

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
November 19, 2008 – 3:00 P.M.
Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER – Chair

The meeting was called to order by the chair Tilmon Brown at 3:03.

The Introductory Statement was read by the staff.

The members present were Tilmon Brown, Tom Karwinski, Harris Oswalt, Bunky Ralph, Craig Roberts and Jim Wagoner.

Staff present were: Devereaux Bemis, John Lawler and Keri Coumanis.

The Minutes of the previous meeting were approved as posted per a motion of Bunky Ralph.

The Mid-Month Requests were approved as submitted per a motion of Bunky Ralph.

B. MID-MONTH APPROVALS

1. Applicant's Name: Charles Bowen

- a. Property Address: 8 North Lafayette St
- b. Date of Approval: 10/28/08
- c. Project: Repair fire and smoke damage to units 3,4,9 and 10;replace doors to match existing.

2. Applicant's Name: Kathleen Miller

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

3. Applicant's Name: Chris Clarke

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

4. Applicant's Name: Pitzios Family Limited Partnership

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

5. Applicant's Name: Alvin Presnell

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

6. Applicant's Name: Paul Morris

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

7. **Applicant's Name: David Blunt for American Legion**
 - a. Property Address: 607 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: October 31, 2008
 - c. Project: Exterior repairs; temporary COA for ramp for Veteran's Day Parade

C. APPLICATIONS

1. **170-08-CA: 260 North Jackson**
 - a. Applicant: Tom Karwinski
 - b. Request: Parking lot
 - c. **Approved.**
2. **171-08-CA: 68 North Monterey**
 - a. Applicant: Douglas Kearley
 - b. Request: Rear addition
 - c. **Withdrawn at applicant's request.**
3. **172-08-CA: 1616 Government St**
 - a. Applicant: World Gym
 - b. Request: Sign approval
 - c. **Tabled for 90 days.**
4. **173-08-CA: 100 Michael Donald Avenue**
 - a. Applicant: Juanita Owens
 - b. Request: Repairs and renovation to porches, front and back
 - c. **Approved in part; tabled in part.**
5. **174-08-CA: 109-111 S. Conception Street**
 - a. Applicant: Holmes and Holmes Architects
 - b. Request: Install fiber glass porch railings
 - c. **Application moved to Dec. 3 agenda at applicant's request.**
6. **175-08-CA: 517 Dauphin Street**
 - a. Applicant: Glenn Jones
 - b. Request: Construct balcony/rear-raised deck.
 - c. **Withdrawn at applicant's request.**
7. **176-08-CA: 462 Dauphin Street**
 - a. Applicant: FMS Engineering, LLC
 - b. Request: Install west wall windows
 - c. **Approved with conditions.**
8. **177-08-CA: 3 Dauphin Street**
 - a. Applicant: Walcott Adams Verneville Architects
 - b. Request: Demolition; parking lot plan.
 - c. **Withdrawn at applicant's request.**
9. **178-08-CA: 109 Bradford Avenue**
 - a. Applicant: Manticore Properties, Inc.

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

C. Other Business

1. **Materials for Courthouse Annex:** Susan McGallagher was present to discuss the proposed masonry and stone for the Courthouse Annex. Ms. McGallagher showed the Board samples. The Board had some concern over the selected brick and felt that softer, wood-fired brick would be more appropriate for a historic district. Ms. McGallagher will be returning before the ARB on December 3, 2008 in order to bring in additional masonry samples and present an application for a COA in a more formal manner.
2. **ARB Schedule:** Staff and Board members discussed the in-house schedule pertaining to generating staff reports, agendas, minutes and COAs. Staff committed to issuing the COAs and publishing the minutes on Thursday and Friday following the meeting. Agendas and staff reports will be available for the public and mailed to the Board no later than one week before the relevant ARB meeting.
3. **Announcement:** The ARB will be the subject of a City Council Rules Committee Hearing on Dec. 2 at 1:30 p.m.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

170-08-CA: 260 North Jackson Street
Applicant: Lowerline Properties LLC/Tom Karwinski
Received: 11/03/08
Meeting: 11/19/08

Tom Karwinski recused himself.

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: DeTonti Square
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-B
Project: Alter parking lot plan submitted in March.

BUILDING HISTORY

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

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “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. This building is currently undergoing renovation. A COA was granted in March, 2008 for the following site work: (1) Leave all existing walls and repair as needed with materials to match; (2) Install a new concrete walk to the new shared entrance; (3) Create an area for garbage cans with a 6’-0’ fence on three sides; (4) Install a 6’-0” metal picket fence on top of the existing block wall; (5) Install a 6’-0” metal picket fence with capped stucco columns along the front and north sides of the parking area; (6) Install an 8’-0” wood privacy fence at the corner of the building by the trash cans; (7) Create a new parking area to the north of the building using concrete parking pads and bumpers, concrete curbs; (8) Install a grasscrete driving field; (9) Landscape around parking area. The applicant proposes changing item #8 and seeks approval for a concrete driving field.
- B. The Mobile Historic District Design Review Guidelines read, in pertinent part:
1. “Modern paving materials are acceptable in the historic districts. However, it is important that the design, location and materials be compatible with the property.
 2. Landscaping can often assist in creating an appropriate setting. Asphalt is inappropriate for walkways. Gravel or shell are preferred paving material, however, a variance from the Board of Zoning Adjustment is required for commercial applications. Hard surface materials may also be acceptable.
 3. The appearance of parking areas should be minimized through good site planning and design. New materials such as grasspave or grasscrete, which provides a solid parking surface while still allowing grass to grow giving the appearance of a continuance of a front lawn, may be a feasible

4. Parking areas should be screened from view by the use of low masonry walls, wood or iron fences or landscaping.”
- C. The proposed work on the site includes the following:
1. install a concrete driving field.

RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

No one was present to discuss the application; however, on behalf of the owners, Tom Karwinski submitted a written statement and revised site plan detailing the landscaping.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place following the submission of the written statement. Chairman Brown inquired about the cost of installing drainage versus the use of grasscrete. Mr. Karwinski indicated to staff that the cost to install drainage would be more economically feasible than using grasscrete. Ms. Ralph discussed the various acceptable materials for paving in historic districts.

FINDING OF FACT

Harris Oswalt moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report as written.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as found by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Based on the guidelines, the staff analysis and the public testimony heard here today, the application has been granted a certificate of appropriateness.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 11/19/2009

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

171-08-CA: 68 North Monterey
Applicant: Douglas Kearley
Received: 11/03/08
Meeting: 11/19/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing Property
Zoning: R-1
Project: Changes to approved plans for rear renovation.

BUILDING HISTORY

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

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “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. The applicants have a current COA to do a porch addition and renovation to the rear of the house. The applicants have decided to change their plans and now return to the ARB for approval.
- B. The Mobile Historic Guidelines, state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Original or historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof should be maintained. Materials should be appropriate to the form and pitch and color....Accessory roof elements not original to the structure, such as vents, skylights, satellite dishes, etc. shall be located inconspicuously.”
 - 2. “The type, size and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building. Original window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing.”
 - 3. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. Historic porches should be maintained and repaired to reflect their period. Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/ columns, proportions and decorative details. The balustrade of the stairs should match the design and materials of the porch.”
 - 4. The Secretary of the Interior Standards state: “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, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”
- C. The applicants propose:
 - 1. adding a 14’6” by 20’ addition to 1st floor, northeast corner
 - 2. enclosing 2nd story porch
 - 3. adding approximately 10’ to the 2nd floor rear wall

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

STAFF ANALYSIS

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Application withdrawn at applicant's request.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

172-08-CA: 1616 Government Street
Applicant: Harry Dodich for World Gym
Received: 08/25/08
Meeting: 09/17/08 (Tabled); 11/19/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way District
Classification: Non-contributing
Zoning: B-3
Project: Install signage.

BUILDING HISTORY

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

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “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 is a non-contributing building located outside the Old Dauphin Way District, but falls within the ordinance for signage along government street.
- B. The Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and Government Street read, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “For buildings without a recognizable style, the sign shall adopt the decorative features of the building, utilizing the same materials and colors. . .
 - 2. Owner shall submit an overall sign plan addressing placement, materials, and design. Signage for the building and for the tenants shall be consistent. . .
 - 3. The total maximum allowable sign area for all signs is one and one half square feet per linear front foot of the principal building, not to exceed 64 square feet.
 - 4. Internally lit signs are prohibited.”
- C. Applicant proposes:
 - a. Installed a 4’ by 15’9” aluminum sign
 - b. Aluminum face
 - c. External lights to be approved at a later date.
 - d. Approximately 60 sq. ft. total

STAFF ANALYSIS

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

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

John Graham was present to discuss the application. Mr. Graham explained that, despite telling Staff otherwise, the Gym was not in a position at this time to change out the sign, but could entertain doing so after the first of the year.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. The Board explained to the applicant that it could not allow the existing sign to remain permanently and granted the applicant 90 days to work out a solution.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved to table the application for 90 days, at which point the applicant should reappear before the Board with plans to replace the non-conforming sign. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Based on the guidelines, the staff analysis and the public testimony heard here today, the application has been tabled for 90 days.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

173-08-CA: 100 Michael Donald Avenue
Applicant: Juanita Owens
Received: 10/10/08
Meeting: 11/05/08 (Tabled); 11/19/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing Property
Zoning: R-1
Project: Repair 2nd story porch railing; install new back porch and steps; approve changes to rear of house.

BUILDING HISTORY

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

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “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. The applicant has a current COA to do in-kind repairs. Staff has been working with the applicant; however, the applicant had already installed the windows and siding to the back of the home before applying for the COA. Staff advised the applicants to refrain from making any more significant changes to the exterior of the home and to apply for a COA. The applicants would like to retain the changes made to the back of the house as well receive approval for a new back door landing, repairs to the 2nd story porch and repainting. Per Urban Development, the rear porch was enclosed when the applicants acquired the property. The applicants did total replacement of the rear siding.
- B. The Mobile Historic Guidelines, state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Original or historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof should be maintained. Materials should be appropriate to the form and pitch and color....Accessory roof elements not original to the structure, such as vents, skylights, satellite dishes, etc. shall be located inconspicuously.”
 - 2. “The type, size and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building. Original window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing.”
 - 3. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. Historic porches should be maintained and repaired to reflect their period. Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/ columns, proportions and decorative details. The balustrade of the stairs should match the design and materials of the porch.”
 - 4. The Secretary of the Interior Standards state: “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work

C. Applicants intend to:

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

STAFF ANALYSIS

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

Staff recommends approval for:

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

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

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

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ranita Smith was present to discuss the application. Ms. Smith explained the work done to date and future work they intended to complete. Ms. Smith would like to keep the second story porch as-is, but is open to suggestions. Ms. Smith stated that she would like to continue roofing the entire house with the 3-tab brown roofing material. The applicants did not bring the plans for the back porch as planned, but will work with Staff to get the plans finalized.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Board members discussed the second story porch. Staff clarified the evolution of the house from a one-story center hall to a two-story center hall.

FINDING OF FACT

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report C(2) as written. Bunky Ralph moved to table the remainder of the application. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued for the reroofing project only and the remainder of the application be tabled. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Based on the guidelines, the staff analysis and the public testimony heard here today, the application has been granted a certificate of appropriateness for the reroofing work and the remainder projects have been tabled.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 11/19/08

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

174-08-CA: 109-111 S. Conception Street
Applicant: Holmes and Holmes Architects
Received: 10/21/08
Meeting: 11/19/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Contributing Property
Zoning: R-1
Project: Install fiber glass railing.

BUILDING HISTORY

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

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “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. According to MHDC records, the existing rear balustrade was installed in 1990. In order to alleviate maintenance concerns, the applicants seek approval for the installation of fiberglass balustrade.
- B. The Mobile Historic Guidelines, state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. Historic porches should be maintained and repaired to reflect their period. Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/ columns, proportions and decorative details. The balustrade of the stairs should match the design and materials of the porch.”
 - 2. “The materials should blend with the style of the building.”
- C. Applicant propose:
 - 1. installing fiberglass materials for the rear porch railings
 - a. 3” rounded strongrail system
 - b. Square pickets
 - c. White finish

STAFF ANALYSIS

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

Application moved to December 3, 2008 ARB meeting at applicant’s request.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

175-08-CA: 517 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Glenn Jones
Received: 10/31/08
Meeting: 11/19/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street
Classification: Non-contributing Property
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct rear balcony.

BUILDING HISTORY

This townhome was newly constructed on Dauphin Street in 2007.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “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. The applicant proposes installing a rear deck over his parking area, with a staircase providing access to the roof of the deck.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior Standards state:
 - 1. “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, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”
- C. The applicant proposes:
 - 1. constructing a deck with sheet metal
 - 2. situated above existing masonry walls
 - 3. deck to be 23’ wide
 - 4. install handrails on roof of deck
 - 5. install stair case to roof of deck
- D. Clarification needed:
 - 1. visibility of structure from street
 - 2. proposed height
 - 3. elevations

SAFF ANALYSIS

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Application withdrawn at applicant's request.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

176-08-CA: 462 Dauphin Street
Applicant: FMS Engineering, LLC.
Received: 10/29/08
Meeting: 11/19/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street
Classification: Contributing Property
Zoning: R-1
Project: Install windows along west wall.

BUILDING HISTORY

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

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “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. The applicants are seeking approval to install 4 windows on the second floor, west façade of the building. The lot adjacent to the west wall of the building is vacant. The west wall of the building is now exposed where historically it would have been an interior party wall. There are no windows currently along the west wall. The applicants also seek approval for a new fence and sign.
- B. The Mobile Historic Guidelines, state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The type, size and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building. Original window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing.”
 - 2. “Fences should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District. The height of solid fences in historic districts is generally restricted to six feet, however, if a commercial property or multi-family housing adjoins the subject property, an eight foot fence may be considered.”
 - a. While the current guidelines do not address the height of picket fences across the front yard, the Board has determined that 3’ open fences are appropriate for historic districts.
 - 3. The Sign Design Guidelines provide for the following:
 - a. The overall design of all signage including the mounting framework shall relate to the design of the principal building on the property. Buildings with a recognizable style such as Greek Revival, Italianate, Victorian, Queen Anne, Neo-classic, Craftsman, et al., should use

- b. The structural materials of the sign should match the historic materials of the building. Wood, metal, stucco, stone or brick, is allowed.
 - c. The total maximum allowable sign area for all signs is one and one half square feet per linear front foot of the principal building, not to exceed 64 square feet.
 - d. Internally lit signs are prohibited.
 - e. Lighted signs shall use focused, low intensity illumination.
- C. Applicants propose:
- 1. installing 4 windows along the west wall
 - a. second floor only
 - b. wood windows to match existing 6/6 windows on the front of the façade
 - 2. repaint exterior front façade per submitted colors
 - 3. installing 6' iron fence along south property line along vacant lot (460 Dauphin Street)
 - 4. install sign
 - a. 10' sq. ft.
 - b. Wood sign
 - c. Hung from iron bracket
- D. Clarifications:
- 1. West elevation drawing needed
 - 2. treatment of deteriorated chimney stacks
 - 3. materials used for any masonry repairs needed
 - 4. plan for courtyard/vacant lot

STAFF ANALYSIS

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

AMENDMENT TO STAFF ANALYSIS MADE AT BOARD MEETING

At the Board meeting, Staff announced the MHDC properties committee approved the work based on the west elevation provided by the applicants. Staff has determined the proposed windows are appropriate, provided they match existing in material, dimension and profile. Staff has determined this is one lot of record and therefore there are no permitting obstacles with Urban Development.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Chad Marchand was present to discuss the application. Board members questioned the applicant about the fence and the use of the lot. Mr. Marchand was amenable to installing whatever type of fence the Board wanted. Mr. Karwinski suggested the fence be broken up into sections by brick columns. A Boardmember suggested Mr. Karwinski provide Mr. Marchand a drawing. Mr. Marchand was amenable to this suggestion. Mr. Marchand will also provide a sample photo of the selected fence to the Staff.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

FINDING OF FACT

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending fact C(1)(b) to state that the wood windows have true-divided lites and fact C(3) to state that the fence would be divided into three sections by two brick columns with the design to be approved on a mid-month basis by the Staff. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Based on the guidelines, the staff analysis and the public testimony heard here today, the application has been granted a certificate of appropriateness.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 11/19/08

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

177-08-CA: 3 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Walcott Adams Verneuille, Architects
Received: 10/28/08
Meeting: 11/19/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street
Classification: Non-Contributing Property
Zoning: B-4
Project: Demolition; construct parking lot.

BUILDING HISTORY

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

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “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. The applicants have a current COA to make improvements to the front of this building; however, they now return to the Board for approval to demolish the building and use the lot as a parking lot. The owners of the building also own the property next door – the Elgin Building, which is currently under renovation. The Elgin Building, with its ornate facade, is the city’s last remaining cast iron commercial building. Situated on a corner of the historical commercial corridor for the city, the Elgin Building would not have been freestanding.
- B. Regarding demolitions, the Guidelines read as follows: “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:
 - a. The historic or architectural significance of the structure:
 - 1. Since the façade was changed in the 1970s, this building is considered a non-contributing property within the historic district; however, until more research is conducted, it will be difficult to assess the buildings historic significance.

- b. The importance of the structure to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
 - 1. While the building's façade is not historic, the building's position at the front of the property line and its alignment with the two adjacent buildings does allow the historic character of the streetscape to be reflected today. The removal of this building will create a vacant space and further impair the historic character of the street.
 - c. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
 - 1. Not applicable.
 - d. Whether the structure is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood, the county, or the region or is a good example of its type, or is part of an ensemble of historic buildings creating a neighborhood;
 - 1. Not applicable.
 - e. Whether there are definite plans for reuse of the property if the proposed demolition is carried out, and what effect such plans will have on the architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological, social, aesthetic, or environmental character of the surrounding area.
 - 1. The owners intend to use this lot as parking for the adjacent property, which is currently undergoing renovation and will be used as office space.
 - 2. Staff is concerned that yet another vacant lot will impair the historic integrity of the district. This building does correctly reflect the historic streetscape. There would not have been a vacant lot between these two buildings. Therefore, Staff believes a building is more appropriate for this space than a parking lot.
2. *Content of applications.* All applications to demolish or remove a structure in a historic district shall contain the following minimum information:
- a. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 - 1. 1979; \$110,000.
 - b. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 - 1. Leasing the property for office space.
 - c. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 - 1. The owner stated that he has listed the property for sale but did not specify the price.
 - d. 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. Not applicable.
 - e. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
 - 1. The owner intends to provide parking on this lot for the building next door; costs were not submitted with the application.
 - f. Financial proof of the ability to complete the replacement project, which may include but not be limited to a performance bond, a letter of credit, a trust for completion of improvements, or a letter of commitment from a financial institution; and
 - 1. None submitted.
 - g. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.
 - 1. None submitted.

3. *Post demolition or relocation plans required.* In no event shall the board entertain any application for the demolition or relocation of any historic property unless the applicant also presents at the same time the post-demolition or post-relocation plans for the site.”
- C. Applicants intend to:
1. Demolish the existing building;
 2. Level and pave lot for parking;
 3. Install decorative stucco piers at driveway/entrance to parking lot;
 4. Install low stucco wall along north property line;
 5. Install ornamental iron fencing along north property line above wall;
 6. Install new lighting.
 7. Color of stucco to be Sherwin Williams 6157, “favorite tan.”
- D. Clarifications needed:
1. height of fence

STAFF ANALYSIS

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

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Application withdrawn at applicant’s request.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

178-08-CA: 109 Bradford Avenue
Applicant: Manicore Properties, LLC
Received: 10/28/08
Meeting: 11/19/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing Property
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct rear staircase and porch; retain non-conforming windows.

BUILDING HISTORY

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

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “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. The applicants are seeking approval for non-conforming windows installed without a COA. The applicants removed steel casement windows without approval from the ARB. Staff cited the applicants and issued a stop work order. The applicants are also seeking approval for a two-story landing and staircase on the rear of the building to allow for rear egress. The original back porches were removed without ARB approval in 2005.
- B. The Mobile Historic District Guidelines read, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The type, size and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building. Original window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing.”
 - 2. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. Historic porches should be maintained and repaired to reflect their period. Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/ columns, proportions and decorative details. The balustrade of the stairs should match the design and materials of the porch.”
 - 3. “The materials should blend with the style of the building.”
 - 4. “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, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”
- C. Applicants propose:
 - 1. retaining 32-1/1, double-hung, insulated vinyl windows
 - a. multi-lite, steel casement windows were removed
 - 2. constructing a rear staircase and landing
 - a. two-story, 3’-4” x 18’ structure

- b. situated on concrete pad
- c. shed roof with 3-tab shingles
- d. all pressure treated wood materials

D. Clarifications needed:

- 1. Color of shingles
- 2. design for columns
- 3. exterior doors

STAFF ANALYSIS

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

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Randy Pope was present to discuss the application. Mr. Pope discussed the history of the project and stated that the windows were badly deteriorated before they were removed and 4-5 were missing entirely. Mr. Pope explained the rear staircase was needed to provide egress from the building. The Board questioned the materials of the rear staircase and what would be permitted. The Board questioned whether the applicants had looked into any other options for replacement windows. The Board suggested the applicant take some time to reconsider the design of the rear staircase and research options for replacement windows.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board table the application for 30 days and the applicants return before the ARB on or before the December 17th meeting. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Based on the guidelines, the staff analysis and the public testimony we have heard here today, the application has been tabled for 30 days.