

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

April 6, 2011 – 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: Gertrude Baker, Kim Hardin, Bill James, Thomas Karwinski, Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswald, and Craig Roberts.
Members Absent: Carlos Gant, Jim Wagoner, Janetta Whitt-Mitchell, and Barja Wilson.
Staff Members Present: Cart Blackwell, Keri Coumanis, and John Lawler.
2. Mr. Oswald moved to approve the minutes of the March 16, 2011 meeting as amended by the Board. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
3. Mr. Karwinski 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: David Zimmerman**
 - a. Property Address: 155 Warren Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/10/11
 - c. Project: Reface an existing hanging sign with the name of the new tenant.
2. **Applicant: Caribbean Design**
 - a. Property Address: 958 Savannah Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/10/11
 - c. Project: Demolish the remains of a burned structure.
3. **Applicant: Bill Partridge**
 - a. Property Address: 203 George Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/10/11
 - c. Project: Construct a wooden overhang over the rear entrance. The overhang will be located above the existing decked stoop. The roofing material will match the existing.
4. **Applicant: Monty Graham**
 - a. Property Address: 7 Gladys Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/11/11
 - c. Project: Repair and replace rotten woodwork. Repaint to match existing color scheme.
5. **Applicant: Monty Graham**
 - a. Property Address: 1760 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/11/11
 - c. Project: Repair and replace rotten woodwork. Repaint to match existing color scheme.
6. **Applicant: Chuck Dixon Home Improvements**
 - a. Property Address: 1122 Montauk Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/14/11
 - c. Project: Replace rotten woodwork to match the existing.
7. **Applicant: Shannon Baker**
 - a. Property Address: 956 Church Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/14/11
 - c. Project: Repaint body-- Olympic color Dark Sage; front door and sash--Spanish tile; foundation brick--New black; trim Antique Lace.

- 8. Applicant: Melanie Glenn**
- Property Address: 202 South Catherine Street
 - Date of Approval: 3/14/11
 - Project: Install a six foot interior privacy fence.
- 9. Applicant: Floyd Hendricks**
- Property Address: 1120 Palmetto Street
 - Date of Approval: 3/15/11
 - Project: Level the foundation. Repair and replace rotten wooden siding and woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repair and when necessary replace wooden windows to match the existing. Repair and replace wooden shutters to match the existing. Reroof the house with architectural shingles. Repaint the house per the existing color scheme.
- 10. Applicant: Tarrance Johnson**
- Property Address: 119 Dauphin Street
 - Date of Approval: 3/15/11
 - Project: Install 21 sq ft sign per design in file.
- 11. Applicant: Chris Holmes for Bayside Remodelers**
- Property Address: 200 Rapier Avenue
 - Date of Approval: 3/16/11
 - Project: Repair/replace rotten wood on porch to match existing in material and dimension as necessary.
- 12. Applicant: Mark & Denise Burks**
- Property Address: 20 South Monterey Street
 - Date of Approval: 3/16/11
 - Project: Reroof the house and the garage with Timberline shingles charcoal grey in color. Paint the house per the submitted Valspar color scheme. The body will be Gray Slit. The door will be Very Black. The trim will be Chef White.
- 13. Applicant: Charles McLeod**
- Property Address: 19 Common Street
 - Date of Approval: 3/17/11
 - Project: Reroof the house with architectural shingles.
- 14. Applicant: Richard Tippy**
- Property Address: 955 Church Street
 - Date of Approval: 3/18/11
 - Project: Level foundations. Repair and replace rotten wooden woodwork, detailing, and decking to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material.
- 15. Applicant: Paul Howen**
- Property Address: 31 Blacklawn
 - Date of Approval: 3/18/11
 - Project: Paint the body of the house FloClaire yellow and paint the trim white.
- 16. Applicant: Howard Todd & Karen N. Duren**
- Property Address: 9 Macy Place
 - Date of Approval: 3/21/11
 - Project: Remove a later replacement door. Install a glazed and paneled door that is more in keeping with the design and the period of the house.
- 17. Applicant: Cameron Pfeiffer & Shane Traylor for Ralph Burton Pfeiffer, Jr.**
- Property Address: 205 Everett Street
 - Date of Approval: 3/21/11
 - Project: Remove iron burglar doors and bars. Remove later metal awnings from the house, remove the engaged later metal carport from the side of the house, and remove a later metal gateway. Repaint the house FloClaire Yellow.

18. Applicant: Chuck Dixon

- a. Property Address: 1413 Brown Street
- b. Date of Approval: 3/22/11
- c. Project: Repair/replace rotten wood as necessary, clean the wrought iron railings, repaint to match existing. Repair porch deck to match original tongue and groove.

19. Applicant: Michael A. Amos

- a. Property Address: 112 Houston Street
- b. Date of Approval: 3/23/11
- c. Project: Reroof the house with Timberline Architectural shingles.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2011-20-CA: 205 Everett Street

- a. Applicant: Cameron Pfeiffer and Shane Traylor for Ralph Burton Pfeiffer, Jr.
- b. Project: Demolish an ancillary structure.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2011-21-CA: 65 North Reed Avenue

- a. Applicant: Chris & Leah Pfeiffer
- b. Project: Demolish a later ancillary structure.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

3. 2011-22-CA: 114 Ryan Avenue

- a. Applicant: Lucy Barr for Jeff & Appleton Weston
- b. Project: Construct a new rear porch and enclose an existing later ancillary structure.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

4. 2011-23-CA: 102 Ryan Avenue

- a. Applicant: Lucy Barr for David & Joanne Cooper
- b. Project: Construct an ancillary structure.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

5. 2011-24-CA: 2256 DeLeon Avenue

- a. Applicant: Will Mastin for Mikell & Ashley Leland
- b. Project: Install fencing, hardscaping, and landscaping.

TABLED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

- 1. APPEALS

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2011-20-CA: 205 Everett Street
Applicant: Cameron Pfeiffer and Shane Traylor for Ralph Burton Pfeiffer, Jr.
Received: 3/21/11
Meeting: 4/6/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Demolish an ancillary building.

BUILDING HISTORY

This concrete block house and detached garage were completed in 1953. The main house and garage feature rounded corner blocks.

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 owner recently received midmonth approval authorizing the removal of later metal awnings and a later carport. As part of his rehabilitation effort, the applicant proposes the demolition of a former garage.
- B. 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;
205 Everett Avenue constitutes non-contributing infill construction. Both the house and converted garage date from 1953. The application for demolition concerns the garage. Both the house and the former garage were constructed in 1953. The single story garage is constructed of concrete blocks. The building features rounded corner blocks and a gabled roof.
 - ii. The importance of the structure to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;

1. This property is situated on Everett Street. This two block street is located west of Michigan Avenue, a thoroughfare lined with fashionable turn-of-the-century and early Twentieth-Century dwellings. A number of lots on Everett serve as the back lots of Michigan Avenue properties. Everett Street underwent significant changes during the latter half of the Twentieth Century. Demolitions, substantial commercial construction, and multi-family infill occurred. 205 Everett Street constitutes single family infill construction. The property faces the playing field of the expanded Leinkauf elementary school complex. In comparison to other lots on Everett Street and throughout the Leinkauf District, 205 Everett is a small parcel. The converted garage is located behind the rear plane and to the side of the 1953 residence. It is only minimally visible from the public right of way.
- 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.
- 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. Though constructed at the same time as the main house, there are numerous examples of concrete block houses with contemporaneous ancillary structures located throughout the City of Mobile.
- v. Whether there are definite plans for reuse of the property if the proposed demolition is carried out, and what effect such plans will have on the architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological, social, aesthetic, or environmental character of the surrounding area.
 1. If granted demolition approval, the applicants will demolish the former garage.
- vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 1. The applicant purchased the property in February of 2011 for a purchase price of \$27,500.
- vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 1. The applicant is not demolishing the principal building, which is in the process of undergoing a renovation, but proposes the demolition of the garage only.
- viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 1. The property 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. Not relevant.
- x. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
 1. Not relevant.
- 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; and
 1. Not necessary.

- 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.”

C. Scope of Work:

- 1. Demolish a single story concrete block ancillary building.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the demolition of a single story ancillary structure. The concrete block building is located at 205 Everett Avenue. The property is non-contributing residential infill.

In reviewing applications for demolition, the following concerns are taken into account: the architectural significance of the building; the condition of the building; the effect of the demolition on the historic district; and the nature of any proposed redevelopment.

As per the architectural significance of the building, this ancillary structure functioned as the ancillary structure of a 1953 non-contributing dwelling. The single story building is constructed of concrete blocks. Built as a garage, the rectilinear building originally did not feature any fenestration. Numerous utilitarian structures of this type and construction were erected across postwar Mobile’s residential and commercial landscapes.

As per the building’s state of repair, the building is structurally sound. That said the building is need of extensive wood replacement and interior refurbishment. A later metal roof surmounts the structure. The installation of roof has caused eave damage.

The converted garage is located to the side and the rear of the main residence. The building is minimally visible from the street. The structure does not contribute to the streetscape.

As part of a larger effort entailing the renovation the main house and beautification of the grounds, the applicant would simply demolition the unused building.

Taking into the building’s lack of architectural significance and minimal impact on the streetscape, Staff does not believe the demolition of the non-contributing garage will impair the architectural or the historical integrity of the historic district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-3), Staff does not believe this application will impair the historic character of the historic district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Cameron Pfeiffer 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. Pfeiffer if she had any questions to ask, comments to make, or clarifications to address regarding the Staff Report. Ms. Pfeiffer responded saying that while she was unsure as to the building's date of construction, she knew that the property suffered fire damage at sometime during its history. She stated that the building currently has mold, vermin, and rot issues. Ms. Pfeiffer explained that if demolition approval was granted the small backyard would be expanded therefore becoming a more usable space. She reiterated the building's deteriorated condition.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any questions to ask the applicant's representative. Mr. James asked Ms. Pfeiffer if the demolition included the removal of the building's concrete slab. A discussion ensued. Ms. Pfeiffer told the Board that the slab would be removed and grass would be planted in on the footprint.

Mr. Ladd asked the Board if they had any further questions for Ms. Pfeiffer. Ms. Baker asked for clarification regarding the extent of the demolition request. Mr. Blackwell clarified Ms. Baker's concerns.

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. No further discussion ensued from the Board.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Karwinski 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. Karwinski 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: 4/6/12

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2011-21-CA: 65 North Reed Avenue
Applicant: Chris & Leah Pfeiffer
Received: 3/21/11
Meeting: 4/6/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Demolish a later ancillary structure.

BUILDING HISTORY

This Arts & Crafts influenced bungalow with Craftsman detailing dates from circa 1920. The façade's gable features a handsome tripartite window. The ancillary structure dates from circa 1950.

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 demolition of a later two-story garage-apartment.
- B. 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:
 - xiii. The historic or architectural significance of the structure;
65 North Reed Street features a contributing Arts & Crafts influenced bungalow dating from circa 1920. This application concerns the demolition of property's garage. The two-story garage was constructed later than the main house. It is neither depicted in the 1925 Sanborn, nor mentioned in legal recordings of the property dating from the early 1940s. The two story structure only appears in the 1955 Sanborn Maps. This post Second World War building is comprised of ground floor parking and upper story living space. The building is not of the same architectural caliber, material selection, and construction as the main dwelling.

- xiv. The importance of the structures to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
 - 1. 65 North Reed Avenue is one of several streets in the Old Dauphin Way Historic District that still possesses usable alleyways. Many alleys within the vicinity, the district, and the larger city are no longer maintained. An increasing number of alleys subdivided into private ownership. Several ancillary structures survive on North Reed Avenue's western alley. While indicative of the density and usability of Mobile's once sprawling network of alleys, the subject property's two-story garage-apartment is stylistically insignificant and geographically isolated.
- xv. 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.
- xvi. 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. Mobile's historic districts possess a vast array of Twentieth-Century ancillary structures. Garage apartments are found throughout the city. This later example does not relate to or contribute aesthetically to the property's historic residence.
- xvii. 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 applicants plan on demolishing the building and installing interior lot fencing.
- xviii. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 - 1. The owner/applicants purchased the property in April of 2010 for a purchase price of \$236,000.
- xix. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 - 1. The applicants have found the costs of renovating the unused building to be cost prohibitive.
- xx. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 - 1. The property has not been listed for sale.
- xxi. 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. Not relevant.
- xxii. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
 - 1. Not relevant.
- xxiii. 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; and
 - 1. Not applicable.
- xxiv. 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.”

C. Scope of Work:

1. Demolish a two-story garage-apartment.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the demolition of a later two-story garage apartment located to the rear of contributing Arts and Crafts-influenced house. The building is located in the northwest corner off the property’s rear lot off the North Reed Avenue’s northern alley. The structure is visible only from within the alley.

In reviewing applications for demolition, the following concerns are taken into account: the architectural significance of the building; the condition of the building; the effect of the demolition on the historic district; and the nature of any proposed redevelopment.

The two-story garage apartment is one of many multi-purpose, mid Twentieth-Century ancillary structures found across the city. More architecturally sophisticated and typologically advanced examples are found throughout the Old Dauphin Way district in particular. This later building does not exhibit the same caliber of construction, detailing, and materials as the main house.

This building is for the most part structurally secure, but much of its detailing is in the early states of decay. It has been unused by the present and previous owners.

Many ancillary structures of varying periods are found across the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The structure is only visible to the passerby upon entering and driving down North Reed Avenue’s north alley.

The applicants propose demolishing the garage and better utilizing the small backyard.

Based on the garage’s lack of architectural significance, later date of construction, and absence of engagement with the streetscape, Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or the historic integrity of the property or the historic district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Chris Pfeifer 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 Mr. Pfeiffer if he had any comments to make, clarifications to address, or comments to add with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Pfeiffer told the Board that the building is not only in bad

condition, but it also poses safety concerns. He added that the garage portion of the building is not adaptable to most modern automobiles.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow board members if they had any comments to make or questions to ask the applicant. No questions were asked and no comments were made.

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

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: 4/6/12

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2011-22-CA: 114 Ryan Avenue
Applicant: Lucy Barr for Jeff & Appleton Weston
Received: 3/21/11
Meeting: 4/6/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct a new rear porch and enclose an existing ancillary structure.

BUILDING HISTORY

This one-and-one-half story Colonial Revival house was built in 1939. The house features classical detailing and traditional proportioning.

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 April 9, 2007. At that time, the Board approved the construction of a small rear addition. The current owner’s representative proposes the construction of a new rear porch and the alteration of an existing ancillary structure. Both the carport and the rear porch date from the current owner’s occupancy.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation and Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. Historic porches should be maintained and repaired to reflect their period. Particular attention should be paid to the handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details.”
 - 2. “The form and shape of the porch should maintain their historic appearance. The materials should blend with the style of the building.”
 - 3. “An ancillary structure is any structure other than the main building on the property. It is included but is not limited to garages, carports, pergolas, decks, pool covers, sheds and the like. The appropriateness of accessory structures shall be measured by the guidelines applicable to new construction. The structure shall complement the design and scale of the main building.”
 - 4. “New additions, alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy 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.”

5. “New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would remain intact.”

C. Scope of Work:

1. Demolish the later rear porch and wrap-around steps.
2. Construct a new rear porch.
 - a. The porch will measure 9’ 10” in depth. The length will remain the same.
 - b. The porch will rest atop a brick foundation whose treatment will match the foundation of the body of the house.
 - c. Castle Stone pavers will floor the porch.
 - d. Five wooden columnar piers matching the existing in design and location will demarcate the porch bays.
 - e. A composite picket and elaborated wheatsheaf wooden railing will extend between the porch’s columnar posts.
 - f. The porch’s fascia and trim will match that found elsewhere on the house and on the carport.
 - g. The porch’s shed roof will be sheathed with shingles matching those found on the body of the house.
 - h. Two flights of Castle Stone paved steps will provide ingress and egress to the porch.
 - i. The steps accessing the porch’s south elevation will feature a picketed railing. The steps accessing the porch’s east elevation will feature a landing with a picketed and elaborated wheatsheaf railing and a flight of steps with a picketed railing.
3. Remove the existing brick patio.
4. Castle Stone pavers will be laid on the location of the existing porch.
5. Enclose the open bays of a later garage/carport.
 - a. The wooden lap siding will match the dimensions of the existing siding.
 - b. The three bay West Elevation will feature a two paired fifteen light wooden French door flanked by two six-over-six wooden windows. The door unit will be slightly recessed.
 - c. The South Elevation will feature three six-over-six windows.
 - d. The East Elevation will remain the same.
 - e. The North Elevation will be faced with wooden siding.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of new rear porch and the enclosure of a carport. Both the porch and the carport are later additions to the historic property.

Regarding the proposed porch, the porch is not visible from the public right of way. The proposed porch will be the same length as the existing porch. Only the depth of the porch will increase. The wrap around deck-like steps will be removed and will be replaced with single flight steps, a more historically appropriate stair treatment. The foundation treatment, columnar supports, fascia configuration, and roofing material will match either that of the existing porch or the body of the house. The shed roof type and porch pavers will allow the addition to read as a later alteration to the historic fabric. The proposed patio will occupy the footprint of the existing patio. The proposed porch and patio meet the design and material standards outlined in the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s historic districts.

As per the proposed alterations to the later carport, the scope of work will not entail the increase of the building's footprint. The scope of work calls for the enclosure of the later carport's open bays. The siding type, window selection, and door treatment matches that found on the enclosed rear portion of the carport and the main house. The retention of the carport's front or west-facing columnar piers in the form of pilasters will provide visual solidity to the structure's corners and aesthetic continuity with main house. The design and materials meet the standards outlined in the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Lucy Barr 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 Ms. Barr if she had any questions to ask, clarifications to make, or comments to add with regard to the Staff Report. Ms. Barr answered no.

Mr. Karwinski said he had two design-related comments to make. He first voiced concern regarding the proposed porch's cornice line. Mr. Karwinski pointed out that existing porch's cornice line matches up with the main cornice line. He told Ms. Barr that the proposed porch's broken cornice line might result in run off issues. Mr. Karwinski then asked Ms. Barr why the porch's north-facing steps were so narrow. Ms. Barr explained that the north-facing steps were intended for utilitarian not public use. She told the Board the steps were included at the applicant's request. A discussion of the porch's plan ensued.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any further questions for Ms. Barr. No questions ensued. Addressing the audience, Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone present 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. Oswalt 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. Oswalt 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: 4/6/12

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2011-23-CA: 102 Ryan Avenue
Applicant: Lucy Barr for David and Joanne Cooper
Received: 3/21/11
Meeting: 4/16/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct an ancillary structure.

BUILDING HISTORY

This Colonial Revival House dates from 1925. The two-story residence features pronounced eaves and an elegant entry.

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 removal of a canvas-topped parking cover and the construction of carport.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation and Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “An ancillary structure is any structure other than the main building on the property. It is included but is not limited to garages, carports, pergolas, decks, pool covers, sheds and the like. The appropriateness of accessory structures shall be measured by the guidelines applicable to new construction. The structure shall complement the design and scale of the main building.”
 - 2. “New additions, alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy 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.”
 - 3. “New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would remain intact.”
 - 4. Fences “should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement, and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District.”
- C. **Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):**
 - 1. Remove the canvas-topped parking cover from the property’s alley accessed vehicular entry.
 - 2. Construct a carport on the location formerly occupied by the canvas-topped cover

- a. The carport will measure 22.8/22' in width (reflecting slight differentiation in the East and West Elevations) and 25' 6" in depth.
- b. The carport will site atop existing paving.
- c. Squared section boxed wooden columnar piers matching those found on the rear house's rear elevation will support the carport's truncated hipped roof.
- d. The carport's roof will be an extension of the side roof of the recessed side wing's hipped roof.
- e. The fascia, roof overhang, and roof pitch will match the existing.
- f. The West Elevation will feature two boxed square section columnar piers and one pilaster-like pier treated in the same manner.
- g. The North Elevation will feature two boxed square section columnar piers.
- h. The East Elevation will feature three boxed square section columnar piers.
- i. The South Elevation will feature two boxed square section columnar piers.
- j. Paving, posts set in or on, roof deck treatment
- k. A single flight of wooden steps will provide ingress and egress from the carport to the rear deck. A three bay wooden privacy fence with a gate in the westernmost bay will be constructed off the deck's north elevation. The expanses of fencing will match the existing.
- l. A truncated roof will extend over the deck. The roof treatment and sheathing will match that of the rear porch and the carport.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the removal of a temporary parking cover and the construction of a carport. The carport will be located to the side of the main house and will be accessed via alley. Existing landscaping and fencing will remain in place thereby obscuring view of the structure from the public right of way.

The Design Review Guidelines state that ancillary structures should complement the design and scale of the main structure. Through the use of columnar supports, fascia detailing, and roof type/treatment the design, the structure adopts the design components and proportional relationships found on the body of the house. By adopting features found on the body of the house and later additions, the proposed carport will "read" as a later alteration the historic complex. The roof structure will engage that of the main house. The structure will adopt both the truncated hipped format found on the rear elevation (that proposed for the carport) and the flat roof format of the single story north wing (that proposed for the overhang extending over the rear deck). The differentiated roofing types will further highlight the old from the new.

The proposed three bay expanse of fencing will match the existing. The fencing meets the height requires outlined in the Guidelines. The stair insertion into the existing door will not affect the historic structure of the building. The materials meet the standards outlined in the Design Review Guidelines for New Residential Construction in Mobile's Historic District.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-4), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Lucy Barr was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd asked the applicant's representative if she had any question to ask, comments to add, or clarifications to address with regard to the Staff Report. Ms. Barr explained to the Board that the existing fencing would remain in place and the flat roof would be extended over the rear deck.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any questions to ask Ms. Barr. No questions ensued from the Board. Addressing the audience, Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone present who had comments to make either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, Mr. Ladd closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Oswalt 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 approved. Mr. Karwinski voted against the application.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Oswalt 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: 4/6/12

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
RECORD

2011-24-CA: 2256 DeLeon Avenue
Applicant: Will Mastin for Mikell & Ashley Leland
Received: 3/21/11
Meeting: 4/6/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Install new fencing, hardscaping, and landscaping.

BUILDING HISTORY

This 1928 house was built according to the designs of Mobile architect Harry Inge Johnstone. In this design, Johnstone combined his penchant for flush siding with his knowledge of traditional design. The resulting residence exemplifies the simple sophistication that hallmarks high end late 1930s design.

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 17, 2011. At that time the Board approved the alteration of fenestration and the construction of a porch. As part of the ongoing renovation of the property, the applicant’s representative submits a proposal calling for the construction of fencing, hardscaping, and landscaping.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Fences “should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement, and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District. The height of solid fencing is generally restricted to six feet, however, if a commercial property or multi-family housing adjoins the subject property, an eight foot fence may be considered. The finished side of the fence should face toward the public view. All variances must be obtained prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness”
 - 2. “Modern paving materials are acceptable in historic districts. However, it is important that the design, location and materials be compatible with the property.”
 - 3. “Landscaping can often assist in creating an appropriate setting.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
 - 1. Remove the remainder of the six foot iron fence which enclosed the property.
 - 2. Construct fencing of various types and heights that will extend along the western, southern, and eastern sides of the lot.
 - a. Construct an 8’ high brick wall along a portion of the western lot line.

- The wall will step down to a height of 4' as at transitions to adjacent section of fencing.
- b. Construct a two part 5' high fence (height of posts) along the western, southern, and eastern sides of the lot.
 - c. The lower portion of the fence will be comprised of brick base.
 - d. This lower portion of the fence will measure roughly 18" in height.
 - e. The base, one utilizing an advanced top course, will be faced with "Old Mobile" bricks.
 - f. The upper portion of the fence will be comprised of wooden picket fence.
 - g. The pyramidal capped expanses of pickets of the upper portion of the fence will interspersed between taller 5' posts.
 - h. The taller posts of the upper portion of the fence will feature necking and pyramidal caps.
 - i. The fence will extend along in southerly direction on the location of the former iron fence.
 - j. The fence will step back into the lot about those areas east and west of the property's DeLeon Avenue pedestrian entrance.
 - k. Reconstruct the stair's accessing the pedestrian gateway.
 - l. Two brick piers featuring truncated caps will flank the recessed pedestrian gateway.
 - m. An arcuated gate featuring an lower paneled and upper picketed sections will provide access to the grounds.
 - n. A small section of the two part brick and picket fence will extend between a point just west of the southeast corner of the house and southern expanse of fence. A gate similar in design to the pedestrian entrance gate will be employed.
 - o. The two part brick and wood fence will extend along the eastern lot line for a limited expanse where it will transition into a ramped brick wall.
 - p. To the west of the ramped brick wall bay there will be located an expanse of wooden fencing measuring 6' in height. The wooden fencing will negotiate an existing Oak tree.
 - q. The wooden fence will extend between brick advanced piers measuring roughly 8' in height.
 - r. The wooden fence will terminate at brick wall located behind a pool.
 - s. The brick will measure roughly 7' in height will feature advanced piers measuring roughly 8' in height. Both the wooden and masonry sections of fence will be located on location the site of an earlier 8' section of fence that was removed prior to the construction an adjacent pool.
 - t. The brick wall will be fronted by alternating sequence of wall fountains and raised planters.
 - u. The brick wall will terminate at an existing brick wall of the same height.
3. Reinstall, extend, and install brick and stone and brick paths, terraces, and borders to the west, south, and east of the house. The hardscaping will include a brick landing pad to be located between the inner edge of the sidewalk and the street.
 4. Install landscaping.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of various types of fencing, the implementation of a comprehensive landscaping plan, and the installation of hardscaping.

With regard to the proposed fencing, this property previously featured a six foot iron fence and an eight foot brick wall. The eight foot wall was located on the eastern lot line. Portions of the iron fence were

removed to facilitate the construction of a side porch and the refurbishment of the interior. The eight foot brick wall was removed as consequence of the porch construction and a pool installation.

Ashland Place is Mobile's finest example of City Beautiful-informed suburban development. City Beautiful developments of this residential type were defined by large open lots with a minimum of built enclosures separating lots. Fencing is therefore an area of design concern.

The proposed five foot brick and picket fence (one which would extend along the western lot line, an inset southern expanse, and a portion of the eastern lot line) meets the design and materials standards outlined in the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts. Both existing and proposed landscaping will obscure the fence. Said fence will be lower in height than the former iron fence.

An eight foot brick wall and seven foot wooden on eastern lot line, as well as an eight foot wall proposed for western lot line, exceed the height limits outlined in the Design Review Guidelines. The Guidelines state that fencing exceeding a height of six feet is considered when the property abuts multi-family and/or commercial property. This property abuts neither multi-family nor commercial construction. Staff cannot recommend approval of those sections of fencing which exceed six feet in height.

As per the grounds improvement portion of the application, the paving selections meet the design and material standards articulated in the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts. Brick and Castle Stone pavers are found elsewhere on the property and employed throughout the district. The installation of a brick landing pad on axis with the DeLeon Avenue pedestrian entrance, the portion of the hardscaping occupying the right of way, would require coordination with the office of Right of Way. The plantings comprising the landscape portion of the site package are traditional plantings that are in keeping the property and the district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff recommends approval of all landscape and hardscaping portions of the application. Staff also recommends approval of those portions of the fencing proposal whose heights do not exceed six feet in height. Staff does not believe said sections of fence will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district. Recommendation for approval does not extend to those sections of fence exceeding six feet in height.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Will Mastin 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. Mastin if he had any comments to add, clarifications to make, or questions to ask regarding the Staff Report. Mr. Mastin said that applicants had decided to alter the fencing proposed for the west lot line. He explained that they would like to amend their application to call for a six foot section of wall on the west side of the property in lieu of the proposed eight foot section articulated in the plans. With the proposed amendment in mind, Mr. Mastin told the Board that the only fencing which would exceed eight feet would be located on the eastern lot line.

Addressing the applicant and his fellow Board members, Mr. Roberts voiced concerns regarding the height of proposed fencing. He said that the Board's policy had been to restrict the height of fences to six feet when subject properties did not abut multi-family or commercial properties. Mr. Karwinski said that

exceptions had been made on account of site and location. He cited a wall at 221 South Dearborn Street, a property located adjacent to Canal Street.

Mr. Lawler addressed the Board. He told the Board that eight foot fences had been both approved and installed throughout the Ashland Place Historic District. Mr. Lawler reminded the Board that they are charged with determining whether an application impairs a property or a district. He voiced his concern against hard and fast rules that did not take into account site and context. Mr. Lawler again reminded the Board of the presence of other eight foot fences and walls across the historic districts. He reiterated that impairment was the deciding factor in approving or denying any application. Mr. Lawler told the Board that if denied applications of this type were likely to receive hostile reception from the City Council. Mr. Ladd addressed his fellow board members. He told them that he lived on the opposite side of the street. Mr. Ladd said that the eight foot sections of fence was set back within an elevated lot amid shrubbery and vegetation.

A discussion of fence heights ensued.

Mr. Mastin explained that the proposed eight foot sections of fence and wall were located in small, wedge-shaped portion of the lot.

Mr. Karwinski stated that he not object to the wall. He asked Mr. Mastin if the existing plantings which front the property would remain in place. Mr. Mastin explained that the applicant's had requested that the shrubbery remain in place. Mr. Karwinski observed that while the earlier iron fence was taller than the proposed fence it was transparent not opaque in form. He further noted that a reduction in number and density of plantings would affect how the experience and vista of the property from the street. Mr. Mastin said that the shrubbery would require renewal pruning and shaping, but it would remain in place. Mr. Karwinski asked what color the fence would be painted. Mr. Mastin said that the fence would be painted white.

Mr. Roberts complemented Mr. Mastin on the whole of his firm's design. He said that the height of the fencing was an issue on multiple levels. Mr. Roberts admitted that this property was unique. He said that not only is the parcel an extensive one, but it is also elevated above the street. Mr. Roberts stated that the house also atypical. As means of explanation, he asked Staff, his fellow board members, and Mr. Mastin the location of the original main entrance. Staff answered that the main entrance faces west or into the lot, not to the street. Mr. Roberts reasoned that in this light the eight foot sections of fence and wall could be considered rear lot enclosures. He said that the eastern section of lot might function as private recreational space, but it was still the side yard. Mr. Roberts impressed upon the Board the importance of rules. He said that the Board ordinarily restricts the height of wooden picket fences to three feet and metal fences to four feet when they extend beyond the front plane of the house. Mr. Roberts said that in granting approval for this application additional a precedent would be set.

Ms. Coumanis asked Mr. Mastin to explain the fence plan. Mr. Mastin explained the varying types and heights of the fencing proposal. A discussion of the use and layout of the lot ensued. Mr. Mastin was asked why the earlier eight foot wall was not retained. He told the Board that the construction of a porch and a pool necessitated the removal of the wall. Referencing the plans, Mr. Ladd observed that the foundation planters located on the eastern lot line called for a taller expanse of fencing. Mr. Mastin stated that this section of the property was only private portion of the lot. He observed that it functioned as a defacto backyard space. Mr. Mastin said the wall would provide privacy.

Mr. Roberts said that the overall effect of the neighborhood needed to be considered. He said that if at some later time the shrubbery were removed both five foot and eight foot sections of fence would be visible to the passerby. He again complemented the design, noting its beauty, but stated that in the context

of the neighborhood it could be seen as a barricade. Mr. Roberts pointed out that the District's other lawns were open to the street, as was typical of City Beautiful planned suburbs such as Ashland Place. Mr. Roberts cited how earlier eight foot fences located within the district, particularly those fences flanking the Ryan Avenue entrance off Old Shell Road, detracted from the historic landscape.

Ms. Baker asked for clarification regarding the heights and locations of the fencing. Mr. Mastin explained the locations and heights of the various types of fencing. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Karwinski complimented the design. He asked Mr. Mastin why the design did not feature a driveway off DeLeon Avenue. Mr. Mastin explained that there was no room for a drive. Discussion ensued. Mr. Ladd noted that the incline posed safety and access issues. He advised against the inclusion of a vehicular drive.

Ms. Coumanis reiterated the disparity between the earlier and the proposed fencing. Ms. Hardin furthered the discussion. Mr. James stated that he believed the proposal to be a good design, one that addressed issues presented by a unique location. He said that the streetscape image would remain the same, pointing out that only the internal layout and appearance of the lot would change. Ms. Harden agreed, but noted that the Guidelines restricted the height of fencing. Mr. Mastin pointed out that the fence stepped down as it neared the street. Ms. Coumanis reminded the Board that they had denied a previous application where an eight foot section of fence extended beyond the plan of the house. A discussion of building and property context ensued. Ms. Hardin stated that while each application should be reviewed on a case by case basis, rules are required as well.

Ms. Coumanis asked Mr. Mastin if the applicants would consider the dropping the height of those sections of eight foot fence that would extend front plan of the house. A discussion of the location of the earlier eight foot fence ensued. Mr. Karwinski moved to table the application for purposes of an on site review. The Board agreed to convene on Wednesday, April 13, 2011 at 4:00. The applicant was requested to provide an updated site plan detailing the changes the applicant's proposed. The site plan was to be enumerated with letterings reflecting the Staff Report.

TABLED