

CITY OF MOBILE
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

Minutes of the Meeting
June 27, 2005

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:02 p.m. by Acting Chair, Bunky Ralph.

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

Members Present: Lynda Burkett, Douglas Kearley, David Tharp, Bunky Ralph, Joe Sackett, Tilmon Brown, Cameron Pfeiffer.

Members Absent: Michael Mayberry Harris Oswald, Cindy Klotz, Robert Brown.

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

Staff Members Absent: Wanda Cochran

<u>In Attendance</u>	<u>Mailing Address</u>	<u>Item Number</u>
Roger Franklin	109 S. Georgia Ave.	067-04/05-CA
Bill Smith	66 Bradford Ave.	067-04/05-CA
Art Green	1738 Hunter Avenue	067-04/05-CA
Chris Miller	Infirmiry Health Systems	067-04/05-CA
James Larriviere	13 Houston Street	067-04/05-CA

Lynda Burkett moved to approve the minutes as emailed. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley and approved.

Douglas Kearley motioned to approve the mid-month Certificates of Appropriateness. The motion was seconded by Lynda Burkett and approved.

MID-MONTH APPROVALS

1. Applicant's Name: Joe Basenberg
Property Address: 207 Rapier Avenue
Date of Approval: 6/1/05 jdb
Work Approved: Repair/replace rotten wood matching existing in materials, profile and dimension. Paint house in existing paint scheme. Install rear balustrade to match balustrade on front. Replace existing Pella windows with new to match existing. Install shutters where missing.
2. Applicant's Name: Alan R. Carrio
Property Address: 256 Dexter Street
Date of Approval: 6/2/05 weh
Work Approved: Repaint house following Sherwin Williams colors:
Body – Downing Earth
Trim – Downing Sand
Accent – Aurora Brown
3. Applicant's Name: Dauphin Way United Methodist Church
Property Address: 1507 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 6/2/05 weh

- Work Approved: Replace sections of deteriorated chain link fence around playground with fence to match existing. Remove gates and install fence panels to control access.
4. Applicant's Name: Don Williams
Property Address: 1114 Government Street
Date of Approval: 6/3/05 weh
Work Approved: Reconstruct elements of building on new site as per submitted plans. Restore exterior elevations, reveal garage doors, repair and replace rotten siding with materials to match existing in profile and dimension. Plans for rear exit doors and fire escape to be submitted to the Board for approval at a later date.
 5. Applicant's Name: Naomi Henningsen
Property Address: 504 Church Street
Date of Approval: 6/3/05 asc
Work Approved: Install sandblasted and laser etched wood double faced sign. Sign to be placed behind front fence in yard. Overall height of pole sign to be 8'. Sign panel dimension to be 4'-9" x 2' for a total square footage of less than 20 square feet.
 6. Applicant's Name: Graham Roofing
Property Address: 8 Houston Street
Date of Approval: 6/3/04 asc
Work Approved: Re-roof building with 3 tab fiberglass shingles, black in color.
 7. Applicant's Name: J.C. Duke Construction
Property Address: 350 Charles Street
Date of Approval: 6/3/05 weh
Work Approved: Repair fire damage to residence. Repair or replace damaged or missing siding with materials matching existing in profile and dimension. Re-roof with materials matching existing in color, profile and dimension. Replace or repair damaged windows with windows matching existing in profile and dimension. Replace damaged front door with new door matching existing in profile and dimension. Replace rear sliding glass door with either new sliding glass door matching existing or with a pair of wood French doors.
 8. Applicant's Name: Williams Foundation
Property Address: 1000 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 6/6/05 asc
Work Approved: Repair foundation as necessary to match existing.
 9. Applicant's Name: James and Woody Walker
Property Address: 470-476 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 6/6/05 weh

- Work Approved: Restore/rehabilitate as per submitted plans. New roof to be installed; dormers to be added; cantilevered balcony to be installed along façade; supported balcony to be installed on rear elevation; damaged brick to be repaired; all brick to be cleaned with masonry cleaner; all windows to be repaired/replaced with 6 over 6 wood windows; stucco to be repaired; repair and reconstruct transoms and storefront to match existing; repair and reconstruct all wood storefronts.
NOTE : this CoA replaces a CoA dated 11/20/95
10. Applicant's Name: Coulson Roofing
Property Address: 2313 Springhill Avenue aka 216 Levert Avenue
Date of Approval: 6/7/05 asc
Work Approved: Re-roof one story flat sections of house with built up roof to match existing.
11. Applicant's Name: Waterfront Rescue Mission
Property Address: 208-210 State Street
Date of Approval: 6/8/05 weh
Work Approved: Repair or replace rotten porch flooring with materials matching existing in profile and dimension. Repaint to match existing.
12. Applicant's Name: St. Francis Street United Methodist Church
Property Address: 15 North Joachim Street
Date of Approval: 6/9/05 weh
Work Approved: Install exterior lighting as per submitted plans.
13. Applicant's Name: R & S Investments
Property Address: 264 Stocking Street
Date of Approval: 6/9/05 weh
Work Approved: Reconstruct roof from fire damage. Remove inappropriate addition over first floor porch. Return entry to single door. Replace porch rail using MHDC stock rail number 1. Paint in proposed color scheme.
14. Applicant's Name: Stephen Carter
Property Address: 453 Conti Street
Date of Approval: 6/10/05 asc
Work Approved: Install replacement roofing using 5 v crimp metal roofing, silver and color.
15. Applicant's Name: Traditional Services
Property Address: 165 St. Anthony Street
Date of Approval: 6/10/05 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof building to match existing.
16. Applicant's Name: Traditional Services
Property Address: 65 North Reed Avenue
Date of Approval: 6/10/05 weh

- Work Approved: Re-roof building. Change color from black to dove gray.
17. Applicant's Name: Maury Andrews/ Werneth McDonald Construction LLC
 Property Address: 112 South Georgia Avenue
 Date of Approval: 6/13/05 asc
 Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary on porch and siding with new materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Repaint new materials to match existing color scheme.
18. Applicant's Name: Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund
 Property Address: 912 Savannah Street
 Date of Approval: 6/9/05
 Work Approved: Repair and/or replace rotten wood with materials matching existing in profile and dimension. Replace chamfered porch columns and porch rail to match existing. Remove aluminum window and replace with wood window to match existing. Prime and paint. Re-roof with timberline shingles, charcoal in color.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. **063-04/-5-CA** 18 North Monterey Street
Applicant: Owen Drey and Katherine Peterson
Nature of Request: Alterations to existing residence as per submitted plans.
APPROVED. Certified Record attached.
2. **064-04/05-CA** 300 Marine Street
Applicant: Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund
Nature of Request: Alterations to existing residence as per submitted plans.
APPROVED. Certified record attached.
3. **065-04/05-CA** 127 Dauphin Street/ 5 St. Emanuel Street
Applicant: Joseph Cleveland Architects
Nature of Request: Complete restoration of historic buildings for mixed use (business, residential and parking) as per submitted plans.
APPROVED Certified Record attached.
4. **066-04/05-CA** 1400-1402 Church Street
Applicant: Creola Ruffin, Owner/ Ben Cummings, Architect
Nature of Request: Remove existing rear porches and reconstruct rear new rear porches to code as per submitted drawings.

WITHDRAWN

5. **067-04/05-CA** 8 Kenneth Street
Applicant: Mobile Infirmary/Gulf Health Properties
Nature of Request: Demolish historic structure to install park as per submitted plans.
DENIED. Certified Record attached.
6. **068-04/05-CA** 1209 Government Street
Applicant: Lipford Construction for Mr. & Mrs. Sahawneh
Nature of Request: Enclose second floor back porch with screen as per submitted plans.
APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. Certified Record attached.
7. **069-04/05-CA** 1209 Selma Street
Applicant: Katherine Lubecki
Nature of Request: Extend rear of house 4' as per submitted plans.
Construct rear deck measuring 12' x 24'
APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

Miscellaneous Business:

1. Design Subcommittee for 109 Levert must be selected. Douglas and Cameron will serve in this capacity.
2. Lynda Burkett announced that she will host a Midtown party for mayoral candidate Sam Jones. It will be held on July 10 in the late afternoon.
3. David Tharp announced that the AIA will be extending invitations to the candidates to speak at AIA meetings.
4. Devereaux Bemis announced that Congress is mounting a campaign to alter the easement program—specifically, people who own property in a designated historic district with review board control will be excluded from donating easements or have their benefits greatly curtailed.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:40 p.m.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

063 -04/05-CA 18 North Monterey Street
Applicant: Owen Drey and Katherine Peterson
Received: 5/25/05 Meeting Dates:
Submission Date + 45 Days: 7/09/05 1) 6/27/05 2)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Conflicts of Interest: Douglas Kearley recused himself from discussion and voting on the application.
Nature of Project: Install 3 bedrooms in existing attic. Install two new dormers. Change window in existing gable on north side to meet code. Relocate two existing windows from the south to the north side. Relocate gable window to kitchen. Remove existing windows at rear porch and install wood French doors, install French doors at master bath. Install operable wood windows on north & south sides. Install new mineral fiber shingle roof at front porch to match existing. Remove existing lattice and install new MARC lattice privacy screen. Repaint house. Install new skylights in east roof.

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

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

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

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

- The proposed construction is in compliance with Section 3 of the Design Review Guidelines.
- A. The main structure is a one story wood frame vernacular residence, ca. 1910 with an “L”-shaped front porch.
 - B. The property is a contributing structure within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District.
 - C. Due to its siting on a corner, three elevations are highly visible from public view.
 - D. The following is the description from the National Register Nomination:

“Small single story wood frame vernacular house with steeply pitched hipped roof, single light gable dormer and also a pediment gable project from the face of the main roof; the sloping porch roof extends from the main façade just below the cornice level over a full width front porch that also extends down the north side of the building; entrance door is centrally located on façade under this porch and includes wide sidelights and full width transom; porch is supported on simple Ionic columns.

- E. Plans call for alterations at both the roof level and the north (left), south (right) and east (rear) elevations. No changes are proposed for the west (front) elevation.

- F. Alterations to the north elevation:
 - 1. Remove full-length double hung wood window in kitchen and replace with rectangular window reused from attic dormer
 - a. with the remodeling of the kitchen, the existing full length window interrupts the new floor plan
 - b. while removing the existing window would not normally be acceptable, due to its location on a secondary façade, and the reuse of an original window from the roof dormer, the alteration is acceptable under Secretary of the Interior’s Standard number 2
 - 2. Remove triple wood & glass construction and replace with a pair of double hung windows; double hung windows to be reused from east and north elevations
 - a. the triple wood & glass construction to be removed is not original to the house
 - b. the double hung wood windows to be reused are currently located in both the reconfigured kitchen and master bathroom
 - c. since these will no longer be need in their current location, the reuse of these historic materials in their new location is a preferred alternative to their destruction, as stated in Secretary of the Interior’s Standard number 2
 - 3. Install new operable window in attic dormer
 - a. due to the change in use from attic space to living space, current building code requires an operable window in sleeping areas
 - b. the decorative Queen Anne window will be reused in the kitchen over the sink
 - c. since this decorative window will no longer be need in its current location, the reuse of this historic window in its new location is a preferred alternative to its destruction, as stated in Secretary of the Interior’s Standard number 2

- G. Alterations to the south elevation:
 - 1. Add new dormer with operable wood sash in roof at bedroom number 3
 - a. dormers are a traditional way of adding space in attic areas
 - b. the proposed dormer is in keeping with other existing historic roof details
 - c. this dormer does not impair the essential form or integrity of the historic property as stated in the Secretary of the Interior’s Standard number 10

- H. Alterations to the east elevation:
1. Install 2 pair of wood French doors in proposed master bath.
 - a. rear of houses are the preferred locations for alterations and additions in order to preserve and retain the overall historic character of a property
 2. Add rear deck at master bathroom.
 - a. a rear deck is a modern interpretation of a traditional porch form
 - b. therefore, allowing the deck as designed and access through the French doors in the master bath to match those proposed along the rear of the house does not impair the essential form and integrity of the historic property
 3. Remove five existing solid glass windows and a pair of wood French doors with sidelights and transom and replace with 4 pair of wood French doors.
 - a. this affected area is not original
 - b. the removal of non-historic material will not impair the integrity of the historic structure
 4. Add new dormer with operable wood sash in roof at bedroom number 2
 - a. dormers are a traditional way of adding space in attic areas
 - b. the proposed dormer is in keeping with other existing historic roof details
 - c. this dormer does not impair the essential form or integrity of the historic property as stated in the Secretary of the Interior's Standard number 10
 5. Install a pair of 2' x 4' skylights over existing stair to second level.
 - a. skylights are a modern alternative to larger dormers and are their installation is reversible, as stated in Secretary of the Interior's Standard number 10.
- I. Facts F-H are in compliance with numbers 2 and 10 of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, as follows:
1. Number 2 –
The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alterations of the features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.
 2. Number 10 –
New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.
- J. The applicants amended the application to request a 6' wood privacy fence along the north property line.
1. There are similar fences at the sidewalk along New Hamilton at both 17 North Monterey and 20 North Reed Avenue.
 2. The Historic District Overlay would allow the construction of this fence in the same line as the two existing fences.
- K. The following work items were omitted from this application by the applicant:
1. On the south elevation the window called for removal in the master bath will remain.
 2. The deck extension will not be constructed.
 3. The lattice screening on the north elevation will not be constructed.

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

The applicants were present to answer any questions pertaining to their application. They had read the staff report and had no additions.

The Board asked about changes. The applicants explained that a window necessary for egress from a bedroom would be added to one dormer and that two additional dormers would be added on the east and south elevations. A rear deck added in the recent past will be removed.

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

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no additional board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved that based upon the facts found by the Board that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Lynda Burkett and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 06/27/06.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

064 -04/05-CA 300 Marine Street
Applicant: Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund
Received: 5/25/05 Meeting Dates:
Submission Date + 45 Days: 7/09/05 1) 6/27/05 2)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden Historic District
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Conflicts of Interest: Douglas Kearley recused himself from discussion and voting on the application.

Nature of Project: Alterations to existing residence as per submitted plans.

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

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

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

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

The proposed construction is in compliance with Section 3 of the Design Review Guidelines.

1. The subject property is listed as a non-contributing structure within the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.
2. Recent selective demolition has revealed that the subject property is, in fact, an early to mid 19th-century residence.
3. The 1904 Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps list the subject property as a neighborhood store with half of the porch enclosed, as it currently appears.
4. Staff approved selective exploratory demolition on a mid-month basis to remove inappropriate later additions.
5. The structure was originally constructed with a full-length front porch and rear shed rooms.
6. The proposed restoration returns the structure to its original configuration.
7. Proposed work items include:
 - a. removal of front porch infill

- b. reconstruction of front porch including new columns, porch railing and steps
 - c. removal of a deteriorated rear addition
 - d. removal of a deteriorated second floor rear addition
 - e. restoration of the original roof line
 - f. construction of rear shed rooms
 - g. installation of 6' high masonry fencing around rear courtyard
 - h. installation of a picket fence around front yard
 - i. installation of 6' high wood privacy fence around side/rear yard
 - j. installation of parking area to left of residence
8. Though an early core exists, due to later changes and alterations, the building was considered non-contributing to the historic district.
 9. The proposed renovations will return the building to much of its original appearance and may make it eligible as contributing in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

There was no one present to represent the applicant.

Staff explained that a mid-month CoA had been issued for exploratory demolition. That demolition revealed that the building originally had a full width porch.

The Board questioned whether the building had always been a store and, if it had originally been a residence, was it single family or a duplex.

Staff responded that the location of two fireplaces suggested that it had been a duplex.

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

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no additional Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved that based upon the facts found by the Board that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 06/27/05.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

065 -04/05-CA 127 Dauphin Street/ 5 St. Emanuel Street
Applicant: Joseph Cleveland Architects, JTB Group, LLC, Developers
Received: 5/25/05 Meeting Dates:
Submission Date + 45 Days: 7/09/05 1) 6/27/05 2)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4, General Business
Conflicts of Interest: Tilmon Brown and David Tharp recused themselves from discussion or voting on the application.
Nature of Project: Alterations to existing buildings as per submitted plans.

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

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

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

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

The proposed construction is in compliance with Section 3 of the Design Review Guidelines.

- A. 125-127 Dauphin Street – McCrory’s 5 & 10 Cent Store:
1. 125-127 Dauphin Street was originally constructed in 1930 as McCrory’s 5 & 10 Cent Store.
 2. At the time of construction, the ca. 1907 Fitzgerald Store was incorporated into the store and had facades along both Dauphin Street and St. Emanuel Street.
 3. Both structures are contributing elements within the Lower Dauphin Street Historic District.
 4. The existing commercial storefronts on the first floor date from ca. 1965.
 5. There are no historic photographs from which to reconstruct the original 1930 storefronts.
 6. The proposed storefront configuration for the McCrory Building occupies the original storefront openings in a manner that is reminiscent of a 1930s design.

7. The proposed storefront retains the brick bulkhead, and is finished with a combination of smooth and pebble-dash stucco separating the storefront glazing.
- B. 5 St. Emanuel – The Fitzgerald Store
1. Only one rusticated pilaster remains from the original first floor storefront of the Fitzgerald Store.
 2. Historic photographs depict a canopy system suspended from the face of the building, with transoms above.
 3. Due to the first floor use as a parking garage, the transom area will be a system of metal grates to allow ventilation.
 4. The historic photographs are not legible enough to discern the original storefront configuration below the canopy.
 5. The proposed storefront design represents a typical Classical Revival storefront with one pair of operable garage doors on the left, a single lobby entrance at the center, and a matching pair of fixed storefront doors on the right.
 6. The applicants are using modern materials in a traditional way to replicate the missing storefronts.
- C. Facts A and B are in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards 2, 3 and 10, which state:
1. Standard 2 –
The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alterations of the features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.
 2. Standard 3 -
Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.
 3. Standard 10 –
New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

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

Staff reported that the first story will be storefront, with the upper stories residential. The first story of the St. Emanuel Street building will be parking. The applicant will return with a fire escape design.

Staff also noted that the applicants are working on a tax credit for the project.

There were no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no additional Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Lynda Burkett moved that based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board adopts the facts in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley and approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Lynda Burkett moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application DOES NOT impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 06/27/06.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

067-04/05 – CA 8 Kenneth Street
Applicant: Gulf Health Properties/ Mobile Infirmary
Received: 6/8/05 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 7/23/05 1) 6/27/05 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of the Project: Demolish existing historic residential structure. Landscape vacant lot once structure has been removed.

STAFF REPORT

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

- A. Historic or Architectural Significance
 1. The Old Dauphin Way Historic District was created in 1984.
 2. 8 Kenneth Street is a one and one-half story frame vernacular structure, constructed ca. 1915 by the Clarke-Butler Realty Company.
 3. 8 Kenneth Street is a contributing structure within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District.
 4. The house was built from plans and elevations found in a Sears & Roebuck and Company catalog.
 5. While the house was not a Sears Kit, it was based on MODERN HOME NO. 145.
 6. The developer for this structure was L.S. Arnold.
 7. The first residents of 8 Kenneth Street were the John Huffstetler Family.
 8. John Huffstetler was a partner in Huffstetler & Crabtree Mercantile Co.

- B. Importance to the Integrity of the District
 1. Mobile’s Old Dauphin Way neighborhood is a large, late 19th-century/early 20th-century suburban neighborhood...The majority of the development in this district...dates from the 1870s and 1880s through World War I. Within this large grouping are examples of various Victorian styles as well as large numbers of bungalows...Between 1830 and World War II, the Old Dauphin Way developed as a solidly middle-class residential neighborhood. The residential character is evident in the size and massing of building form that represents adaptations to local climate considerations. In response to these influences, a group of buildings evolved that maintain a compactness of size, massing and consistent program while responding to a variety of stylistic influences...
 2. 8 Kenneth Streets represents the only known residence in Mobile based on Sears & Roebuck and Company plans.

- C. Ability to Reproduce Historic Structures
1. The type and quality of the materials used in the construction of 8 Kenneth Street are no longer readily available.
 2. The structure dates from the first quarter of the 20th century, before the introduction of nominal dimension lumber. Components include old growth pine structural members and siding, historic windows, doors and interior decoration, etc. Replacement material would have to be garnered from salvage yards or specially milled.
 3. In the event that reconstruction was attempted, the cost to reproduce 8 Kenneth Street would be prohibitively expensive.
- D. Ensemble of Historic Buildings Creating a Neighborhood
1. The subject property is a boundary for the Old Dauphin Way Historic District and thereby is an important anchor to the neighborhood.
 2. Removal of this residence would erode the National Register boundary of the Old Dauphin Way Historic District.
 3. Kenneth Street borders the Midtown National Register Historic District and is surrounded by contributing structures in both the Midtown District and the Old Dauphin Way Historic District.
- E. Proposed Redevelopment Plans for the Site
1. The application states that the site will be landscaped similarly to the park at the corner of Dauphin and Kenneth, another Mobile Infirmary property.
 2. A modern park would be a non-contributing feature to the Old Dauphin Way Historic District.
 3. According to neighbors, the existing park is rarely used and its expansion would be of little or no benefit to the neighborhood.
- F. Effect of Proposed Project on the Old Dauphin Way Historic District
1. The removal of 8 Kenneth Street would degrade the streetscape along this relatively intact section of Kenneth Street .
 2. The removal of 8 Kenneth Street would impair the architectural, cultural, historical, social, aesthetic and environmental character, of not only this section of Kenneth Street, but also the Old Dauphin Way Historic District.
 3. The City of Mobile has endeavored to increase residences within the Historic Districts and the destruction of this residence would violate the policies of the City of Mobile.
 4. The demolition of 8 Kenneth would remove a viable residential structure from the City's tax rolls.
- G. Content of Application
1. Property information:
 - a. 8 Kenneth Street was acquired by the applicant in 2003 for \$133,500
 - b. The applicant states that the property is in fair/average condition .
 - c. The property is currently occupied.
 2. Alternatives Considered
 - a. The applicants state that no alternatives have been considered to retain the residence.
 3. Sale of Property by Current Owners
 - a. Information presented in the application notes that 8 Kenneth Street has not been listed for sale, nor does the applicant intend to list the property for sale.
 4. Financial Proof
 - a. No financial proof was included with the application.

H. Other:

1. The owners of this property received a variance for the adjacent property in order to provide off-premise signage for their facility.
2. The creation of this park would seem to serve no community value for either the applicant or the City of Mobile.

Staff recommends denial of the request to demolish.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Chris Miller, Property Manager for Gulf Health Properties, appeared before the Board. He explained that the building on Kenneth Street is in deteriorated condition and, after the tenants are evicted, will deteriorate even further. He also explained that the Infirmary had recently received a beautification award from Keep Mobile Beautiful for their park at the corner of Dauphin and Kenneth. The park will be extended onto this lot.

The Board asked about the eventual plan for the property in question.

Mr. Miller explained that he did not know. While it is possible that Kenneth Street might be widened, plans change often, so he was unsure of its eventual use.

Bunky Ralph asked why the Infirmary wished to extend the park. Staff more specifically asked the status of other properties on Kenneth Street. Mr. Miller responded that the Infirmary did not own any other buildings on Kenneth.

Several residents from the district were present to speak against the project:

Arthur Green, a resident of Hunter Avenue and a member of the Board of the Old Dauphin Way Association, appeared on behalf of the Association. Mr. Green explained that the ODWA was opposed to the demolition as was he personally. He asserted that the demolition was a thinly veiled excuse for expansion by the hospital into the residential neighborhood. He stated that this was simply the first step in the demolition of other houses along Kenneth Street. He noted that the demolition of the house would remove the building from the tax rolls resulting in a loss of revenue for the City. He also questioned whether long-term maintenance of the park might not eventually be shifted to the City.

Bill Smith, also a member of the Old Dauphin Way Association, opposed the demolition saying he agreed with the points made by the previous speaker.

James Larriviere, a resident of Houston Street, expressed that this demolition was part of a long-term trend to demolish historic residences in the neighborhood. He also opposed the demolition agreeing with the previous speakers' points.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no additional Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board adopt the facts in the staff report adding the fact G. 1 d. that the owner representative states that the property is in poor condition. The motion was seconded by Joe Sackett and approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts adopted by the Board, that the application does impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be denied. The motion was seconded by Cameron Pfeiffer and approved with Jim Wagoner abstaining.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

068 -04/05-CA 1209 Government Street
Applicant: Lipford Construction for Dr. and Mrs. Mazon Sahawneh
Received: 5/25/05 Meeting Dates:
Submission Date + 45 Days: 7/09/05 1) 6/27/05 2)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of Project: Screen rear porch as per submitted plans.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES AND DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3	Porches	Screen rear porch

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

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

The proposed construction is in compliance with Section 3 of the Design Review Guidelines. The Guidelines state that “Where rear or side porches are to be enclosed (or screened) one recommended method is to preserve the original configuration of columns, handrails and other important architectural features.”

1. The subject property is listed as a contributing structure within the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.
2. The 1907 Renaissance Revival-style Burgess-Maschmeyer House was designed by architect George Rogers.
3. The porch proposed to be screened is on the rear façade of the residence.
4. The porch proposed to be screened is barely visible from public view.
5. The proposed method of screening the porch retains the original columns and porch rail as illustrated in the drawings.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted with the following condition:

1. That the vertical elements be wood to match the new construction.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

There was no one present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff explained that the work was minor and asked if this work is something the Board would be comfortable having staff approve on a mid-month in the future. Having no major objections from the Board, staff will prepare a resolution to allow for approval of similar work on a mid-month basis. Staff explained that the conditional approval recommended in the staff report simply was a clarification that screening members would be wood.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no further Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved that based upon the facts adopted by the Board, that the application does impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued on condition that the screening strips are wood.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 06/27/06.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

069 -04/05-CA 1209 Selma Street
Applicant: Katherine Lubecki
Received: 6/13/05 Meeting Dates:
Submission Date + 45 Days: 8/18/05 1) 6/27/05 2)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Conflicts of Interest: Douglas Kearley recused himself from discussion and voting on the application.
Nature of Project: Extend rear of residence 4’ as per submitted plans. Construct rear deck measuring 12’ x 24’.

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

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3	Porches	Screen rear porch

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

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

The proposed construction is in compliance with Section 3 of the Design Review Guidelines.

1. The subject property is listed as a contributing structure within the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.
2. The subject property, constructed in 1913, is a large two story residence with both Arts & Crafts and Classical Revival architectural elements.
3. The rear of the building has had a series of changes and no longer represents the original rear configuration.
4. Plans for the proposed rear addition contain the following details matching the original structure:
 - a. corner board trim
 - b. wood siding
 - c. roof pitch
 - d. reused existing windows

- e. new windows to match existing
 - f. new brick piers to match existing
 - g. deck handrails to match MHDC stock rail number 1.
5. The proposed rear addition will not be visible from public view.
 6. The essential form and integrity of the historic property will not be impaired as stated in Section 10 of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

There was no one present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff explained that there had been multiple rear additions over time and that this small addition would essentially square up the rear elevation. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no additional Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 06/27/06.