

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

August 16, 2017 – 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. Cartledge Blackwell, MHDC Assistant Director, called the roll as follows:
Members Present: Harris Oswalt, Robert Allen, John Ruzic, Catarina Echols, Nicholas Holmes, III, Craig Roberts, Jim Wagoner, Kim Harden, Carolyn Hasser, and Steve Stone.
Members Absent: Robert Brown, and David Barr.
Staff Members Present: Cartledge W. Blackwell, Florence Kessler, Bridget Daniel, and Paige Largue.
2. Mr. Roberts moved to approve the minutes from the July 19th 2017 meeting. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.
3. Mr. Stone noted a change for midmonth approval No. 1 from 200 Government Street to 1200 Government Street. Mr. Allen inquired as to midmonth approval No. 14 (1506 Dauphin Street) which called for the rebuilding of an existing rear porch located out of public view and the extension of its roof line. Mr. Blackwell explained the porch was out of public when viewing the front of the house. He further clarified the porch was not visible from public view when looking at the front of the house “head on” and explained that was office policy. Mr. Allen then inquired as to midmonth No. 6 (52 Monterey Street) which called for the construction of an ancillary building to build per a MHDC stock design. Mr. Blackwell explained that the stock design had been approved by the Board, said approval found on the mid-months approval list, and copies said design could be obtained at the MHDC office. Staff agreed to include the design into the regular bi-monthly ARB meeting for September 6th. Mr. Stone made a motion to approve the midmonths as amended. The motion was seconded and approved. Mr. Allen voted in opposition.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED

1. Applicant: Jose and Ellen Attar

- a. Property Address: 1200 Government Street
- b. Date of Approval: 07/07/2017
- c. Project: Paint house in the following color scheme: body: off white; trim: white; and shutters: hunter green. When and where necessary replace deteriorated wood to match existing as per profile, dimension and material.

2. Applicant: Donald and Joyce Jiles

- a. Property Address: 1055 Selma Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/10/2017
- c. Project: Replace portions of existing wooden fence. Extend existing 6' wooden dogeared fence along eastern perimeter of lot no further than front facade plane of main house. Construct picket fence in advance of main house along East, West, Southern perimeter with pedestrian gate on southern border.

3. Applicant: Stephanie Price

- a. Property Address: 964 Savannah Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/10/2017

c.Project: Construct wooden steps off rear of house to lead into back door. Install canvas awning over back door. Install downspout next to backdoor. Construct 6' wooden dogeared fence from Northeast corner of house, turning along Eastern perimeter, and finishing at the Southeast corner of the house no further than the front facade.

4. Applicant: Mary Miller Brinnon

a.Property Address: 120 Bush Avenue
b.Date of Approval: 7/11/2017
c.Project: Reroof with black architectural shingles.

5. Applicant: Katherine Whiteley

a.Property Address: 106 S. Catherine Street
b.Date of Approval: 7/11/2017
c.Project: Repair and replace deteriorated wood to match in profile, dimension and material. Repaint in the following color scheme from Sherwin Williams: body-quiver tan; trim: trim; door: copper penny.

6. Applicant: Jeffrey Hartley

a.Property Address: 52 Monterey Street
b.Date of Approval: 7/11/2017
c.Project: Construct ancillary building per MHDC stock designs so situated to meet municipal setback requirements.

7. Applicant: Eddie Butler

a.Property Address: 1658 Hunter Avenue
b.Date of Approval: 7/20/2017
c.Project: Partial reroof asphalt shingles to match.

8. Applicant: John Halbrooks

a.Property Address: 158 Davitt Street
b.Date of Approval: 7/20/2017
c.Project: Reroof with asphalt on house.

9. Applicant: Wet Willie's Inc.

a.Property Address: 200 Dauphin Street
b.Date of Approval: 7/24/2017
c.Project: Use 24" x 36" sandwich board in wood or metal composite.

10. Applicant: Kim Hall

a.Property Address: 53 S. Hallett Street
b.Date of Approval: 7/26/2017
c.Project: Remove collapsed portion of later rear addition damaged by fallen tree. Repair rear east elevation wall with lapsiding and wood trim to match existing house. Repair or replace door if necessary to match existing.

11. Applicant: Bryan Lew

a.Property Address: 59 S. Hallett Street
b.Date of Approval: 7/27/2017
c.Project: Reroof in charcoal gray.

12. Applicant: Paul McCaffrey

a.Property Address: 205 Dexter Avenue
b.Date of Approval: 7/12/2017

- c.Project: Reroof with architectural shingles in approved color.
- 13. Applicant: Rachel Elaine Spencer Miller**
- a.Property Address: 60 S. Laffeyette Street
- b.Date of Approval: 7/12/2017
- c.Project: Replace deteriorated wood when necessary to match existing in dimension, profile and material. Repair existing wooden window.
- 14. Applicant: Christopher Conti**
- a.Property Address: 1506 Dauphin Street
- b.Date of Approval: 7/13/2017
- c.Project: Rebuild existing rear porch located out of public view. Extend roof up to 12' from house. Porch deck will continue to extend 19' from house and be 30' in width. Construct ADA compliant ramp to afford access to deck and porch. Porch, deck and ramp will have railing.
- 15. Applicant: 553 Church Street**
- a.Property Address: June Hope
- b.Date of Approval: 7/13/2017
- c.Project: Repaint in the following color scheme: body harbor gray; trim in white dove.
- 16. Applicant: Fred South of Renovations by Fred South LLC for William Olena**
- a.Property Address: 304 Breamwood Avenue
- b.Date of Approval: 7/13/2017
- c.Project: Repairing and replacing 1" x 8" wooden siding. Repair one window and soffitt to match existing in dimension, profile and material. Repaint to match existing.
- 17. Applicant: Greg Murphy of G&K Enterprises on behalf of McCleave, Allenstein & Denson**
- a.Property Address: 507 Church Street
- b.Date of Approval: 7/18/2017
- c.Project: Repair and replace deteriorated wood to match existing in dimension, profile and material.
- 18. Applicant: Historic Restoration Society**
- a.Property Address: 911 Dauphin Street
- b.Date of Approval: 7/18/2017
- c.Project: Renewal of Certificate Dated September 16, 2015 for the construction of two additions.
- 19. Applicant: John Bell**
- a.Property Address: 13 S. Lafayette
- b.Date of Approval: 7/20/2017
- c.Project: Repaint to match existing.
- 20. Applicant: Wendell Quimby**
- a.Property Address: 162 S. Monterey Street
- b.Date of Approval: 7/20/2017
- c.Project: Black asphalt shingle roof.
- 21. Applicant: Wendell Quimby**

- a. Property Address: 605 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/20/2017
- c. Project: Black asphalt shingle roof.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2017-37-CA: 607 Government Street

- a. Applicant: Stephen L. Zito of Zito Russell Architects on behalf of 1857 Foundation
- b. Project: Restoration and Rehabilitation Related – Conduct in-kind repairs to the body of a historic building; construct a connector between the historic core and a later non-contributing rear addition; rehabilitate a non-contributing rear addition to the building; and reinstate fencing.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2017-35-CA: lot formerly numbered 250 Chatham Street (subdivided southern portion thereof)

- a. Applicant: Darrel J. Williams of Darrel J. Williams Associates on behalf of Geri Moulton
- b. Project: Clarifications and Revisions to a Holdover (thus numbering of 35 instead of 39.) calling for New Residential Construction – Construct a private residence.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

3. 2017-38-CA: 953 Augusta Street

- a. Applicant: Gerald and Michael Diane Keehn
- b. Project: After-the-Fact Approval: Retain front doors installed without the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness and the pulling of a building permit.

APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Rules and Regulations

Following the review and vote on applications comprising the agenda, Mr. Blackwell introduced Ms. Florence Kessler from the City of Mobile Legal Department. It was explained that the notice of the proposed change to the Board's Rules and Regulations had been posted for public viewing for over 45 days on the MHDC website and at Government Plaza (public bulletin board in elevator lobby to South Tower). Ms. Kessler then moved forward to address with the Board any questions, comments, or concerns before a final vote to pass the proposed changes.

Mr. Allen noted that he had prompted most of the proposed changes. He inquired as to term limits. Mr. Oswald and Ms. Kessler stated term limits for Board members can only be addressed by City Council. Both noted that an ordinance change would also be required.

Mr. Allen inquired as to who determines the emergency status of a special meeting under section 6(d). Ms. Kessler suggested the chair and the Board trust the chair act responsibly. Discussion ensued.

Ms. Kessler noted she would change any typo which said “8.b.3” to “8.c.2” when necessary.

Mr. Allen put forth the question of why have any rules regarding the notice of the agenda if there are no consequences; referencing 6(h) “failure to provide notice will not invalidate any action by Board”. Mr. Kessler responded that the Board had decided in the June meeting of the ARB to set that as a standard for flexibility. Mr. Blackwell summarized public notice of the ARB. Mr. Oswalt proposed striking the sentence, while Mr. Harden suggested further clarification.

Mr. Allen also stated his concern over the current midmonth process.

Mr. Holmes made a motion to approve the Rules and Regulations as written. The motion was seconded and approved. Mr. Allen and Ms. Harden voted in opposition.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2017-37-CA: 607 Government Street

Applicant: Stephen L. Zito of Zito Russell Architects on behalf of 1857 Foundation

Received: 7/31/2017

Meeting: 8/16/2017

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East

Classification: Contributing

Zoning: T5.1

Project: Restoration and Rehabilitation Related – Conduct in-kind repairs on the body of a historic building; Construct a connector between the historic core and a later contributing rear addition; rehabilitate a non-contributing rear addition to the building; and reinstate fencing.

BUILDING HISTORY

The historic core of this property, an 1857 dwelling, constitutes one of six extant Antebellum dwellings located East of Broad Street on Mobile’s famed Government Street. The Bracketed Greek Revival expression of the Italianate style house ranks as one of the grandest iterations of a Mobile side hall with wing dwelling. Once over six hundred of these dwelling types lined Mobile’s downtown and eastern Midtown arteries. Less than forty of the distinctive typology survive. The subject example was constructed for the Kennedy family. For over a century, the building served various institutional roles, most notably the Seaman’s Hall and the American Legion. The long languishing building is poised for a much needed restoration.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on November 19, 2008. At that time, the Board reviewed an application for work conducted without the

issuance of building permits or a certificate of appropriateness. The property has changed ownership since the property's last appearance before the Board. The new owners bring before the Board a project entailing the following: in-kind repairs to the historic house comprising the body of the building; construction of a new connector between the historic core and later non-contributing rear addition; rehabilitation of a later non-contributing rear addition; and the reinstallation of fencing.

- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
1. "Deteriorated architectural features shall be repaired rather than replaced, whenever possible. In the event replacement is necessary, the new material should match the material being replaced in physical character and durability. Repair and replacement of missing architectural features should be based on accurate duplications of features, substantiated by historic, physical or pictorial evidence."
 2. "Preserve and repair original masonry materials."
 3. "Preserve masonry features that define the overall historic character, such as walls, cornices, pediments, steps and foundations."
 4. "Take particular care with historic masonry. Consult Staff for guidance when repairing and replacing mortar joints and masonry."
 5. "Use new roof materials that convey a scale and texture similar to those used traditionally."
 6. "Preserve the decorative and functional features of a primary door."
 7. Preserve historic stylistic and architectural details and ornamentation.
 8. "Where repair is impossible, replace details and ornamentation accurately."
 9. "Historically accurate light patterns shall be employed. Use photographic, physical, and/or documentary evidence for the design."
 10. "Replace shutters where they previously existed when possible."
 11. "If a new awning is installed where the original building did not have an awning, install the awning in a reversible manner that will not negatively impact the structure and appearance of the building."
 12. "Design an addition so that the overall characteristics of the site are maintained."
 13. "Design an addition to be compatible with the color, material, and character of the property, neighborhood, and environment."
 14. "Design the building components (roof, foundations, doors, and windows) to be compatible with the historic architecture."
 15. "Maintain the relationships of solids to voids (windows and doors in an exterior wall as is established by the historic architecture."
 16. "Design doors and doorways to an addition to be compatible with the existing historic building."
 17. "Differentiate an addition from the historic structure using changes in material, color, and/or wall plane."
 18. "Use details that are similar in character to those on the historic structure."
 19. "Design a window on an addition to be compatible with the original historic building."
 20. "Choose shutters for additions that are compatible with those on the existing historic building."
 21. "Install a cast-iron or other metal fence not exceeding 36" in height if located in the front yard. 48" shall be considered under certain circumstances. Coping walls located

- below cast-iron fencing may be appropriate in certain locations and do not count toward the total height.”
22. Based on the chosen fence material, use proportions, heights, elements, and levels of opacity similar to those found of similar material and style in the historic district.”
 23. Design a fence located behind the front building plane to not exceed 72” (six feet) in height. If the subject property abuts multifamily or commercial property, a fence up to 96” (eight feet) in height will be considered.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

1. Conduct in-kind repairs and when necessary replacement of existing elements on the historic house comprising the principle portion of the building (as well as work pertaining to the historic body of the building).
 - a. Infill one basement on East (inner block/side) Elevation. The facing will match. See C-1-c for description.
 - b. Remove later openings from the basement’s east elevation. Install new windows with glazing. Said windows will be three-light transom-like extruded aluminum windows.
 - c. Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated stucco facing the brick walls.
 - d. The composition (no Portland) of the new stucco will not cause for structural or visual (scoring will be respected) disjunction.
 - e. Paint the building per the submitted Sherwin Williams color scheme: body, White Heron; trim, Extra White; shutters and accents, Rockwood Green; porch ceiling, Minor Blue; and water table, Chelsea Gray.
 - f. Repair and when necessary replace “Minton” tiles paving the front portico.
 - g. Reinstall and repair the original front door.
 - h. Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated wooden windows (or elements) and casings to match the existing as per light configuration, material composition, and decorative profile (wood and glazing).
 - i. Reinstate (new) framed and louvered arcuated shutters. One set of shutters will be fixed aluminum (Northeast corner). Said portion is not original fabric.
 - j. Repair or replace to match a parapet cap (Northeast corner).
 - k. The aforementioned shutters will be sized to fit the window reveals and widths.
 - l. Repair cast-iron brackets
 - m. Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing as per composition, profile, and dimension.
 - n. Remove later downspouts.
 - o. Install new downspouts.
 - p. Remove later pipe railings from steps accessing the front portico.
 - q. Install curved cast-iron railing between the antipodia-like cheeks of the front steps.
 - r. Install a cast-iron grille within the circular roundel punctuating the front gable.
 - s. Reroof the building with grey-colored slate shingles or grey architectural GAF shingles.

- t. Repair masonry about the existing basement entrance.
 - u. Cast-iron railings will be employed about the basement entrance.
 - v. Install a barrel-vaulted canopy over the basement entrance opening from the West (South Dearborn Street oriented) Elevation.
 - w. The aforementioned canopy will be anchored into a low coping wall matching that to be employed on the fencing enclosing the front and side lawns.
2. Construct a new addition atop the juncture between the historic core of the building and the later non-contributing rear addition.
 - a. The addition will be inset from the from the façade line of the East Elevation (inner block/side oriented) and slightly in advance of the Rear (South) Elevation of the extant original side wing.
 - b. The walls of the concrete block addition will be parched with stucco.
 - c. A shed roof will be concealed on the side by a parapet.
 - d. Three six-light extruded aluminum windows and a single metal door will comprise the connector's South (rear) fenestration.
 - e. Either grey slate or grey architectural GAF shingles will be employed.
 3. Rehabilitate a later non-contributing addition located to the rear of the historic body of the building.
 - a. Continue the same color scheme employed on the historic core of the building on the rear addition.
 - b. Remove a metal door from the West (South Dearborn Street oriented) Elevation.
 - c. Instate a new double wooden door with surmounting aluminum barrel-vaulted canopy in advance thereof on the West Elevation.
 - d. Said canopy will employ brackets.
 - e. Instate three arcuated window bays matching those employed on the body of the house to the south of the doors in terms of size, casing, material, and design on the West Elevation.
 - f. The windows will feature wooden shutters.
 - g. The southernmost of the aforementioned windows will be blind and will be fronted by recessed fixed shutters.
 - h. Instate a water table-like molding in line with the water table molding found on the main house.
 - i. Extend the molding beltcourse found on the house along the South Elevation.
 - j. Remove and install downspouts.
 - k. Repaint hollow metal doors on the South (rear) Elevation.
 - l. Construct a dog-leg composition steel staircase off of the South Elevation.
 - m. Convert the flat roof into a rooftop deck.
 - n. Repair the cap atop the coping parapet.
 4. Reinstate fencing within the front and side lawns.
 - a. The fencing will be two part in construction.
 - b. A 1' 4" coping will be comprised the lower portion.
 - c. The aforementioned coping wall will be constructed of concrete block that will be parched with stucco and surmounted by a concrete cap.

- d. Sections of less than 4' tall cast iron decorative fencing (height counting finials) interspersed between 4' 8" tall posts.
 - e. The sections of fencing (generally 9' in length) and finials will match the historic fencing documented on and in surviving on the property (five posts and two sections).
 - f. The fencing will extend along the northern portion of the East lot line (inner block), the whole of the North lot line (Government Street oriented), and the northern portion of the West lot line (South Dearborn Street oriented).
 - g. Decorative gates will be employed at walkways accessing the façade's front portico and the West Elevation's ground floor entrance.
5. Install a small six-foot section of wooden privacy fencing and gate extending from the South Elevation to the northwest corner of the house to the south of the property.
 6. Conduct repairs to sidewalks in the municipal right of way.
 - a. The surfacing located in advance of the improved Dearborn Street entrance will extend further into the right of way.
 - b. Railings will be employed about the aforementioned entry-like extension.
 7. Install landscaping.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves for the restoration and rehabilitation involves the following: in-kind repairs on the body of the historic building; construction of a connector between the historic core of the building and the later non-contributing addition; sympathetic alterations to a non-contributing rear addition to the building; and reinstating of fencing.

With regard to the redress of damaged components, the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that deteriorated architectural features shall be repaired rather than replaced, whenever possible. In the event replacement is necessary, the new material should match the material being replaced in physical character and durability (See B 1 & 7-8.). The historic core of the building proposed for restoration features wooden, masonry, iron, and other historic materials. All wooden elements too deteriorated for repair would be replaced to match the existing as per material, profile, and dimension. As per masonry and stucco, the Design Review Guidelines pay additional attention to original masonry. The Guidelines state that historic masonry should be preserved and notes the importance of the employ of proper mortar (See B 2-4.). The composition (traditionally soft mortar based) and application (preservation of the ashlar pattern) of the historic masonry surfaces will be respected. Historic windows would be preserved. When elements (or in rare instances where whole sashes) require replacement, the light configuration, detailing, recess, and casing will be replicated (See B-9). Two fixtures within existing basement openings on the inner block/side elevation will be replaced with a period and building appropriate three-light pattern installations. Shutters would be reinstated at window fenestration. In accord with the Guidelines, said shutters restore the original appearance of the fenestrated bays (See B-10.). Said shutters will be sized to fit reals. The original front door, which was moved inside the house, would be restored. The door and its casing would be reinstated so as to restore the placement and articulation of the original frontis-piece (See B-6.). Slate tiles would be installed on the roof. Slate was roofing material employed on affluent residences of this building's period and style (See B-5.). The applicant would like to reserve the

option of grey architectural GAF shingles if slate should be too cost prohibitive. Asphalt shingles are already employed on the building. Existing pipe railings would be removed from the steps accessing the front portico. More aesthetically and historically appropriated cast-iron railings would be employed. The design of the railings is more responsive to the historic and stylistic context. Original “Minton” tiles paving the porch would be restored so as to preserve those more unique historic elements (See B 1-2.). A new barrel-vaulted canopy and iron railings would be employed at the South Dearborn Street oriented basement entrance. Said awning-like device constitutes a reversible intervention which adopts an arcuated form that draws from the arched elements that define the house (See B-11.)

The proposed connector would be located atop lower-story portions of an existing juncture between original and later fabric behind the main house. The location was the originally occupied by a porch and a lost rear wing. In respect to overall site conditions, the historic character of not only the site, but also its surroundings would be preserved on account of the rear and inset nature of the proposed addition’s placement. The inset from the side elevation, lower height, and shed roof form would serve to differentiate the proposed new construction from the historic fabric (See B-17.). The addition would “read” as a later, albeit sensitive intervention to historic fabric. The location, proportion, and form of the addition recall the appearance rear gallery, the original historic condition of the subject portion of the property. There would thus be engendered a nuanced capability with the historic context (See B-14.). While the proposed plans indicate that the concrete block walls would be painted, said walls would be parched with stucco so as to be in accord with Design Review Guidelines, which list unfinished concrete block as inappropriate for use as outward wall surfacing in the locally designated historic districts. Said stucco-facing would better complement the house and the surrounding district (See B-13.) The fenestration sequence proposed for the South (Rear) Elevation responds to that of the house in terms of what originally stood behind it on the first-story level (See B-15.). Extruded aluminum windows such as that proposed are authorized for use on additions such as that proposed. The truncated height responds to the lowered height of other windows found on the original house’s South Elevation. The windows will be recessed and the corbelling detailed in traditional fashions (See B-18 & 19.). No fenestration is proposed for the East/inner block/side portion of the addition. The parapet-banked form would convey the spirit of traditional masonry piazza screen though. Metal doors are allowed for the rear portions of commercial/institutional complexes. The proportioning is responsive to the design of the addition (See B-16.). A single metal door would barely visible from the public view will be employed.

With regard to proposed alterations to the later non-contributing rear addition to the historic core of the building, the changes are restricted to West Elevation or Dearborn Street oriented side and the South or Rear Elevation. In accord with the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts, the proposed alterations and detailing are responsive to that found on the historic portion of the building (See B-18.). First addressing the South Dearborn fronting portion of the alterations, the dado-like water table proposed for thereon commences at the juncture of the one outlining the transition from the original building’s basement and first-story levels (See B-14.). The size, detailing, material, and light configuration of the proposed windows matches the historic windows (See B-19.) The proposed solid to solid ratio responds to that found the original building’s two principle elevations (See B-15.). The shutters associated with the windows would match those proposed for reinstallation/reinstitution on the original building (See B-20.). As to

the South or Rear Elevation of the later non-contributing addition, the painting and replacement of metal doors found thereon is authorized for commercial/institutional contexts, especially on later non-contributing rear portions of buildings. While not specifically addressed in the Design Review Guidelines, the fire code related installation of the rear stairs constitutes a reversible design consideration that is so sited and designed as to not impact historic fabric. Said installation would be minimally visible on account of the location, position of addition, and conditions of the adjoining property to the South. The overall character of the site would not adversely be impacted (See B-12.). The conversion of the rooftop to a deck entails no design changes other than the removal of a section of parapet for the purpose of accessing the aforementioned stairs.

Two different types of fencing are proposed – cast-iron fencing for the front and side lawns and a small expanse of privacy fencing that would feature a gate. A cast-iron fence formerly enclosed the front and side yards. Said fence originally extended in an easterly direction across a substantial portion of the adjacent property. Portions of said fencing were relocated – legally and illegally – in decades past. For at least the past eight years, five fence posts and two sections of fencing have remained on the property. The application calls for the reinstallation of cast iron fence sections and posts of the same design, height, material, and dimension as the original, as documented by physical, documentary and pictorial evidence, to once again serve as the enclosure for the front and side lawns. The interrelation of parts in terms of opacity would be the same (See B-22.) Said cast iron fence would rest atop a coping wall. In accord with the Design Review Guidelines, the open work portion of the fence would not exceed four feet in height for the fence sections. The Guidelines also allow for coping walls in certain situations. The height of said coping walls, if deemed appropriate, does not count toward the overall height of the fence (See B-21.). Many Mobile houses constructed or embellished during the late 1850s and late 1860s featured cast iron fence atop coping walls. The nearby Horst-Ezell House at Conti and Hamilton Streets represents an extant instance. Lost examples include the Chandler-McGill House formerly located at Government and Joachim Streets. Institutional examples include the Christ Church Cathedral and Cathedral of the Immaculate Conception properties. A small section of proposed six foot tall privacy fence/gate would be located behind the later rear non-contributing addition. The Design Review Guidelines allow fence of such type and height in the subject location (See B-23.).

Landscaping is also proposed, as is additional paving in the right of way. The designs of the aforementioned considerations would be respectful of the historic context of the property and the surrounding district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-23), Staff does not believe this application would impair either architectural or the historical character of the building or the surrounding district. Staff recommends the approval of this application in full pending final review from the Consolidated Review Committee (CRC).

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Blackwell introduced the application and informed the board the applicant was amenable to facing the proposed connector with stucco.

Mr. Stephen Zito, the owner's architect and representative, and Ms. Gillian Faircloth McGee, architect with Zito-Russell, were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt thanked Mr. Blackwell and welcomed Mr. Zito and Ms. McGee and asked as the applicant's representatives. He asked Mr. Zito and Ms. McGee if they had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make. Mr. Zito stated that the covered entrance to the basement on the West elevation was a fabric awning over a metal frame.

Upon receiving a query from Mr. Ruzic, Mr. Blackwell clarified the location, design, and treatment of the proposed connector.

Mr. Wagoner asked if the proposed renovations would have an adverse effect on the property located directly behind the later addition. Mr. Zito noted that the staircase is close to the lot line, but a close dialogue had been maintained with abutting and surrounding stakeholders.

Mr. Stone inquired as to the origin of the basement entrance on the West elevation. Mr. Blackwell responded the entrance was cut from a window in the 1940's so as to afford access to a bar that opened in that portion of the building. He further noted the awning will deter water from the entrance. Mrs. McGee stated gutters would be installed as well.

Mr. Allen asked for further clarification regarding the East Elevation's basement level fenestration. Mr. Blackwell clarified that the existing non-original windows on the East Elevation's basement level would be replaced with extruded aluminum windows. He explained that the Design Review Guidelines authorize the consideration and approval of extruded aluminum windows on historic buildings when original windows have been removed.

Mr. Oswalt asked his fellow Board members if any amongst them had any additional questions for the applicant's representatives. No further questions ensued.

Mr. Oswalt opened the application to public comment. No one was present to speak either for or against the application. Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public discussion.

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 written, 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: August 17, 2018

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2017-35-CA: formerly 250 Chatham Street (subdivided southern portion thereof)
Applicant: Darrel J. William of Darrel J. Williams Associates on behalf of Geri Moulton
Received: 7/31/2017
Meeting: 8/16/2017

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Clarifications and Revisions to a Holdover calling for New Residential Construction – Construct a private residence.

BUILDING HISTORY

This portion of a larger lot, what is now a newly subdivided lot, has never been developed. The site originally formed the side portion of a front lawn for present day 250 Chatham Street. That 1867 residence originally was situated within the center of the subject block. The house was relocated closer to the street (and the foundation lowered in height) during the early 20th Century to allow for the redevelopment of the western (rear) reaches of the block.

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 lot, one which was until recently a portion of a larger property, firstly and lastly appeared before the Architectural Review Board on July 19, 2017. The application, one calling for new residential construction, was tabled for clarifications outlined in and expanded from the Staff Report. The application up for review constitutes a revised application addressing said clarifications.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Maintain the visual line created by the fronts of buildings along a street.”
 - 2. “Maintain the side yard spacing pattern on the block.”
 - 3. “Design the massing of new construction to appear similar to that of historic buildings in the district.”

4. “Design the scale of new construction to appear similar to that of historic buildings in the district.”
5. “Design exterior building walls to reflect traditional development patterns of nearby historic buildings.”
6. “Use exterior materials and finishes that complement the character of the surrounding district.”
7. “Design a roof on new construction to be compatible with those on adjacent historic buildings.”
8. “Design a new door and doorway on new construction to be compatible with the historic district.”
9. “Design a porch to be compatible with the neighborhood.”
10. “Design piers, a foundation and foundation infill to be compatible with those of nearby historic properties.”
11. “Locate and design windows to be compatible with those in the district.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

1. Construct a single family residence.
 - a. The house will be setback 25’0” from the Chatham Street right of way.
 - b. The house will comprise an irregular Y-shape in composition.
 - c. The central portion of the house’s center block will feature a pavilion-like clerestory.
 - d. The house will rest atop a watertable-like raised slab foundation.
 - e. The height of the foundation height will be 24” to 30” in height.
 - f. The aforementioned foundation will be stucco-faced.
 - g. The walls will be faced with stucco (See photographs provided indicating finish.).
 - h. The windows will be either aluminum clad wood or extruded aluminum in construction and multi-light in configuration.
 - i. A wooden entablature-like fascia with moldings will extend around the house.
 - j. Copper downspouts will be employed.
 - k. Hipped roofs and flat roof forms will surmount the building.
 - l. The roof will be sheathed in architectural shingles.
2. East (Façade/Chatham Street-facing) Elevation
 - a. The South Elevation will be defined by three dominant parts: a setback southern entrance with a frontis piece (prominent door surround or architrave); a central block fronted by a terrace and a porch; and a setback northern portion.
 - b. The southernmost entrance portion of the South Elevation will feature an arcuated frontis piece featuring engaged Tuscan columns composed of stone.
 - c. A stoop accessed by a flight of southward cascading steps will access the frontis piece. A planter atop a pedestal will terminate the southeast corner of the stoop.
 - d. Iron gates (double) will be located within arcuated frontis piece.

- e. The frontis piece will provide access to a vestibule providing access to double wooden doors (arcuated).
 - f. The center block will be further compartmentalized into three distinct sections: an advanced in wall plane center block fronted by a terrace, a southernmost portion also fronted by the same terrace, and porch fronted northernmost portion.
 - g. The terrace extending across the southernmost and central portions of the center block will feature two urns atop pedestals.
 - h. The urns will define and puncture cascading steps accessing the terrace.
 - i. The aforementioned center block will feature seven fenestrated bays.
 - j. Seven double French doors with ramped (curved) inner frames will comprise center block's first-story fenestration.
 - i. Limestone lintels will surmount the two doorways on the southernmost end.
 - ii. Eight-light transoms will surmount the three French doors in the central portion.
 - k. The center blocks northernmost portion will be fronted by a single bay porch.
 - l. Unarticulated ante and Tuscan columns will define the porch.
 - m. Cooper framed and colored porch screening will be situated within the porch bay.
 - n. The center block will be surmounted by a hipped roof.
 - o. The advanced central portion of the center block will be treated like a pavilion with an heightened/elevated entablature.
 - p. The Northernmost portion of the West Elevation will feature two pairs of equidistantly spaced six-light windows with limestone lintels.
3. South (Augusta Street-facing) Elevation
- a. The South Elevation will feature three primary components: the terminal expanse of the East-facing, but side attuned porch, terrace, and stoop; an advanced center portion fronting dominant center block; and a recessed garage portion
 - b. The terminal expanse of the East-facing, but side attuned porch, terrace, and stoop will also be attended by their associated pedestal surmounting urns and end of the frontis piece.
 - c. The single-story advanced center portion of the South Elevation will feature a bank of three six-light windows surmounted by limestone lintel.
 - d. A hipped roof will surmount the advanced single-story and recessed two-story portions of the South Elevation's center block.
 - e. Two garage bays will punctuate the South Elevation's westernmost portion.
 - f. Glazed and paneled garage door will be employed.
4. West (rear) Elevation
- a. The West Elevation will be defined by three primary components: a one-story southern expanse; a recessed center block with a smaller one-story advanced portion; and a northern portion.

- b. The southernmost portion of South Elevation's center portion will extend beyond the central portion's southernmost termination.
 - c. The southernmost portion of the West Elevation will not feature fenestration.
 - d. A hipped roof will surmount the southernmost portion of the West Elevation.
 - e. The West Elevation's two-story center block of the West Elevation will feature three double French doors with eight-light transoms.
 - f. A flight of cascading steps will telescope outward from the French doors.
 - g. The advanced portion of the center portion will not feature fenestration.
 - h. A hipped roof will surmount the West Elevation's center block.
 - i. The single-story northern portion of the West Elevation will feature a pairing of ten-light windows.
5. North Elevation
- a. The North Elevation will be defined by two principle components: a single-story portion; and the terminal end of the front porch.
 - b. The single-story westernmost portion of the North Elevation will feature two pairs of eight-light windows with limestone lintels.
 - c. A hipped roof will surmount the western portion of the north Elevation.
 - d. Copper framed and copper colored screening will be installed within the terminal bay of the front porch.
6. Alter fencing sections to incorporate gates at the southeast corner of the property.
FENCING.
7. Install hardsurfacing about a new front walkway.
8. Install a drive from the existing curbcut to the garage.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of a private residence on the southern portion of a recently subdivided property. The street number is for the present 250 Chatham Street. The application further constitutes a holdover with revisions to an application that appeared before the Board on July 19, 2017. Clarifications and modifications have largely been addressed (See drawings & supplemental literature provided and staff report and clarifications herein.). When reviewing applications for new residential construction, the following principle criteria are taken into account: placement & orientation; massing; scale; façade elements; and materials.

Placement involves consideration of two main considerations: setbacks and orientation. Setbacks from the street and between buildings are taken into account. As the property is a corner lot, responsiveness to the setbacks of two street streets, Augusta Street in addition to Chatham Street, is warranted .With regard to the front setback, the residence bearing the main building at the street number 250 Chatham Street, originally stood in the center of the subject block. The house was later moved closer to Chatham Street and lowered in height to allow for the development of five residential lots to the rear (West of the house). The original dwelling is situated at an angle to the street. The 25' setback of the house responds to both that setback and the setback of 250 Chatham Street and the historic dwelling located at 300 Chatham Street, the residence located on

the lot immediately south of Chatham Street from the subject property. With regard to the Augusta Street setback, the house would not be so situated as to extend beyond the front plane of or too are within the body of the houses behind it on that street. In accord with the Design Review Guidelines, the placement of the house then maintains the visual line or “façade line” of buildings along the both Augusta and Chatham Streets (See B-1.). Additionally, the spacing between the proposed residence and the abutting houses would not be out of character with the block or surrounding district (See B-2.). As to orientation, the building faces Chatham Street and Washington Square, the principle vehicular artery, but through its corner entrance engages Chatham Street as well. The way the proposed building’s wall planes cascade to the corner entrance further would serve to tie together the two impacted streetscapes.

Massing refers to the relationship between the component parts comprising a building. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state that massing of new residential construction should appear to be similar to that of historic buildings in the districts (See B-3.). Scale is related to massing. It refers to the relationship between different buildings. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state that the scale of new construction should appear similar in scale to nearby historic buildings (See B-4.). Traditionally, most historic buildings were compartmentalized. Breaking of the larger built massing started at foundation and extended to the roof. An irregular massing, but symmetrically spirited arrangement of traditional rectilinear forms, informs the proposed design. The irregular massing serves to compartmentalize the literal (and figural) architectonic box. The dominant architectural vocabulary of Washington Square, which the property fronts, is Italianate in career. The particular stylistic variant of the Italianate that informs those buildings fronting the Square is asymmetrical villa or the bracketed side hall with wing. Both house types are irregular in the massing. Moving beyond the basic compartmentalization of overall forms to the horizontal layering of those forms, the watertable-like foundation of the proposed dwelling responds directly to the original house informing 250 Chatham Street, as well as to other houses on the block, so is compatible with the historic context (See B-10.). The Design Guidelines state that walls of new construction should reflect traditional development patterns (See B-5.). In terms of height, the ceiling heights of the interior volumes (12’) provide wall heights, which like the foundations, are responsive to the historic context. The surmounting roof proposed is also compatible with the low-pitched forms that typify the buildings on adjoining blocks and surrounding the street (See B-7.). The nestling of single-story forms through breaks, recesses, advances, and other modulations of plane is responsive the architectural context.

Of the advancing and recessing masses that server to compartmentalize the building, the porch is among the most prominent of the façade elements. The Design Review Guidelines state that porches should be compatible with district (See B-9.). The proposed porch is symmetrical in composition and engaged to a terrace. Similar constructions are found on the street. The porch serves to anchor and enliven the balanced core of the center block. The previously mentioned corner entrance constitutes another notable aspect of the street-engaged elevations. The proposed frontis piece, like the porch, represents a notable design component informing broad periods of Mobile’s architectural history. In addition to the porch and the main entrance, proposed doors and windows enliven the design, compartmentalize the massing, and respond to tradition. Both doors and windows respond to those found in the district (See 8 & 11).

As to materials, the drawings of the proposed building depict a stucco treatment. Many 19th Century and early 20th century residential buildings were faced with stucco. Two buildings on the subject block and the original ground floor of 250 Chatham Street were faced with stucco. The Stratton Houses located two blocks to the north on Chatham Street and one house opposite are also stucco faced. 300 Chatham Street (the historic dwelling mentioned previously in relation to setbacks) and the two houses west of the lot, are brick. The materials then complement the character of the neighborhood.

CLARIFICATIONS ADDRESSED

1. Further articulate how the front gates created from fencing sections will be articulated. (Please see attached 5A-5G.)
2. Provide the design of the front doors located within the entrance vestibule. (See image 7A.)
3. Provide a design of the garage doors. (See attached 1A-1D.)
4. Provide samples of stucco. (See attached - 2A.)
5. Section of cornice details. (See attached drawing under Fascia/ Soffit/ Frieze Detail.)
6. Example/ Sample of copper screen. (See attached 3A.)
7. Example of urn, gate, wall (can be image). (Image of gate seen on attached 5A-5G).
8. Example of architectural shingle. (See attached 4A.)

CLARIFICATIONS REMAINING

1. What is the setback from Augusta Street sidewalk?
2. Provide a sample, detail, or image of the windows.
3. What is the color scheme? – If the Board is amenable and the application approved, staff is amenable to working with/approving color scheme on the administrative level.

SUGGESTIONS

1. Consider blind bays on portions of the West (rear) and North (a side) Elevation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-11), Staff does not believe this application would impair either architectural or the historical character of the building or the surrounding district. Pending the aforementioned clarifications, Staff recommends of the approval of this application. Staff also encourages the consideration of the suggestions regarding faux fenestration.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ms. Geri Moulton, owner and Mr. Darrel J. Williams, the owner's design professional and representative, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. After thanking Mr. Blackwell, Mr. Oswalt asked Ms. Moulton and Mr. Williams if she or he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make. Mr. Williams stated that Mr. Blackwell had addressed the application in full, but went on to note that he was present to address any questions relating to the clarifications addressed in the staff report and from the staff presentation. Referencing material and construction samples in his possession, Mr. Williams stated that he would share those additional items with the Board.

Mr. Oswalt asked his fellow Board members if any amongst them had any questions to ask Ms. Moulton or Mr. Williams.

Mr. Roberts inquired as to whether fiberglass columns were an acceptable alternative to wood or stone columns. Mr. Blackwell replied yes that the subject of the query represented another approved material for consideration.

Mr. Ruzic inquired as to ceiling heights and scale on the Spanish Colonial residences cited in the staff report and located further North on Chatham Street. Mr. Blackwell addressed Mr. Ruzic's query. He noted the ceiling heights and scale relationships of not only the dwellings which Mr. Ruzic inquired, but also the two historic houses located to either side the proposed dwelling on Chatham Street. Mr. Blackwell further explained the Spanish Colonial houses seen on Chatham Street possess terraces and basic symmetry which the proposed dwelling exhibits.

Mr. Holmes asked if the mold under the flat edge of the roof line was to be a flat 1" x 8" piece of molding or broken up by another piece. Mr. Williams responded there was to be no other molding underneath.

Mrs. Echols suggested a clay barrel tile roof or a lighter roof shingle. Mr. Williams noted the applicant was considering a lighter shingle color to imitate slate.

No further questions ensued.

Mr. Oswalt opened the application to public comment. No one was present to speak either for or against the application. Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public discussion.

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 written, 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 approved. Mr. Stone voted opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: August 17, 2018

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2017-38-CA: 953 Augusta Street

Applicant: Gerald and Michael Diane Keehn

Received: 7/25/2017

Meeting: 8/16/2017

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden Historic District

Classification: Contributing

Zoning: R-1

Project: After-the-Fact Approval: Retain front doors installed without the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness and the pulling of a building permit.

BUILDING HISTORY

This wood frame dwelling dates circa 1852. The dwelling features the defining characteristics of a vestigial “Creole Cottage” including full-length gallery, all-encompassing roof, two doors, and a passageless interior.

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. According to MHDC vertical files, this property last came before the Architectural Review Board on March 4th, 2015. At that time, a Certificate of Appropriateness was granted for the restoration and alteration of the building. The application up for review calls for retention of two front doors installed without the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness and pulling of a building permit.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Replacements (doors) should reflect the age and style of the building.”
 - 2. “Design a door and doorway to be compatible with the historic building.”
 - 3. “(Acceptable building materials) Materials that are same as the original, or that appear similar in texture and finish to the original are acceptable. These often include: wood panel; wood panel with glass lights; leaded glass with lead comes; metal with painted finish; other materials original to the building.”

- C. Scope of Work (per submitted photographs, testimonials, and accompanying literature):
1. Retain two wooden front doors.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application calls for the after-the-fact-approval of work conducted without issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness or the pulling of a building permit. The work conducted involved the removal of existing doors and the installation of replacement doors.

Staff received a SRO on July 10, 2017. A site visit to the property immediately ensued. A Notice of Violation (NOV) was issued the following day and sent to the home owners. Upon receiving the NOV, the homeowners contacted staff and submitted an application to appear before the Architectural Review Board.

The portion of the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts addressing historic or contributing buildings state that alterations to that classification of building should be so designed as to be compatible with the age and style of the building (See B 1-2). The doors which were removed, while old, were not original to period of construction and stylistic character, but testified to the building's stylistic evolution. As installed, the designs and detailing of the unauthorized doors are not in keeping with the regional Greek Revival and "Creole" Cottage typology of the house. The owners are amenable to removing detailing from the doors to convey a more simplistic design. In regards to composition of materials, (wood and glass) is allowed are under the guidelines (See B-3).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-3), Staff does believe the doors as installed impair the architectural or historical character of the building or district. Staff does not recommend this application as proposed.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Gerald and Ms. Michael Diane Keehn, the owner's, were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. After thanking Mr. Blackwell for the presentation and offering several alternatives, Mr. Oswalt welcomed Mr. and Ms. Keehn and asked as owners if he or she had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Mr. Keehn explained that the house had been restored and renovated in the past year. He further explained that the doors were installed at the end of the project and only after careful deliberation. Mr. Keehn stated he and his wife would be amenable to removing the trim and painting the doors to make them as unobtrusive as possible.

Mr. Stone complimented the applicant's work in restoring the one. He stated that he would agree to the removal of the trim. Both Mr. Stone and Mrs. Echols stated they preferred the natural treatment. Mr. Roberts stated that doors blend more with the building if they were painted. He too complimented the overall restoration.

Mr. Holmes stated that the Creole and Coastal Cottages of that era generally possessed doors with four panels. He further explained two small panels would have been positioned on the bottom half with two larger proportioned panels on the upper half.

Mr. Allen noted that the previous doors did not match and were from a later period. He too expressed that the removal of moldings and painting of surfaces would allow for the doors to better blend. Mr. Allen noted the house's close proximity to the street, especially in relation to all other houses on the block. He added that said proximity caused for consideration of security and safety.

Mr. and Ms. Keend were asked if they were amenable to both removing the molding below the glazed portions of the doors and to painting the doors. Both of the applications expressed their amenability to the aforementioned considerations.

Mr. Oswalt asked his fellow Board members if any amongst them had any questions to ask Mr. and Mrs. Keehn. No further questions ensued.

Mr. Oswalt opened the application to public comment. No one was present to speak either for or against the application. Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public discussion.

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 as amended to note the removal of moldings below the glazing and painting of the surfaces of both doors.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as amended, the application to remove molding and paint the doors 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: August 17, 2018