the existing color scheme.
13. Applicant's Name: Krista Reynolds
Property Address: 1203 New St. Francis Street
Date of Approval: 6/20/05 weh
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary to match existing in profile, material and dimension. Repaint house in the existing color scheme.
14. Applicant's Name: Stauter Construction Company
Property Address: 251 Marine Street
Date of Approval: 6/21/05 jdb
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary to match existing in material, profile and dimension.
15. Applicant's Name: Building and Maintenance Company
Property Address: 221 S. Dearborn Street
Date of Approval: 6/21/05 kfm
Work Approved: Re-paint porch in existing gray color scheme.
16. Applicant's Name: Richard Williams
Property Address: 1259 Selma Street
Date of Approval: 6/21/05 jdb
Work Approved: Re-roof house with shingles to match existing in profile, dimension and color.
17. Applicant's Name: Ralph Reynolds Roofing
Property Address: 508 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 6/22/05 jdb
Work Approved: Replace built-up flat roof.
18. Applicant's Name: Sean McFadden
Property Address: 1564 Eslava Street
Date of Approval: 6/23/05 jdb
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary to match existing in material, profile and dimension.

19. Applicant's Name: Pete's Home Improvement and Foundations
Property Address: 202 South Catherine
Date of Approval: 6/23/05 jss
Work Approved: Repair foundation as necessary. Repairs are not visible from the exterior.
20. Applicant's Name: Ted Pitsios
Property Address: 258 North Claiborne Street
Date of Approval: 6/23/05 jdb
Work Approved: Roof building with timberline shingles, slate blend in color. Paint stucco body light yellow as per sample, trim white.
21. Applicant's Name: Roger Wettlaufer
Property Address: 300 Rapier Avenue
Date of Approval: 6/24/05 jss
Work Approved: Jack house, place concrete pilings under original brick footings.
22. Applicant's Name: Amanda Wells
Property Address: 200 Dexter Avenue
Date of Approval: 7/12/05 weh
Work Approved: Remove existing deck and rear door. Install new deck, door and rain hood. Enclose open porch at second floor with lattice and wood window to match existing, all as per submitted plans.
23. Applicant's Name: Kenneth Blackwell Enterprises, LLC
Property Address: 208 State Street
Date of Approval: 6/27/05 weh
Work Approved: Repair roof with materials to match existing in material, profile, color and dimension.
24. Applicant's Name: Warren and Jaqueline Carmichael
Property Address: 256 South Cedar Street
Date of Approval: 6/27/05 weh
Work Approved: Pour footings for patio and level slab using river rock as per submitted sample.
25. Applicant's Name: John and Deana Howell
Property Address: 55 North Monterey Street
Date of Approval: 6/27/05 jdb
Work Approved: Repaint house to match existing color scheme.
26. Applicant's Name: Paul Morris
Property Address: 114 South Ann Street
Date of Approval: 6/28/05 asc
Work Approved: Repaint house in the following color scheme:
Trim – White
Body – DD152 Macaroni (pale yellow)

27. Applicant's Name: Dixie M Carlson and/or Alver A. Carlson
Property Address: 1653 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 6/29/05 asc
Work Approved: This COA replaces COA dated 6/29/04
Replace deteriorated siding with materials matching existing in profile and dimension. Repair/replace porch flooring with materials matching existing in profile and dimension. Repair windows with materials matching in profile and dimension. Repair sills as necessary. Repair and/or replace handrails and columns with materials matching existing in profile and dimension. Prep house for painting. Colors to be submitted at a later date.
28. Applicant's Name: Cotton Capers
Property Address: 1302 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 6/29/05 asc
Work Approved: Repaint building with Sherwin Williams, Nomadic Desert (light tan). Repaint logos to match existing.
29. Applicant's Name: Kenneth and Barbara Merrill
Property Address: 1750 Hunter Avenue
Date of Approval: 6/30/05 weh
Work Approved: Extend existing pre-approved and constructed storage shed approximately 5' in rear over existing slab as per submitted plans. Materials to match existing in profile and dimension.
30. Applicant's Name: Meaher Homes
Property Address: 66 North Monterey Street
Date of Approval: 6/30/05 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof residence with architectural Timberline shingles, charcoal in color.
31. Applicant's Name: Mary Toombs
Property Address: 59 LeMoyne Place
Date of Approval: 7/1/05 weh
Work Approved: Paint house in the following colors:
Body – Benjamin Moore Carolina Gull
Trim – Benjamin Moore Gray Lake
32. Applicant's Name: Susan Goff/Keith New
Property Address: 304 Congress Street
Date of Approval: 7/5/05 asc
Work Approved: Repair foundation as necessary with materials matching existing in profile and dimension. Repaint house in existing color scheme.
33. Applicant's Name: Jean Lankford
Property Address: 403 Congress Street
Date of Approval: 7/5/05 asc

Work Approved: repair brick as necessary to match existing. Sand and paint trim antique white. Reinstall 6' wood fence following damage by Hurricane Ivan.

34. Applicant's Name: Cameron Pfeiffer
Property Address: 204 Michigan Avenue
Date of Approval: 7/6/05 weh
Work Approved: Replace roof with 3 tab shingles, charcoal in color. Install flashing around roof line. Replace rotten soffit as necessary with materials matching existing in profile and dimension. Repaint to match existing. Repoint chimneys and replace existing flashing with new copper flashing.

35. Applicant's Name: Cingular Wireless
Property Address: 1500 Government Street
Date of Approval: 7/7/05 weh
Work Approved: Install signage totaling 45 sf as per submitted plans.

OLD BUSINESS:

1. **059-04/05-CA** 109 Levert Avenue
Applicant: Mr. & Mrs. Lyle Hutchison, Owners, Lucy Barr Designs, Owner Representative
Nature of Request: Enlarge garage to accommodate two cars and add second floor, all as per submitted plans.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. **071-04/05-CA** 207 Rapier Avenue
Applicant: Joe Basenberg
Nature of Request: Install Country Manor Shakes (steel shingles), slate gray in color, on roof as per submitted sample.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

2. **072/04-05/CA** 306 Marine Street
Applicant: Hubert H. Stokes
Nature of Request: Demolish structure damaged by fire.

DENIED Certified Record attached.

3. **073/04-05/CA** 1119 Church Street
Applicant: S. Adam Davis, Owner/Dennis Carlisle, Architect

Nature of Request: Additions & remodel residence to include 1 ½ story addition in rear, 1 story addition in rear, add rear deck, reconfigure front porch, remove clipped gable, and replace inappropriate windows in gable with compatible windows.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS:

1. Devereaux Bemis announced that staff intends to hire a graphic designer to professionally lay out the guidelines. Board members will receive a copy of the guidelines to review. It is important to review them as soon as possible.
2. Devereaux has been offered the use of a house near Beaufort, SC in October or November. The review boards of both Charleston and Beaufort meet on the 2nd Wednesday of the month. Perhaps a group could drive together to see these boards in session.
3. Traditional Building will hold a conference in New Orleans on October 20-22. Sessions are generally good and the conference is easily accessible. AIA CEU credits are available.
4. A Certified Local Government conference will be held in Montgomery September 16-17, 2005. The conference will be sponsored by the Alabama Historical Commission, Black Heritage Council and the Alabama Preservation Alliance.
5. Ed Hooker reviewed an application placed on a previous agenda for the addition of a rear porch at 1400-02 Church Street. The request had been withdrawn prior to the meeting, however, Board members had received drawings for the project as part of their agenda package. Staff explained that the owners did not intend to construct the porches when the application was withdrawn but have now decided to proceed with the construction. In addition, the property was posted at the time, satisfying the requirement of providing public notice. Staff requested authority to handle the case on a mid-month basis. The Board agreed to the proposal on a motion by Douglas Kearley and second by David Tharp.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

060-04/05-CA 109 Levert Avenue
Applicant: Mr. and Mrs. Lyle Hutchison
Received: 5/23/05, 7/12/05 Meeting Dates:
Submission Date + 45 Days: 9/23/05 1) 6/13/05 2)7/25/05

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Conflicts of Interest: Harris Oswalt recused himself from discussion and voting on the application.
Nature of Project: Alter garage as per submitted plans.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES AND DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3	Accessory Structures	Alter existing garage

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed 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 historic district.”

STAFF REPORT

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff’s judgment:

A. Garage Alterations:

- The proposed construction is not in compliance with Section 3 of the Design Review Guidelines.
1. The existing garage is a contributing historic structure constructed at the same time as the 1929 residence.
 2. The Ashland Place neighborhood was developed as an early streetcar suburb along the Springhill Avenue trolley line.
 3. Automobiles were an important element in the layout of the neighborhood, and many of the houses were constructed with free-standing garages and carriage houses.
 4. The National Register Nomination lists 24 contributing outbuildings in the Ashland Place Historic District.
 5. The existing garage retains its original design, with the exception of decorative concrete block infill at the garage door opening.
 6. The proposed design calls for extending the garage opening 7’ forward to allow for larger vehicles.
 7. The proposed design calls for the addition of a second story for storage and later playroom.

8. The second floor addition is delineated from the first floor by a wide board.
9. Above the wide board the second floor siding narrows in width.
10. The area increased at the garage door steps in 6" from the corner and has a change in siding width to delineate between the original and the addition.

Based on the above facts, Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Lucy Barr appeared on behalf of the owner. She had read the staff recommendations and had no additions to the application.

There was no one else present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application.

Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record.

The Board questioned if there were any zoning issues to be resolved. Staff reported that the building would not contain a kitchen so it would not be considered a living unit.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no additional Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

David Tharp moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board adopt the facts in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Tilmon Brown and approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 07/25/06.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

071-04/05-CA 207 Rapier Avenue
Applicant: Joe Basenberg
Received: 7/12/05 Meeting Date (s):
 Submission Date + 45 Days: 9/23/05 1) 7/25/05 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single family residential
Additional Permits Required: (1) Roofing
Nature of Project: Install new roofing material on existing historic residence as per submitted sample.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3	Roofs	Install new metal roofing

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “The Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed 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 historic district…”

STAFF REPORT

- A. The Guidelines state that “A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Original historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof, should be maintained. Materials should be appropriate to the form and pitch and color.”
1. The main structure is a two story frame Victorian structure.
 2. The material requested for use is a patterned steel shingle which measures 12 ½ ” by 11 ¾”.
 3. The pattern replicates wood shakes.
 4. Historically, metal roofs were installed around the turn of the 20th century.
 5. Metal roofs varied in design from standing seam to 5-v crimp to tin shingle.
 6. This material has not been previously requested or approved for use in Mobile’s Historic Districts.
 7. The Board did approve a similar material for use at 1064 Palmetto Street in November 2004.

Staff recommends that the Board determine the appropriateness of the material for this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Joe Basenberg appeared before the Board. He questioned the fact in the staff report that the material had not previously been approved when a similar material had been approved at 1064 Palmetto Street. Staff explained that the roof at 1064 was a panelized system, whereas the roofing material proposed for use at 207 Rapier was a shingle. Mr. Basenberg commented that he was hoping to install a roofing system that would withstand hurricanes, hail storms, etc. since he had replaced the roof numerous times. Following questions from the Board, he stated that it was his understanding that the new roof would fit with the existing fascia. There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no additional Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Douglas Kearley moved that, based upon the facts presented in the application and from testimony at the hearing, that the Board adopt the facts in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and approved with David Tharp voting in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 07/25/06.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

072-04/05 – CA 306 Marine Street
Applicant: Hubert H. Stokes
Received: 7/1/05 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 8/16/05 1) 7/25/05 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Conflicts of Interest: Douglas Kearley recused himself from discussion and voting on the application.
Nature of the Project: Demolish existing historic residential structure severely damaged by fire. Landscape vacant lot once structure is removed.

STAFF REPORT

Section 10 of the Preservation Ordinance prohibits the demolition or relocation of “any property within a historic district unless the Board finds that the removal or relocation of such buildings will not be detrimental to the historical and architectural character of the district...” In making this determination, the Board must examine a number of factors set out in the ordinance, each of which is discussed below:

- A. Historic or Architectural Significance
 - 1. The Oakleigh Garden Historic District was created in 1972.
 - 2. 306 Marine Street is a one story shotgun structure.
 - 3. 306 Marine Street is a contributing structure within the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.
 - 4. While listed as contributing, the structure has had significant incompatible alterations over time.

- B. Importance to the Integrity of the District
 - 1. Mobile’s Oakleigh Garden District neighborhood is a large, late 19th-century/early 20th-century suburban neighborhood...The majority of the development in this district...dates from the 1870s and 1880s through World War I. Within this large grouping are examples of various Victorian styles as well as large numbers of bungalows...Between 1830 and World War II, the district developed as a solidly middle-class residential neighborhood. The residential character is evident in the size and massing of building form that represents adaptations to local climate considerations. In response to these influences, a group of buildings evolved that maintain a compactness of size, massing and consistent program while responding to a variety of stylistic influences...
 - 2. The shotgun is the most prolific and prototypical style in the district.

- C. Ability to Reproduce Historic Structures
 - 1. The type and quality of the materials used in the construction of 306 Marine Street are no longer readily available.

2. The structure dates from the first quarter of the 20th century, before the introduction of nominal dimension lumber. Components include old growth pine structural members and siding, historic windows, doors and interior decoration, etc. Replacement material would have to be garnered from salvage yards or specially milled.
3. In the event that reconstruction was attempted, the cost to reproduce 306 Marine Street would be prohibitively expensive.

D. Ensemble of Historic Buildings Creating a Neighborhood

1. The subject property is one of numerous shotgun residences in the district.
2. Removal of this residence would not erode the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.

E. Proposed Redevelopment Plans for the Site

1. The application states that the site will be cleared of building debris and grassed.

F. Effect of Proposed Project on the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.

1. The removal of 306 Marine Street would not degrade the streetscape along this relatively intact section of Marine Street.
2. The removal of 306 Marine Street would not impair the architectural, cultural, historical, social, aesthetic and environmental character of the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.

G. Content of Application

1. Property information:
 - a. 306 Marine Street was acquired by the applicant in 1985 for \$15,000.
 - b. The applicant states that the property was in good condition prior to the fire.
 - c. The property is currently unoccupied.
2. Alternatives Considered
 - a. The applicant states that no alternatives have been considered to retain the residence.
3. Sale of Property by Current Owner
 - a. Information presented in the application notes that 306 Marine Street has been listed for sale for \$30,000.
 - b. Applicant states that there have been 2 offers made on the property.
4. Financial Proof
 - a. No financial proof was included with the application.

H. Other:

1. Staff has inspected the property and determined that reconstruction is not economically feasible.

Based on the above facts, Staff recommends approval of the request to demolish.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Hubert Stokes appeared before the Board. He reported that the property was rental and a duplex and that he had placed a for sale sign on the property 2 days following the fire. It is being marketed at \$30,000 although the lot has not been appraised. He is seeking demolition of the house since he believes it would be easier to market the lot without the house. He stated that he has had two offers, neither of which was sufficient.

There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Tilmon Brown expressed his belief that everything is salvageable and that the Board should work to retain all historic properties in the districts. A comparison was made with another fire-damaged property on Stocking Street that was purchased and is now under renovation

FINDING OF FACT

David Tharp moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board adopt the facts in the staff report with the following modifications:

C.3. Though the removal of any historic building impairs the integrity of the district, it is the opinion of the staff that restoration of this building would result in the creation of a substantially new structure and

H.1. Staff has inspected the property and determined that the historic fabric is substantially compromised. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved to hold over the application for 30 days. After clarification of procedure by the Board attorney, the motion was withdrawn.

Tilmon Brown moved, that based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district according to the Guidelines and that the application be denied until August 22, 2005 to allow the owner the opportunity to sell the property for rehabilitation. If the property does not sell, the applicant may reappear before the Board with the same demolition application. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and unanimously approved. Staff will work with the applicant.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

073 -04/05-CA 1119 Church Street
Applicant: S. Adam Davis
Received: 7/12/05 Meeting Dates:
Submission Date + 45 Days: 9/23/05 1) 7/25/05 2)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of Project: Remodel existing rear addition of residence to create 1 ½ story living space in rear; construct 1 story addition in rear; add rear deck; reconfigure front porch; remove clipped gable; and replace inappropriate windows in gable with compatible windows.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES AND DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3	Additions	Alter existing elevations

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed 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 historic district.”

STAFF REPORT

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff’s judgment:

- The proposed construction is in compliance with Section 3 of the Design Review Guidelines.
- A. The main structure is a one story wood frame vernacular residence, ca. 1900 with an “L”-shaped front porch.
 - B. The 1904 Sanborn Map suggests the structure was originally a high Victorian with a bay and possibly a turret over the front door.
 - C. The current appearance reflects a major change to a bungalow with a large end gable roof, possibly due to a fire.
 - D. The property is a contributing structure within the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.
 - E. Due to its siting in the middle of the block, only the front elevation is visible from public view.

- F. Alterations to the north elevation:
1. Remodeling of front porch to include: removal of brick and ironwork columns; replace with wood box columns and new wood balustrade.
 - a. the existing front porch is not the original porch design as denoted by the 1904 Sanborn Map
 - b. the existing porch presumably dates from the 1950s and detracts from the historic character of the residence; for this reason, the alteration is acceptable under Secretary of the Interior's Standard number 2
 - c. the proposed porch is more in keeping with the bungalow style roof
 2. Remove clipped gable at front and replace with continuous end gable:
 - a. the clipped gable to be removed is not original to the house
 - b. clipped gables are not typically associated with the bungalow style
 3. Install new compatible triple window in end gable:
 - a. due to the change in use from attic space to living space, current building code requires an operable window in sleeping areas
 - b. the existing silver aluminum windows are not original to the gable
 - c. the new triple wood window is more compatible to the bungalow style
- G. Alterations to the south elevation:
1. Remove shed roof from rear addition and continue gable roof over addition:
 - a. the existing rear addition is sheathed in aluminum siding and detracts from the architectural integrity of the residence
 - b. the alteration to the existing rear addition continues the design elements and roof line of the main residence
 - c. this change does not impair the essential form or integrity of the historic property as stated in the Secretary of the Interior's Standard number 10
 2. Construct addition measuring 15'-8" x 15'-6"
 - a. the proposed addition copies design elements from the main residence such as windows, siding, eave, soffit and cornice details
 - b. an existing corner board distinguishes the main residence from both existing and proposed additions, as stated in the Secretary of the Interior's Standards number 9.
 3. Add deck at rear of residence:
 - a. a rear deck is a modern interpretation of a traditional porch form
 - b. therefore, allowing the deck as designed does not impair the essential form and integrity of the historic property
- H. Facts F-G are in compliance with numbers 2, 9 and 10 of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, as follows:
1. Number 2 –
The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alterations of the features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.
 2. Number 9 –
New 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, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

3. Number 10 –
New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Based on the above facts, Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Architect Dennis Carlisle and the owner appeared before the Board. Mr. Carlisle reported that he agreed with the staff report.

Staff reported that, based upon Sanborn Fire Insurance maps, the house had once been two stories with a pronounced Victorian footprint. At some point in time, perhaps following a fire, the house was altered to its present Bungalow appearance with clipped gable and brick plinths and balustrade. A bay projection on the façade remains from the earlier period.

Staff explained that, while the house was categorized as contributing in the district nomination to the National Register, following these proposed changes, its status in the nomination would be changed to non-contributing. The owner expressed surprise that the house would not qualify for the local marking program.

The Board questioned if the applicant would remove cmu infill on the east side of the foundation. The owner responded that the cmu will be removed and lattice panels installed.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no additional Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

David Tharp proposed adding fact I. Applicant has indicated that concrete block infill will be removed and replaced with lattice.

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and at the meeting, that the Board adopt the facts in the staff report adding fact I. as stated above.

The motion was seconded by Tilmon Brown and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 07/25/06.