

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
April 18, 2012 – 3:00 P.M.
Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Bradford Ladd, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
Members Present: David Barr, Mary Cousar, Kim Harden, Thomas Karwinski, Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswalt, and Craig Roberts.
Members Absent: Gertrude Baker, Carlos Gant, Nick Holmes, III, Jim Wagoner, Janetta Whitt-Mitchell.
Staff Members Present: Devereaux Bemis, Cart Blackwell, and John Lawler.
2. Mr. Karwinski moved to approve the minutes of the April 4, 2012 meeting. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
3. Ms. Cousar moved to approve the midmonth COA's granted by Staff. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED.

1. **Applicant: Richard Brown for David Harbor and Patti Corder**
 - a. Property Address: 1217 Elmira Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/29/12
 - c. Project: Paint the house per the submitted BLP color scheme. The body will be Fort Morgan Sand. The porch ceiling will be Selma Street Gray. The porch decking and reinstalled shutters will be Bellingrath Green.
2. **Applicant: Richard Brown for Barbara Turley**
 - a. Property Address: 1062 Church Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/29/12
 - c. Project: Reconstruct the front steps.
3. **Applicant: Robert Warren**
 - a. Property Address: 159 South Dearborn Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/27/12
 - c. Project: Repair/replace rotten wood as per the existing and repaint to match the existing color scheme.
4. **Applicant: Donald Hadley for St. Mary's Catholic Church**
 - a. Property Address: 1453 Old Shell Road
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/29/12
 - c. Project: Repair, and when necessary replace, wooden and metal window frames, sashes, and/or comes to match the existing.
5. **Applicant: Dandi Dolbar**
 - a. Property Address: 124 North Ann Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/29/12
 - c. Project: Repaint an iron railing to match the existing color.
6. **Applicant: Virginia and Callie Andreades**
 - a. Property Address: 506 Monroe Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/29/12
 - c. Project: Repaint the house per the submitted color scheme. The body will be mauve, the shutters will green (or maroon), and the trim will be white. Repair, and when necessary, replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing.

- 7. Applicant: New Beginnings Construction**
 - a. Property Address: 1557 Monroe Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/3/12
 - c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated and fire damaged woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Replace a door to match the existing. Repaint per the existing color scheme. Reroof.
- 8. Applicant: Kelsey Bohm for JJPR**
 - a. Property Address: 412 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/3/12
 - c. Project: Install a hanging sign. The double-faced sign will not impede the passerby. The metal sign will 2.5" in height and 2" in width. Said signage will feature the name of the business concern.
- 9. Applicant: Centre for the Living Arts**
 - a. Property Address: 6 South Joachim Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/4/12
 - c. Project: Install a 19 square foot sign above the storefront windows. The exhibition sign will remain in place for one year.
- 10. Applicant: Willy Robinson**
 - a. Property Address: 16 South Lafayette Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/4/12
 - c. Project: Repair a sidewalk. The dimensions and composition will match the existing.
- 11. Applicant: David O'Brien**
 - a. Property Address: 304 North Claiborne Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/2/12
 - c. Project: Repaint the house per the existing color scheme. Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork when and where necessary. The work will match the existing.
- 12. Applicant: Thomas Construction**
 - a. Property Address: 315 Weinacker Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/4/12
 - c. Project: Replace rear French door as per existing.
- 13. Applicant: Toni Ryales**
 - a. Property Address: 6 South Conception Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/5/12
 - c. Project: Install two small hanging metal signs at the ends of the existing awning. The total square footage of both hanging signs will be less than 4 square feet.
- 14. Applicant: William Gadd**
 - a. Property Address: 957 Palmetto Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/6/12
 - c. Project: Repaint the house Cricket Field. Repair, and when necessarily replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material.
- 15. Applicant: David Calametti**
 - a. Property Address: 360 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/6/12
 - c. Project: Repaint ironwork and trim.
- 16. Applicant: Tibor A. Steinberger**
 - a. Property Address: 1214 Palmetto Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/6/12
 - c. Project: Repair existing six foot privacy fence.

17. Applicant: TLC Construction

- a. Property Address: 315 Weinacker
- b. Date of Approval: 4/10/12
- c. Project: Make repairs to a fire-damaged house. Replace roofing shingles to match the existing. Repair, replace, and woodwork to match the existing. Touch up the color scheme per the existing.

18. Applicant: Sara W. Kindt

- a. Property Address: 1119 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 4/10/12
- c. Project: Paint the foundation piers and shutters Mark Twain Gray.

19. Applicant: Debbie Hicks

- a. Property Address: 1402 Blacklawn Street
- b. Date of Approval: 4/10/12
- c. Project: Repair windows so that they open, replace broken glass as necessary, remove/replace rear door with solid wood door, replace missing bricks at top of chimney, replace rotten wood where necessary as per existing in dimension and profile. Paint exterior as per existing.

20. Applicant: Keith Hancock with Hancock Roofing Inc.

- a. Property Address: 214 South Cedar Street
- b. Date of Approval: 4/6/12
- c. Project: Reroof to match the existing.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2012-25-CA: 315 Dexter Avenue

- a. Applicant: David Catron with Southern Building Structures for Cherie & Dennis Hansen.
- b. Project: Ancillary Construction – Install a prefabricated ancillary structure in the rear lot of the property.

DENIED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2012-26-CA: 1023 Dauphin Street

- a. Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley for the Salvation Army
- b. Project: Demolition – Demolish a non-contributing building; Redevelopment – Expand an adjacent parking lot, install landscaping, and fencing.

DEMOLITION APPROVAL. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

3. 2012-27-CA: 150 Government Street

- a. Applicant: David McConnell for LeClede Investors, LLC
- b. Project: Restoration/Renovation – Reroof cast iron galleries; repaint ironwork; and repair and repaint gallery decking.

APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

- 1. Window Replacements – Discussion Postponed.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2012-25-CA: 315 Dexter Avenue
Applicant: David Catron with Southern Building Structures for Cherie & Dennis Hansen
Received: 3/20/12
Meeting: 4/4/12

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Ancillary Construction – Install a prefabricated ancillary structure in the rear lot of the property.

BUILDING HISTORY

This hipped roofed “Craftsman” bungalow dates from 1935. The rectilinear house features an asymmetrically positioned gabled front porch.

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 applicants propose the construction of a garage within the rear lot. This proposal was submitted in time for and included as part of the April 4, 2012 Agenda. At the applicant’s request, it was changed to the present meeting.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and the Guidelines for New Residential Construction in Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “An accessory structure is any construction other than the main building on the property. It includes but is not limited garages, carports, pergolas, decks, pool covers, sheds and the like. The appropriateness of accessory structures shall be measured by the guidelines applicable for new construction. The structure should complement the design and scale of the main building.”
 - 2. “In new buildings, exterior materials - both traditional and modern – should closely resemble surrounding historic examples. Modern materials having the same textural qualities and character as materials located on nearby historical examples maybe acceptable.”
- A. Scope of Work:
 - a. The building will be located 17’ from the East (rear) property line, 13’ from the North property line, and 10’ 6” from the South property line.
 - b. The building will measure 24’ 1” in width, 28’ 1” in depth, and 8’ in height (not counting a roof pitch of 4”/12).

- c. The building will rest atop a raised concrete slab foundation.
- d. The building will feature metal siding and roofing.
- e. The A-framed roofed building will be sheathed with metal panels.
- f. The West Elevation will feature a metal vehicular garage door.
- g. The North Elevation will feature a vinyl clad steel door with a small glazed light and a sixteen light vinyl window.
- h. The East (Rear) Elevation will not feature fenestration.
- i. The South Elevation will not feature fenestration.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of storage shed in the rear of the property.

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts require that ancillary construction be measured according to the Guidelines applicable to New Residential Construction. The Guidelines further state that design and scale of ancillary construction complement the property's main building. (See B (1) of the Staff Report.)

Assembled out of pre-fabricated components, this installation would be minimally visible from the public view. The Board has approved and authorized Staff to approve the installation of small scale storage buildings. Location, design, and materials are subject to review.

While the proposed installation would be minimally visible from the public view, the scale, materials, and detailing of the proposed structure are not in keeping with historic integrity of the property's principal building. Metal siding is not approved for replacements on and additions to historic buildings. Metal roofing is reviewed on a case by case basis. Vinyl windows are not approved.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff believes that this application will impair the architectural and the historical character of the property and the district. Staff does not recommend approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Dennis Hansen, Cherie Hansen, and Mike Chapman were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicants and their representative. He asked them if they had any questions to ask, comments to make, or clarifications to address with regard to the Staff Report.

Mrs. Hansen told the Board that she had resided on this property since 2003 and that her automobile had been broken into on several occasions. She said that this application for a rear lot garage was part of an effort to prevent future burglary attempts. Mrs. Hansen said that while the design of the proposed building was not historic, it was still nice. She inquired as to alternatives.

Mr. Hansen said that a later wooden shed is currently located in another portion of the backyard. He added that the aforementioned ancillary structure is in a bad state of repair. Mr. Hansen said that he and his wife needed a place to store yard equipment and park vehicles. He said that the proposed building would not be visible from the street.

Mr. Chapman spoke on behalf of the application. He pointed out the special features of the proposed shed. Noting that the building was not a typical metal storage shed, Mr. Chapman stated that building's special features include trimmed siding and a roof pitch comparable to traditional construction. He said that a shingle roof could be substituted for metal if the Board so required.

Mr. Ladd thanked Mr. and Mrs. Hansen and Mr. Chapman. He explained that the Board's task is to uphold the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts, as well as to take into consideration Board rulings. He told the Hansens and Mr. Chapman that each application is reviewed on an individual basis.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any comments to make, questions to ask, or clarifications which required address.

Mr. Roberts asked Staff what was the size limit of approvable ancillary installations. Mr. Blackwell explained that Staff approves up to and just beyond 10' x 10' installations. He said that setbacks, visibility, materials, and design are taken into account.

Mr. Roberts asked the applicants and their representative if they were amenable to substituting another siding for the metal siding. Mr. Chapman said that he would look into that alternative.

Mr. Bemis told the applicants of the MHDC stock garage plan.

Mr. Karwinski said that he had several comments. He said that ancillary construction should recall the design and detail of the main building. Mr. Karwinski noted that given the building's use it could be slab on grade and feature hardiplank siding. He said that both the roof form and pitch should be based on that of the main house.

Mentioning that the house features a hipped roof body and a gabled roof porch, Mr. Hansen inquired as to which roof type and pitch should be used as basis for design.

Ms. Harden stated that either a hipped or gabled roof would be appropriate.

Mr. Roberts agreed saying that exposed rafter tails and window forms, along with other details/construction methods, should be employed.

Mr. Chapman said that hardiplank siding could be employed, but he was unsure as to altering roof pitches and increasing overhangs.

Mr. Karwinski said that he had further comments to make. Mentioning the siting of the building, he said that by moving the building further to the drive it would be easier for vehicles to access in addition to allowing greater engagement with the yard. Mr. Hansen said that while the building could be moved slightly, the proposed location was determined by trees located within the backyard.

Mr. Karwinski addressed the size of the building. He said that even though the building appeared to comply with zoning restrictions it could be smaller.

Mr. Ladd asked Mr. Chapman if there were slightly smaller sizes of what appeared to be an incremental design. Mr. Chapman answered yes.

Mr. Roberts asked Staff the best procedure for ruling upon the application. Mr. Bemis stated that based on the Board comments an ensuing submission would be a redesign therefore it could be denied and still

reappear at the earliest possible date. Mr. Blackwell said that if a revised application was received by Monday, April 23rd the application could be placed on the May 2, 2012 Agenda and if received by the April 30th, the application would be placed on the May 16th Agenda.

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 written.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2012-26-CA: 1023 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley for the Salvation Army
Received: 3/29/12
Meeting: 4/18/12

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-2
Project: Demolition – Demolish a non-contributing building; Redevelopment – Expand an adjacent parking lot, install landscaping, and fencing.

BUILDING HISTORY

This building dates from 1887. The single story frame structure was constructed as a rental residence. During the middle third of the 20th Century, the building was converted from residential to commercial use. During the latter half of that time period, the original façade was removed and the current storefront installed.

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 calls for the demolition of the non-contributing building and the redevelopment of that portion of the larger Salvation Army property. The redevelopment proposal would entail the extension of a parking lot, the installation of fencing, and the installation of landscaping.
- B-1. The 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 house dates from 1887. The single story frame residence was drastically altered sometime between 1925 and 1955. During the latter half of that period, the façade and portions of the side elevations were

removed and commercial frontages were installed. Concrete block additions were constructed to the south and east of the building. The interior partitions were removed. As a result of the aforementioned alterations, the building is listed as a non-contributing structure.

- ii. The importance of the structures to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
 1. This building is a non-contributing structure located within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. While lacking in architectural integrity, the building contributes to the built density of the district, adds solidity to the corner location, and functions as part of the rhythmic spacing buildings along Dauphin Street.
- 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. With the exception the gable, most of the remaining historic fabric is in advanced state of decay.
- 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. Other residential to commercial conversions can be found across the older portions of Mobile. These altered buildings are characterized by mid-twentieth century storefronts which front surviving historic fabric and detailing.
- 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. The redevelopment proposal calls for the extension of a parking lot, the installation of hardscaping, the construction of fencing, and the installation of landscaping.
- vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 1. The Salvation Army acquired the building on July 1, 1976 at a purchase price of \$28,000.
- vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 1. The Salvation Army has been unable to realize an alternative other than the demolition of the building.
- viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 1. The building has not been listed for sale.
- 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. NA.
- x. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
 1. See submitted materials.
- 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. Application submitted.
 - xii. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the Board.
 1. See submitted materials.
 3. *Post demolition or relocation plans required.* In no event shall the Board entertain any application for the demolition or relocation of any historic property unless the applicant also presents at the same time the post-demolition or post-relocation plans for the site.”
- B-2. The Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
1. “Modern paving materials are acceptable in the historic districts. However, it is important that the design, location and materials be compatible with the property.”
 2. “Landscaping can assist in creating an appropriate setting. Asphalt is inappropriate for walkways. Gravel and shell are preferred paving materials; however, a variance is required for commercial applications. Hard surface materials may be acceptable.”
 3. “The appearance of parking areas should be minimized through good site planning and design. New materials such as grasspave and grasscrete, which provides a solid parking surface while still allowing grass to grow giving the appearance of a continuance of a front lawn, may be feasible.”
 4. “Parking areas should be screened from view by the use of low masonry walls, wood or iron fences or landscaping.”
 5. “Proposed lighting should be designed to avoid invading surrounding areas.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plan):
1. Demolish the building.
 2. Expand the parking areas located to the east and west of the building to cover the site.
 - a. Asphalt paving will be installed atop the site of the house.
 - b. Thirteen new parking spaces will be provided.
 3. Install fencing.
 - a. The existing 3’ picket fence will extend around the site.
 - b. The fencing will match the existing picket fence extending along the eastern portion of the property’s Dauphin Street frontage, as well as along a portion of the Pine Street frontage.
 - c. The fence will be angled at the northwest corner of the property. An existing historic marker will be relocated within the triangular area created by the canted section of fencing. This accent feature will be surrounded by a ring of brick pavers.
 4. Install landscaping
 - a. Perimeter landscaping will extend along the northern and western sides of the house site.
 - b. Perimeter shrubbery will be fronted by sod.
 - c. Sod will surround the canted corner’s focal area.
 - d. Two trees will be planted in the perimeter landscaping area.
 - e. Two trees will be planted in an inner landscape island. The landscape island will be planted with sod.
 5. Construct a new sidewalk along Dauphin Street and reinstate the traditional green space.
 - a. Remove sidewalk extensions.
 - b. The paving dimensions and material will match the existing.
 - c. Plant grass between the outer edge of the restored sidewalk configuration and the street.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the demolition of a non-contributing building. Demolition applications entail the review of the following: the architectural significance of the building; the condition of the building; the nature of the proposed redevelopment; and the impact of the demolition on the streetscape and district.

The non-contributing building dates from 1887. The one time single family rental residence was extensively altered during the middle third of the 20th Century. A commercial store front was installed, interior partitions removed, and additions were constructed. With the exception of the Façade's gable and West Elevation's siding, little of the building's original fabric or form remains. Later additions wrap the East and South Elevations.

Some portions of the building are structurally secure and well maintained while others areas and constructions exhibit signs of deterioration. The commercial storefront and additions remain in a good state of repair, as does the Façade's gable, the most prominent feature remaining from the original design. The West Elevation's siding is missing in locations and the framing is rotten in part.

As a corner lot construction, this building contributes to the built density and rhythmic spacing of two streetscapes. If approved for demolition, the existing parking areas located to the south and east of the site would be extended over the site. Fencing matching existing fencing that extends along Dauphin and Pine Streets would enclose the site. Landscaping would be installed. The sidewalk would be reduced in size and reconfigured to a traditional footprint. An existing historic marker would be relocated to the northwest corner of the site. Situated within an angled green space, the marker would function as an anchor for the corner location.

The middle portion of this block underwent extensive alteration as a result of the construction of the Salvation Army building. Parking lots and lawn flank the complex's main building. If the demolition of the corner building was approved, the westernmost parking areas would be expanded to northwest corner of the complex. While the traditional fencing, landscape components, reconfigured sidewalk, and angled accent would minimize the impact of the parking area, the resulting void would alter the built density and rhythmic spacing of Dauphin and Pine Streets. The intersection of Dauphin and Pine would be particularly affected. An undeveloped portion of lot is located at the southwest corner of the intersection a vacant lot occupies the northeast corner.

In recent decades, the Architectural Review Board has approved the demolition of two non-contributing corner location commercial establishments. On July 8, 1998, the Old Dauphin Way Review Board approved the demolition of 1560 Old Shell Road (northwest corner of Kilmarnock Street and Old Shell Road). The 1953 building, formerly Ibsen Garden Supply Co, was designed by C. L. Hutchisson, Jr. On October 21, 2009, the Board approved the demolition of 100 North Catherine Street (northeast corner of North Catherine and Old Shell Road). Parking lots surrounding by fencing and featuring internal landscaping were subsequently developed on both lots.

CLARIFICATIONS

1. What type shrubbery and trees will be planted?
2. Will any on site lighting be employed?

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B-3) and B-2 (1-5), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the historic district. Pending the aforementioned clarifications and the inclusion (if possible) of taller understory perimeter plantings, Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Douglas B. Kearley was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant's representative. He asked Mr. Kearley if he had any questions to ask, comments to make, or clarifications to address with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Kearley answered no.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any comments to make, questions to ask, or clarifications which required address.

Mr. Karwinski asked for clarification regarding the proposed plantings. Mr. Kearley stated that while the site plan was exacting as to curbcuts, fencing, paving, and dimensions, it was not finite as to plantings.

Mr. Karwinski asked Staff if it was correct to move the historic marker. For instance, he asked if it would be appropriate to move a marker indicating the box within Ford Theatre where Lincoln was assassinated to an exterior location. Mr. Bemis explained to Mr. Karwinski that the text of the sign proposed for relocation was not site specific. Mr. Kearley agreed. He said that it had been relocated to the site from Bienville Square.

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 written

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 4/18/13

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2012-27-CA: 150 Government Street
Applicant: David McConnell for LeClede Investors LLC
Received: 4/2/12
Meeting: 4/18/12

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Restoration/Renovation – Reroof cast iron galleries; repaint ironwork; and repair and repaint gallery decking.

BUILDING HISTORY

The LeClede is Mobile’s only surviving 19th-Century hostelry. The building was constructed in three different stages. An easternmost two-story section located at the northwest corner of Government and Saint Emanuel Streets dates from 1855. A taller third story, central section was constructed the year thereafter. These 19th-Century portions of the complex were combined into one ownership in 1871 under the name of the LaClede. The western and final section was built in 1940. The two eastern portions of the building are graced with cast iron galleries.

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. This application calls for the reroofing of galleries, the repainting of ironwork, and the repair and repainting of porch decking.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The porch (or gallery) is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. Historic porches should be maintained and repaired to reflect their period.”
 - 2. “The form and shape of the porch and its roof should maintain their historic appearance. The materials should blend with the style of the building.”
 - 3. “A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Original or historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof should be maintained. Materials should be appropriate to the form and pitch and color.”
 - 5. “Period color schemes are encouraged.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Remove metal roofing from the building’s cast iron galleries.
 - 2. Install asphalt roofing atop the existing roof structure. The roofing shingles will match shingles employed on the body of the building.

3. Repair and replace the gallery decking to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material.
4. Repaint the gallery decking and iron work Satin Black.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the reroofing historic cast iron galleries, repair and replacement of decking, and repainting of ironwork and decking.

Single or Tiered galleries are a defining feature of Mobile's 19th-Century architecture. The Design Review Guidelines state that historic porches or galleries should be maintained to reflect their period. The form and pitch of roofing should be maintained. Materials should blend with the style of the building (See B (1-3) of the Staff Report).

Historic iron galleries traditionally featured metal roofs. Often concave, but sometimes undulating or convex in curvature, the pitch of the roof either adapted its pitch to the windows sills of upper the story fenestration or the roof treatment of the surmounting superstructure. While neither section of the LaClede's two galleries feature their original metal roof, pictorial and documentary evidence indicate that the building's galleries were always covered by a metal sheathing. In cases of low pitch such as at the LaClede Hotel (particularly the 1856 or middle portion), metal roofs served to prevent the collection and backflow of rainwater.

With the exception of two galleries (350 and 357-359 Church Street), the remainder of Mobile's cast iron umbrages feature metal roofs. Documentation of the initial approval of the aforementioned exceptions cannot be located. The latter example is restricted to the recessed side galleries.

Taking into the historical significance of the building, sections B (1-3) of the Staff Report, and the pitch of the galleries, Staff believes the proposed reroofing will impair the architectural and historical integrity of the building.

As per the repainting of the ironwork and the repair/replacement and painting of porch decking, these interventions will match existing.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval in part and denial in part.

Based on B (1-3), Staff believes the proposed re-roofing will impair the architectural and historical character of the building and the district. Staff does not recommend approval of that portion of the application.

Based on B (4), Staff believes the in kind repair work and color scheme will not impair the architectural or the historical character of the building. Staff recommends approval of that portion of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

David McConnell was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Blackwell explained to the Board that there had been miscommunication with regard to this application. He said that only the center section of roof was to be replaced. Gesturing to an image in the PowerPoint presentation, he pointed out that the aforementioned location no longer features a metal roof. He said that proposed bitumen roofing was acceptable.

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicants' representatives. He asked Mr. McConnell if he had any questions to ask, comments to make, or clarifications to address with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. McConnell explained the reason and location of the deterioration and the proposed corrective intervention.

Ms. Harden asked for clarification as to the location of the proposed roof work and the type of proposed decking. Mr. McConnell addressed Ms. Harden's queries.

No further questions ensued from the Board. Given that no persons were in the audience present to speak either for or against the application, Mr. Ladd 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, amending facts to note that existing metal roofing would remain and that the color of the bitumen roof would be either Weatherwood or Chestnut.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 4/18/12