

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
August 15, 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: David Barr, Carolyn Hasser, Nick Holmes III, Thomas Karwinski, Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswalt, Craig Roberts, and Jim Wagoner.
Members Absent: Gertrude Baker, Carlos Gant, Kim Harden, and Janetta Whitt-Mitchell.
Staff Members Present: Cart Blackwell, Keri Coumanis, and John Lawler.
2. Mr. Karwinski moved to approve the minutes of the August 1, 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: Gulf Equipment Corporation**
 - a. Property Address: 1655 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/26/12
 - c. Project: Replace existing equipment with similar technology, no increase in footprint or height of tower.
2. **Applicant: David Lau**
 - a. Property Address: 509 George Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/25/12
 - c. Project: Reroof the float barn as per existing, metal roof.
3. **Applicant: Professional Remodeling and Repair**
 - a. Property Address: 251 Marine Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/25/12
 - c. Project: Remove the concrete steps accessing the front porch. Construct a flight of wooden steps with railings match the porch railings. Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint per the existing color scheme.
4. **Applicant: Alec Glenn**
 - a. Property Address: 20 South Catherine Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/26/12
 - c. Project: Reroof the house and ancillary with asphalt shingles.
5. **Applicant: Coulson Construction**
 - a. Property Address: 1551 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/30/12
 - c. Project: Install a two ply-modified fiberglass felt, granulated. Roof will be flat and not visible to the public viewing.
6. **Applicant: Cunningham Bounds, LLC**
 - a. Property Address: 1601 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/30/12
 - c. Project: Install a metal hand railing(s).

7. **Applicant: Emily McCrocklin**
 - a. Property Address: 1113 Old Shell Road
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/31/12
 - c. Project: Replace deteriorated woodwork and windows to match the existing. Repair roofing. Install a small brick patio off the rear elevation.
8. **Applicant: P. C. Wave, LLC**
 - a. Property Address: 1509 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/31/12
 - c. Project: Paint the building per the submitted Sherwin Williams color scheme. The body will be Gray Cloud. The trim will be white.
9. **Applicant: Michael Stricklin**
 - a. Property Address: 225 McDonald Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/31/12
 - c. Project: Partial demolition work is approved in advance of the August 1, 2012, ARB permit in order to facilitate foundation repairs.
10. **Applicant: Michael Rattner**
 - a. Property Address: 1770 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/31/12
 - c. Project: Renew a midmonth of 14 June 2011 – Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Replace porch decking to match the existing.
11. **Applicant: Historic Mobile Preservation Society**
 - a. Property Address: 350 Oakleigh Place
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/2/12
 - c. Project: Place a construction dumpster on the back parking lot and place a small storage pod on the grounds. Approval for both installations is for a year and will be renewable after that date if construction exceeds 365 days.
12. **Applicant: Fauston Neff Weber**
 - a. Property Address: 51 South Julia Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/6/12
 - c. Project: Install a 4' high aluminum fence. Said fence will enclose the front and side lawns.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. **2012-50-CA: 1551 Old Shell Road**
 - a. Applicant: Wilbur Hill with Brown Studio Architecture for Dr. Philip Buttera
 - b. Project: New Construction – Construct an addition.
APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
2. **2012-51-CA: 107 Saint Francis Street / 31 North Royal Street**
 - a. Applicant: Kristi Hodges with Headrick Signs for Trustmark Bank
 - b. Project: Signage – Remove and replace sign.
APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
3. **2012-52-CA: 51 North Ann Street**
 - a. Applicant: Jonathan or Stephen Boyer with Weather Guard for Leslie Bordas
 - b. Project: Reroofing – Reroof a house with metal roofing.
APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
4. **2012-49-CA: 112 Lanier Avenue**
 - a. Applicant: John and Barbara Janecky
 - b. Project: Alteration to Approved Plans – Construct a rear addition.
APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. **OTHER BUSINESS**

1. Discussion

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2012-50-CA: 1551 Old Shell Road
Applicant: Wilbur Hill with Brown Studio Architecture for Dr. Philip J. Buttera
Received: 7/30/12
Meeting: 8/15/12

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-1
Project: New Construction – Construct a rear addition.

BUILDING HISTORY

This non-contributing brick-veneered office building dates from the 1970s. The slab on grade building features salvaged ironwork.

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 2, 2012. At that time, the Board approved the construction of a monument sign and the implementation of a landscape/parking plan for the southern portion of the now subdivided property.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standard’s for Historic Rehabilitation and 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 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.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Construct a rear addition
 - a. The T-shaped addition will be located off the Rear or South Elevation.
 - b. 24’ 6” deep by 48’ body of the addition will be connected to main building by way of a 6’ 2” deep by 10’ 11” connector.
 - c. Like the main building, the addition will rest atop a slab on grade foundation.
 - d. The brick veneered wall expanses and quoins will match those found on the main building.
 - e. The addition will feature vinyl nine-over-six windows matching those found on the main building. Louvered shutters flank the windows.

- f. The body of the addition will be surmounted by gable on hip roof like that of the main building. The connector will be surmounted by a gable roof.
 - g. The roofing shingles and ventilators will match the existing.
 - h. The North Elevation will not feature fenestration.
 - i. The West Elevation will feature two vinyl nine-over-six windows.
 - j. The body of the addition's South Elevation will feature two vinyl nine-over-six windows.
 - k. The connector's South Elevation will feature a multi-light glazed and paneled door.
2. Install two new sections of concrete paving.
 - a. A walkway will extend between the side walk located to south of the building and the connector's south-facing entrance.
 - b. A walkway connecting the existing rear wing's south-facing door to the parking lot will be constructed.
 1. Relocate the building's mechanical units within the inner court created by the construction of the addition.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Preservation and the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts do not specifically address additions to non-contributing buildings. The former do state that additions in general should be differentiated from yet compatible to the existing. The plan of the addition, a rectangular block accessed via a connector, would provide a break between the older and proposed fabric. Additionally, this plan allows for the placement of mechanical equipment beyond the public view. The proposed addition will feature wall surfaces, window types, roof pitches, and roof forms matching the existing. The existing windows are vinyl. In order to bring the application into compliance with the Historic District Guidelines which do not allow the installation of vinyl windows, Staff recommends the use of either vinyl clad or aluminum clad windows that would match the windows approved for ongoing new construction on the now sub-divided property.

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 addition. Staff recommends approval of this application on the condition that clad windows be employed instead of vinyl windows.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Wilbur Hill was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Blackwell informed the Board that the applicant was agreeable to amending the application to employ the recommended clad wooden windows.

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant. He asked Mr. Hill if he had any comments to make, questions to ask, or clarifications to address.

Mr. Hill explained the rationale behind the design. Noting that the building was a non-contributing structure, he said that matching proportions, forms, and treatments had been employed in a more exacting fashion than would have been done if the building had been a historic structure. He then addressed the

materials. After describing the materials and the finishes, Mr. Hill explained to the plan to the Board. He said that the addition would house two examining rooms. The hyphen-like connector was then, he said, a practical as well as an aesthetic device. Speaking of earlier phases of the design process, Mr. Hill told the Board that a simple undifferentiated extension would have been, in his mind, a bad design decision both visually with regard to its appearance and practically with regard to the plan.

Mr. Ladd pointed out that the addition would be at best minimally visible from the public view. Mr. Hill concurred.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any questions to ask the applicant's representative.

Mr. Karwinski said that he had one comment to make. Addressing Mr. Hill, he complimented the approach. Speaking to all assembled, he explained that while this building was contributing building he wished the overall form of the addition, an new construction linked to the existing fabric by way of connector, was employed more often as means of adding to a historic building.

Mr. Wagoner double checked with Mr. Hill to see if clad windows would be employed.

Mr. Hill answered yes.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any further questions to ask or comments to make to the applicant's representative. Upon hearing no response, Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. No comments ensued. Mr. Ladd then 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 clad wooden windows would be employed.

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: 8/15/13

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2012-51-CA: 107 Saint Francis Street / 31 North Royal Street
Applicant: Kristi Hodges with Headrick Signs & Graphics for Trustmark Bank
Received: 7/30/12
Meeting: 8/15/12

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Signage – Remove and replace signage.

BUILDING HISTORY

This thirty-four story skyscraper originally housed the First National Bank. From the time of its completion in 1965 to 1986, the building was the tallest structure in the State of Alabama. Commercial establishments occupy the ground floor. Floors two through six serve as a parking deck. The seventh through the thirty-third floors house offices. The Bienville Club is situated on the thirty-fourth floor.

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 February 16, 2011. At that time, the Board approved the installation of mechanical dishes and antenna atop the building’s roof.
- B. The Sign Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Signs shall be mounted or erected so they do not obscure the architectural features of the openings of the building.”
 - 2. “No signs or portions of signs shall extend above the cornice line of the building face. Roof top signs are prohibited.
 - 3. “The overall design of all signage including the mounting framework shall relate to the design of the principal building on the property.”
 - 4. For buildings without a recognizable style, the sign shall adopt the decorative features of the building, utilizing the same materials and colors.”
 - 5. “The size of the sign shall be in proportion to the building and the neighboring signs.”
 - 6. “The total maximum allowable sign area for all signs is one and one half square feet per linear foot of the principal building, not to exceed 64 square feet. A multi-tenant building is also limited to a maximum of 64 square feet.”
 - 7. “Internally lit signs are prohibited.”
 - 8. “Lighted signs shall use focused, low intensity illumination. Such lighting shall not shine into or create glare at pedestrian or vehicular traffic, nor shall it shine into adjacent areas.”

- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
1. Remove the existing signage.
 2. Replace said signage.
 - a. The total square footage of all the signage will not exceed the existing variance.
 - b. All of the lettered signs will be made of aluminum.
 - c. East Elevation
 - i. Install a new hexagonal-shaped logo sign.
 - ii. The log sign will measure 7' x 7' 7".
 - iii. The back lit blue and white logo sign will rely upon reverse channel illumination.
 - i. Install a new lettered sign.
 - ii. The lettered sign will measure 10" x 68-5/8".
 - d. North Elevation
 - i. Install a new lettered sign before the entrance.
 - ii. The aluminum sign will measure 11' x 4' 1/2".
 - e. West Elevation
 - i. Install a new hexagonal-shaped logo sign.
 - ii. The log sign will measure 7' x 7' 7".
 - iii. The back lit blue and white logo sign will rely upon reverse channel illumination.
 - i. Install a new hexagonal-shaped logo sign.
 - ii. The logo sign will measure 3' x 3' 3".
 - iii. The back lit blue and white logo sign will rely upon reverse channel illumination.
 - iv. Install a lettered sign over the drive-thru entrance.
 - v. The lettered sign will measure 1' 6" x 10' 5-3/8".
 - f. South Elevation
 - iv. Install a new hexagonal-shaped logo sign.
 - v. The logo sign will measure 7' x 7' 7".
 - vi. The back lit blue and white logo sign will rely upon reverse channel lighting.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the removal and the replacement of corporate signage. When reviewing signage applications, sign size, location, materials, lighting, and design are taken into account.

The Sign Design Guidelines from Mobile's Historic Districts and Government Street restrict signage size to 64 square feet. A variance is required to exceed the 64 square feet allotment. This property possesses a variance. The proposed signage would replace existing signage of the same size. The total square footage does not exceed that granted in the variance. Taking into account the previous approval, along with the size building and the height of the building, Staff believes the total square footage would not adversely affect the historic district.

In accord with the Sign Design Guidelines from Mobile's Historic Districts and Government Street, the proposed signage will not obscure significant architectural features or finishes.

The lettered signs will rely upon street level illumination and the logo signs will utilize reverse channel illumination. Both types of lighting are in accord with the Sign Design Guidelines from Mobile's Historic Districts and Government Street.

The sign designs would not adversely affect the surrounding historic district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-8), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building or the addition. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Kristi Hodges with Headricks Signs and Rodney DePriest with Trustmark Bank were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant's representatives. He asked Ms. Hodges and Mr. DePriest if they had any comments to make, questions to ask, or clarifications to address.

Mr. DePriest addressed the Board. He relayed, as they were likely aware, that Bank Trust and Trustmark had recently merged. Mr. DePriest stated that on behalf of Trustmark he looked forward to establishing a new corporate identity in Mobile.

Ms. Hodges told the Board that the existing signage would simply be replaced. She said that the square footage would remain the same and that only the design would change.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any comments to make or questions to ask. No questions ensued from the Board. Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. No comments ensued from the audience. Mr. Ladd closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report 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: 8/15/13

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2012-52-CA: 51 North Ann Street
Applicant: Jonathan or Stephen Boyer with Weather Guard for Leslie Bordas
Received: 7/30/12
Meeting: 8/15/12

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Reroofing – Reroof a house with metal roofing.

BUILDING HISTORY

Constructed circa 1905, this Queen Anne house, along with its northern neighbor and twin, is of Mobile’s finest representatives of a larger late 19th-Century / early 20th-Century residential typology. The façade of these easily identifiable houses feature projecting bays and recessed porches. Some of the finest examples possess intricate carved and sawn wood embellishments.

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 applicant proposes the removal of the existing asbestos roofing and the installation of metal roofing.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Original or historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof should be maintained. Materials should be appropriate to the form and pitch and color.”
- C. **Scope of Work (per submitted the submitted plans):**
 - 1. Remove existing asbestos roof (along with remains of a wooden shack roofing found below).
 - 2. Install a Galvalume metal roofing system featuring ribbed panels.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the installation of a metal roof. Metal roofs are reviewed on a case by case basis. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state that roofing materials should be appropriate to the form, pitch, and color of the roof.

Assessing roof form or configuration involves evaluation of a roof’s plan. As with many Queen Anne houses, this house possesses a complex roof structure. Secondary gables and sheds either skirt or project from the house’s principal pyramidal-form hipped roof.

The pitches of both the principal hip and the secondary gables are fairly steep.

The color of the proposed roofing is historically appropriate.

Metal roofing is a traditional roofing material in Mobile. Often used as a replacement material in the early part of the 20th-century, metal roofs in Mobile were often used on vernacular houses with simple roof forms. As the 19th Century progressed, the variety of metal roofing alternatives and their application increased. Both frame & masonry and residential & commercial buildings featured metal roofs. Standing seam panels and individual shingles were the most common types of metal roofing. 5-V crimp was another alternative. Texture was an important part of the Queen Anne style and the houses normally featured three dimensional materials. Since the Board considers the style of the house in making its decisions concerning alterations, a metal shingle roof would be more appropriate. While houses of this style and period often featured metal roofs, ribbed panel metals were not employed. 5-V crimp panels have been approved on houses possessing less complicated rough configurations than that encountered on this house. Ribbed panels would detract from the interplay of the roof parts. Staff recommends the use of metal shingles like those employed on 1054 George Street, a house of similar date, style, and roof form.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1), Staff believes this application impairs the architectural and the historical character of the building and the district. Staff does not recommend approval of this application and suggests the use of metal shingle.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Jonathan Boyer with Weather Guard was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Blackwell told the Board that the applicant was amenable to employing a 5-V Crimp metal roofing system.

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant's representative. He asked Mr. Boyer if he had any comments to make, questions to ask, or clarifications to address.

Mr. Boyer thanked the Board for hearing the application. He then addressed the particulars of the house's roof. Mr. Boyer said that unlike his most recent application before the Board, a reroofing of a house and ancillary at 1050 Palmetto Street, this application entailed the removal of shack shingles located beneath the existing asphalt roof. He told the Board that Weather Guard had employed 5-V Crimp metal roofs across the state. Speaking of this application in particular, Mr. Boyer said that he personally was in favor of employing the 5-V Crimp panels over the ribbed panels.

A discussion ensued as to the removal and reuse of salvageable asbestos shingles.

Mr. Wagoner doubled checked with applicant, asking him if he was authorized to amend the application. Mr. Boyer answered yes.

Mr. Ladd asked if there were any further questions or comments from the Board. Upon hearing neither comments nor questions from his fellow Board members, Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone from the

audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. No comments or questions ensued from the audience. Mr. Ladd then 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 a 5-V Crimp metal roof would be employed.

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: 8/15/13

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2012-49-CA: 112 Lanier Avenue
Applicant: John F. & Barbara Janecky
Received: 8/6/12
Meeting: 8/15/12

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 August 1, 2012. At that time the Board reviewed a revised set of drawings calling a rear addition. These plans departed from those approved on March 2, 2011. The approved plans called for the construction of rear addition and reconstruction of a 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 a second set of revised plans. A Design Review Committee has been scheduled for August 8, 2012. Previous attempts to schedule a DRC in time for resubmission failed.
- 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. Exposed portions of slab will be faced with bricks salvaged from the affected areas of the house.

- b. The walls will be faced with hardiboard shingles in part and board and batten siding.
- 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 eaves 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. The western portion of the South Elevation will be faced with shingled siding.
 - iii. The eastern portion of the South Elevation will be faced with board and batten siding.
 - iv. The South Elevation's eastern portion will feature either a Tudor inspired awning (no image provided as of time of review) that will be located over the south-facing-door or a three bay porch. The shed roofed porch (See the schematic rendering provided.) will be supported by four square section bracketed posts. The porch roof, a three foot extension of the gable will feature exposed rafter tails. The concrete porch will be edged with bricks salvaged from the affected areas of the Rear Elevation.
 - v. 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 walls of the East Elevation's ground floor will be faced with board and batten siding.
 - iii. The walls of the East Elevation's gable will be faced with board and batten siding or half-timbering.
 - iv. 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.
 - ii. The eastern portion of the North Elevation will be faced with board and batten siding and the northern portion will be faced with shingles.

STAFF ANALYSIS

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 first set of revised plans constituted, 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, uniform wall facing, continuous gable roof (The application, though unspecified, called for the reuse of salvaged brick as a facing for the exposed portions of the foundation.). The result of the changes to the walls and the roof was 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 comingle 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).

The second set of revised drawings differ from the first in that they attempt to provide differentiation between the front and rear portions of the additions. With the exception of a schematic rendering for a south-facing porch, the alterations are restricted to walls planes, not the overall massing. A kick-like shed would extend over the porch. An alternative treatment calls for a Tudor-inspired overhang to be located above the south-facing door. The western portion of the revised plans would be faced with hardiboard shingles while the eastern portion would be faced with board and batten siding. The applicant’s new plant uses board and batten siding or half-timbering within the East-facing gable.

A major concern of the Board at the previous meeting was the massing of the addition and its roofline. Neither of those problems has been addressed and the Board suggested stucco rather than wood siding. Due to the minimal revisions to the preceding, Staff believes this application impairs the architectural and the historical integrity of the house and the district on account of the addition’s overall massing, exterior surfacing, and roof structure.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Barbara Janecky and Red Booth were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Prior to commencing the presentation portion of the meeting, Mr. Blackwell informed the Board that a Design Review Committee had convened on the site on August 8, 2012. He explained to the Board that revised drawings reflected comments made at August 1, 2012 meeting and the August 8, 2012 Design Review Committee meeting had been submitted for review this morning. He distributed copies of the revised drawings and asked the Board to disregard the drawings found in their Board packets. During the PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Blackwell pointed out the revised drawings that were up for review.

Mr. Ladd recued himself from the discussion and left the meeting. Mr. Oswalt assumed the role as chair.

The ensuing Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed the applicant and her contractor. He asked Mrs. Janecky and Mr. Booth if either of them had any comments to make, clarifications to address, or comments to make.

Mr. Booth told the Board that revised plans were a product of the Design Review Committee.

Mr. Karwinski asked for clarification as to who served on the Design Review Committee. Mr. Oswalt told his fellow Board members that along with himself, Mr. Barr and Mr. Holmes had served on the preceding Wednesday's Design Review Committee.

A discussion ensued as to the extent of the changes.

Mr. Holmes addressed the Board. He said that the addition was at best minimally visible from Lanier Avenue and that the East Elevation, which faces the alley, was the only portion that was fully visible from the public view. Taking the predicament at hand (partially executed work whose massing is not in accord with approved plans), Mr. Holmes explained that the Design Review Committee attempted to further develop and differentiate the South Elevation. He added that fencing and shrubbery largely obscured the North Elevation. He spoke of the addition of porch that served to break differentiate the massing and use of uniform wooden shingles that were an improvement over the initially proposed hardboard shingles.

A discussion of materials ensued.

Mr. Oswalt asked his fellow Board members if they had any further questions to ask.

Mr. Karwinski said that he had one overall comment to make. He said that the overall design was the same. Mr. Karwinski said that the design was not an appropriate addition to historic building.

Mr. Karwinski and Mr. Holmes entered into a discussion as to the nature of the design.

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, amending facts to note the use of wooden shingles as the predominant wall sheathing, the use of a stuccoed treatment in the east-facing gable, and the addition of a south-facing porch & a pergola.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Holmes 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 and Mr. Roberts voted in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 8/15/13