

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
April 19, 2017 – 3:00 P.M.
Multi Purpose Room, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Harris Oswalt, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
Members Present: Harris Oswalt, Robert Brown, Craig Roberts, Steve Stone, Robert Allen, John Ruzic, David Barr, Steve Stone, and Carolyn Hasser.
Members Absent: Catarina Echols, Nicholas Holmes III, Jim Wagoner, and Kim Harden.
Staff Members Present: Shayla Beaco, Cartledge W. Blackwell, Melissa Mutert, Bridget Daniel, and Paige Largue.
2. Mr. Stone asked to include the names of those in opposition to any motions. He also requested the minutes of the April 5, 2017 ARB meeting to include the initial motion for 1055 Elmira Street. Mr. Stone moved to approve the minutes for the April 5, 2017 meeting as amended with the initial motion for 1055 Street. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.
3. Mr. Stone moved to approve midmonth COA's granted by Staff. The motion received a second and was approved with one in opposition, Mr. Robert Allen. Mr. Allen stated in four months over one hundred Certificates of Appropriateness's have been issued without public notice or input.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED

1. **Applicant: Martin Douglas**
 - a. Property Address: 506 Monroe Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/27/2017
 - c. Project: Install 8' x 10' wood shed with asphalt shingles to meet setback requirements. Shed will be painted to match house. Reroof house with architectural shingles in charcoal. Repair deteriorated wood to match existing in dimension, profile and material including shutters and lattice. Repaint house in the following color scheme: Behr PPU14-02 Glass Sapphire Blue- Body
Behr 790C Silver Drop White-Window Frames and Railing Olympic OL141 Steeple Gray-Lattice Work, Top Railing, Porch Deck .
2. **Applicant: LMD LLC**
 - a. Property Address: 1151 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/27/2017
 - c. Project: Install metal sign to say "Hollywood Beauty Supply" with white letters and purple background .
3. **Applicant: Marcio Simao**
 - a. Property Address: 961 Selma Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/29/2017.
 - c. Project: Install privacy fence and gates.
4. **Applicant: Bradley Robertson**
 - a. Property Address: 952 Savannah Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/30/2017
 - c. Project: Reroof architectural shingles in charcoal. Replace deteriorated wood work fascia board to match existing in material, profile, and dimension. Repaint to match existing.

5. **Applicant: Edmund Zoghby**
 - a. Property Address: 7 N. Claiborne Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/31/2017
 - c. Project: Reroof with architectural shingles. Replace deteriorated woodwork to match existing in dimension, profile, and material. Replace rear asbestos shingles on sunporch facade with lapsiding. Repaint to match.
6. **Applicant: Tim Bullock**
 - a. Property Address: 603 St. Francis Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/4/2017
 - c. Project: Repair and replace rotten wood. Reapint to match.
7. **Applicant: HVA Properties LLC**
 - a. Property Address: 211 S. Cedar Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/4/2017
 - c. Project: Repair and and replace deteriorated wood on front porch soffits, fascia, ceiling, railings, and balustrade to match existing. Repaint to match.
8. **Applicant: Emile Buerger**
 - a. Property Address: 66 N. Reed Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/4/2017
 - c. Project: Construct 22'0" x 8'0" deck off rear of house.
9. **Applicant: Liz Garza on behalf of BA and Virginia Naman**
 - a. Property Address: 119 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/24/2017
 - c. Project: Install individual storefront sign with metal letters saying "Superfoods" on constructed wooden sign. A faux foliage ground will surround a metal panel sign.
10. **Applicant: Jacob Green**
 - a. Property Address: 1008 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/4/2017
 - c. Project: Touch up existing paint scheme to match.
11. **Applicant: Melissa Hamilton**
 - a. Property Address: 161 S. Dearborn Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/4/2017
 - c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork including lapsiding and porch railing to match in dimension, profile, and material. Touch up paint to match existing. Repaint shutters in SW6425 Relentless Olive.
12. **Applicant: Matt Allen**
 - a. Property Address: 116 Houston Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/5/2017
 - c. Project: Reroof in architectural singles, charcoal.
13. **Applicant: Jeff Sims**
 - a. Property Address: 1108 Church Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/5/2017
 - c. Project: Repaint in existing color scheme.
14. **Applicant: Sean O'Donnell**
 - a. Property Address: 1707 Hunter Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/5/2017
 - c. Project: Repair rot, reroof.

15. Applicant: Chris McGough

- a. Property Address: 52 S. Catherine Street
- b. Date of Approval: 4/5/2017
- c. Project: Replace sill beam. Repoint brick piers with appropriate mortar where deteriorated.

16. Applicant: Jeff Sims

- a. Property Address: 500 Marine Street
- b. Date of Approval: 4/5/2017
- c. Project: Repaint.

17. Applicant: Mary Beth Harris

- a. Property Address: 1409 Campbell Street
- b. Date of Approval: 4/6/2017
- c. Project: Remove failing, partial remaining, bottom chimney stack on eastern ridge of house.

18. Applicant: Matt Allen

- a. Property Address: 6 N. Jackson Street
- b. Date of Approval: 4/7/2017
- c. Project: Reroof in architectural shingles, dark gray.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2017-18-CA: 1102 Savannah Street

- a. Applicant: Douglas Kearley of Douglas Burtu Kearley Architect on behalf of Charles and Lou Ann Ingram
- b. Project: Ancillary Related – Demolish a non-contributing ancillary building and construct a new ancillary building.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2017-19-CA: 615 Dauphin Street:

- a. Applicant: Robert Maurin of Maurin Architecture on behalf of Wendell Quimby
- b. Project: Storefront and Courtyard Related – Alter a previously remodeled ground floor storefront and Redesign a courtyard.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

3. 2017-20-CA: 1008 Government Street:

- a. Applicant: Jacob Greene
- b. Project: Extension of a Corrective Measure – Allow for a four month extension to remove inappropriate siding and install historically appropriate siding.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Discussion

a. Rules & Regulations

Mr. Blackwell distributed the Rules and Regulations previously adopted by the Board. He requested that the Board review the document before the May 3, ARB meeting, and that if the Board should have anything to address to send it to MHDC staff on or before April 28, 2017.

Mr. Blackwell also noted that hard copies of the Mobile Historic District's Guidelines will be delivered to the Board at their next meeting.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2017-18-CA: 1102 Savannah Street
Applicant: Douglas Kearley of Douglas Burtu Kearley Architect on behalf of Charles and Lou Ann Ingram
Received: 3/29/17
Meeting: 4/19/17

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing (main dwelling) and Non-Contributing (ancillary)
Zoning: R-1
Project: Ancillary Related – Demolish a non-contributing ancillary building and construct a new ancillary building.

BUILDING HISTORY

This property features a principle dwelling dating from 1912. With a façade featuring a projecting bay window paired with a gallery, the center hall dwelling perpetuates a popular mid Victorian residential typology found across the Deep South. The subject dwelling is a late example and employs then popular Colonial Revival elements and details.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

The Historic Preservation Ordinance (Article IV, Chapter IV) 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 August 6, 2008. On the aforementioned date, the Board approved the reconfiguration of a portion of the roof atop a the main house. The application up for review calls for the demolition of a non-contributing ancillary building and the construction a new ancillary building.
- B. The City of Mobile Historic Preservation Ordinance and the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 1. When reviewing applications for the demolition of buildings, the following criteria are taken into account “architectural significance, physical condition, impact on the streetscape, and nature of any proposed redevelopment.”
 2. “Design an accessory structure to be subordinated in scale to that of the main residence.”

3. "If a proposed accessory structure is larger than the size of typical historic accessory structures in the district, break up the mass of the larger structure into smaller modules that reflect traditional accessory structures."
4. "Locate a new accessory structure in line with other visible accessory structures in the district."
5. "A new accessory structure should be compatible with those in the district."
6. "Cement-based fiber siding" is listed as acceptable material for ancillary new construction.

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

1. Demolish a non-contributing ancillary building.
2. Construct a new ancillary building.
 - a. The building will be situated 8' from the West (a side) and 3' 6" from the North (rear) property line.
 - b. The building will measure 38' in length and 23' 6" in depth (greatest point).
 - c. The building will rest atop brick-veneered foundation piers designed to match those supporting the principle residence.
 - d. Framed and recessed lattice skirting panels will extend between the foundation piers.
 - e. The building will feature ceiling heights slightly greater than 9'.
 - f. The walls will be clad with hardiboard/plank siding.
 - g. Corner boards will be employed.
 - h. Aluminum clad wood windows featuring a two-over-two light configuration will be employed.
 - i. A combination of hipped and gable roof structures will surmount the building.
 - j. Asphalt shingles will sheath the roof.
 - k. South Elevation (principle façade)
 - i. The composition of the South Elevation will recess back into the lot in a northeasterly direction.
 - ii. A faceted bay window featuring three two-over-two windows surmounted by a gable with a vertically oriented louvered lunette will comprise the westernmost portion of the three part South Elevation.
 - iii. The middle portion of the South Elevation will be fronted by a three bay porch accessed by a westerly splayed flight of wooden steps.
 1. Three turned and chamfered porch posts will define the aforementioned umbrage.
 2. Picketed railings will extend between the porch posts.
 3. Tongue-and-groove porch decking will be employed.
 4. A glazed & paneled wood door and two two-over-two windows will comprise the fenestration this middle portion of the building.
 5. The building's principle hip roof will surmount the whole of this middle portion of the building.
 - iv. A recessed bay without fenestration will comprise the easternmost portion of the South Elevation.
 - l. West (a side) Elevation
 - i. The westernmost window within the South Elevation's faceted bay window's fenestration will obliquely engage the West Elevation.
 - ii. Gable and hip roof forms will surmount the whole.
 - m. North (rear) Elevation
 - i. The North Elevation will feature a one two-over-two window.
 - ii. Gable and hip roof forms will surmount whole.
 - n. East (a side) Elevation

- i. The composition of the East Elevation will recess backward in a southwesterly direction.
- ii. The composition of the East Elevation is three part.
- iii. A glazed and paneled door will be located in the northernmost portion of the East Elevation.
- iv. A wooden stoop with picketed railings and balustrades will access the aforementioned door.
- v. A gable roof with a vertically oriented lunette will surmount the northernmost portion of the East Elevation.
- vi. A porch bay will comprise the middle portion of the East Elevation.
- vii. The principle hip roof will surmount the aforementioned and extend beyond the northernmost portion.
- viii. The easternmost window of the South Elevation's faceted bay window's fenestration will obliquely engage the East Elevation.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the demolition of a later non-contributing ancillary building and the construction of a new ancillary building.

With regard to the demolition of existing ancillary building, the same criteria by which Board reviews the demolition of principle buildings are taken into account. According to the Historic Preservation Ordinance and the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts, the main design considerations taken into account are as follows: significance, condition, impact on the street and the district, and nature of proposed development (See B-1.). With regard to architectural significance, the ancillary building proposed for demolition does not date from the period of significance that confers the property its contributing status. Constructed long after the main contributing dwelling's completion, the building is not of the same architectural caliber and construction quality as the residence which it was constructed to serve. As to condition, the building constitutes on grade construction. The building suffers from rising damp and rotting wood. The impact on the streetscape would be minimal for while structure can be viewed at the end the driveway from certain angles, it is located at the rear of a deep lot. As to the nature of proposed redevelopment, a new ancillary building is proposed for construction. See the ensuing paragraph for the analysis of said new construction.

New ancillary construction involves review of considerations pertaining to placement, scale, massing, design, and material. With regard to placement, the proposed ancillary building is located in line with other visible accessory buildings in the district and, more particularly, for on the block upon which the building stands. Additionally, more significant ancillary buildings of the house's construction period were located close to or on the rear lot (See B-4.). The proposed design adopts a traditional raised per foundation, siding clad walls, and rake roof structure that is consistent with the design of more advanced ancillary construction of similar use for main building's period of construction (See B-5.). While the size is larger, the breaking of the building parts into smaller modules breaks with the scale of the building and compliments the house (See B-3.). The proposed building's asymmetrical composition with its projecting bay and inset porch responds directly to the main residence, as does the employment of siding, sash, windows, cornice returns, and other motifs/elements/constructions. Though the ancillary building's ceiling heights are lower than those of the main house, secondary buildings generally had lower ceiling heights. The diminution in scale is also responsive to the step-downs of roof and elevation on the side and rear of the house. The change in scale is therefore responsive to historical and contextual conditions

(See B-2.). As to material, exterior claddings such as hardiboard/plank are authorized for new construction. Siding is employed on the main residence.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-6), Staff does not believe this application will impair either the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district. Staff recommends approval of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Douglas B. Kearley, the owner's representative, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed Mr. Kearley and asked him as the applicant's representative if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make. Mr. Kearley stated that Mr. Blackwell addressed the application in full.

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

Upon being queried by Mr. Roberts, Mr. Blackwell confirmed that the application was addressing both the demolition of the ancillary structure and the new construction. Mr. Roberts asked if a variance would be necessary to construct the new ancillary building since it was considered residential. Mr. Kearley noted that the owners would seek the variance if they chose to construct the interior as planned. Mr. Ruzic questioned the need for a variance. Mr. Kearley stated that the owner's intention was not to rent the proposed ancillary building.

Mr. Stone stated that a window was not drawn on the North Elevation. Mr. Kearley noted it would be a diamond window.

Mr. Brown asked where parking was located. Mr. Kearley replied the area west of the main house is currently employed as parking would continue to be used as such. No other questions ensued.

Mr. Oswalt opened the application to public comment. No one was present to speak either for or against the application. Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report as amended to note that a diamond window shall be located on North elevation.

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.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: April 19, 2018

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2017-19-CA: 613-615 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Robert Maurin with Maurin Architecture on behalf of Wendell Quimby
Received: 3/27/17
Meeting: 4/19/17

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: T5.1
Project: Storefront and Courtyard Related – Alter a previously remodeled ground floor storefront and Redesign a courtyard.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to materials located within this property’s MHDC vertical file, the two-story eastern portion of this property dates circa 1870 and the later one-story western portion dates from circa 2002.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

The Historic Preservation Ordinance (Article IV, Chapter IV) 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 May 8, 2001. On the aforementioned date, the Board approved the alteration of fenestration and the creation of a courtyard. The application up for review calls for the alteration of a later ground-floor storefront and changes to the courtyard approved in 2001.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Preserve the key character-defining features of a historic commercial façade.”
 - 2. “Retain an original bulkhead as a decorative panel.”
 - 3. “Locate a new storefront in the same plane as it was historically.”
 - 4. “Design a wall to be compatible with the architectural style of the house/building and existing walls in the district.”
 - 5. “When building a solid wall, use a finish and material that is similar in texture, mass, and durability to historic walls in the neighborhood.”
 - 6. “Visually connect the street and building.”
 - 7. “Where evidence does not exist, use a contemporary interpretation of a traditional storefront.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Remove a later storefront and bulkhead.
 - 2. Install a new storefront.
 - a. Install set of three French steel doors in masonry opening.
 - b. The doors will measure 9’9-1/2”H x 5’8”W or 9’9-1/2”H x6’0”W.

- c. The doors will be of a multi-light configuration.
3. Reconfigure a courtyard
 - a. Remove the existing masonry coping wall and surmounting iron fencing.
 - b. Remove steel bars located on windows.
 - c. Remove paving.
 - d. Install brick pavers.
 - e. Install masonry seating/ planters.
 - f. Install landscaping.
4. Repaint the building.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the alteration of a previously remodeled ground floor storefront and the redesign of a courtyard constructed within the present century.

While the façade of the second-story older portion of the building remains intact, the ground floor has been altered on numerous occasions as is a typical practice in the commercial Design realm. With regard to the work proposed to the storefront, the subject storefront dates from the 1990s. Staff file photographs illustrate that a metal roof up door occupied the subject location prior to the creation of the present storefront sequence. Two sections of bulkhead would be removed if the proposed storefront was installed. Imagery in other historical archives and physical examination show that the bulkhead is not original so no historic fabric would be lost (See B-2.). The westernmost fenestrated bay, a doorway, one of the most important and few remaining original design characteristics on the ground floor, would remain (See B-1.). Said door served as the ground floor entrance to the second-story portion of the building. The new storefront would be located in a same plan as historic examples (See B-3.). In terms of composition, a tripartite grouping of fenestration comprised of three pairings of French doors is appropriate to the period. Said work would be complementary to historic patterns, not remove Historic fabric, and respond to the historic transom zone, and while still be differentiated from the historic fabric view a responsive, but present day contemporary light configuration and material (See B-7.).

As to the proposed alterations to the courtyard, said construction dates from the early 2000s. Prior to the creation of the Lower Dauphin Commercial Historic Districts there stood a multi-story masonry building on the site. The MHDC vertical file contained no certified record as to the approval and construction date one-story addition to the main building which is located behind courtyard. No historic fabric would be lost. In accord with the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts, the wall is compatible to the historic building while allowing for the installation of cotemporary Street furniture (See B-4.) The wall material and finish are similar to the texture, mass, and durability of examples of historic walls (See B-5.). The creation of an entrance to courtyard from Dauphin Street would serve to visually connect the later addition which the courtyard fronts to the principle street which the complex engages (See B-6.). A sense of enclosure would be retained by the redesign of the wall, albeit with improved access and creation of axis. A plaza-like space engaging fenestration on the main building's side elevation would be afforded on the increasingly enlivened Dearborn Street elevation through the execution of the proposed work.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-6), Staff does not believe this application will impair either the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Robert Maurin, the owner's representative, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed Mr. Maurin and asked him as the applicant's representative if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make. Mr. Maurin stated that Mr. Blackwell had addressed the application, but that the applicant also intends to repave the courtyard and re-landscape the same.

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

Mr. Stone questioned the penmarks on the plans. Mr. Blackwell reiterated comments made during the presentation to the effect of disregarding the annotations.

Mr. Ruzic asked for clarification on the origin of the bulkhead. Mr. Blackwell explained the current bulkhead was constructed in the early 2000's. Prior to the aforementioned date, a metal garage door occupied the space.

No further questions ensued.

Mr. Oswalt opened the application to public comment. No one was present to speak either for or against the application. Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public discussion.

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 approved 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: April 19, 2018

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2017-20-CA: 1008 Government Street
Applicant: Jacob Green
Received: 4/3/17
Meeting: 4/19/17

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Extension of a Corrective Measure – Allow for a four month extension to remove inappropriate siding and install historically appropriate siding.

BUILDING HISTORY

This house dates from 1889. Bavarian born “architect” Rudolph Benz executed the designs. With its complex grouping of volumes and employment of varying types of wood manufacture, the dwelling is a notable instance of the American variant of the larger Anglo-American Aesthetics Movement. Benz designed Mobile’s most important Aesthetics Movement informed residential and commercial buildings. Other works executed by Benz and his firm in that vein include: (203 Dauphin Street, presently Noble South); (204-206 Dauphin Street, presently Naman’s); (1 South Royal Street, formerly Three Sisters or Zadek’s and presently Bunde); 1010 Government Street (McCartney House); McCoy House (no longer extant; portion of Main Branch of the MPL); and Festorazzi House (portion of the Spanish Plaza site).

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The application up for review calls for a four month extension to remove inappropriate siding and install siding that matched the original.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Preserve the key historic features of a wall.”
 - 2. “The exterior materials of a building help define its style, quality, and historic period. Original materials should be preserved whenever feasible.”
 - 3. “If the original material is wood clapboard, for example, then the replacement material should be a material that matches the original in finish, size, and the amount of clapboard exposed.”
 - 4. “When replacing materials on a non-primary façade or elevation, match the original material in composition, scale, and material.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Extension of a Corrective Measure – Allow for a four month extension to remove inappropriate siding and install historically appropriate siding.

2. Install wooden siding matching the historic siding in profile, dimension, and material in impacted locations.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application entails the extension of a corrective measure. The scope of work calls for a four month extension to remove inappropriate siding and to be immediately followed by installation of historically appropriate siding. On March 21, 2016, the applicant received approval to replace rotted siding to match the existing in profile. Less than a month later on April 4, 2017, the applicant received a second Certificate of Appropriateness authorizing the replacement of wood siding, boards, decking, columns, and components to match the existing in material and profile. On April 26th, the MHDC office was notified of an SRO or 311 regarding the installation of siding of profile different than that which was being removed. The applicant was given a year by which to rectify the situation.

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that the key historic exterior materials of a building help define its style, quality and period and should be preserved whenever possible (See B 1-2.). The Guidelines go on to say that if the original siding is wood clapboard then the replacement material should be a material that matches the original in finish, size, and amount lap exposed (See B-3.). On account of the profile, the size does not match. The novelty lap siding employed neither matches the original nor does it reflect period.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-3), Staff believes the siding installed does impair the architectural and historical character of the building and districts. Staff recommends approval of the proposed extension of the replacement with siding to match that which was removed in terms of profile, dimension, and material.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Jacob Green was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed Mr. Green and asked him if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make. Mr. Green stated that Mr. Blackwell addressed the application in full.

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

Mr. Roberts asked what the previous siding in question was replaced with at the pertinent portions in question. Mr. Green responded 6" drop-siding. He further explained that collectively the house had seven types of siding.

Mr. Roberts asked Mr. Green if it was explained to him the best practice in which to replace the siding. Mr. Blackwell stated that staff had reviewed thoroughly with Mr. Green the proper procedures for repairing and replacing wood material on a historic structure. Mr. Roberts then read the Certificate of Appropriateness which stated, "Replace rotted siding to match existing in profile..."

Mr. Green said he wanted to better the appearance and condition of a prominent house. Mr. Roberts acknowledged Mr. Green's cooperative attitude. Mr. Green asked for an extension on the replacement of the siding on the exterior of the house. He further explained the ongoing interior renovations currently in

progress. Mr. Roberts noted that the magnitude of a project this size must entail much within and without the dwelling. Mr. Green stated he was completing the work by himself.

Mr. Oswalt asked if the Board had any other questions to ask or comments to make. Mr. Allen asked for clarification as to which siding would be replaced. Mr. Blackwell confirmed the two sections of first-story siding on the South Elevation (façade) would be replaced to match that which was removed, as would the first-story siding on the West Elevation. It was confirmed for Mr. Allen the East elevation siding will remain since no work was performed.

Mr. Allen asked in more detail as to the West Elevation. Mr. Green requested that if possible he would like to retain the existing replacement siding on the first-story portion of the subject elevation. Mr. Blackwell noted that replacement of West elevation siding would bring the applicant in full compliance as to historical approvals. Mr. Green stated he would like to differentiate between the drop-siding and lap-siding on this elevation if possible.

Mr. Allen asked if the Rear Elevation had drop-siding prior to the work performed. Mr. Green stated he picked the siding employed on the Rear Elevation and then employed it continuously. Mr. Blackwell noted that Mr. Green was operating within permit on the rear elevation.

Mr. Roberts asked if the application is for Mr. Green to come into compliance. Mr. Blackwell answered yes. Mr. Roberts noted that during the Victorian period buildings often featured several types of siding on one house.

Mr. Blackwell confirmed for Mr. Allen that the Certificate of Appropriateness was written as Mr. Roberts had read earlier with no more or no less detail. Mr. Allen then inquired of paint certificate that was issued. Mr. Green stated that he renewed that CoA.

Mr. Roberts asked Mr. Green if he understood to return all drop-siding which was previously lap-siding (including the West elevation) to lapsiding unless he asked for an exception. Mr. Green replied yes.

Mr. Blackwell noted that the application was in response to a 311 call and that approving the work would bring the house into compliance by matching the lapsiding that was removed (which would then allow candidacy for the Historic Marker program) and place subject portion of the scope of work in the same context as the rest of good work on the house.

No other questions ensued.

Mr. Oswalt opened the application to public comment. No one was present to speak either for or against the application. Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public discussion.

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 approved 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 a period of four months.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: April 19, 2018