

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

September 5th 2018 – 3:00 P.M.

Multi-Purpose Room, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The acting Chair, Steve Stone, called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. Paige Largue, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
Members Present: Bob Allen, John Ruzic, Carolyn Hasser, Craig Roberts, Steve Stone and Kim Harden.
Members Absent: David Barr, Robert Brown, Jim Wagoner, Harris Oswalt, Catarina Echols, and Nick Holmes.
Staff Members Present: Bridget Daniel, John Sledge, and Paige Largue.
2. Mr. Roberts moved to approve the minutes of the August 15, 2018 meeting. The motion received a second and was approved unanimously.
3. Mr. Roberts moved to approve the MidMonths. The motion received a second and was approved with one opposed, Mr. Allen.

B. MIDMONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED.

1. Applicant: **Rebecca Shaw**

- a. Property Address: 254 S. Ann Street
- b. Date of Approval: 8/7/2018
- c. Project: Remove porch infill and box columns. Repair and replace deteriorated wood siding to match existing in dimension, profile, and material. Repair existing wood windows. Replace plexi-glass in door with glass. Construct framed lattice between piers. Repaint in neutral color scheme (white/tan/ grey) with Bellingrath Green accents. Paint porch ceiling haint blue.

2. Applicant: **BJE Properties, LLC**

- a. Property Address: 267 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 8/7/2018
- c. Project: Remove sign due to safety concerns. Save salvageable portion of sign. Repair rotten wood to match.

3. Applicant: **Ricky Bradford**

- a. Property Address: 50 S. Lafayette Street
- b. Date of Approval: 8/8/2018
- c. Project: Reroof asphalt shingles, charcoal black.

4. Applicant: **Bluewater Holdings, LLC**

- a. Property Address: 1 S. Royal Street
- b. Date of Approval: 8/8/2018
- c. Project: Replace metal face on projecting sign with painted metal. Apply four interior window decals and one window decal.

5. Applicant: **Middle Land, LLC**

- a. Property Address: 210 S. Washington Street
- b. Date of Approval: 8/10/2018
- c. Project: Install generator (out of public view) located next to current service equipment on southeast corner.

- 6. Applicant: John Coletta**
- Property Address: 203 Adams Street
 - Date of Approval: 8/10/2018
 - Project: Repair and replace deteriorated wood including siding and trim. Repaint to match existing.
- 7. Applicant: Robert Dueitt of Robert Dueitt Construction**
- Property Address: 216 Lanier Avenue
 - Date of Approval: 8/13/2018
 - Project: Replace door on north elevation not visible from public view with custom window to match other windows with panel on bottom and multi light configuration above. Paint to match existing windows.
- 8. Applicant: Keneth Ohanlon**
- Property Address: 52 S. Julia Street
 - Date of Approval: 8/13/2018
 - Project: Construct wrought iron fence along west and south elevation. Fence may be up to five feet in height per variance issued previously.
- 9. Applicant: David Miller**
- Property Address: 126 Michael Donald Avenue
 - Date of Approval: 8/13/2018
 - Project: Erect six foot privacy fence north side lot, east (rear).
- 10. Applicant: William Appling**
- Property Address: 9 S. Joachim Street
 - Date of Approval: 8/13/2018
 - Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork to match in material, dimension and profile. Repaint trim to match. Repaint door "Traffic Light Green" by Devoe Paint.
- 11. Applicant: John Zukley**
- Property Address: 313 N. Jackson Street
 - Date of Approval: 8/15/2018
 - Project: Reroof with 5V Crimp metal, silver.
- 12. Applicant: LCH Properties**
- Property Address: 401 Church Street
 - Date of Approval: 8/15/2018
 - Project: Commercial reroof, with new shingles, flashing, vents, and pipe boots.
- 13. Applicant: Jeff Hopkins**
- Property Address: 110 S Dearborn Street
 - Date of Approval: 8/15/2018
 - Project: Reroof with asphalt shingle.
- 14. Applicant: State Permits, Inc.**
- Property Address: 50 St. Emanuel Street
 - Date of Approval: 8/15/2018
 - Project: Replace deteriorated window components and other wood to match in dimension, profile and material. Repair damaged roof shingles to match existing.
- 15. Applicant: Joseph Mahoney**
- Property Address: 250 Michigan Avenue
 - Date of Approval: 8/17/2018
 - Project: Reroof asphalt shingles.
- 16. Applicant: Archdiocese of Mobile**
- Property Address: 400 Government Street
 - Date of Approval: 8/17/2018
 - Project: Repair and replace termite damage as per existing, including front door, windows, window sills, and trim.

17.Applicant: PNC Bank

- a. Property Address: 17 Macy Place
- b. Date of Approval: 8/17/2018
- c. Project: Board windows, secure property.

18.Applicant: Tiffany Bookout of MH3 Printing

- a. Property Address: 210 S. Washington Street
- b. Date of Approval: 8/23/2018
- c. Project: Install one painted wood composite sign that will be 3 ft. in height and 5 ft. in width.

19.Applicant: Nassar Parvinrouh

- a. Property Address: 1403 Blacklawn
- b. Date of Approval: 8/23/2018
- c. Project: Reroof.

20.Applicant: John Baker

- a. Property Address: 956 Charleston Street
- b. Date of Approval: 8/23/2018
- c. Project: Power wash, sand, repair/replace any rotten wood to match, repaint light blue body, white trim, door and shutters darker blue.

21.Applicant: Michael Farley of Patriot Roofing

- a. Property Address: 113 N. Julia Street
- b. Date of Approval: 8/27/2018
- c. Project: Reroof with architectural shingles in color to match existing.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2018-26-CA: 1355 Old Shell Road

- a. Applicant: Mr. Paul Anderson
- b. Project: Construct an ancillary building.
APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2018-27-CA: 1356 Government Street

- a. Applicant: Mr. Steve Stone of Dakin Street Architects for Grace Lutheran Church
- b. Project: Demolish a non-contributing ancillary building.
APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

- 1. Ms. Largue stated there were at least four applications on the upcoming September 19th agenda.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2018-26-CA: 1355 Old Shell Road
Applicant: Mr. Paul Anderson
Received: 8/15/2018
Meeting: 9/5/2018

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing (main building)
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct an ancillary building.

BUILDING HISTORY

The main house dates circa 1900.

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 February 20, 2013 according to the MHDC vertical files. At that time approval for a metal roof on the main building was obtained. The proposed scope of work includes construction of a two-story ancillary building.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. In general, the addition of a new accessory structure to a historic property or within a historic district should refer to guidelines for new construction presented in Chapters 6 and 7. Additional specialized guidelines are provided here. A new accessory structure should be compatible with those in the district.
 - 2. Design an accessory structure to be subordinate in scale to that of the primary structure. (Section 9.1)
 - 3. Locate a new accessory structure in line with other visible accessory structures in the district. (Section 9.2)
 - 4. These are traditionally located at the rear of a lot.
 - 5. Maintain the relationship of solids to voids (windows and doors) in an exterior wall as is established by the historic building.
 - 6. Materials that are compatible with the historic district in scale and character are acceptable. These often include: Wood frame; Masonry; Cement-based fiber siding; Installations (Pre-made store-bought sheds, provided they are minimally visible from public areas.)

7. Place a new accessory structure on a site with adequate space on all four sides to allow continued maintenance of the structure. Typically, a minimum of five feet is adequate.
8. Pertaining to roofing materials, materials that are similar in character, scale, texture and color range to those used on nearby historic buildings are acceptable. These often include: Asphalt dimensional or multi-tab shingles; Wood shake or shingle; Standing seam metal; Metal shingles; 5-V crimp metal; Clay tile; Imitation clay tile or slate. (Section 6.40)
9. Use a door material that blends well with surrounding historic buildings. Wood is preferred. Paneled doors with or without glass are generally appropriate. (Section 6.41)
10. Materials that are similar in character, profile, finish and durability to those (windows) used on nearby historic buildings are acceptable. These often include: Wood; Vinyl-clad wood; Aluminum-clad customized wood; Extruded Aluminum.

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

1. Construct a new ancillary building (garage).
 - a. The ancillary building will be situated 3' from the East lot line and 3' from the South line (replicating pre-existing setbacks for ancillary buildings from neighboring properties).
 - b. The will measure 14' in width and 26' in depth.
 - c. The building will rest atop a concrete slab.
 - d. The building's walls will be faced with Hardiboard siding.
 - e. The wall heights will be 8'1".
 - f. The building will feature two-over-two wooden, aluminum clad, or custom extruded aluminum windows.
 - g. A gabled roof will surmount the building.
 - h. Timberline shingles or asphalt in a neutral color will sheath the roof.
 - i. North (façade, facing rear of dwelling) Elevation
 - i. The West Elevation will be defined by a garage door on the first story and double window on the second story.
 - ii. The garage will have an overhang above it.
 - iii. The aforementioned overhang will be sheathed in shingles, feature hardiplank siding on its east and west elevations, and extend three feet from the building.
 - j. West (a side) Elevation
 - i. The West Elevation will feature a multi-paneled door in either wood or metal on the northern portion of the first story.
 - ii. A window will punctuate the center of the second story elevation.
 - k. South (rear) Elevation
 - i. The South Elevation will feature a door on the western portion of the first story, and a window centrally located on the second story.
 - l. East (a side) Elevation
 - i. The South Elevation will feature one window located centrally on the northern portion.

STAFF ANALYSIS

New ancillary construction involves review of considerations pertaining to placement, scale, massing, design, and material. The building proposed will occupy the southeast corner of the property. The side setback of three feet is permissible by reason of the Historic District Overlay, a planning regulation authorizing in certain cases the employment of traditional setbacks within Midtown's four locally designated National Register Districts (Old Dauphin Way being one). As witnessed by surrounding properties and Midtown back lots in general, ancillary buildings were generally placed on or close to lot lines so the lot. In accord with The Design Review Guidelines, the building is in line with the specific and the same general location as traditional ancillary construction (See B-3).

With regard to scale, the Design Review Guidelines state that new ancillary construction should be compatible with that found within the district (See B-2.). Given the period of significance for Old Dauphin Way (1820s – 1940s), compatibility takes many forms. Scale is a crucial factor for compatible infill in a historic landscape. While ancillary installations for on grade construction are allowed for garden sheds other reversible interventions, permanent construction should reference and be subordinate to the scale of the principle building when visible from the public view (two story garages structures are in cases an exception) (See B-3.). The proposed building will rest atop a concrete slab. The proposed wall height is 8'1". For new construction of principle buildings, a minimum ceiling height of 10' is specified. Taking account into the secondary use of the building, and subordinate scaling requirements of the building in relation to the overall design impact, the scale is commiserate with the Guidelines.

With regard to design, compatibility of features serves as means to preserve the character of a property and district. The plans have been altered to be more compatible with the principal building. Kneebrackets seen on plans will not be employed. The owner would like to retain a 3' overhand over the garage door and is amenable to suggestions. The proposed ancillary building features two-over-two wooden windows like the main residence. The employment of design features such as the windows and hardiplank lapsiding complement the house.

With regard to materials, the Design Review Guidelines authorize the use of composite materials such as cementitious siding (See B-5.) on new construction. The profile and dimension of the siding compliments that of the main house. The proposed door and window materials meet the Design Review Guidelines (See B1-9, B-10). These materials are differentiated form, but compatible with the older construction of the principal building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-5), Staff does not believe this application would impair either the architectural or the historical significance of the building or the district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Paul Anderson, owner, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Stone asked Mr. Anderson if he had any concerns, questions, or comments. Mr. Anderson replied Ms. Largue explained the project fully.

Mr. Roberts noted Mr. Anderson might have an issue in the permitting office pertaining to another structure on the property in a residential zone. He suggested eliminating the floor plan showing a bathroom and kitchen, or clearly denoting which floor plan he is planning to construct.

Mr. Allen asked if the lapsiding was to match that of the principal building. He explained there had been confusion on another project in which the size of the ancillary building's siding was inches larger than the principal building. Mr. Anderson replied the siding would match in profile and dimension.

Mr. Stone asked for clarification on the depth of the building. He noted the information given stated both 28' and 26' in depth. Mr. Anderson clarified the building will be slightly smaller than the plans at 26' in depth.

Mr. Ruzic pointed out the gabled roof of the ancillary building is different than the hipped roof of the main building. Ms. Largue stated she canvassed the district and found several ancillary buildings with gabled roofs that did not match the principal building's roofline.

Ms. Harden asked if the building will have kneebraces as shown on the plans. Mr. Anderson clarified the building would not. Ms. Harden asked if the building would have an awning above the garage door. Mr. Anderson explained he would like to have the awning with different supports.

Mr. Ruzic asked about the garage door's composition. Ms. Largue noted the Guidelines are not specific, but generally vinyl is not acceptable and metal or wood is allowed. Ms. Harden noted the glass in the garage door on the drawing is different than the picture. Mr. Anderson stated the door would be wood clad and have a light configuration like the door in the picture provided in the Board Member's packets.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

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

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Ruzic 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 with the building having no kneebraces; the canopy constructed over the garage door; the depth to be 26' of the building; and the garage door to match the image in the photo.

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 and the amended application, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district and that the application be approved.

The motion received a second and was approved unanimously.

Expiration: September 6, 2019

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2018-27-CA: 1356 Government Street
Applicant: Mr. Steve Stone of Dakin Street Architects on behalf of Grace Lutheran Church
Received: 8/20/2018
Meeting: 9/5/2018

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing (Main Building), Non-contributing (Ancillary)
Zoning: B-1
Project: Demolish a non-contributing ancillary building.

BUILDING HISTORY

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

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on July 9, 1997 according to the MHDC vertical files. At that time the Board denied an addition to the ancillary building because of issues with fireproofing. The Board provided two alternative designs for midmonth approval. . The proposed scope of work includes demolition of the ancillary building.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state, in pertinent part: With regards to demolition, the Guidelines read as follows: "Proposed demolition of a building must be brought before the Board for consideration. The Board may deny a demolition request if the building's loss will impair the historic integrity of the district." However, our ordinance mirrors the Mobile City Code, see §44-79, which sets forth the following standard of review and required findings for the demolition of historic structures:
 - 1. *Required findings; demolition/relocation.* The Board shall not grant certificates of appropriateness for the demolition or relocation of any property within a historic district unless the Board finds that the removal or relocation of such building will not be detrimental to the historical or architectural character of the district. In making this determination, the Board shall consider:
 - i. The historic or architectural significance of the structure;
 - 1. This property was built in the 1950s. This building is listed as a non-contributing structure in the Old Dauphin Way District. It holds neither architectural merit nor historical significance.
 - ii. The importance of the structure to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;

1. While the building adds to the built density of the Old Dauphin Way Historic District and Government Street, it does not contribute to either the architectural or historical character of neighborhood or streetscape.
 - iii. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
 1. The building materials are capable of being reproduced or acquired.
 - iv. Whether the structure is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood, the county, or the region or is a good example of its type, or is part of an ensemble of historic buildings creating a neighborhood;
 1. This building is not an example of a particular style and does contribute to the historic aesthetic of the neighborhood or street.
 - v. Whether there are definite plans for reuse of the property if the proposed demolition is carried out, and what effect such plans will have on the architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological, social, aesthetic, or environmental character of the surrounding area.
 1. If granted demolition approval, the building would be demolished, debris would be removed, and a new building compatible with the church will be constructed.
 - vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 1. The date the current owner acquired the property is the early 1950's.
 - vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 1. The building has undergone several renovations and alterations since it was first constructed to accommodate the church's activities.
 - viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 1. N.A.
 - ix. Description of the options currently held for the purchase of such property, including the price received for such option, the conditions placed upon such option and the date of expiration of such option;
 1. N.A.
 - x. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
 1. A new activity center will be constructed.
 - xi. Financial proof of the ability to complete the replacement project, which may include but not be limited to a performance bond, a letter of credit, a trust for completion of improvements, or a letter of commitment from a financial institution.
 1. N.A.
 - xii. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.
 1. See submitted materials.
2. *Post demolition or relocation plans required.* In no event shall the Board entertain any application for the demolition or relocation of any historic property unless the applicant also presents at the same time the post-demolition or post-relocation plans for the site."

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

1. Demolish a non-contributing ancillary building.
2. Remove debris.
3. Construct new ancillary building that will complement the church's architectural style.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application concerns the demolition of an ancillary building which is listed as a non-contributing building in the Old Dauphin Way National Register Historic District. The property has been extensively altered since it was constructed in the 1950's.

When reviewing demolition applications, the Board takes into the account the following considerations: the architectural significance of the building; the condition of the building; the impact the demolition will have on the streetscape; and the nature of any proposed redevelopment.

The ancillary building at 1356 Government Street is a non-contributing building located within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The building is not an example of any notable architectural typology or style.

This stucco and brick building is currently in good condition. The building has seen several additions over the years. Originally it was a one story brick building. It now features a second story clad with stucco, and other stucco additions.

While building contributes to the built density and rhythmic sequencing of the landscape, it does not lend to historic character or physical experience of Government Street. Located on an inner lot, the building is viewed from head on angle but setback far from the sidewalk.

If granted demolition approval, the building would be demolished, debris would be removed, and a new building for church activities would be constructed in keeping with Mobile's Historic District Guidelines. The design will be approved at a later Architectural Review Board meeting. A concept plan has been submitted and shows a new one story masonry building which mimics the material and architectural features of the church.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B(1-ii) and B(1-x), Staff does believe the application as is will impair either the architectural or the historical character of the property or district. Staff recommends approval of the application as proposed.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Grady Luttmann and Mr. Michael Milling, representatives, were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Stone recused himself. The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Roberts asked Mr. Luttmann and Mr. Milling if they had any concerns, questions, or comments.

Mr. Roberts asked what issues, if any, they were having with the building. Mr. Luttmann responded severe mold, an exhaustive list of repairs, and not being utilized for necessary activities.

Mr. Roberts asked if a financial study had been completed on the project. Mr. Luttmann responded that in order to clean the building of mold and make necessary repairs and improvements the cost would be 1.3-1.6 million dollars. He further explained a new building would cost \$500,000-600,000.

Mr. Allen asked if the architect of the church, Mr. Carl Burmeister designed the ancillary building in the late 50's, early 60's. Mr. Luttmann stated the ancillary building was a one story brick building designed by another architect, Mr. Nichols. Mr. Roberts asked if the building was added onto in 1992. Mr. Luttmann confirmed it had been.

Mr. Roberts noted the cost to repair and remediate mold was large. Mr. Milling stated if repaired, the project would have been executed in five phases.

Mrs. Hasser noted a mistake in the staff report. Ms. Largue confirmed staff recommended the approval of the application based on its architectural insignificance, cost to repair, and supplied redevelopment plans.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

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

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Allen 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 reflect staff endorsement of the application.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Ruzic moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board and the amended application, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district and that the application be approved.

The motion received a second and was approved unanimously.

Expiration: September 6, 2019