

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

August 1, 2018 – 3:00 P.M.

Multi-Purpose Room, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The acting Chair, Steve Stone, called the meeting to order at 3:15 p.m. Paige Largue, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
Members Present: Bob Allen, John Ruzic, David Barr, Nick Holmes III and Steve Stone.
Members Absent: Harris Oswalt, Carolyn Hasser, Catarina Echols, Jim Wagoner, and Robert Brown, Kim Harden and Craig Roberts.
Staff Members Present: Marion McElroy, Bridget Daniel, and John Sledge.
2. Mr. Holmes moved to approve the minutes of the June 20, 2018 meeting. The motion received a second and was approved unanimously. Mr. Holmes moved to approve the minutes of the July 18, 2018 meeting. The motion received a second and was approved unanimously.
3. Mr. Roberts moved to approve the Midmonths. The motion received a second and was approved with one opposed, Mr. Allen.

B. MIDMONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED.

1. Applicant: Linda Cashman

- a. Property Address: 251 S. Georgia Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 7/9/2018
- c. Project: Replace two second story windows to match original in materials, profile, and dimensions, and reroof bay window.

2. Applicant: Ilene Miller

- a. Property Address: 600 Eslava Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/9/2018
- c. Project: Redeck front porch, repair/replace rotten wood to match.

3. Applicant: Katheryn Butler

- a. Property Address: 1170 Fry Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/9/2018
- c. Project: Replace roof, repair/replace wooden siding, replace windows and doors to match in materials, profile and dimension, repaint to match.

4. Applicant: Frances Garcia

- a. Property Address: 1164 Fry Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/9/2018
- c. Project: Replace roof, repair/replace rotten siding, windows and doors to match original in material, profile, and dimension.

5. Applicant: Katheryn Butler

- a. Property Address: 1153 Texas Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/9/2018
- c. Project: Replace roof, repair/replace rotten siding, windows and doors to match original in material, profile, and dimension.

6. Applicant: Katheryn Butler

- a. Property Address: 1151 Texas Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/9/2018
- c. Project: Replace roof, repair/replace rotten siding, windows and doors to match original in material, profile, and dimension.

7. Applicant: Wily Butler

- a. Property Address: 1189 Texas Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/9/2018
- c. Project: Replace roof, repair/replace rotten siding, windows and doors to match original in material, profile, and dimension.

8. Applicant: Katheryn Butler

- a. Property Address: 1204 Texas Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/10/2018
- c. Project: Repair Replace roof, repair/replace rotten siding, windows and doors to match original in material, profile, and dimension.

9. Applicant: John Stimpson

- a. Property Address: 954 Texas Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/10/2018
- c. Project: Reroof with neutral (brown, gray, black) architectural shingles. Repair columns to match one of the three columns. Repair and replace deteriorated wood siding to match existing in dimension profile, and material. Repaint in following color scheme: Body-St. Anthony Street Gray; Trim, columns, casing, windows-white; Shutters, front door and
- d. decking-Bellingrath Green; Porch Ceiling-Church Street Gray.

10. Applicant: John Stimpson

- a. Property Address: 952 Texas Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/10/2018
- c. Project: Reroof with neutral (brown, gray, black) architectural shingles. Repair columns. Repair and replace deteriorated wood siding to match existing in dimension profile, and material. Repaint in following color scheme: Body-Joachim Street Beige; Trim, columns, casing, windows-white; Shutters and decking-Bellingrath Green; Porch Ceiling-Church Street Gray; Door-Claiborne Street Red.

11. Applicant: Jan Dabney

- a. Property Address: 1707 Laurel Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/11/2018
- c. Project: Repair/replace rotten wood as necessary and repaint to match.

12. Applicant: Margaret Damrich

- a. Property Address: 10 S. Catherine Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/11/2018
- c. Project: Build three foot fence with pergola, paint; replace damaged palings on six foot privacy fence at rear, add wood gate at driveway.

13. Applicant: Sun Coast Roofing on behalf of Barbara Esminger

- a. Property Address: 1716 Laurel Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/12/2018
- c. Project: Repair and replace rafter tails on corners to match in dimension, profile, and material on main house. Replace 1x6 soffitt. Replace roof on ancillary building to match existing: asphalt shingles.

14. Applicant: Derek Thomas of Thomas Properties

- a. Property Address: 7 N. Dearborn Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/12/2018
- c. Project: Paint mural on secondary elevation depicting downtown.

15. Applicant: HVA Properties

- a. Property Address: 211 S. Cedar Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/17/2018
- c. Project: Repair/replace rotten wood, including porch ceiling, to match original, repaint to match. Repair flat roof over porch.

16.Applicant: Bruno Cosimi

- a. Property Address: 158 Macy Place
- b. Date of Approval: 7/17/2018
- c. Project: Reroof to match existing.

17.Applicant: Lydia Blackwell

- a. Property Address: 1005 Caroline Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 7/20/2018
- c. Project: Roof with metal 5V crimp galvalume.

18.Applicant: Southern Hounds

- a. Property Address: 1111 Elmira Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/23/2018
- c. Project: Repair, replace rotten wood as necessary to match existing in profile, dimension, and material, patch roof to match, repaint.

19.Applicant: Barja Wilson

- a. Property Address: 1000 Old Shell Road
- b. Date of Approval: 7/23/2018
- c. Project: Replace rafters, decking as needed, reroof with slate gray asphalt shingles.

20.Applicant: Adam Kerian on behalf of the City of Mobile

- a. Property Address: 104 S. Lawrence Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/24/2018
- c. Project: Remove damaged fascia and soffitt and replace to match existing in dimension, profile and material. Repaint to match existing.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2018-23-CA: 221 Dauphin Street

- a. Applicant: Robert Maurin on Maurin Architecture on behalf of Dr. Gene Terrezza
- b. Project: Renovate a non-contributing building facade.

APPROVED: CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2018-17-CA: 1654 Government Street

- a. Applicant: Pamela and Jeffrey Kent
- b. Project: PREVIOUSLY HELDOVER: Porch Related: Retain porch railing, planters, and gate installed without a Certificate of Appropriateness.

DENIED: CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Ms. Largue reported on the National Alliance Preservation Commission Forum Conference she attended with Board member, Steve Stone, and Commission member, Jean Dodge. She noted Des Moines was a wonderful city to visit. She explained the sessions were informative and stressed the importance of reviewing ARB packets before the meeting and keeping discussion around the guidelines.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2018-20-CA: 221 Dauphin Street

Applicant: Robert Maurin on Maurin Architecture on behalf of Dr. Gene Terrezza

Received: 7/10/2018

Meeting: 8/1/2018

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial

Classification: Non-Contributing

Zoning: T5.2

Project: Rehabilitation and Addition Related: Conduct to the body of a historic building; demolish later non-contributing rear addition and construct new addition in same footprint; install fenestration; and instate fencing.

BUILDING HISTORY

The DeMouy building was originally constructed in 1899 by William DeMouy. The building was modernized in by J.F. Jacobson or J.F. Maury in the late 1930's. The first story storefront was furthered altered in more recent years. Original portions of the building can be seen in the rear.

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 May 3, 1999 according to the MHDC vertical files. At that time neon lighting strips in window display were denied. . The proposed scope of work includes in-kind repairs, alteration of fenestration, and construction of a gallery.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. "Alterations to non-historic commercial buildings must be compatible with the historic district."
 - 2. "Design an alteration to retain a placement and orientation that is compatible with the district."
 - 3. "Design an alteration to appear similar in massing and scale with historic commercial buildings in the district."
 - 4. "Use building elements that are of a similar profile and durability to those seen on historic buildings in the district."
 - 5. "Use building materials that are compatible with the surrounding context."
 - 6. "Maintain significant historic façades in their original form."
 - 7. "Repair deteriorated building materials by patching, piecing-in, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing the material."

8. “Where historic (wooden or metal) windows are intact and in repairable condition, retain and repair them to match the existing as per location, light configuration, detail and material.”
9. “Use contemporary details, such as window moldings and door surrounds, to create interest while expressing a new, compatible style.”
10. “Consider designing a structure using a contemporary interpretation of a historic style that is authentic to the district while ensuring that it is distinguishable as being new.”

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

1. Demolish specific façade elements.
 - a. Remove steel awning frame.
 - b. Remove existing aluminum storefront door on eastern portion of first floor.
 - c. Remove aluminum frame windows on second floor.
 - d. Remove existing downspouts.
2. Repair or replace materials in kind.
 - a. Replace aluminum storefront door on eastern portion of the first floor.
 - b. Repair or replace black siding to match in dimension and profile on eastern portion of first floor.
 - c. Repair and replace marble panels on western portion of first floor.
 - d. Repair aluminum storefront.
 - e. Replace downspouts.
3. Install new doors and gallery.
 - a. Install steel single lite steel doors and casing where windows previously occupied an opening in same footprint.
 - b. Construct new gallery.
 - i. Gallery will be 10’9” in depth and 27’8-1/2” in width.
 - ii. The gallery deck will have a finished floor height of 14’9”.
 - iii. Gallery will consist of 1-1/4” painted steel railing with horizontal pickets and IPE decking.
 - iv. Gallery will be supported by centrally located 2” painted steel pipes and attached to building.
 - v. Gallery will be circular in construction.
4. Repaint brick and steel in Sherwin Williams “Incredible White” and IPE decking in dark brown.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the renovation of a non-contributing commercial building, including in-kind repairs, alteration of fenestration, and construction of a gallery. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts says to reference the section on changes to non-historic commercial buildings, and new construction of commercial buildings, when looking to alter a non-contributing building in a local district. The alterations to the existing building are minimal, with the exception of a new gallery.

Elements of the existing façade will be removed and replaced. A steel awning frame, one aluminum storefront door, aluminum windows on the second floor, and downspouts will be removed. Other materials will be cleaned and repaired to match existing (See B-7). Regarding change in fenestration on the façade, the aforementioned windows will be replaced by three sets of steel doors. The doors will fit the existing window openings and therefore maintain the current rhythm of the street.

A new gallery will be constructed. Mobile's downtown is filled with galleries and balconies. The gallery will be contemporary in nature with its steel composition and circular form. The façade is not a pure example of any architectural style. However, at the time the façade was extensively renovated in 1937 the Art Deco and Art Moderne styles were popular for commercial buildings. The upper story's smooth facade with horizontal emphasis is reminiscent of the art moderne style (B-11). The curved lines of the proposed gallery can be seen on finer art moderne examples such as the Red Cross Building at 853 Dauphin Street (B-10).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-11), Staff does not believe this application would impair either the architectural or the historical significance of the building or the district. Staff recommends approval of this application pending approval from the Consolidated Review Committee being held on July 25th, 2018.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Robert Maurin, representative of the owner and architect, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Stone asked Mr. Maurin if he had any concerns, questions, or comments. Mr. Maurin replied he did not.

Mr. Stone asked for Mr. Maurin to confirm how many lites were configured on each door. Mr. Maurin replied the doors were composed of single lites.

Mr. Stone commented he liked the proportion of columns on the model, but they look to be larger than the 4" diameter specified on the drawings. Mr. Maurin stated the columns were currently designed to be 4", but the supports may be altered to support the balcony structurally.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

Mr. Stone opened the application to public comment. With no one to speak either for or against the application, Mr. Stone closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Holmes 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. Holmes moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district and that the application be conceptually approved, contingent on a variance from decking and column requirements of the Consolidated Review Committee. The motion received a second and was approved unanimously.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2018-17-CA: 1654 Government Street
Applicant: Pamela and Jeffrey Kent
Received: 5/21/2018
Meeting: PREVIOUSLY HELDOVER for a Design Review Committee at 6/6/18, and heldover by request of the applicant on 7/17/2018.

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: HELDOVER: Porch Related: Retain wooden porch railing, planters, and gate constructed without Certificate of Appropriateness.

BUILDING HISTORY

This bungalow was designed by notable local architect C.L. Hutchisson, Sr. and constructed in 1924. Mr. Hutchisson was responsible for over 233 residence designs in Mobile; 37 in Old Dauphin Way.

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 October 24th, 1995 according to the MHDC vertical files. At that time the repair of a roof was approved. The proposed scope of work includes retaining wooden railings and planters.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Preserving a front porch is a high priority. A rear or side porch also may be important to preserve, especially for a building located on a corner lot, and their preservation is encouraged.”
 - 2. “Repair a porch in a way that maintains the original character.”
 - 3. “If replacement is required, design it to reflect the time period of the historic structure.”
 - 4. “Where an original porch is missing entirely, base a replacement porch on physical or photographic evidence. If no evidence exists, draw from similar structures in the neighborhood.”
 - 5. “When reconstructing a porch, pay particular attention to matching the handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details”
 - 6. “The removal or alteration of any historic landscaping features, materials, or distinctive architectural features should be avoided.”
 - 7. “Deteriorated architectural features shall be repaired rather than replaced, wherever possible.”
 - 8. “Distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship which characterize a building, structure or site should be treated with sensitivity with particular emphasis on preservation of the features.”

9. "Preserve an original porch or gallery on a house."
10. "Replace a historic porch element to match the original."
11. "Use replacement materials and elements that are appropriate to the style, texture, finish, composition and proportion of the historic structure."
12. "When reconstructing a porch, pay particular attention to matching the handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details."
13. "Do not use a railing that is too elaborate for the building (of a different style)."
14. "(Pertaining to porch additions) "Do not use a contemporary deck railing for a porch addition placed at a location visible from the public street."

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

1. Retain the following porch components:
 - a. Wooden slats will stack to form a wooden railing.
 - b. The railing will be placed between existing brick plinths and planters.
 - c. The wooden planters will be constructed on top of brick plinths.
 - d. A wooden stair with gate will be located on the east elevation and access the side yard.
 - e. Wood will be stained.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the retention of porch railing, planters and wooden stairs with gate installed without a Certificate of Appropriateness. The application had been held over at the June 6th, 2018 ARB meeting. At that time, a Design Review Committee had been set in place for an onsite visit for further review. On June 14th Ms. Catarina Echols and Mr. Robert Allen visited the site with the owner.

The house had featured a Chippendale style pattern appropriate for the period of the building. Photographic evidence surfaced after the June 6th meeting shows a different traditional railing in place circa 1977. The latest images on file shows this Craftsman influenced Bungalow with Chippendalesque railing was in place until 2017. When replacing a porch detail, the *Design Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts* state that if replacement of a porch element is necessary, the replacement "the time period of the historic structure"(See B-3). The guidelines further address replacement of porch elements are to be appropriate to the style, finish and texture, composition and proportion of the historic building (See B-11). While the wood material of railings, planters, and gate is acceptable, the composition and profile of the boards is not period appropriate.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-3), Staff does believe the application as is will impair either the architectural or the historical character of the property or district. Staff recommends denial of the application as proposed.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

The owner was not present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Stone asked Mr. Allen what occurred at the Design Review Committee site visit. Mr. Allen stated his thoughts on the meeting. He explained he thought the railing to tall to fit the features of existing brick

plinths. He further explained if height is an issue, a thin metal railing can achieve code compliance with coupled with a shorter balustrade. Mr. Allen noted we do not know for certain what the original balustrade designed by known architect C.L. Hutchisson, Sr. looked like, however pictorial evidence from 1977 shows a classically styled balustrade and most recently a Chippendale style balustrade. He continued by stating both of these railings were period appropriate and see through. He commented the solid balustrade installed would not be related to the period of the house.

Mr. Stone asked about a wooden gate that had been installed at the front step entrance of the veranda. Ms. Lague replied the owners had removed the wooden gate and were approved to install a metal gate that would be less obtrusive, yet still give the owners the privacy they need.

Mr. Holmes stated an owner can ask for a variance on the code for height of a railing on a historic commercial property. Mr. Stone agreed that an owner can ask for a variance of height of rails and stair rails.

Mr. Holmes noted the fine architecture of the building and that the rail installed was out of character for the period and building.

Mr. Stone replied to Mr. Ruzic that the two issues noted by Mr. Allen were rail height and transparency. He continued by saying that the Board does not know the original railing design. Mr. Holmes stated that while the Board does not know the original design, they do know the style of this period of home.

Mr. Allen noted that at the Design Review Committee site visit a question arose about the possible removal of the railing on the South elevation and if that would be enough to meet the guidelines.

Mr. Stone noted the wood of the railings could always be repurposed into planters that would achieve the aesthetic the owner would like, and also not require any design review.

Mr. Holmes commented we can approve building in concept and request to finish landscape plan with requirements before final approval by staff. Mr. Roberts agreed. Mr. Oswalt mentioned we can have conditional approval. Mr. Roberts agreed and stated staff could not approve until the lighting and fence were addressed.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

Mr. Stone opened the application to public comment. With no one to speak either for or against the application, Mr. Stone closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Holmes 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. Holmes moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, the application does impair the historic integrity of the building and the district and that the application be denied based on the following sections of the *Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts*:

“Porches and galleries are important elements of traditional Mobile residential architecture. They frame and protect primary entrances. They also display a concentration of decorative details. In many neighborhoods, they continue to serve as outdoor living rooms. Preserving a front porch is a high priority. A rear or side porch also may be important to preserve, especially for a building located on a corner lot, and their preservation is encouraged.

6.4 Preserve an original porch or gallery on a house.

»Maintain the height and pitch of a porch roof.

»Do not enclose a front porch if feasible.

»If a porch is to be screened, do so in a manner that preserves the existing porch elements and does not damage them.

»Where a rear or side porch is enclosed, preserve the original configuration of columns, handrails and other important architectural features.

6.5 Repair a porch in a way that maintains the original character.

6.6 If replacement is required, design it to reflect the time period of the historic structure.

»Replace a historic porch element to match the original.

»Use replacement materials and elements that are appropriate to the style, texture, finish, composition and proportion of the historic structure.

»Where an original porch is missing entirely, base a replacement porch on physical or photographic evidence. If no evidence exists, draw from similar structures in the neighborhood.

»Match the balustrade of a historic porch to the design and materials of the porch.

»When reconstructing a porch, pay particular attention to matching the handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details.

»Do not completely replace an entire porch or element unless absolutely necessary. Only replace the element or portion of an element that requires replacement.

»Do not use cast-iron columns or railing where no evidence exists that these elements were used historically.

»Do not use a brick base for a wood column (exception is Craftsman styles).

»Do not use a railing that is too elaborate for the building (of a different style).

»Do not relocate an original front stairway or steps.”

The motion received a second and was approved unanimously.