

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
April 2, 2014 – 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: Robert Allen, Robert Brown, Kim Harden, Carolyn Hasser, Nick Holmes III, Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswalt, Craig Roberts, and Steve Stone
Members Absent: Catarina Echols and Jim Wagoner
Staff Members Present: Devereaux Bemis, Cart Blackwell, and Keri Coumanis.
2. Steve Stone moved to approve the minutes of the March 5, 2014 meeting. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
3. Harris Oswalt 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: William Appling**
 - a. Property Address: 12 South Conception Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/5/14
 - c. Project: Install a hanging metal sign. The double-sided sign will meet both the size requirements and height requirements.
2. **Applicant: Mack Lewis**
 - a. Property Address: 158 South Jefferson Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/28/14
 - c. Project: Repair and when necessary replace a porch railing to match the existing.
3. **Applicant: John Stimpson**
 - a. Property Address: 403 George Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/5/14
 - c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork on both the main house and back building. All wood repairs (siding, decking, and woodwork) will match the existing with regard to profile, dimension, and material. The main house will be painted Hampshire Gray (Benjamin Moore) with white trim. The back building will be painted Leigh Green (Benjamin Moore).
4. **Applicant: Judy Burleson**
 - a. Property Address: 1306 Chamberlain Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/5/14
 - c. Project: Install a storm door (solid glass panel) per the submitted rendering.
5. **Applicant: Kevin Cross**
 - a. Property Address: 311 Charles Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/7/14
 - c. Project: Construct a 6'tall wooden privacy that will enclose a portion of the rear lot (per submitted plan and design).
6. **Applicant: A-1 Roofing and Construction**
 - a. Property Address: 4 Macy Place
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/8/14
 - c. Project: Reroof the house. The roofing material will match the existing.

7. **Applicant: RSI**
 - a. Property Address: 456 Civic Center Drive
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/11/14
 - c. Project: Install window graphics (per submitted renderings) in two commercial building's windows. The graphics will not exceed the total square footage allotment for window-related signage.
8. **Applicant: Restore Mobile**
 - a. Property Address: 1051 Texas Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/11/14
 - c. Project: Roof the house in 3-tab as opposed to GAF Architectural shingles.
9. **Applicant: Diane Allumbugh**
 - a. Property Address: 605 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/12/14
 - c. Project: Install air handler on roof, not visible from street.
10. **Applicant: Breggan Jackson**
 - a. Property Address: 1201 New Saint Francis Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/13/14
 - c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in composition, material, and dimension. Repaint the building per the submitted color Benjamin Moore color scheme: the body will be Navajo White; trim will be White Dove; Front door will be Chrome Green; and Shutters will be night horizon. Reroof the house with asphalt shingles.
11. **Applicant: Browning Law Firm**
 - a. Property Address: 258 State Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/14/14
 - c. Project: Retain a composite board hanging sign. Said sign is suspended (like a lawyer's "shingle") on an existing cast iron sign armature.
12. **Applicant: Kevin Quinn**
 - a. Property Address: 16 South Reed Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/14/14
 - c. Project: Repair rotten wood, repair column bases and capitals, porch flashing to qualify for Banner and Shield. Repaint porch dark red, repaint house to match existing.
13. **Applicant: Edward Adams**
 - a. Property Address: 19 South Reed Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/21/14
 - c. Project: Repaint house existing colors.
14. **Applicant: JPS Construction**
 - a. Property Address: 263 Houston Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/14/14
 - c. Project: Remove rotten wood on house and replace to match, paint to match existing.
15. **Applicant: Kathy Sherman**
 - a. Property Address: 1762 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/20/14
 - c. Project: Repair/replace fence to match the existing in profile, height, placement and material. Six foot privacy.
16. **Applicant: John Leach**
 - a. Property Address: 2251 Ashland Place Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/21/14
 - c. Project: Add fabric awning on west patio doors to match that existing on south patio.

17. Applicant: Jennifer Humphreys

- a. Property Address: 307 Dexter Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 3/24/14
- c. Project: Install fencing. Install a six foot high interior lot privacy fence. The aforementioned fencing will not extend beyond the front plane of the house. Install a picket fence in the front yard. The Gothic picketed fence meets setback, height, and design requirements

18. Applicant: Paul Pugh with Nord-Sud Shipping

- a. Property Address: 605 Saint Emanuel Street
- b. Date of Approval: 3/25/14
- c. Project: Retain a monument sign. The size, height, materials, design, and location of the sign meet the parameter articulated in the Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts and Government Street (Signage Corridor).

19. Applicant: Ryland Randolph

- a. Property Address: 1367 Brown Street
- b. Date of Approval: 3/25/14
- c. Project: Repaint house, porch deck, shutters, foundation black green; body gray; trim will be cream. This COA amends that of December 9, 2013.

20. Applicant: Linda Cashman

- a. Property Address: 251 South Georgia Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 3/28/14
- c. Project: Install a 42" high iron fence (per submitted plan) that will enclose the property's front lawn. Said fence will feature decorative posts. The intervening pickets will be similar to those employed on the house's iron handrails.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2014-10-CA: 162 South Georgia Avenue

- a. Applicant: Lynn Davidson
 - b. Project: Addition - Construct a rear porch
- APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

2. 2014-11-CA: 50 Lemoyne Place

- a. Applicant: Jake and Melissa Epker
 - b. Project: Fenestration – Replace a front door.
- APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

3. 2014-12-CA: 412 Dauphin Street

- a. Applicant: Forrest Daniell for the Mattress Factory Lofts Homeowner's Association
 - b. Project: Renovations and Repairs – Replace fenestration, reroof, and repaint.
- APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

4. 2014-32-CA: 1306 Chamberlain Avenue

- a. Applicant: David Hoagland with Hoagland Construction for Judy Burleson
 - b. Project: Reroof a residential building.
- APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

5. 2014-14-CA: 15 South Pine Street

- a. Applicant: Kenneth McCants
 - b. Project: After-the-Fact-Approval – Retain an unauthorized addition and alterations to an ancillary building.
- APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

6. 2014-15-CA: 204 South Dearborn Street

- a. Applicant: Joseph Patterson with JPS Construction for Debra J. Forrest

b. Project: After-the-Fact-Approval – Retain unauthorized windows.
TABLED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. **OTHER BUSINESS**

1. Discussion

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2014-10-CA: 162 South Georgia Avenue
Applicant: Lynn Davidson
Received: 3/17/14
Meeting: 4/2/14

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Addition – Construct a rear porch.

BUILDING HISTORY

This center hall dwelling dates from 1904. The traditional detailing and proportional relationships are indicative of a shift from the Aesthetics Movement inspired Queen Anne to a more classically rooted neoclassicism.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on August 18, 1999. At that time, the Board approved the alteration of fenestration on the Rear Elevation. With this application, the owners propose the addition of a rear porch.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation and the Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and Government Street state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy the historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”
 - 2. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions, and decorative details.”
 - 3. “The materials should blend with the style of the building.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans and photographs):
 - 1. Remove a later rear deck.
 - 2. Construct a rear porch.
 - a. The porch will measure 24’ 6” in width and 10’ 6” in depth.
 - b. The porch will rest atop brick foundation piers.

- c. Boxed and recessed lattice (wooden) panels will extend between the aforementioned piers.
- d. Two square section paneled piers will support the porch's roof.
- e. The porch's southern ell and three flights of wooden steps will feature picketed railings. Intermediate newel-like posts will be employed on the ell.
- f. The porch will feature a three part entablature.
- g. The porch's slightly pitched membrane sheathed roof will be surmounted by wooden picketed railings. Said porch pitch is based on the original front porch. As with the front porch, intermediate newel-like posts will punctuate the aforementioned railings. The railings will match existing railings located on the Rear Elevation.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of a rear porch. The proposed porch would not be visible from the public view. Construction of the porch would require the demolition of a later deck. The Secretary of the Interior Standards state that the new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features in order to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment (See B-1.). On account of the single-story massing and the location behind sun porches, the porch would "read" as a later and sympathetic addition to historic fabric. The proportions, components, and detailing of the porch are derived from the house's existing porches. In accord with the Design Review Guidelines, the design pays attention to both porch railings and posts (See B-2.). The materials should blend with the style of the building (See B-3.).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on (B 1-3), Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or historical character of the building or the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Lynn Davidson was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant. He asked Ms. Davidson if she had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make. Ms. Davison answered no.

Ms. Harden and then Mr. Roberts asked for clarification regarding the northern portion of the porch. Mr. Blackwell and Mr. Roberts addressed the concern. Mr. Roberts explained to Ms. Davidson that he and Ms. Harden were making inquiries for benefit of her application.

Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, 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 fact

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: 4/2/15

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2014-11-CA: 50 Lemoyne Place
Applicant: Jake and Melissa Epker
Received: 3/25/14
Meeting: 4/2/14

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Fenestration – Replace a front door.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to literature located within this property's MHDC file, this American Foursquare type dwelling dates circa 1905.

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 was last scheduled to appear before the Architectural Review Board on December 4, 2014. The application was withdrawn for further clarifications requested by MHDC Staff and City Legal. With this application, the applicants submit a revised rendering of a door matching the original as a replacement door for unauthorized door units installed in the Summer of 2013. Retention of said doors was denied by the Board on August 21, 2013. The Board's ruling was upheld by the City Council at their October 22, 2013 meeting.
- B. The Design Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. "Often one of the most important decorative features of a house, doorways reflect the age and style of a building. Original doors and openings should be retained along with any moldings, transoms or sidelights. Replacements should respect the age and style of the building."
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plan):
 - 1. Remove an unauthorized door unit.
 - 2. Reconfigure the door opening to fit the original treatment.
 - 3. Install a double door unit featuring paneled and glazed doors.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the removal and replacement of unauthorized doors. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that replacement doors should respect the age and style of the building (See B-1.). While the proposed replacements do not feature the leaded glass documented in

early photographs found within this property's MHDC files, the design is substantiated based on photographed and physical evidence of the original doors and casings.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on (B 1), Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or historical character of the building or the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of the application. Staff does note that the failure to replace the leaded glass of the doors will likely cause the house to be ineligible for a historic marker.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Melissa Epker was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant. He asked Ms. Epker if she had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments. Ms. Epker answered no.

Mr. Ladd asked Ms. Epker how much time she thought it would require craftsmen to construct and install the door. Ms. Epker explained that she was uncertain. She elaborated by explaining that in another project which she was involved, custom doors had taken over two months to be made. Ms. Epker stated that those units had not been installed. Mr. Ladd thanked Ms. Epker. He said that he asked about timing for reason of facilitating the proposal. Ms. Epker said that the ordering, executing, and installing the door would likely take in excess of eight weeks.

Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, Mr. Ladd closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

Steve Stone moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report as written.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

After some discussion and Mr. Bemis encouragement, the Board decided upon a three month time frame for the replacement of the existing doors. 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.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 4/2/15

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2014-12-CA: 412 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Forrest Daniell for the Mattress Factory Lofts Homeowner's Association
Received: 3/17/14
Meeting: 4/2/14

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Renovations and Repairs – Replace fenestration, reroof, and repaint.

BUILDING HISTORY

Constructed in 1904 as Pollock & Company, this building was constructed according to the designs of local architect Rudolf Benz. The Bavarian born Benz executed designs for approximately a dozen commercial buildings on Dauphin Street. His known residential designs include the Hearin-Blacksher House (Blacksher Hall) and the demolished Dobson's Boarding House (later remodeled by George B. Rogers; site occupied by the Taco Bell on Government Street).

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on March 4, 2009. At that time, the Board approved and made further requirements regarding unauthorized work on the complex's rear building.
- B. The Design Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. With regard to doors, "replacements should respect the age and style of the building."
 - 2. "Where windows cannot be repaired, new windows must be compatible to the existing."
 - 3. "Particular care should be taken with masonry surfaces. Bricks should match the original in profile, color, finish (strike), and thickness."
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans and photographs):
 - 1. Replace wooden (sash) windows to match the existing in construction, light pattern, and material.
 - 2. Remove later French door units located on the South (Façade) and West Elevations.
 - 3. Replace the aforementioned doors. Said replacement doors will match the existing as per appearance, but will be either aluminum clad wood or fiberglass in material. The doors will be stained a mahogany color.
 - 4. Repair, repoint, and/or replace brickwork to match the existing as per mortar type, color, mortar type, brick appearance, and brick dimension.

5. Install balcony railings on balconies on which no railings were installed. The aforementioned railings will match those employed on the building's existing balconies.
6. Sand, clean, and repaint the building's cast iron posts.
7. Paint the remainder of the building's façade the same red hue as the wall expanses found below leaving the roundels and accents either unpainted or painted with an approved accent color.
8. Reroof the building. The roofing materials will match the existing.
9. Replace the parapet coping to match the existing.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves renovations to a non-contributing building. The prominently located and grandly scaled building was extensively remodeled over the course of the latter half of the 20th Century. On October 17, 2005, the Board approved the re-opening and partial reclamation of original window openings on the upper stories. None of the original fenestration survived and/or was retained. In keeping with the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts, the proposed installations are compatible with existing (See B-2.). The proposed window replacements would match the existing in material, construction, and light configuration. The proposed doors and casings would match the existing. Given that the fenestration is not original, the use of aluminum clad door units would not jeopardize historic fabric or alter the design of the building. However, fiberglass doors are generally not approved for the front. Given that the façade was painted at an earlier date (evidenced by physical and documentary evidence), the repainting of the building's gable would neither jeopardize the historic materials, nor impair the integrity of the building. The installation of decking and railings on one of the Rear Elevation's balconies was approved several years ago. In kind replacement of roofing and flashing would not alter the buildings appearance or character. The brick and mortar repair will match the original in profile, color, finish (strike), and thickness (See B-3.).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-3), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building. Staff recommends approval of this application, but recommends that doors be replaced by aluminum clad units instead of fiberglass units.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Leo Lanier and Forrest Daniell were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicants' representatives. Mr. Lanier and Mr. Daniell explained that when submitting this application there had been some confusion that they had not properly addressed as per the scope of work. They stated that the Mattress Factory Lofts Homeowner's Association wanted to present three options before the Board with regard to the windows and doors: in kind replacement wood replacement of fenestration using mahogany instead of pine; metal clad fenestration; and fiberglass units.

Mr. Roberts said that excepting the fiberglass units, all of the proposed alternatives would meet the ARB's requirements.

Ms. Harden asked for clarification as to existing and original fenestration. Mr. Blackwell addressed Ms. Harden's queries.

Ms. Harden encouraged the applicant's representatives and the Board to consider replacement fenestration that would match the original units as opposed to the existing units. Mr. Roberts stated that while he understand Ms. Harden's concerns, that since the Board had approved the existing units it would be going back against that earlier approval to require the applicants to go back to earlier treatment. Mr. Ladd reminded his fellow Board members that they were convened to discuss the application as presented.

Mr. Allen instigated a discussion regarding which door and window units would be replaced. Both Mr. Allen and Mr. Holmes encouraged the applicants to replace all of the later units with a higher quality material and construction. Mr. Lanier and Mr. Daniell mentioned the use of double-paned construction.

Mr. Bemis and Ms. Coumanis raised concerns as to the use of double-paned units. A discussion ensued. The applicants agreed to use mahogany units that would match the design and construction of the existing doors and windows.

Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. No comments ensued. Mr. Ladd closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Stone moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending facts to note that door and window units would be replaced with mahogany replacement units that would match the existing with regard to construction and design.

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: 4/2/15

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2014-13-CA: 1306 Chamberlain Avenue
Applicant: David Hoagland
Received: 3/5/14
Meeting: 4/2/14

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Metal Roofing - Reroof a residential building.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to the MHDC's property files, this two-story side hall dwelling dates from 1910.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on November 27, 2006. At that time the Board approved the installation of 5-V crimp metal roof.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. "A roof is one of the 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."
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted site materials):
 - 1. Reroof the residential building 5-V Crimp roofing panels (Galvalume).

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application concerns the installation of metal roofing panels. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that roofing materials should be appropriate to the form and pitch and color of the building (See B-1.). On November 27, 2006, the Board approved the installation of the same roofing panels proposed in this application. 5-V crimp and standing seam metal are traditional roofing treatments. Metal roofing panels and shingles were installed on many late 19th-Century and early 20th-Century dwellings.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

No one was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Harden asked for clarification as per the slope of front gallery's roof. Mr. Blackwell addressed Ms. Harden's query.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Stone moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report as written.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 4/2/15

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2014-14-CA: 15 South Pine Street
Applicant: Kenneth McCants
Received: 3/5/14
Meeting: 4/2/14

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: After-the-Fact-Approval – Retain an unauthorized addition to existing ancillary building.

BUILDING HISTORY

This Arts and Crafts informed “bungalow” dates from the first third of the 20th Century.

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. On February 19, 2014, the owner/applicant received a Notice of Violation for unauthorized work. A partially completed addition to an ancillary building was noticed and cited by inspectors from Urban Development. With this application, the owner/applicant proposes the retention of the aforementioned addition.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for 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 to garages, carports, pergolas, decks, pool covers, sheds, and the like. The appropriateness of accessory structure shall be measured by the guidelines applicable to new construction. The structure should complement the design and scale of the main building.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted materials):
 - 1. After-the-Fact-Approval – Retain an unauthorized additions and alterations to existing ancillary building.
 - 2. The building was a concrete block structure.
 - 3. The new construction matches the original building in materials.
 - 4. The gabled roof has been reconfigured to cover the entire structure.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the after-the-fact approval of additions to an ancillary building. As evidenced by photographs supplied by the office of Urban Development, the walls of the addition (unroofed until recent months) have existed for several years. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that the appropriateness of accessory structure shall be measured by the guidelines applicable to new construction. The structure should complement the design and scale of the main building (See B-1.). With exception of one of the doors located on the building, the proposed building complements the design of the existing structure.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the property or the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of this application, but recommends that the applicants replace the West Elevation's northernmost door with one that meets the Design Review standards.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Kennet McCants was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Ms. Harden asked for clarification as per the doors accessing the ancillary building. Mr. Blackwell addressed Ms. Harden's query. No further Board discussion ensued. Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, Mr. Ladd closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Stone moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending facts to authorize Staff to work with the owner/applicant as per the replacement door.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Stone 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.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 4/2/15

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2014-15-CA: 204 South Dearborn Street
Applicant: Joseph Patterson with JPS Construction for Debra J. Forrest
Received: 3/5/14
Meeting: 4/2/14

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: After-the-Fact-Approval – Retain unauthorized replacement windows.

BUILDING HISTORY

This one-and-one-half-a-story wooden dwelling dates circa 1871. With its side hall plan, all encompassing gable roof (over the original portion of the house), and porch-fronted façade, this house ranks among Mobile's most exemplary extant Workman's Cottages.

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. On August 27, 2014, the applicant's representatives obtained a Certificate of Appropriateness for construction of a privacy fence and the painting of the main house. In February of 2014, the house's six-over-six wooden windows were removed.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. "The type, size, and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building. Original window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing."
 - 2. "Where windows cannot be repaired, new windows must be compatible with the existing."
 - 3. "Snap-in or artificial muntins" are listed as inappropriate window construction.
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. After-the-Fact-Approval – Retain unauthorized windows.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the after-the-fact-approval of unauthorized work. The applicants representatives received midmonth approvals for the replacement of rotten woodwork in kind on July 23, 2013 and the repainting of the building on August 27, 2013, no approval was issued for the replacement of windows.

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that original window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing. The Guidelines go on to clarify that where windows cannot be repaired, new windows must be compatible with the existing (See B 1-2.). The replacement of windows was not included in the approved scope of work. While the six-over-six light replacement windows installed on the Side and Rear Elevations match the light configuration of the original windows, slap-in or artificial muntins are listed as inappropriate for use on both replacements and new construction in Mobile's historic districts (See B-3).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-3), Staff believes this application impairs the architectural and historical character of the building. Staff does not recommend approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Joseph Patterson 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. Patterson if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Mr. Patterson explained that windows were not originally intended to be a part of the scope of work. He elaborated by saying that crews removed the windows on account of their condition and at the owner's request.

Mr. Roberts asked Mr. Patterson if he had pulled a building permit. Mr. Patterson answered no. Mr. Ladd said that regardless if a permit had been pulled, the Board was present to assist the applicant in addressing the problem.

Mr. Stone asked Mr. Patterson how many windows had been replaced. Mr. Patterson answered ten. Mr. Allen asked if the whole units, casings included, had been removed. Mr. Patterson answered yes.

Mr. Roberts said if the windows were badly deteriorated and had been replaced with better quality replacements, the Board could possibly have worked with the applicant.

The Board moved to table the application to the next meeting so the owner could attend. Mr. Holmes asked Mr. Blackwell to pull related files for properties located on Lafayette, Old Shell Road, Macy Place, and Bradford Avenue which the Board had reviewed window-related requests.

TABLED.