

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
November 15, 2017 – 3:00 P.M.
Multi Purpose Room, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Harris Oswalt, called the meeting to order at 3:05. Paige Largue, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
Members Present: Harris Oswalt, Robert Allen, John Ruzic, Catarina Echols, Craig Roberts, Robert Brown, Kim Harden, Carolyn Hasser, David Barr, and Steve Stone.
Members Absent: Nick Holmes III and Jim Wagoner.
Staff Members Present: Bridget Daniel, and Paige Largue.
2. Mr. Oswalt heldover approval of the minutes from November 1st, 2017 until the next meeting. .
3. Mr. Stone moved to approve the Midmonths. The motion received a second and was approved with one in opposition, Mr. Robert Allen.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED.

1. **Applicant: Angela Williams**
 - a. Property Address: 502 George Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/16/2017
 - c. Project: Replace fire damage on porch railing to match, repair eaves as necessary, patch roof to match.
2. **Applicant: Kress Investments LLC.**
 - a. Property Address: 18 S. Royal Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/16/2017
 - c. Project: Rake out joints, refill, and waterproof exterior with clear sealant.
3. **Applicant: O’Gwynn LLC.**
 - a. Property Address: 204 Conti Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/19/2017
 - c. Project: Repair rotten decking on balconies as needed, repair roof replacing shingles as needed.
4. **Applicant: Melissa Roberts**
 - a. Property Address: 1555 Church Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/20/2017
 - c. Project: Remove shingles, reroof charcoal gray.
5. **Applicant: Charles Jackson**
 - a. Property Address: 152 Roberts Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/20/2017
 - c. Project: Tear off old shingles, reroof charcoal gray.
6. **Applicant: David Knowles**
 - a. Property Address: 253 West Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/23/2017
 - c. Project: Erect six foot privacy fence across rear of driveway.
7. **Applicant: Pamela Fair**
 - a. Property Address: 411 Chatham Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/25/2017
 - c. Project: Reroof with 25 year asphalt shingles, black.
8. **Applicant: Bradley Roe**
 - a. Property Address: 119 N. Julia Street

- b. Date of Approval: 10/26/2017
- c. Project: Repair/replace siding to match, repaint exterior of house existing scheme. Reshingle roof with Onyx Black by Owens Corning. Rescreen porch.

9. Applicant: Congress Warehouse

- a. Property Address: 919 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 10/26/2017
- c. Project: Remove a section of wooden privacy fencing along the east lot line. Install decorative bollards and chains (painted). Repair and when necessary reconstruct six foot privacy fencing to either side. Replacements palings will match in height, placement, and material. Paint said fencing and other existing privacy fencing.

10. Applicant: Nord Sud

- a. Property Address: 605 St. Francis Street
- b. Date of Approval: 10/27/2017
- c. Project: Repair termite damage to exterior walls. Replace siding to match original in profile and dimension, paint to match.

11. Applicant: Donald Scholebo

- a. Property Address: 1558 West Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 10/30/2017
- c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated wood including soffitt, fascia to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Repaint white. Repair windows.

12. Applicant: Thomas Bernhardt of Bernhardt Construction and Roofing

- a. Property Address: 11 N. Julia Street
- b. Date of Approval: 10/30/2017
- c. Project: Reroof with architectural in charcoal.

13. Applicant: Pornnapha Mahang

- a. Property Address: 966 Government Street
- b. Date of Approval: 11/1/2017
- c. Project: Install one (1) individual storefront sign "Aroy Thai Cuisine" for a total of 64 square feet signage painted metal composite.

14. Applicant: James Hartberger of Jesco Inc.

- a. Property Address: 26 N. Royal Street
- b. Date of Approval: 11/2/2017
- c. Project: Repair brick facade where necessary and replace mortar with appropriate mix.

15. Applicant: Linda Steele on behalf of The First Church of Christ, Scientist

- a. Property Address: 944 Conti Street
- b. Date of Approval: 11/2/2017
- c. Project: Install two (2) wall plaque sign both painted metal composite. One sign will be 24 sq. ft. total stating name of organization "First Church of Christ, Scientist" and hours of operation. Second sign will be 6 sq. ft. total will name of organization.

16. Applicant: Archbishop of Mobile, Corp.

- a. Property Address: 406 Government Street
- b. Date of Approval: 11/3/2017
- c. Project: Install window decals with business name.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2017-55-CA: 357 Chatham Street

- a. Applicant: Michael Rogers on behalf of Project Redline, LLC
- b. Project: Alteration of previously approved Plans – Change fenestration.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2017-56-CA: 50 North Reed Avenue

- a. Applicant: Don Bowden with Bowden Architecture on behalf of Rich and Elizabeth K. Heidal
- b. Project: Addition – Construct a rear addition.

APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

3. 2017-57-CA: 113 Saint Joseph Street

- a. Applicant: Mary Kay Lanzillota of Hartman-Cox on behalf of the GSA
- b. Project: Local Section 106 - Restoration of and site changes to the Campbell Courthouse.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Discussion

Mr. Allen stated this meeting was the third in a row no legal representation was in attendance. In response to Mr. Allen's inquiry, Ms. Lague said Ms. Florence Kessler was still representing the Board. She continued by saying she would confirm Ms. Kessler was still attorney for the Board.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2017-55-CA: 357 Chatham Street
Applicant: Michael Rogers of Rogers and Willard on behalf of Project Redline, LLC
Received: 11/6/17 **special appearance beyond deadline as agreed at meeting of November 1, 2017.*
Meeting: 11/15/17

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Non-contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Alteration of previously approved Plans – Change fenestration.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to the 1904 Sanborn Map, no structure stood on the subject property. MHDC property files record the existence of a substation for Alabama Power in 1989. The substation was removed through the efforts of the Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund.

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 1, 2017. On the aforementioned date, the Board approved amended plans calling for the construction of a single family residence. The amendments largely related to fenestration. The application reappears before the Board with changes suggested in the staff report and recommended at the meeting, but parting in some respects from the amended application as approved at the meeting.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Locate and size a window to create a solid-to-void ratio similar to the ratios seen on nearby historic windows.”
 - 2. “Use traditional window casement and trim similar to those seen in nearby historic buildings.”
 - 3. “Place and size a special feature, including a transom, sidelight or decorative framing element, to complement those seen in nearby historic buildings.”
 - 4. “Where a blind or shutter is fixed, hang them on a window casing in a manner to replicate an operable shutter.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
 - 1. Alter fenestration of previously approved plans.
 - a. West Elevation (façade)

- i. Employ louvered shutters instead of paneled shutters.
- b. South (a side) Elevation
 - i. A pair six-over-six windows will be employed instead of a pair of nine-over-nine windows.
- c. East (rear) Elevation
 - i. Windows will be sized to match the dimensions of the façade's windows.
- d. North (a side) Elevation
 - i. Add a six-over-six window.
 - ii. A pair of nine-over-nine windows will be replaced by a pair of six-over-six windows.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application calls for the revision of previously approved plans. At this property's last appearance before the Board (November 1, 2017), the Board approved an amended fenestration schedule. It was noted that if the applicant elected to alter the plans as approved, as well as additional recommendations and suggestions mentioned, that revised plans would need to be provided by November 6, 2017 in order to make the meeting for November 15th. The plans submitted respond to the previous staff report for and board discussion of November 1, 2017. In general, the fenestration types have been consolidated and additional fenestration added. Taking each elevation individually with respect changes made in relation to commentary that ensued at the meeting, see the below:

Façade – Shutters have been retained, albeit converted to a more traditional louvered variety instead of solid paneled shutters. Fixed shutters are allowed so as they fit the casing in the manner of a traditional window (See B-). Latter Arts and Crafts bungalows at times featured fixed shutters. Many early examples, as well as later instances, possessed operable ones. The presence of the shutters will further distinguish the façade and broaden the width of the subject fenestration, a topic of discussion at the last meeting.

South (a side) Elevation – A pair of six-over-six windows has been proposed instead of nine-over-nine windows. This substitution serves to better regularize the window selection, a concern mentioned at the meeting. Nine-over-nine windows are now only employed on Façade and Rear Elevation. While a tripartite grouping of windows has been retained, Arts and Crafts houses often featured higher windows or a transom or other nature in their principle entertaining spaces, particularly around fireplaces and built-in furniture. Side elevations were the locations of such special feature windows (See B-3.).

East (rear) Elevation – The rear elevations windows have been sized to match those employed on the façade, a discussion point during the meeting.

North (a side) Elevation - Two changes inform changes to the fenestration on this elevation. An additional window has been added on the westernmost portion of the façade. As with South Elevation, a pairing of nine-over-nine windows has replaced by a pairing of six-over-six windows. Nine-over-nine windows are now employed on only the Façade and the Rear Elevation.

Traditional casings of simple nature remain so as to be responsive to the dominant treatment for the inspirational bungalow typology and the surrounding windows in the immediate vicinity (See B-2.). The

location and sizing of the windows has been improved by the increase in the number of windows on side elevations, the employ of shutters on the façade, and coordination of window types on elevations (See B-1.).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-15), Staff does not believe this application would impair the architectural or the historical character of the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of this application and requests to approve the color scheme administratively upon its provision by the applicant.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Mike Rogers, applicant, and Mr. Brian Aycock, project architect, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Ruzic recused himself.

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed Mr. Rogers and Mr. Aycock, and asked if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Mr. Aycock acknowledged the Boards previous issue with the window schedule at the November 1st, 2017 meeting. He explained the formula for the proposed six-over-six windows was based on the entirety of the Oakleigh neighborhood landscape. He further explained in reviewing the windows on other houses in the area, 66% of windows are six-over-six configuration. He stated the nine-over-nine windows retained on the proposed drawing were for “puncture weight”. Regarding the windows shutters, he stated over 45% of the neighborhood had shutters on houses.

Mr. Oswalt then asked if any of his fellow Board members had any questions pertinent to the application which to ask Mr. Aycock or Mr. Rogers.

Mr. Roberts expressed two issues with the design: the shutters and window configuration. He stated previously had suggested removing the shutters and enlarging the windows on the front elevation because they were too narrow. He stated six-over-six windows would not be of that scale and proportion. Mr. Aycock clarified for Mr. Roberts that the shutters were bifold shutters and operable and noted a bungalow located in close proximity with shutters.

Mr. Stone clarified his comments at the previous meeting regarding the windows and egress had been addressed in the proposed drawings.

Mr. Allen stated that although over 45% of the houses have shutters in the district; the number does not take into account architectural styles including Greek Revival and Victorian. He further commented that the previous Board did not approve shutters on his personal home, a bungalow, located in the neighborhood.

Mr. Aycock stated his contention the proposed design belonged in the neighborhood. He explained the massing, scale, and orientation fits the landscape well. He also stated the shutters were operable and used as a means to add color to the house and therefore street presence.

Upon request by Mr. Roberts, Mr. Aycock explained the windows as proposed are not impact resistant and will require a film application.

Mr. Allen stated the Board had approved in the previous meeting a window configuration of three-over-one or six-over-one. He explained when referencing the typology of the house, seven bungalows in the area possessed six-over-six windows; three houses had six-over-one windows; and twelve houses possessed three-over-one windows.

Mr. Aycock stated the applicants intention to find a solution and that they would be amenable to changing the mullions to satisfy the Board.

Ms. Harden noted that enlarged the front bedroom windows would prohibit furniture placement. Mr. Roberts stated the windows could be slightly wider and the room would still be able to accommodate furniture. Mr. Allen commented a three-three pattern in lieu of a two-two-two window pattern for the six-over-six configuration would be better.

Ms. Harden inquired as to the difficulty of acquiring windows for modular housing. Mr. Aycock responded you can choose any window. He clarified on this property the window configuration was a design decision.

Mr. Roberts asked Ms. Largue if the applicant knew of the Design Review Committee available. Ms. Largue stated while it may not have been mentioned to the architect, staff had been working with the applicant in the pre-development phase. She further noted the Board had given direction to the applicant at the previous meeting.

Mr. Rogers stated the Historic Mobile Preservation Society (HMPS) had previously spoken in favor of the project and were satisfied with the new construction. He commented the house is made for the present and that should be taken into consideration.

Mr. Roberts noted after the previous meeting several people in the neighborhood expressed appreciation for the Board's comments.

Mr. Oswalt opened the application to public comment.

Mr. Jamie Betbeze, Oakleigh resident, expressed his agreeableness to the typology of the house in the neighborhood. He further expressed appreciation to the Board and their attention to detail. Mr. Betbeze commented the approval of the application as written or amended would set precedent for the other houses built for the project and for the neighborhood.

Mr. Allen inquired as to the three smaller windows on South (side) elevation. Mr. Aycock commented the sheet R.2 depicted the interior perspective of the elevation and how furniture might be placed. He noted the blue bungalow in close proximity also possessed smaller groupings of windows. Mr. Aycock stated it was not unusual to find smaller windows over locations such as bookcases. He commented the windows gave the house character. Mr. Allen submitted to the Board and audience two images of houses found in the neighborhood where smaller windows flanked a chimney.

Mr. Rogers noted the house on North Reed previously reviewed during the meeting which also had smaller windows on a side elevation, albeit not the same sequencing.

Mr. Stone recounted the two areas of concern: the six-over-six windows and the three smaller windows

on the South elevation. He noted the applicant's previous statement of being amenable to six-over-one windows. Mr. Roberts also stated the shutters as an issue.

Upon hearing Ms. Harden's statement about the light configuration of the windows, Mr. Allen stated the configuration of the windows on the elevations was an issue as well.

Mr. Stone stated the Boards issues: all windows to a six-over-one configuration; two front windows widened; and three windows on the side changed. Mr. Roberts stated the shutters could be eliminated as well.

Ms. Echols stated the three small windows on the South elevation were not concerning. She continued by saying the six-over-six window configuration was a concern.

Mr. Cooper Norman commented he was new to the area. He stated the proposed pitch of the roof resembled a Cape Cod typology in which case the six-over-six configuration would be appropriate.

No further discussion ensued from the Board.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Stone 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 approved with one opposed, Mr. Robert Allen. Mr. Allen stated he did not feel comfortable voting in favor with the minutes of the previous meeting not posted.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Barr moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the building and the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

The motion received a second and was approved with four in opposition: Kim Harden, Steve Stone, Robert Allen and Craig Roberts.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration: November 16, 2018

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2017-56-CA: 50 North Reed Avenue
Applicant: Don Bowden with Bowden Architecture on behalf of Rich and Elizabeth K. Heidal
Received: 10/30/17
Meeting: 11/15/17

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Addition – Construction a rear addition.

BUILDING HISTORY

Completed in 1908, this house highlights the popularity of a mid-Victorian Era residential typology – the bay window and porch fronted central passage – and the growing appeal of the a revivalist style – the Colonial Revival.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The application up for review calls for the construction of a rear addition.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Design an addition to be compatible with the color, material, and character of the property, neighborhood, and environment.”
 - 2. “Design the building components (roof, foundation, doors, and windows) of the addition to be compatible with the historic architecture.”
 - 3. “Maintain the relationships of solids to voids (windows and doors) in an exterior wall as is established by the historic building.”
 - 4. “Differentiate an addition from a historic structure using changes in material, color, and/or wall plane.”
 - 5. “Place an addition so that it is subordinate to the historic residential structure.”
 - 6. “Design an addition to be compatible in massing and scale with the original historic structure.”
 - 7. “Use exterior materials and finishes that are compatible to those of the original historic residential structure in profile, dimension, and composition.”
 - 8. “Design an addition to that it is subordinate to the historic residential structure.”

9. “Design piers, foundations, and foundation infill on an addition to be compatible with those on the historic building.”
10. “Use details that are similar in character to those on the historic structure.”
11. “Design and place a new porch to be compatible with the existing historic building.”
12. “Design windows on an addition to be compatible with the original historic building.”

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

1. Construct a rear addition.
 - a. The addition will be comprised of both open and enclosed spaces.
 - b. The addition will take the form of a galleried hyphen fronted in part by a stoop and a garage.
 - c. The hyphen connector and associated porch spaces will rest atop brick foundation piers.
 - d. Framed and recessed lattice skirting panels will be set between the aforementioned piers.
 - e. A skirting board will be employed on the hyphen, gallery, and stoop.
 - f. The aforementioned spaces will feature square section columnar porch posts matching those found on the body of the house.
 - g. A gable roof will continue the pitch of one of the Rear Elevation’s hipped roofs.
 - h. The garage portion of the addition will rest atop a concrete slab.
 - i. A gable roof set perpendicular to the street will surmount the garage.
 - j. The addition will be faced with hardiboard siding.
 - k. The addition will feature wooden windows.
 - l. The roof forms will be surmounted by asphalt shingles matching those employed on the body of the house.
 - m. A brick or stuccoed faced chimney will extend from the roof of the hyphen portion of the addition.
 - n. South (a side) Elevation
 - i. The westernmost portion of the South Elevation, a gallery-fronted hyphen, will be four bays in length. Said bays will be defined by square section columnar porch posts.
 - ii. The westernmost bay will be fronted by a stoop.
 - iii. The aforementioned stoop will feature framed and recessed lattice skirting panels at foundation level and will be enclosed by a picketed railing with newel posts.
 - iv. A flight of wooden steps will extend in an easterly direction from the stoop. Said stairs will feature a railing matching that employed on the stoop.
 - v. The gallery bays will be compartmentalized by recessed and framed porch screening. The panels will feature lower bottom porches that will divide at a balustrade-like level by a horizontal cross bar separating them from the taller upper panels.
 - vi. The westernmost section bay will feature a door in its westernmost half that will access the stoop mentioned above.
 - vii. The frieze-like fascia and eave treatment of the porch will match those found on the body of the residence.
 - viii. A hipped roof will surmount the gallery.
 - ix. The eastern portion of the South Elevation, which informs the garage, will feature two vehicular bays.
 - x. The rolling and paneled composite material doors will front the two vehicular points of entry.

- xi. A bracketed copper roofed awning will extend above and over the vehicular bays.
- xii. The garage's gabled roof will feature the same raked eave and shingled pediment treatment as those found on the body of the house.
- xiii. An arcuated window matching those found within the pedimented gables of the body of the house will be employed in the garage portion's gable.
- xiv. The terminal ends of recessed shed-roofed dormers oriented to the East and West cardinals will be project from and frame the roof.
- o. East (rear) Elevation
 - i. Four single-light windows will be located in the Garage's shed-roofed dormer.
- p. North (a side) Elevation
 - i. The westernmost or garage portion of the North Elevation will feature a two-light window and two two-over-two windows.
 - ii. A larger two-over-two window will slip within and below the garage portion of the addition's cornice return. Said window will be arcuated like the fenestration found in the main house's gables.
 - iii. The westernmost portion of the North Elevation, the hyphen, will feature three open bays possessing the same columnar piers and framed screening as that employed on the South Elevation.
- 2. Expand an existing curbcut to width slightly larger at its outermost flare from expanse defined by the garage doors. Said curbcut and small drive will surfaced in concrete.
- 3. Remove and reinstate sections of fencing to accommodate the addition and then tie in the sections fencing to the Southwest corner of the garage.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of an addition. Said addition would be located to the rear of a corner lot house. The proposed addition takes the form of open and enclosed spaces comprised of a garage connected to a contributing main residence by way of a hyphen-like space fronted by a porch.

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that additions should be compatible with the character of the property, neighborhood, and environment (See B-1.). Both parts of the addition – the porch fronted hyphen and enclosed garage – respond to the house, property, and surrounding architectural landscape and site conditions. Massing, scale, elements, and details are drawn from and compatible with the historic architecture of the main residence (See B 2 & 6.). In accord with the Design Review Guidelines, the foundations of the two parts of the larger whole are compatible with those found on the respective main residence and typological genre (referring to the garage)(See B-9.). The porch and hyphen rest on brick foundation piers with lattice panels interspersed between. The aforementioned foundation structure and screening are found the residence. As to the garage, that building typology traditionally employed an odd grade treatment. The porch fronted hyphen would be at a setback in wall plane so as to be both subordinate to and differentiated from the main residence (See B 4 & 5.). The overall connector and block format of the addition is strongly encouraged by the Design Review Guidelines. Overall, the subordination is further secured by not exceeding the height of the body of the house. Though the garage is multi-story, the grade of that portion of the addition is lower. A similar long addition is located just opposite the side street at 20 North Reed Avenue. The setbacks are authorized by the Historic District Overlay, a planning and zoning component of municipal legislation allowing for traditional setbacks with Midtown's four locally designated historic districts. There are a number of multi-story ancillary buildings located within the back lots of North Reed Avenue (71 and 73 North Reed Avenue). The proposed bay sequences of the porch fronted hyphen respond to the sequencing of the porch portions of the house thus perpetuating a rhythmic solid-to-void ratio (See B-3.). As was typical of

many garages, there is proposed fenestration on the principle elevation which vehicles entered and a more irregular treatment elsewhere in instances where it is employed. True to many such buildings, there was no fenestration to the side of vehicles, here the rear Elevation. The two dominant window configurations – arcuated in gables and two-over-two in larger wall planes - are drawn from those found on the main residence (See B-12.). Hardiboard is approved for additions. In accord with Design Review Guidelines, the profile, dimension, and construction are compatible with the original house (See B-7.). Detailing and elements on the porch, hyphen, gables, and other components and features are drawn from the historic building (See B-11.).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-12), Staff does not believe this application would impair either the architectural or the historical character of the property or surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of this application in full.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Don Bowden, the owner's representative, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed Mr. Bowden and asked if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make. Mr. Bowden replied Ms. Largue had addressed the application in full.

Mr. Oswalt then asked if any of his fellow Board members had any questions pertinent to the application which to ask Mr. Bowden.

Mr. Allen inquired as to the end plane of the existing building on the North elevation. Mr. Bowden replied that the existing building ended near a small window on the easternmost portion of the existing building. Mr. Bowden then clarified that the addition to the existing building will be with feathered in wood to match, while new construction of the garage will be clad in hardiplank siding.

Ms. Harden noted that the Board's previous request to leave a cornerboard intact to show differentiation from the existing building and new. Mr. Bowden stated he would be amenable to keeping a cornerboard in place at this location.

Upon request from Mr. Stone, Mr. Bowden confirmed the fence was going to be extended to the sidewalk edge.

Addressing lot coverage, Ms. Harden noted that the porch hyphen as proposed was inset from the existing building and proposed garage.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

Mr. Oswalt opened the application to public comment. With no one to speak either for or against the application, Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Roberts 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 amended to include a cornerboard on the North elevation where the existing house and proposed addition meets.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the building and the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

The motion received a second and was approved. Mr. Stone voted in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration: November 16, 2018

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2017-57-CA: 113 Saint Joseph Street
Applicant: Mary Kay Lanzillota of Hartman-Cox on behalf of the GSA
Received: 10/30/17
Meeting: 11/15/17

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: N.A.
Classification: Individually Listed on the National Register of Historic Places
Zoning: Municipal
Project: Local Section 106 Review - Restoration of and Site changes to the Campbell Courthouse

BUILDING HISTORY

Completed in 1934 and expanded in 1940, the John A. Campbell Federal Courthouse constitutes one of the finest essays of an interwar genre of neoclassicism that is popularly referred to as Stripped Classicism or “Greco Deco”. Championed and made popular in the United States by French born architect Paul Cret, the expression employed Beaux Arts planning approaches and proportions, but adopted simplified detailing that at times adopted then popular Art Décor, Art Modern, or other modernist styles. The style witnessed realization in Depression Era United States, across the British Empire, Fascist Italy, and Nazi Germany. With the Birmingham and Elmore County Courthouses, the John Campbell Federal Courthouse, ranks as one of Alabama’s finest essays of an international idiom. It was designed by the firm of Carey and Dowling.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The application up for review – restoration and site improvement informed appears before the Board as part of the Federal Section 106 Review Process.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Preserve original building materials.”
 - 2. “Remove only those materials that are deteriorated, and beyond reasonable repair.”
 - 3. “Preserve and repair original masonry surfaces.”
 - 4. “Preserve historic stylistic and architectural details and ornamentation.”
 - 5. “Where repair is impossible, replace details and ornamentation accurately.”
 - 6. “When replacing historic details, match the original in profile, dimension, and material.”
 - 7. “When historic windows are not in a repairable condition, match the replacement window design to the original.”
 - 8. “Design alterations so that the resulting building placement does not alter these established patterns.”

9. “Maintain historic façade elements.”
10. As per windows, employ (when possible), “photographic, physical, and/or documentary evidence for the design.”

C. Scope of Work:

1. Repoint brick when and where necessary. The grout will match that as originally installed composition, strike, and color.
2. Clean existing brick, limestone, and granite are varying staining accretions using conservation sensitive approaches and materials.
3. Repair and when necessary replace limestone and granite to match the existing in size, profile, composition, and appearance.
4. Remove later windows.
5. Install new aluminum windows that will match the original windows in placement proportion, scale, material, dimension, and design.
6. Remove, repair, clean, and when necessary replace to match existing spandrel panels to match the existing in all respects.
7. Remove later utility and mechanical interventions.
8. Repair impacted surfaces in the aforementioned locations with materials and resulting faces respectively compatible compositional and visually.
9. East Elevation
 - a. Remove portions of the knee wall from the podium.
 - b. Salvage aforementioned materials for reuse.
 - c. Remove later railings.
 - d. Remove steps.
 - e. Reconstruct steps.
 - f. Instate bollards.
 - g. Remove hedges and later plantings (some cases planters).
 - h. Install new plantings (See landscaping schedule.).
 - i. Construct access ramps.
 - i. The access ramps will extend from either side of the front podium.
 - ii. Intermediate landings and equidistantly spaced landings will provide transition.
 - iii. The access ramps will be fronted with Alabama limestone matching that found on the body of the building.
 - iv. Construct coping at termini of ramps.
 - v. The aforementioned coping will match that shielding the steps.
 - j. Remove and relocate existing signage.
10. North Elevation
 - a. Remove a riser from a step.
 - b. Construct a knee walls off the entrance to match that which is existing.
 - c. Install new wall lights to either side of a door.
 - d. Remove later curbing (to the side of the building.)
 - e. Remove later landscaping and hardscaping from a narrow expanse located between the inner edge of the sidewalk and the wall.
 - f. Instate new landscaping and surfacing.
 - g. Remove later curbing and curbcut from the street’s edge.
 - h. Extend historic curbing.
11. West Elevation
 - a. See general notes.
12. South Elevation
 - a. See general notes.

13. Repave sidewalks in the Right of Way, construct a landscape strip in the Right of Way, and plant trees in the Right of Way.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application for local Section 106 Review calls for the restoration of and site improvements to Mobile's Campbell Courthouse.

The bulk of the proposed scope of work informing the exterior restoration campaign falls in the general categories of general cleaning, repair, and when necessary replacement of existing materials. The Design Review Guidelines state that original materials should be preserved (See B-1.). The vast majority of the original masonry wall facings – granite, granite, and limestone – are in good physical conditions. Conservation attuned cleaning all surfaces will ensue. Only those components that are deteriorated beyond repair would be replaced (See B 2-3.). The ornamentation and detailing of all replacement would match that which is removed with regards to profile, dimension, and material (See B 4, 5, & 6.). Facing two of downtown's most important streets, this large building features a large amount of fenestration. As was typical of many institutional buildings of the epoch, this government building features broad expanses of notable fenestration. While the original windows have been removed, the spandrels, panels, and surrounds which they are situated survive. The aforementioned stylistic and architectural elements would be removed from cleaning and reinstated with finishes matching that which existed originally (See B-4.). The later windows would be removed. Proposed new windows of an approved material would be installed. Said windows will match the lost originals (See B-7.). Period photographs, surviving instances (deteriorated beyond repair when present), and overall dimensions afford exacting pictorial, physical, and documentary evidence for the restoration attuned replacement (See B- 10).

The proposed site improvements fall into two principle categories – disability compliance and aesthetic enhancement. So to better comply with access requirements, a pair of ramps are proposed for construction to either side of the façade's principle entrance. The original podium with its checks will be preserved. Only portions of the coping will be removed. The construction of the ramps would not alter the building placement and orientation (See B-8.). The employ of pair of ramps would perpetuate the symmetrical composition, a seminal feature of the building's Beaux Arts informed plan. The presence and detailing of the façade would be preserved (See B-9.). With exception of changes to the front steps on the Saint Joseph Street façade, removal of a riser on the St. Louis Street side entrance, removal of later curbing abutting underutilized landscape stations, the remainder of the scope of work involves more aesthetically pleasing landscaping. The locations of landscape areas respect the building and the selection of plantings responds to the area and existing trees employed downtown.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-10), Staff does not believe this application would impair the architectural or the historical character of the building. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mary Kay Lanzillotta, owner's representative, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed Ms. Lanzillotta and asked if she had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Ms. Lanzillotta gave the Board a presentation. She explained that the building was constructed in 1934. She further explained in 1939 a west addition with a courtyard was completed. She noted within the building interior work being completed would mostly affect the courtrooms and lobby. Ms. Lanzillotta stated the intention of creating a “judicial presence” along St. Louis Street, and the designs and landscaped work harmoniously to achieve that result.

Ms. Lanzillotta explained the nature of the proposed exterior work included relaying sidewalks, installing landscaping similar to the site North of the property (new federal courthouse) and repair & replacement work. She noted on the construction drawings that the areas in most need of work were highlighted in red. Ms. Lanzillotta explained that the current windows dating from 1983 would be replaced and similar the original windows in profile and dimension. She further explained that the cast iron spandrels would be painted to match historic colors utilized on the building. Ms. Lanzillotta noted the work being performed to alter access locations was so that the public could access the lobby. She stated bollards were integrated into the rail design when possible. Ms. Lanzillotta explained two light fixtures would be installed on cheekwall locations and would be similar to those found on drawings.

Mr. Oswalt then asked if any of his fellow Board members had any questions pertinent to the application which to ask Ms. Lanzillotta.

Mrs. Hasser asked why ramp on the rear elevation was being relocated to the front entrance. Ms. Lanzillotta explained currently the front entrance is for employees only and they wanted to have the lobby accessible to the public.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

Mr. Oswalt opened the application to public comment. With no one to speak either for or against the application, Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Stone 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

Mr. Stone moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the building and the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration: November 16, 2018