ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
August 1, 2012 – 3:00 P.M.
Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Bradford Ladd, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
   Members Present: Mary Cousar, Kim Harden, Thomas Karwinski, Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswalt, and Craig Roberts.
   Members Absent: Gertrude Baker, Carlos Gant, Nick Holmes III, Jim Wagoner, and Janetta Whitt-Mitchell.
   Staff Members Present: Devereaux Bemis, Cart Blackwell, Keri Coumanis, and John Lawler.
2. Mr. Karwinski moved to approve the minutes of the July 11, 2012 meeting. 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: Grant Zarzour**
   a. Property Address: 1756 New Hamilton Street
   b. Date of Approval: 7/1/12
   c. Project: Repaint per the existing color scheme.
2. **Applicant: Southeast Roofing & Construction**
   a. Property Address: 1705 Hunter Avenue
   b. Date of Approval: 7/6/12
   c. Project: Reroof the house using 30 year Oakridge dimensional shingle by Owens Corning. The shingles will be Driftwood in color.
3. **Applicant: Richard & Peggy Gudmundson**
   a. Property Address: 14 South Catherine Street
   b. Date of Approval: 7/3/12
   c. Project: Install a wooden ancillary installation per submitted plans. The location will meet municipal setback requirements and the materials & design meet the Design Review Board Guidelines.
4. **Applicant: Trae McGill**
   a. Property Address: 1211 Palmetto Street
   b. Date of Approval: 7/9/12
   c. Project: Install 6' shadow box fence along eastern and western elevations per submitted site plan so to tie into existing fences. Install one pedestrian gate on western side of house.
5. **Applicant: Ken Baggette**
   a. Property Address: 20 South Ann Street
   b. Date of Approval: 7/11/12
   c. Project: Reroof the house with architectural shingles.
6. **Applicant: Mary Trufant**
   a. Property Address: 1 Blacklawn
   b. Date of Approval: 7/11/12
   c. Project: Construct a 10' by 20' deck in the backyard. The railing will be of the MHDC stock design. The work will not be visible from the street.

7. **Applicant: Janetta Whitt-Mitchell**
    a. Property Address: 465 Dexter Avenue
    b. Date of Approval: 7/11/12
    c. Project: Repaint the house per the existing color scheme.
8. **Applicant: Harold Allen Home Improvements**
    a. Property Address: 1256 Selma Street
    b. Date of Approval: 7/11/12
    c. Project: Repair / replace back deck components to match existing.
9. **Applicant: Terry Lamb Contracting**
    a. Property Address: 22 McPhillips Street
    b. Date of Approval: 7/11/12
    c. Project: Reroof with metal roof previously approved by Staff.
10. **Applicant: Charles McCloud**
    a. Property Address: 19 Common Street
    b. Date of Approval: 7/12/12
    c. Project: Reroof garage apartment, asphalt shingles to match house.
11. **Applicant: Gulf Equipment Corporation**
    a. Property Address: 255 Church Street
    b. Date of Approval: 7/12/12
    c. Project: Replace mechanical equipment to match the existing.
12. **Applicant: Bobby Czarkowski**
    a. Property Address: 58 Lee Street
    b. Date of Approval: 7/13/12
    c. Project: Install MHDC-approved handrails on front porch and on side porch.
13. **Applicant: William Johnston**
    a. Property Address: 1223 Selma Street
    b. Date of Approval: 7/16/12
    c. Project: Install guttering to match existing.
14. **Applicant: Wayne Askew Contracting**
    a. Property Address: 211 South Cedar Street
    b. Date of Approval: 7/18/12
    c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint per the existing color scheme.
15. **Applicant: Nelson Patterson**
    a. Property Address: 1051 Elmira Street
    b. Date of Approval: 7/18/12
    c. Project: Patch the roof using matching shingles.
16. **Applicant: Chuck Dixon Home Dixon Home Improvements**
    a. Property Address: 119 Gilbert Street
    b. Date of Approval: 7/19/12
    c. Project: Repair and replace woodwork on the house's deck.
17. **Applicant: Ben Stewart**
    a. Property Address: 1563 Monroe Street
    b. Date of Approval: 7/18/12
    c. Project: Repaint the house. The body will be St. Anthony Street Gray and the trim will be Church Street East Gray (off white). Reroof with black shingles.
18. **Applicant: Bernhardt Roofing**
    a. Property Address: 1561 Fearnway
    b. Date of Approval: 7/23/12
    c. Project: Reroof the house. The shingles will match the existing.

19. **Applicant: Susan and Dusty Brown**
    a. Property Address: 150 South Catherine Street
    b. Date of Approval: 7/23/12
    c. Project: Paint the house per the submitted Sherwin Williams color scheme. The body of the house will be Grizzly Gray. The trim will be white. Repair and replace any deteriorated woodwork to match the existing.
20. **Applicant: Linda Cashman**
    a. Property Address: 251 South Georgia Avenue
    b. Date of Approval: 7/23/12
    c. Project: Paint the house per the submitted Sherwin color scheme. The body will be Lantern Light. The trim and columns will be White Dove. The exterior doors and shutters will be black.
21. **Applicant: Margaret Dudley**
    a. Property Address: 200 Dexter Avenue
    b. Date of Approval: 7/23/12
    c. Project: Replace a non-conforming door with glazed and a panel door more in keeping with architectural and historical character of the building.
22. **Applicant: R & J Home Repair, LLC**
    a. Property Address: 300 North Joachim Street
    b. Date of Approval: 7/24/12
    c. Project: Replace two windows to match existing; repair stucco as needed.
23. **Applicant: Daniel Vujnovich**
    a. Property Address: 118 Parker Street
    b. Date of Approval: 7/24/12
    c. Project: Reroof with charcoal black asphalt shingles, erect six foot privacy fence behind plane of house to south property line to replace deteriorated picket fence. Repaint as existing.
24. **Applicant: Dennis Jordan**
    a. Property Address: 163 Everett Street
    b. Date of Approval: 7/25/12
    c. Project: Install two expanses of eight foot high interior lot fencing (multi-family property) to either side of the house extending from the rear corners of the building to the sides of the lot.
25. **Applicant: Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund**
    a. Property Address: 1204 Old Shell Road
    b. Date of Approval: 7/20/12
    c. Project: Paint the residence per the color scheme of 1157 Palmetto Street.
26. **Applicant: Dr. Royshanda Smith**
    a. Property Address: 507 Saint Francis Street
    b. Date of Approval: 6/21/12
    c. Project: Install glazing within the bays of a 2009-2010 porch addition.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. **2012-46-CA: 255 McDonald Avenue**
    a. Applicant: Michael Stricklin
    b. Project: New Construction – Construct a side dormer and a rear addition.
    APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2012-47-CA: 1115 Government Street

a. Applicant: a representative for Taco Bell

b. Project: Remodeling – Update the exterior of a commercial franchise to reflect a new brand image.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

3. 2012-48-CA: 1700 Church Street

a. Applicant: Randy Delchamps for the Estate of Clarke C. Harris

b. Project: Demolition – Demolish a residential building.

WITHDRAWN. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

4. 2012-49-CA: 112 Lanier Avenue

a. Applicant: John F. & Barbara Janecky

b. Project: Approval of Altered Plans – Construct a rear addition.

REFERRED TO DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. **OTHER BUSINESS**

1. Board Site Visit – Craig Roberts
2, Report on NAPC: Harden; Oswalt & Roberts

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2012-46-CA: 255 McDonald Avenue
Applicant: Michael Stricklin
Received: 6/22/12; revised 7/16/12
Meeting: 8/1/12

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: New Construction – Construct a side dormer and a rear addition.

BUILDING HISTORY

This Tudor style residence exemplifies the 1920s/early 1930s penchant for picturesque evocations of medieval architecture. The half-timbered and stone-faced dwelling was constructed for Harry Toulmin. The rough cut granite blocks likely came from the 1839 Mobile County Jail.

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 July 11, 2012. At that time, the Board denied an application that called for the construction of a rear addition and a side dormer. A Design Review Committee was convened and said Committee was held on July 13, 2012. The applicant submits a revised application that takes into account both recommendations made at the previous meeting and guidance offered by the Design Review Committee.
B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts 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 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. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired."

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

1. Construct a side dormer.
    a. The dormer will extend from the South Elevation's hipped roof (from the existing recessed dormer).
    b. The dormer will measure 9' 2" in width and 10' 1 ½" in depth.
    c. The dormer will be setback so to allow the continuation of the flared roof pitch.
    d. The walls of the dormer will be faced with a half-timbered veneer.

e. The dormer will be surmounted by a hipped roof whose pitch will match that of the South Elevation's principal roof slope.
f. The roofing shingles will match those employed on the body of the house.
g. The dormer's South Elevation will feature a salvaged six-over-six window.

2. Construct a rear addition
   a. The rear will measure 22' 5" in width and 19' in depth.
   b. Extending from the East Elevation, the two story addition will a feature a foundation faced with rough cut granite blocks salvaged from the affected areas of the rear elevation.
   c. The addition's first floor will feature a half timbered treatment employing stucco work matching that found on the body of the house.
   d. An intermediate entablature-like band matching the one found on the body of the house will extend around the addition.
   e. The second story will feature half-timbered wall expanses whose dimensions and facings will match those employed on the body of the house.
   f. The addition will feature salvaged fenestration.
   g. The roofing shingles will match those employed on the body of the house.
   h. South Elevation
      i. The South Elevation's first story will feature two fifteen light French doors.
      ii. The doors will be surmounted by single light transoms and framed by half-timbering.
      iii. The second story fenestration will be located within an extension of the existing recessed wall expanse.
      iv. The second story will feature one six-over-six wooden window.
   i. East Elevation
      i. The East or Rear Elevation will replicate the outline of the existing rear ell.
      ii. The East Elevation's first story will feature a pair of six-over-six windows.
      iii. The second story will feature a multi-light window.
      iv. The attic will feature salvaged louvered vent.
   j. North Elevation
      v. The North Elevation's first floor will feature two fifteen light French doors.
      vi. The doors will be surmounted by single light transoms and framed by half-timbering.
      vii. The second story will feature one six-over-six wooden window.

3. Remove the North Elevation's stoop and window. The lower portion of said door bay will be infilled and the upper portion will be converted into a window bay featuring a six-over-six window.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of a side dormer and a rear addition.

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation state that new additions should be differentiated from yet compatible with the historic fabric. The Standards go on to say that compatibility can be achieved through massing, size, scale, and architectural features.

The proposed side addition would project from the South Elevation's hipped roof. Located above an enclosed porch and extending from a recessed dormer, the addition would be visible from the public view. In accord with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, the proposed new construction would employ the architectural details and the roof would adopt the scale of the body of the house. Matching treatments include the wall facing and window type. Side dormers and other larger scale constructions have been

approved by the Board. The proposed work is based on and compliments the design and scale of the main residence. As discussed at the July 11th Architectural Review Board meeting and July 13th Design Review Committee meeting, the dormer has been set back thereby allowing the continuation of flared eave.

Extending from an ell located off the northeast corner of the house, the proposed rear addition would not be visible from the public view. The outline of the existing ell would be replicated by the proposed addition. The initial application called for undifferentiated stucco surfacing on the first story and matching half-timbering for the second floor. The revised application is more developed with regard to its horizontal articulation, materials, and fenestration. The proposed first floor features an articulated watertable faced with rough cut granite blocks salvaged from areas affected by the addition. The first floor would be faced with a more robust half-timbering while the second story would be faced with half-timbering matching that employed on the house. The employment of a watertable and the articulation of the first floor were discussed at both last meeting and the Design Review Committee session. Also recommended and discussed was use of additional fenestration. More fenestration has been employed. As suggested by a Design Review Committee member, additional first story fenestration aligns along a north-south axis.

In the initial application the drawings called for the removal and infill of the North Elevation's entrance. As a consequence of the Design Review Committee, the revised application proposes the conversion of the door bay into a window bay. The stoop and overhang would be removed. Salvaged granite blocks would infill the lower portions of the existing opening and a six over six windows matching those employed elsewhere on this wall expanse would be installed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), 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

Michael Stricklin was present to represent the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant. He asked Mr. Stricklin if he had any comments to make, questions to ask, or clarifications to address. Mr. Stricklin answered no saying that Mr. Blackwell had addressed the revised application, as well as his intention not to employ half-timbering on the first story. He added that the floor plan was still evolving.

Mr. Roberts asked Mr. Stricklin if the rear wing's South Elevation would employ single French doors as specified in the scope of work and drawings or double French doors as shown in the floor plan. Mr. Stricklin told the Board that double French doors would be utilized. A discussion ensued as to the size and proportion of the doors. Mr. Karwinski stated that since the doors would be located on an addition they would not have to match the existing.

Mr. Karwinski pointed out that a number of the revisions on the proposed plan were part of his involvement in the Design Review Committee held on July 13th. He told his fellow Board members that he has copies of his suggested improvements if any of them were interested in seeing them.

Mr. Ladd spoke to the applicant saying that if memory served correctly, Mr. Stricklin was pressed for time with regard to moving into the house. Mr. Stricklin answered yes.

Mr. Ladd asked if any other Board members had any comments to make or questions to ask the applicant representative. No further comments ensued from the Board. Mr. Ladd addressed the audience. He asked if there was anyone present who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, he closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending facts to note that the rear wing's South Elevation doors would be double as opposed to single in configuration.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 8/1/13

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2012-47-CA: 1115 Government Street
Applicant: A representative for Taco Bell
Received: 7/13/12
Meeting: 8/1/12

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District:	Oakleigh Garden
Classification:	Non-Contributing
Zoning:	B-2
Project:	Remodeling – Update the exterior of a commercial franchise to reflect a new brand image.

BUILDING HISTORY

This commercial franchise building dates from 1985. Prior to its construction, the site was occupied by a large two-story residence. The house, which was designed by architect Rudolf Benz and remodeled by George B. Rogers, was lost as a consequence of an arson-related fire.

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 7, 2012. At that time, the Board approved a proposal calling for the exterior renovation of the building, the alteration of the site plan, and the installation of signage. The franchise's representative returns to the Board with a revised application for the building's exterior.

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
   1. "The exterior of a building helps define its style, quality, and historic period."

C. Scope of Work:
   1. Remodel the exterior of the building to reflect an updated brand image.
      a. Stucco roofing tiles will be repaired and when necessary replaced to match the existing.
      b. An upper level roof parapet will be constructed.
      c. The existing entablature-like zone will be subdivided into four horizontal registers and heightened.
      d. The building will be repainted in the following color scheme.
         i. The wall expanses and pavilions will be painted "Camelback."
         ii. The upper parapet and dado will be painted "Rockwood Clay."
         iii. The pavilion accent color will be "Plummy."
         iv. The parapets and sills will be "Umber."
         v. The louvers will be "Status Bronze."
         vi. The upper parapet will be "Iron Ore."

vii. The walls expanses behind the metal louvers will be “Clematis.”

e. North Elevation (Façade)
    i. Construct engaged piers at the northwest and northeast corners of the building’s façade. The two part piers will be broken into dado and field zones.
    ii. The façade’s central projecting pavilion will be reconfigured. The round arched window and rounded parapet will made replaced with a rectilinear treatment. E.I.F.S. panels will face the projecting pavilion.
    iii. The projecting pavilion’s two unit aluminum storefront window will be surmounted by a sign field (sign previously approved) separated from window fenestrated zone by an intermediate metal canopy.
    iv. Two unit aluminum storefront windows will be installed in the existing window bays flanking the projecting central pavilion. A band of fixed metal louvers will be located above the windows.
    v. Can lights will be located on the inner and outer piers.
f. West Elevation
    i. The West Elevation’s entrance bay will be reconfigured. The round arched parapet will be removed and a rectilinear treatment matching that employed on the façade’s central pavilion will be used. E.I.F.S. panels will articulate the flanking piers. A metal canopy will be located above the entrance below a recessed field.
    ii. A pier will be constructed to the south of the entrance. The heightened parapet will extend to the pier.
    iii. A band of fixed metal louvers will extend over the window bays located to the north of the entrance.
    iv. A band of fixed metal louvers will extend south and the to the north of the entrance
    v. Metal can lights will be installed on the three engaged piers.
g. South Elevation: No changes.
h. East Elevation
    i. The drive through entrance and pavilion will be reconfigured to match the rectilinear treatment of the façade’s projecting pavilion and the West Elevation’s entrance. Rectilinear E.I.F.S. panels will be employed.
    ii. A metal canopy will extend from the drive through.
    iii. Metal can lights will be placed on the three engaged piers.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application calls for the renovation of a non-contributing commercial building. The proposed remodeling is part of the franchise’s effort to update its brand image. An earlier proposal calling for the renovation of the building, improvement of the site plan, and the installation of signage was approved on March 7, 2012. The signage and site related components will be executed according to the approved scope of work.

This application is a consequence of comments made March 7, 2012. During that meeting it was noted that while the proposal did not impair the building or adversely affect the district, it was less restrained than the existing design. This proposal calls for a design featuring less vibrant colors and extraneous detail.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Greg Jones 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. Jones if he had any comments to make, questions to ask, or clarifications to address.

Mr. Jones answered no with regard to the scope of work. He did add that given this building's history as a design progenitor of franchises across the country, it seemed appropriate that a new brand image should be launched from the location. Mr. Ladd said that Board members often cite it as example of how a national franchise adapted its image and design to a particular site and historic setting.

Mr. Karwinski addressed the applicant's representative and his fellow Board members. He stated that the design up for review does not suit either the site or streetscape. Mr. Jones responded saying that the revised proposal was toned down at Mr. Karwinski's suggestion. Referencing the overall increase in height, particularly that of existing and proposed parapets, Mr. Karwinski said that proposed work did does not respect the original design. Mr. Karwinski stated that the Spanish tile roof, a characteristic feature of Mobile, would be obscured by the increased verticality of the design.

Mr. Roberts remarked that the Guidelines do not prohibit the alteration of non-contributing contemporary buildings.

Mr. Ladd asked if any other Board members had any comments to make or questions to ask the applicant's representative. No further comments ensued from the Board. Mr. Ladd addressed the audience. He asked if there was anyone present who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, he 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 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.

Mr. Karwinski voted in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 8/1/13

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2012-48-CA: 1700 Church Street
Applicant: Randy Delchamps for the Estate of Clarke Harris, Jr.
Received: 7/16/12
Meeting: 8/1/12

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District:	Leinkauf
Classification:	Contributing
Zoning:	R-1
Project:	Demolition – Demolish a residential building.

BUILDING HISTORY

This contributing residence dates from 1945. The single story residence features a gabled stoop entrance and large side porch.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on November 2, 2011. At that time, the applicant's representative proposed the demolition of the house. The Board encouraged the applicant to investigate alternative courses of action such as listing the property for sale. The applicant's representative reappears before the Board application calling for the demolition of the house.

B. With 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. <u>The historic or architectural significance of the structure;</u>
        1. This contributing residence is one many single story houses featuring a stoop accessed front entrances and a screened side porches found across the region. This wood frame example is situated on a corner lot amid buildings of similar date and style.
    ii. <u>The importance of the structures to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures</u>;

1. This building is located in the westernmost block of Church Street. Extending through three historic districts, the final block of Church Street, upon which this house is situated, is located within the Leinkauf Historic District. This house and others of comparable date and similar treatment comprise an intact streetscape which extends from Breamwood to Houston Streets. The house contributes to the built density, architectural significance, and historic integrity of the surrounding district.

iii. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
   1. A portion of the west elevation has collapsed due to deferred maintenance. The interior has been trespassed upon on numerous occasions. Since last appearing before the Board in November of 2012, the deterioration has escalated on account of demolition by neglect.

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. Single story houses of this design can be found across the Southeast and Northeast.

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 would level the lot and plant grass on the site. The lot would function as a green space.

vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
   1. The property is being gifted to St. John's Episcopal Church.

vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
   1. After assessing the condition of the house, the Church did not consider alternative uses for the property.

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 (either before or after appearing before the Board). It is currently in the process of being gifted to the St. John's Episcopal Church.

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. N.A.

x. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
   1. N.A.

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. Application submitted.

xii. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.
   1. See submitted materials.

2. *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 (per submitted plan):
   1. Demolish a contributing residential building.
   2. Level the lot.
   3. Plant grass.

CLARIFICATIONS

1. Will any trees be removed?
2. Will fencing remain in place?

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the demolition of a single family residence. Demolition applications entail the review of the following concerns: the architectural significance of the building; the effect of the demolition on the streetscape and surrounding district; the condition of the building; and the nature of the proposed development.

This house is a contributing residence in the Leinkauf Historic District. The single story wooden residence, like many of the same date and style, is distinguished by a stoop accessed front entrance and a screened side porch.

The house is located in the westernmost block of Church Street. Church Street extends through three of Mobile's historic districts. All the buildings on this final block of Church Street are extant. Several other buildings facing this stretch of Church Street are of the same period and similar design. This house and the neighboring dwellings contribute not only to the built density, but also to the architectural and the historical character of the Leinkauf Historic District.

This house suffers from years of deferred maintenance and its current state amounts to demolition by neglect. A portion of the building's West Elevation has been open to both elements and trespassers since at least the time of the property's last appearance before the Board. Deterioration of finishings, facings, and fabric continues unchecked. The property was not listed for sale, as was suggested by the Board. No site plan was provided. The applicant has provided an estimate showing that the cost of restoration/renovation. Said estimate exceeds the estimated value of the house. Since no effort seems to have been made to protect the structure or repair it since its last appearance before the Board, staff believes that the deterioration was caused by the inactions of the property owners.

If granted demolition approval the applicant's would level the lot and plant grass on the site.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Randy Delchamps, the Reverend Thomas Heard, and Howard Yeager were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed Mr. Delchamps, the Reverend Heard, and Mr. Yeager. He asked them if they had any comments to make, questions to ask, or clarifications to address.

Mr. Delchamps provided the Board with a oral history of the property and the application, including updates that had occurred since the property's last appearance before them. He explained that the property had been owned by his aunt and uncle and that upon their death it was left to the late Mr. Harris, his cousin. Acknowledging the condition of the property, but explaining the reasons, he said that the deterioration was a result of not being able to do work on the property for a number of years. Mr. Delchamps told the Board that attempts had been made to move his late cousin, the one whose estate he represents, to another residence so to make repairs to the house. Those efforts had proved unsuccessful. Speaking of the present condition, Mr. Delchamps told the Board that he had provided in their packets a cost estimate for restoring the house. to $175,000, he said that the actual cost might prove lower, but not too much. He said that the cost of restoration far exceeded the value of the property.

Mr. Roberts asked Mr. Delchamps if the property had been appraised. Mr. Delchamps answered no. Mr. Roberts said that while Mr. Delchamps was in all probability correct with regard to the value of the property being less than the cost to restore the house, it might prove beneficial in general and for purposes of the application to obtain an assessed value on the property. Mr. Delchamps said that the Reverend Heard of St. Johns and Howard Yeager of the parish's Vestry had also looked into the value of the property.

Mr. Roberts and Ms. Harden asked as to any proposed the property had been considered if demolition were to be approved. Mr. Yeager told the Board that if granted demolition approval, the site would be cleared and then planted with grass and maintained in the same fashion as another green space owned by the church. He said that the aforementioned green space is located one block away on Weinacker Avenue. Mr. Yeager mentioned that the parish owns 1702 Church Street, the house and lot located just west of the site. He and the Reverend Heard stated that this house is in a much better state of repair than 1700 Church Street. Mr. Yeager said that he believed that once the house at 1700 Church Street was demolished and the lot cleared on underbrush the streetscape would not only be improved, but also much safer. He added that no trees would be removed. Mr. Yeager said that if issued demolition approval, the property would initially function as the proposed green space. He added that later on another use, such as parking, might be considered. He and the Reverend Heard both stated that financial concerns precluded any immediate development other than a maintained green space. Mr. Heard reiterated that any existing trees would remain undisturbed.

Mr. Ladd asked if any alternatives other than demolition had been considered. The Reverend Heard answered no. He said that the property was in the process of being gifted to the Church. Mr. Yeager said that the $150,000 to $175,000 cost of restoration far exceeded the value of the house. He and the Reverend Heard said that the parish could not take on such an expense.

Mr. Karwinski addressed his fellow Board members, the applicant, and Church's representatives. He asked the Reverend Heard and Mr. Yeager what the parish's intentions were with regard to 1702 Church Street. Mr. Karwinski said that he was afraid that if 1700 Church Street was demolished, a domino effect might ensue wherein 1702 Church would fall to the wrecking ball as well. The Reverend Heard said that 1702 Church is rented and is in nowhere near the condition of 1700 Church Street. Mr. Karwinski asked the Reverend Heard if he would be willing to commit to not demolishing 1702 Church at some later date. The Reverend Heard responded by saying that it was not in his capacity to make such a commitment. He

explained to the Board that the Diocese of the Central Gulf Coast owns its parish complexes. Any commitment of that nature would have to come from the Diocese.

Mr. Roberts explained to the applicants that given six decades of demolitions which have eradicated much of Mobile's historic buildings, including many on nearby Government Street, demolition applications are taken seriously. He reiterated Mr. Karwinski's concerns as to a possible domino effect. The Reverend Heard said that the condition of the building should be taken into account. Mr. Delchamps agreed.

Mr. Ladd said if demolition is to be considered and approved alternatives should be investigated. He suggested placing the property on the market. Mr. Ladd said that if it did not sell the action taken would prove to the Board additional courses of action had been pursued and it would consequently improve chances for an eventual approval. He said that many people buy and flip properties in conditions as bad as the property in question. Mr. Ladd made this recommendation and said that after listing the property it could then reappear before the Board.

Mr. Delchamps said that this scenario sounded reasonable, but he said that he doubted anyone would be interested in a house in such a bad state of repair.

Mr. Oswalt suggested that if the property received no offers and was approved for demolition, the parish might consider selling the lot for redevelopment.

The Reverend Heard said that when he was first approached about gifting the property to the parish, he knew that it would cause issues because of the expansion of the Leinkauf historic district.
The Reverend stated that he personally had renovated three older homes and that he could not imagine anyone taking on the restoration or renovation of the house in question. He said that it would be more economically feasible to demolish the house and then to rebuild and restore it.

Mr. Ladd explained to the Reverend Heard that the Board was not trying to work against the application but only make sure all options had been investigated and exhausted.

The Reverend Heard said that the house should be considered a nuisance. He added that he could dig up reports calling it such. The Reverend said that in delaying approval of the demolition neither the house's condition nor the streetscapes appearance would improve. Mr. Ladd reiterated that when another application is reviewed, one showing the investigation of alternatives, it would be noted that steps had been made. The Reverend Heard stated the parish and the diocese could be held liable if an issue arose.

Mr. Yeager said that as a business man, he could not see how anyone would be interested in taking on such a big project, one that promised only financial loss.

Mr. Ladd agreed, but he said the effort would be acknowledged. He added that the Board had to take into previous rulings into consideration as well as setting of possible precedent(s). Speaking of a house near his own in the Ashland Place historic district, Mr. Ladd said that the house in question had been empty for some years. It too had fallen into a state of bad repair. Mr. Ladd said that the owner of the aforementioned property had recently placed it on the market.

Mr. Delchamps asked how he would know that if the property was listed and whether or not it had received any offers a demolition to be approved or designation changed. Ms. Harden spoke to Mr. Delchamp's query. She said that while the designation could not be changed, alternative courses of actions would have been investigated thereby providing a foundation for approval.

Mr. Karwinski said that another course of action was restoring the front portion of the residence. He stated that the restoration cost estimate took into account the whole house. By restoring the more substantial front potion, the streetscape would be maintained. He cited a surviving unit of widow's row in the Church Street East Historic District. He said that the two room building had been restored and expanded thus maintain historical character and built density.

Mr. Karwinski said the application could be denied and then an appeal could be sought.

Mr. Delchamps said yes that was an option, but not one he wished to pursue. He said he wanted to work with the Board and then withdrew the application for further consideration.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2012-49-CA: 112 Lanier Avenue
Applicant: John F. & Barbara Janecky
Received: 7/20/12
Meeting: 8/1/12

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Approval of Altered Plans – Construct a rear addition.

BUILDING HISTORY

This two-story residence was constructed in 1937 according to the designs of Mobile architect C. L. Hutchisson, Jr. The house is one of several contemporary Hutchisson designs featuring complex brick patterns and colorings.

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 2, 2011. At that time, the Board approved the construction of a rear addition and the reconstruction of the existing rear garage. The addition was in effect a connector between the main house and garage. The application was renewed on May 29, 2012. Construction commenced shortly thereafter according to permitted plans that were not inspected by Staff. A 311 call was made on July 18, 2012. A stop work order was issued on July 19, 2012. The applicants appear before the Board with revised plans.

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
   1. "New additions, exterior 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."
   2. New additions and adjacent and related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired."

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
   1. Approval of Altered Plans – Construct a rear addition.
      a. The addition will rest atop a concrete slab foundation.
      b. The walls will be faced with wooden shingles.

c. The six-over-six and four-over-four wooden windows will be operable and transom windows will be fixed. Some of the windows will be salvaged and reused from the affected areas of the rear elevation.
d. A continuous gable roof will surmount the connector and the reconstructed garage.
e. The eave treatments and cornice returns will match those found on the body of the house.
f. The roofing shingles will match those employed on the body of the house.
g. West Elevation
    i. The shed roofed West Elevation will feature a six-over-six window. An advanced shed projecting from the North Elevation will be visible in the distance. The aforementioned will not feature any west-facing fenestration.
h. South Elevation
    i. The South Elevation will feature the following fenestration sequence (from West to East): a six-over-six window; a three bay expanse of framed porch screening; a six-over-six window, a four-over-four window, a fifteen light French door and a four-over-four window.
    ii. Three gabled dormers will project from the South Elevation's roof. The center gable will feature two six-over-six windows and the flanking dormers will feature single six-over-six windows.
i. East Elevation
    i. The East Elevation's will feature two garage doors.
    ii. The East Elevation's gable end will feature a six-over-six window.
j. North Elevation
    i. The North Elevation will feature the following fenestration sequence (from East to West): two transom-like windows located within advance shed; a three by expanse of framed porch screening; and a six-over-six window.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The plans submitted for review were permitted by the City of Mobile's West Mobile Permitting Office based on the ARB approval of differing plans. The applicants appear before the Board with an application calling for the approval of the revised plans.

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation state that new additions and related new construction should be differentiated from yet compatible with the existing historic fabric.

The revised plans differ considerably from the approved plan. The Board approved plans called for a reconstructed garage engaged to the main building by way of intermediate connector. This proposal resulted in massings and elevations that provided a sense of "readable" evolution. The design history of the property (a house, a connecting addition, and reconstructed garage) was clearly articulated. Those approved elevations clearly differentiated between the old and the new by way of horizontal layering, wall facings, and roof configuration.

The revised plans constitute, in effect, a rear addition. The simulated watertables and varying roof levels of the approved elevations have been replaced by a slab on grade foundation, lacking a water table or any other distinguishing features between the elevation and the foundation, and a continuous, single-gabled roof. The result of these alterations to the foundation and the roof is a block-like mass that does not approximate the differentiated sequence afforded by the earlier three part plan. Changes in massing affected by revised foundation and roofing treatments are compounded by altered exterior sheathing. The approved plans called for stuccoed walls while the revised plans call for wooden shingles. Historically, few of Mobile's Tudor inspired buildings comingled brick and shingled surfaces. The stuccoed wall treatment of the Board approved design not only allowed for compatibly differential horizontal layering,

but was also in keeping with earlier Board rulings regarding additions to masonry buildings (which generally have taken the form of matching brick or complementary stuccoing).

On account of the addition's overall massing, exterior surfacing, and roof structure, Staff believes this application impairs the architectural and the historical integrity of the building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1), Staff recommends that this application impairs the architectural and historical character of the building and the district. Staff does not recommend approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

John Janecky, Barbara Janecky, and Pete Vallas were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd recued himself. Mr. Oswalt assumed the role of chair. He welcomed the applicants and their representative asking them if they had any comments to make, questions to ask, or clarifications to address.

Mr. Janecky addressed the Board saying that his wife had recently lost her mother and that he said that he would speak to the application. Taking the application back to its inception, Mr. Janecky spoke about the property's garage. He said that the building was neither architecturally significant nor in a good state of repair. Mr. Janecky said that several plans for the rear portion of his property had been considered. The goal had been to make the house more handicap accessible in the future. Comparing the approved work and the work under construction, he pointed many similarities between the two plans. He said that features such as windows, the added dormers, and roofing shingles would match those found on the house. Since there was not enough brick to be salvaged from the affected areas of the rear elevation which to face the addition, Mr. Janecky said he and his wife had reconsidered the addition's exterior facing. He said that upon speaking to their friend and neighbor architect Pete Vallas they decided to employ a different exterior treatment, the proposed hardiboard shingles. Since there was not enough brick to salvage, they found the proposed shingles more attractive than and as historic as the approved stucco. Mr. Janecky said that he and Mrs. Janecky would like to use the shingles. He mentioned that the same siding was found on Mr. Vallas contemporaneous house which is also located on Lanier Avenue. Mr. Janecky said that salvaged bricks would be employed as foundation facings. He said that addition was at best minimally visible from the street and that similar, albeit larger, additions had been constructed on the alley. He reiterated that the plan would allow him and his wife to enjoy the house for the rest of their lives. Mr. Janecky concluded by saying that while he felt strongly about the project, he was here and willing to listen to all suggestions.

Mr. Vallas addressed the Board. He explained that he did not do the work and that he only offered advice as a friend and neighbor. Mr. Vallas stated that the building permit had been initially pulled by Mr. Weems, the original contractor, using the plans approved by the Board. Mr. Boone, the current contractor, nodded in agreement with Mr. Vallas. The latter said that he was present to show his support and to address questions.

Mr. Roberts asked Mr. Vallas if he realized that in making suggestions the plans would alterations. Mr. Janecky addressed the query. He said that he was not aware of the procedure involved. Mr. Roberts said that he remembered the initial as well as the approved plan. He recounted that Chuck Weems had

previously represented the applicants. Mr. Janecky said that Mr. Weems had handled the application therefore he was unaware of the proper steps.

Ms. Cousar said that it seemed common sense to take into account that altered plans would necessitate consultation and reapplication. Mr. Vallas said that he personally did not know that plans had been submitted for permit.

Mr. Oswalt asked for clarification regarding the siding.

The roof was discussed.

Mr. Roberts asked Mr. Blackwell to explain the fundamental difference between the approved and partially constructed plans.

Mr. Oswalt suggested a Design Review Committee. He spoke to the benefits of the the design review process.

The application was referred to a Design Review Committee.