

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

August 15, 2018 – 3:00 P.M.

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

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Harris Oswalt, called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. Paige Largue, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
Members Present: Bob Allen, John Ruzic, David Barr, Robert Brown, Jim Wagoner, Harris Oswalt, Catarina Echols and Kim Harden.
Members Absent: Steve Stone, Carolyn Hasser, Nick Holmes and Craig Roberts.
Staff Members Present: Florence Kessler, Marion McElroy, Bridget Daniel, John Sledge, and Paige Largue.
2. Mr. Oswalt noted that the minutes needed a name to be changed on page 9. Mr. Brown moved to approve the minutes of the August 1, 2018 meeting with corrections. The motion received a second and was approved unanimously. Mr. Wagoner moved to approve the minutes of the July 18, 2018 meeting. The motion received a second and was approved unanimously.
3. Mr. Barr moved to approve the Midmonths. The motion received a second and was approved with one opposed, Mr. Allen.

B. MIDMONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED.

1. **Applicant: Melanie Bunting**
 - a. Property Address: 21 S. Lafayette Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/26/2018
 - c. Project: Repair/replace rotten wood as necessary to match; repaint to match.
2. **Applicant: Catholic Archdiocese**
 - a. Property Address: 2 S. Claiborne Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/26/2018
 - c. Project: Repair/restore historic cast iron gates, reassemble as per existing.
3. **Applicant: National Society of the Colonial Dames**
 - a. Property Address: 104 Theatre Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/26/2018
 - c. Project: Utilize one (1) 3'x2' metal or wooden sandwich board sign.
4. **Applicant: Robert Fleming of Double AA Construction**
 - a. Property Address: 1365 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/27/2018
 - c. Project: Build up roof for rain runoff and reroof with TPO.
5. **Applicant: Steven Shortridge**
 - a. Property Address: 601 Church Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/27/2018
 - c. Project: Repaint in the following color scheme: Body-White; Shutters and Deck-Bellingrath Green; Porch Ceiling-Haint Blue
6. **Applicant: Sydney Betbeze for Restore Mobile**
 - a. Property Address: 1105 Texas Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/30/2018
 - c. Project: Remove asbestos siding and expose clapboard siding underneath. Repair and repair deteriorated clapboards to match in dimension, profile and material. Repair existing windows to match in dimension, profile and material. Replace sashes when necessary with salvaged or wood to match. Prep and prime wood for neutral paint color

scheme. Construct wooden awning with shingles on rear elevation over door and wooden steps with balustrade.

- 7. Applicant: RBC Centura Bank**
 - a. Property Address: 1402 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/31/2018
 - c. Project: Reroof with flat roof over drive thru.
- 8. Applicant: Middle Land, LLC**
 - a. Property Address: 210 S. Washington Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/1/2018
 - c. Project: Replace six foot wooden privacy fence per existing.
- 9. Applicant: Dorothy Patridge**
 - a. Property Address: 162 S. Broad Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/1/2018
 - c. Project: Replace rotten siding and repaint to match.
- 10. Applicant: Charlotte Haas**
 - a. Property Address: 1009 Augusta Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/2/2018
 - c. Project: Reroof with charcoal asphalt shingles.
- 11. Applicant: James Wagoner**
 - a. Property Address: 1805 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/3/2018
 - c. Project: Replace deteriorated wood on ancillary building including siding, decking, and columns to match in dimension, profile, and material. Repaint to match.
- 12. Applicant: Gilbert and Bettie Champion**
 - a. Property Address: 161 S. Georgia Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/3/2018
 - c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated wood decking. Repair balustrade. Repaint to match.
- 13. Applicant: Ryan Lewis**
 - a. Property Address: 161 Michigan Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/3/2018
 - c. Project: Construct new 6' wooden dogeared fence around south, east, and north perimeter of house as needed not to exceed front plane of the house. Fence on south perimeter to have a vehicular gate and setback from lot line per zoning and engineering standards.
- 14. Applicant: Wendell Quimby**
 - a. Property Address: 667 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/3/2018
 - c. Project: Install fence and new pavers.

C. APPLICATIONS

- 1. 2018-24-CA: 307 S. Georgia Avenue**
 - a. Applicant: Mr. Douglas B. Kearley of DBK, Inc. on behalf of Ms. Holly Wiseman
 - b. Project: Construct rear addition.
APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
- 2. 2018-25-CA: 259 S. Monterey Street**
 - a. Applicant: Ms. Helen Harper
 - b. Project: Retain windows installed without a Certificate of Appropriateness.
DENIED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. **OTHER BUSINESS**

Ms. Largue shared that the next meeting of the Architectural Review Board will be held on September 5th.

Discussion took place over how home owners were notified they were in a historic district. Ms. Kessler explained per our ordinance, the seller is to disclose the information to the potential buyer. Mr. Brown stated he recalled a discussion with City Council on the topic. Ms. Kessler stated the aforementioned information was included in the ordinance after that Council discussion. More discussion ensued amongst the Board. Mr. Sledge explained homeowners are notified via mail after the office receives a list from MAWSS. He noted we use to receive a list once a month, but now it is twice a year. Mr. Ruzic suggested the city sending out a letter once or twice a year to home and business owners in the districts. Ms. Largue stated cost of mailing could be an issue, but the office would look into the idea.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2018-24-CA: 307 S. Georgia Avenue
Applicant: Mr. Douglas B. Kearley of DBK, Inc. on behalf of Ms. Holly Wiseman
Received: 7/30/2018
Meeting: 8/15/2018

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct rear addition.

BUILDING HISTORY

This Craftsman residence was constructed in 1927. It features a recessed porch façade with gable port cochere, tapered stucco columns on plinths, and exposed rafter tails.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on April 2, 2002 according to the MHDC vertical files. At that time approval for a rear addition measuring 12’ deep by 29’ 5-1/2” wide was obtained. The proposed scope of work includes a rear addition.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. Design an addition so there is the least possible loss of historic fabric and so the character-defining features of the historic building are not destroyed, damaged or obscured.
 - 2. Design an addition so that the overall characteristics of the site (site topography, character-defining site features, trees, and significant district vistas and public views) are retained.
 - 3. Wherever possible, construct an addition in such a manner that, if the addition were to be removed, the essential form and integrity of the historic structure would be unimpaired.
 - 4. Design an addition to be compatible with the color, material and character of the property, neighborhood and environment.
 - 5. Design the building components (roof, foundation, doors and windows) of the addition to be compatible with the historic architecture.
 - 6. Maintain the relationship of solids to voids (windows and doors) in an exterior wall as is established by the historic building.

7. Differentiate an addition from a historic structure using changes in material, color and/or wall plane. Alternative materials, such as cement fiberboard, are allowed when the addition is properly differentiated from the original structure.
8. If the style of an addition is different than the original, use a style that is compatible with the historic context.
9. Section 6.9: Place and design an addition to the rear or side of the historic building wherever possible.
10. Section 6.10: Design the massing of an addition to appear subordinate to the historic building.
11. Where feasible, use a lower-scale connecting element to join an addition to a historic structure.
12. Where possible, match the foundation and floor heights of an addition to those of the historic building.
13. Design the exterior walls of an addition to be compatible in scale and rhythm with the original historic structure.
14. Design the height of an addition to be proportionate with the historic building, paying particular attention to the foundation and other horizontal elements.
15. Design the addition to express floor heights on the exterior of the addition in a fashion that reflects floor heights of the original historic building.
16. 6.12: Clearly differentiate the exterior walls of an addition from the original historic structure.
17. Use a physical break or setback from the original exterior wall to visually separate the old from new.
18. Use an alteration in the roofline to create a visual break between the original and new, but ensure that the pitches generally match.
19. Exterior materials of additions should be compatible with the exterior materials existing on the historic structure in size, composition and arrangement.
20. 6.13: Use exterior materials and finishes that are comparable to those of the original historic residential structure in profile, dimension and composition.
21. Modern building materials will be evaluated for appropriateness or compatibility with the original historic structure on an individual basis, with the objective of ensuring the materials are similar in their profile, dimension, and composition to those of the original historic structure.
22. Utilize an alternative material for siding as necessary, such as cement-based fiber board, provided that it matches the siding of the historic building in profile, character and finish.
23. Use a material with proven durability. Use a material with a similar appearance in profile, texture and composition to those on the original building.
24. Choose a color and finish that matches or blends with those of the historic building.
25. Do not use a material with a composition that will impair the structural integrity and visual character of the building.
26. Do not use a faux stucco application.
27. Use exterior materials and finishes that are comparable to those of the original historic residential structure in profile, dimension, and composition. The addition shown here, to the right of the original structure, uses siding with a similar profile, dimension and composition.
28. The roof of a new addition should be compatible with the existing historic building. The roof of a new addition should also promote the addition as subordinate in comparison to the historic building.

29. 6.14: Design a roof of an addition to be compatible with the existing historic building.
30. Design a roof shape, pitch, material and level of complexity to be similar to those of the existing historic building.
31. Incorporate overhanging exposed rafters, soffits, cornices, fascias, frieze boards, moldings or other elements into an addition that are generally similar to those of the historic building.
32. Use a roofing material for an addition that matches or is compatible with the original historic building and the district.
33. 6.15: Design roofs such that the addition remains subordinate to the existing historic buildings in the district. Where possible, locate a dormer or skylight on a new addition in an inconspicuous location.
34. In most cases, match a roof and window on a dormer to those of the original building.
35. The number and placement of doors can impact the compatibility of an addition with the existing historic building. A door for additions should be designed to be compatible with the existing building.
36. 6.16: Design doors and doorways to an addition to be compatible with the existing historic building.
37. If a historic door is removed to accommodate the addition, consider reusing it on the addition.
38. Design a door and doorway to be compatible with the historic building.
39. Use a door material that is compatible with those of the historic building and the district.
40. Use a material with a dimensionality (thickness) and appearance similar to doors on the original historic building.
41. Design the scale of a doorway on an addition to be in keeping with the overall mass, scale and design of the addition as a whole.

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

1. Construct a rear addition.
 - a. Addition will extend from the east elevation.
 - b. Addition will be 29' 1/4" in width and 34' 4" in width.
 - c. The addition will be surmounted by a gable roof.
 - d. The roof will be sheathed using asphalt shingles to match those of the existing house.
 - e. Rafter tails will surmount roof to match those existing.
 - f. The walls will be clad with wood siding to match existing in dimension, profile and material.
 - g. Corner boards will be retained.
 - h. The building will single pane wooden or aluminum clad windows to match existing.
 - i. The aforementioned windows will be three-over-one, single lite, or tripart in configuration.
 - j. Door will be single lite in configuration.
 - k. The addition will sit upon brick faced piers with framed lattice skirting in between.
2. South (side) Elevation
 - a. Extend addition 29' 1/4" past existing house.
 - b. Fenestration sequence will be as follows in an easterly direction: three lite rectangular window, three over one window, and three over one window.
 - c. A corner board will punctuate the end of the elevation.

3. East (rear) Elevation
 - a. Construct wooden steps and ramp on the Northern most portion of the elevation.
 - b. Roof will extend over steps and ramp.
 - c. Construct set of three single paned windows in recessed portion of northern elevation.
 - d. Construct three equidistant three-over-one windows in advanced portion of elevation.
 - e. Install lattice louvered vent in both gables on elevation.
4. North (side) Elevation
 - a. Extend elevation from existing portion of house.
 - b. The advanced portion of the new addition will feature a single lite door flanked by single pane windows.
 - c. The door will open to a landing accessing a handicap ramp to the west and set of wooden stairs to the east.
 - d. The eastern portion of the elevation will be 17'0" in depth and recessed from the existing wall plane.
 - e. The aforementioned portion will feature two three-over-one aluminum clad windows.

STAFF ANALYSIS

When addressing the nature of redevelopment the design of the addition comes into consideration. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile Historic Districts state new additions shall be constructed in such a way that does not impair the original design or details of the existing house. (See B-1). The placement, footprint, elevation, and height of the addition serve to make it subordinate to the main body of the residence (See B-2). The addition will be located towards the rear of lot and minimally visible from public view.

Continuing on the topic of additions, the Design Review Guidelines require they shall be differentiated "from a historic structure using changes in material, color and or wall plane" (See B-7). The addition is differentiated by the placement of corner boards.

The Design Review Guidelines also state that "building components (roof, foundations, doors, and windows) of the addition to be compatible with the historic architecture" (See B-5). The siding, asphalt shingles, aluminum clad windows in matching configuration, and rafter tails will match those found on the existing residence.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-5), 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.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Douglas Kearley, representative of the owner and architect, and Ms. Holly Wiseman, owner, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Oswalt asked Mr. Kearley or Ms. Wiseman if he or she had any concerns, questions, or comments. Mr. Kearley introduced Ms. Wiseman to the Board. Ms. Wiseman replied the one light windows will

now be three-over-one wooden windows to match the historic windows on the home. Ms. Wiseman and Mr. Kearley then answered any questions the Board had on the light configuration.

Mr. Largue asked if Mr. Kearley would send the revised elevations for the file. Mr. Kearley replied he would send them.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

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

FINDING OF FACT

Ms. Harden 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. Wagoner moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board and the amended application, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district and that the application be approved, with all single light windows being altered to three-over-one windows.

The motion received a second and was approved unanimously.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2018-25-CA: 259 S. Monterey Street
Applicant: Ms. Helen Harper
Received: 7/23/2018
Meeting: 8/15/2018

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf
Classification: Non-contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Retain windows installed without a Certificate of Appropriateness.

BUILDING HISTORY

This ranch house is depicted on the 1955 Sanborn maps. It is of a finer style of modern residential buildings located in Mobile's Historic Districts. The symmetrical façade, which features wrap around the corner windows, masks two residential apartments.

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 January 4, 2012 according to the MHDC vertical files. At that time after-the-fact approval was obtained for the installation of a fence and repainting of brick. The proposed scope of work includes retaining vinyl windows.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. Regarding non-historic buildings: "Instead compatibility with the character of the district is the focus, as it is with a new building in a historic district. Where there is a question about materials or compatibility that is not covered below, refer to the previous section on additions for historic buildings for guidance."
 - 2. "New elements and materials associated with alterations and additions to non-historic structures should generally blend with those of the existing building. Changes should also respect the character of the historic district."
 - 3. "This section provides guidelines for windows related to alterations or additions to non-historic residential structures in locally-designated historic districts. The number and placement of windows is usually a major design element for residential structures, including additions. Windows should also be compatible with the neighborhood."
 - 4. 6.33 "Design window alterations and windows on new additions to non-historic structures to be compatible with the neighborhood."
 - 5. "Use a material and window type that is similar to those seen historically in the neighborhood. Tempered glass will be considered when required by the Mobile Code of Ordinances."

6. Regarding doors and doorways on additions: “The number and placement of doors can impact the compatibility of an addition with the existing historic building. A door for additions should be designed to be compatible with the existing building.
7. 6.16 “Design doors and doorways to an addition to be compatible with the existing historic building.”
8. “If a historic door is removed to accommodate the addition, consider reusing it on the addition.”
9. “Design a door and doorway to be compatible with the historic building.”
10. “Use a door material that is compatible with those of the historic building and the district.”
11. “Use a material with a dimensionality (thickness) and appearance similar to doors on the original historic building.”
12. “Design the scale of a doorway on an addition to be in keeping with the overall mass, scale and design of the addition as a whole.”
13. “A window in a new addition should be compatible with the size, placement and rhythm of those on the historic building.”
14. 6.21 “Design a window on an addition to be compatible with the original historic building.”
15. “Size, place and space a window for an addition to be in character with the original historic building.”
16. “If an aluminum window is used, use dimensions that are similar to the original windows of the house. An extruded custom aluminum window approved by the NPS or an aluminum clad wood window may be used, provided it has a profile, dimension and durability similar to a window in the historic building.”
17. Pertaining to acceptable window materials on historic buildings: “Materials that do not appear similar to the original in texture, profile and finish are unacceptable. These often include: Vinyl; Mill-finished aluminum; Interior snap-in muntins (except when used in concert with exterior muntins and intervening dividers).

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

1. Retain unauthorized fenestration – two vinyl windows and door- installed without the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The Historic Development office received on May 16, 2018 for work being completed without authorization. A Stop Work Order was issued on May 17, 2018 for alteration of fenestration without a Certificate of Appropriateness. Subsequently, Mr. Sledge and Ms. Largue discussed with the applicant the Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and the Architectural Review Board process. Ms. Harper submitted an application on July 23, 2018.

This application for the retention of windows and door installed without the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness. According to photos in this property’s MHDC vertical file, this dwelling’s previous fenestration was original. This building is listed as non-contributing in to the Leinkauf National Register District in 1987. More recently, the city reevaluated and expanded the district locally in 2009. Since the revision of the nomination, the importance of mid-century modern architecture and its place in our architectural and cultural heritage has become increasingly significant. The home possesses features of a typical ranch style home including brick cladding, low pitch roof and casement windows.

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's state that when reviewing alterations on non-contributing buildings that new elements and materials should blend in with that of the existing building and district (See B-2). The guidelines further explain that where elements are not addressed specifically for non-contributing buildings, one should consult the section on additions to residential historic structures (See B-1).

Replacement doors and windows on non-contributing buildings should be compatible with those doors and found on the existing building or in the district. (See B-7, B-9, and B-14). While the windows and door fit the previous openings, the light configurations are not appropriate with the style and period (See B-9, B-12, B-13 and B-14). The door and windows are vinyl in composition with grilles between glass. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that the profile and material should be similar to those found in historic districts (See B-5). Historic windows are commonly true divided lite. Simulated divided lite windows composed of wood, custom extruded aluminum or aluminum clad are typically approved. Vinyl is not an approvable material in historic districts (B-17).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-5) and B(1-10), 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

Ms. Helen Harper, owner, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Oswalt asked Ms. Harper if she had any concerns, questions, or comments. Ms. Harper replied her neighbors to the west of her property have vinyl windows. She explained the original windows which were in place at the time of her purchase were broken. She further explained the vinyl windows in the rear were already installed when she purchased the home. She offered to install more muntins on the windows. She noted she was trying to improve the building's architectural style. She also stated the neighboring residences currently have its windows boarded.

Mr. Oswalt asked if Ms. Harper or her contractor had pulled a building permit with the City of Mobile. She stated her contractor did not.

Ms. Largue explained the permitting process when properties are located in a historic district. She stated before obtaining a building permit, one must obtain a Certificate of Appropriateness. She noted that with the current permitting system (in place since March of 2017) if one tries to pull a city building permit, a notification pops up stating the property is in a local historic district and requires a COA. She further explained the computer notification has re-routed several applicants to the office.

Mr. Wagoner stated the permit process was significant. He explained had the owner or contractor pulled a building permit per the city ordinance, the owner would not be before the Board. Ms. Harper stated there

were other properties in her neighborhood in violation. Mr. Wagoner also noted that the Board can not address the property unless it was called into the 311 system. Ms. Largue elaborated that the office does not have inspectors to field the districts for violations. She continued that a Service Work Order (SRO) is received after 311 gets a call. Staff then follows up on the SRO and issues a Stop Work Order and/ or Notice of Violation. Staff tries to resolve the issue on staff level. If it can not be resolved on staff level, then it typically appears before the Board.

Ms. Harper suggested covering the windows with shutters. Mr. Wagoner explained the front fenestration is where the issue was since the other vinyl windows were installed by a previous owner. Ms. Largue stated that in the case of fenestration for a non-contributing building, materials are most important versus configuration.

Ms. Harper stated the corner windows are in need of repair. Ms. Harden suggested repairing the windows. She explained it had been her experience in the architecture field that these windows could be repaired by replacing glazing, resealing and replacing only the rusted portion of the windows. Ms. Harper stated the windows were inoperable and aesthetically displeasing. Ms. Harden noted that in one previous project the metal windows had rusted components replaced and the windows were operable again. She also noted the cost of repair was comparable to replacement. Mr. Allen stated a homeowner on Hunter Avenue had restored their metal casement windows. Ms. Harden also cited the African American Archives as another example.

Mr. Oswalt stated in the past the Board has worked with owners to come into compliance by phased replacement for windows. He continued by saying that concept might not work well in this situation since it is only two windows.

Ms. Harper suggested shutters Bahama shutters be installed over the windows.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

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

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Allen 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. Wagoner elaborated that Bahama shutters may be applied for, but it would not address the Stop Work Order (inappropriate materials and configuration of fenestration). Discussion of the Board ensued. Mr. Barr stated the situation was regrettable; however, the material impairs the neighborhood.

Mr. Holmes moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, the application does impair the historic integrity of the building or the district and that the application be denied. The motion received a second and was approved unanimously.