

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
August 17, 2011 – 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: Gertrude Baker , Thomas Karwinski, Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswalt, Craig Roberts, Jim Wagoner, Janetta Whitt-Mitchell, and Barja Wilson.
Members Absent: Carlos Gant, Kim Harden, Bill James, and Janetta Whitt-Mitchell.
Staff Members Present: Cart Blackwell, Sandra Franks, and John Lawler.
2. Mr.Oswalt moved to approve the minutes of the August 3, 2011 meeting. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
3. Mr. Karwinski moved to approve the midmonth COA's granted by Staff as corrected by the Board. The word floor was changed to flower in midmonth # 18. Words were deleted from midmonth # 22. A word was added to midmonth # 25. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED

1. **Applicant: James Curran**
 - a. Property Address: 14 South Ann Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/25/11
 - c. Project: Repair and replace woodwork to match the existing. Touch up the paint per the existing color scheme.
2. **Applicant: Harry Thames**
 - a. Property Address: 22 South Lafayette Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/26/11
 - c. Project: Repair and replace rotten woodwork.
3. **Applicant: Desi Tobias / Bryan Comer**
 - a. Property Address: 1203 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/26/11
 - c. Project: Install a new face on the existing monument sign. The aluminum face will be the same, size, and configuration as the existing. The only change will be an alteration in the name of the firm.
4. **Applicant: Kevin Young with Knight Sign Industries for the RSA**
 - a. Property Address: 107 Saint Francis Street (31 North Royal Street)
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/26/11
 - c. Project: Install independent lighting to illuminate one sign (a logo) on the South Elevation and one sign (a logo) on the west elevation. The signage was previously approved. The signage (logos) is located on the upper stories of the building.
5. **Applicant: Hale & Hughes**
 - a. Property Address: 501 Church Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/28/11
 - c. Project: Repair woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint to match the existing color scheme.
6. **Applicant: Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund**
 - a. Property Address: 1004 Texas Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/28/11
 - c. Project: Repoint and repair foundation piers. Repair and replace deteriorated siding, detailing, decking, and other woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Install a period appropriate glazed and paneled door. Install an MHDC stock

railing on the front porch. Repair and/or replace windows to match the existing. Reroof the building using asphalt shingles.

7. Applicant: Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund

- a. Property Address: 1062 Texas Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/28/11
- c. Project: Repoint foundation piers where necessary. Repair and replace the varying types of wooden siding (board-&-batten and clapboard) to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material (porch decking, detailing, soffits, fascias, etc...). Repair and replace windows to match the existing. Install stylistically and temporally appropriate turned porch posts and glazed. Install porch and step railings per MHDC stock designs. Install period appropriate glazed and paneled doors on the porch. Replace metal roof and asphalt roofing. Repaint per the existing color scheme.

8. Applicant: Sally Irvine

- a. Property Address: 1157 Church Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/28/11
- c. Project: Install new hand rail on rear building's steps per the design provided by the MHDC staff.

9. Applicant: Elaine Harden

- a. Property Address: 56 Hannon Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 7/29/11
- c. Project: Install a glazed and paneled wooden door that is more appropriate to the period and style of the house.

10. Applicant: D. W. Gwatkin Construction for Dennis Carlisle

- a. Property Address: 1568 Monterey Place
- b. Date of Approval: 8/1/11
- c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile and dimension. Touch up the work per the existing color scheme.

11. Applicant: Coulson Roofing

- a. Property Address: 308 Rapier Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 8/1/11
- c. Project: Reroof using 30 year Timberline shingles.

12. Applicant: Paul Thompson

- a. Property Address: 713 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 8/2/11
- c. Project: Repoint brickwork.

13. Applicant: Joy Klotz

- a. Property Address: 959 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 8/2/11
- c. Project: Construct a new rear deck per submitted plans.

14. Applicant: Randy (R & J Home Repair, LLC)

- a. Property Address: 5 North Claiborne Street
- b. Date of Approval: 8/2/11
- c. Project: Repair/replace rear siding on rear addition.

15. Applicant: Kenny McGee

- a. Property Address: 959 Savannah Street
- b. Date of Approval: 8/2/11
- c. Project: Repaint body light blue, trim white with gray handrail and porch deck.

16. Applicant: Tom Roberts

- a. Property Address: 1660 Government Street
- b. Date of Approval: 8/2/11

- c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork. Touch up the paint per the existing color scheme. Replace the canvas of the existing awning.
- 17. Applicant: Teague Construction Systems**
- a. Property Address: 260 N. Joachim Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/27/11
 - c. Project: Reroof the building using GAF 3 tab asphalt shingles, Weathered Gray in color. Replace the rear flat roof with a new modified bitumen roof to match the existing.
- 18. Applicant: Hien Vui**
- a. Property Address: 1275 Spring Hill Avenue (132 North Ann Street)
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/3/11
 - c. Project: Construct a concrete border around the existing flower bed.
- 19. Applicant: Restore Mobile**
- a. Property Address: 1017 Old Shell Road
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/4/11
 - c. Project: Repoint the foundation piers where necessary. Re-install and install framed, suspended, and recessed lattice skirting between the foundation piers. Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork and detailing to match the existing in profile and dimension (porch railing, siding, etc...) Repair and replace (where necessary) window sashes and glazing. Reroof the building with asphalt shingles.
- 20. Applicant: Restore Mobile**
- a. Property Address: 458 Chatham Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/4/11
 - c. Project: Install boxed, recessed, and suspended wooden skirting panels between the house's foundation piers. Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork and detailing to match the existing in profile dimension and material (siding, porch decking, brackets, shingles, etc...). Recreate the original window heights. Reopen and Reglaze the transom above the door accessing the façade's recessed porch. Install six-over-six wooden windows in the window bays. Install period appropriate glazed and paneled doors.
- 21. Applicant: Forrest Raley**
- a. Property Address: 1556 Blair Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/4/11
 - c. Project: Repair rotten woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Retouch paint and staining on front door.
- 22. Applicant: Downtown Mobile Alliance**
- a. Property Address: 260 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/5/11
 - c. Project: Paint the window frames Pantone 708 (a shade of pink). Install a new awning of the same hue on frame of the existing awning.
- 23. Applicant: Bernadette Safford**
- a. Property Address: 1506 Brown Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/5/11
 - c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork where necessary. The repairs will match the existing in profile and dimension. Touch up the paint per the existing color scheme.
- 24. Applicant: Mobile Symphony**
- a. Property Address: 257 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/9/11
 - c. Project: Repaint the building per the existing color scheme.
- 25. Applicant: Claire N. Miller**
- a. Property Address: 1015 Old Shell Road
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/9/11

c. Project: Install fencing (per submitted plan). A three foot tall wooden picket fence will extend between the front porch's newel post and the street. The picket fence will extend along the north lot line and a portion of the western lot line, terminating at a point equal to the front plane of the house. A six foot interior lot privacy fence will pick up at the termination of the aforementioned picket fence. Six fence wooden fencing will enclose the side and rear lots. Said fencing will not extend by the front plane of the house.

26. Applicant: Todd Drummond

- a. Property Address: 260 North Joachim Street
- b. Date of Approval: 8/3/11
- c. Project: Paint exterior: Siding will be Downing Sand - SW2827 and trim will be semi-gloss white.

27. Applicant: Hancock Roofing

- a. Property Address: 1420 Government Street
- b. Date of Approval: 8/8/11
- c. Project: Remove existing asphalt roof and reroof with three tab shingles.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2011-55-CA: 352 Government Street

- a. Applicant: David Wilton for the Archdiocese of Mobile
- b. Project: Rehabilitate a building – Install additional fenestration on the side elevations and replace existing features to match the existing.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2011-56-CA: 1157 Church Street

- a. Applicant: George & Sallye Irvine
- b. Project: Replacement of Windows – Replace windows on an ancillary structure.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

3. 2011-57-CA: 1500 Government Street

- a. Applicant: Wrico Signs for One Main Financial
- b. Project: Signage Approval – Install wall signage.

APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

4. 2011-58-CA: 11 South Hallett Street

- a. Applicant: John H. Seibert
- b. Project: New Construction – Construct a small rear addition.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

5. 2011-59-CA: 454 Chatham Street

- a. Applicant: Adam Woodworth
- b. Project: Repair & Replacement, Alteration of Fenestration, and Site Improvements – Repair/Replace deteriorated features; alter existing fenestration; and install a walk and a driveway.

TABLED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

6. 2011-54-CA: 109 Bradford Avenue

- a. Applicant: Murray Thames Contractor, Inc. and Frank Lott for L'Arche
- b. Project: Review of Tabled Application Calling for Window Replacement and New Construction – Replace unauthorized windows and construct a rear porch.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. GUIDELINES

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2011-55-CA: 352 Government Street
Applicant: David Wilton for the Archdiocese of Mobile
Received: 7/27/11
Meeting: 8/13/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Rehabilitate a building – Install additional fenestration on the side elevations and replace existing features to match the existing.

BUILDING HISTORY

This two-story building appears as an overlay in the 1955 Sanborn Maps.

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 15, 1993. At that time, the Board approved alterations to the façade’s storefront. The applicant’s representatives appear before the Board with application calling for the installation of additional side elevation fenestration and the in kind replacement of existing features.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The type, size and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building.”
 - 2. “The size and placement of new windows for additions and alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
 - 3. “Awnings will be reviewed on a case by case basis.”
 - 4. “Doors reflect the age and style of a building.”
- C. **Scope of Work (per submitted plans):**
 - 1. Install additional fenestration on the East and West Elevations.
 - a. Install a single metal and glazed door with overhanging metal canopy on the East Elevation’s ground floor. With exception of a cross bar, the bronzed door will match the facades’ existing doors.
 - b. Install five metal windows on the East Elevation’s second story. Said windows will utilize the same finish and framing as the façade’s storefront windows.
 - c. Install five metal windows on the West Elevation’s second story. The finish and framing will match the existing as well as those proposed above.
 - 2. Replace the façade’s ground floor awning to match the existing with regards to composition, dimensions and color.
 - 3. Repaint the building per the existing color scheme.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the installation of additional fenestration and the in kind replacement of existing features. This modern building constitutes 1950/1960s non-contributing infill construction.

Situated on the lot line, the building's lengthy side elevation did not originally feature fenestration. Slit-like windows were installed on the ground floor. The proposed second story windows would feature the same framing and finish as the façade's storefront fenestration, as would the proposed door. The remainder of the application calls for the in kind replacement of existing features and finishes.

On account of the non-contributing status of the building, the previous changes made to the building, and the sensitivity of the invention, Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical integrity of the historic district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-4), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the historic district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Laurie Sikorowski and David Wilton 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 them if they had any comments to add, questions to ask, or clarifications to make with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Wilton answered no.

Mr. Roberts complimented the building. He asked Mr. Wilton and Ms. Sikorowski about the building's function, as well as the uses of several other Archdiocesan properties in the area.

Ms. Sikorowski explained to the Board that the building's interior was being remodeled. She said that the window portion of the application stemmed from the desire to obtain light.

Mr. Karwinski suggested the planting of trees in front of the building. Mr. Roberts disagreed.

Mr. Ladd asked if any additional Board members had questions for the applicant's representatives. No further comments or 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. Upon hearing no response, 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: 8/17/12

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2011-56-CA: 1157 Church Street
Applicant: George and Sallye Irvine
Received: 8/1/11
Meeting: 8/17/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Non-Contributing Ancillary Building
Zoning: R-1
Project: Window Replacement – Replace windows on an ancillary structure.

BUILDING HISTORY

This two-and-one-half story residence dates from circa 1899. Constructed as rental dwelling by the Hearin family, the house is one of six houses on this block that featured similar plans and massings. All have been variously altered over the years. The subject dwelling features a wrap around porch and second story gallery.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on March 3, 1997. At that time, the Board approved the installation of a section of iron fence and an iron gate. The owners/applicants propose the replacement of the garage apartment’s tripartite aluminum jalousie window grouping with six-over-six aluminum windows.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The type, size and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building. Original window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing.”
 - 2. “Where windows cannot be repaired, new windows must be compatible to the existing. The size and placement of new windows for additions and alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted drawing):
 - 1. Remove the tripartite jalousie window grouping from the garage apartment’s North Elevation.
 - 2. Replace the jalousie windows with a six-over-six tripartite aluminum grouping. Said light configuration would match that found elsewhere on the building.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the replacement of an ancillary building's aluminum jalousie windows with six-over-six aluminum sash windows.

The ancillary structure is located in the rear northwest corner of the lot. Plantings and siting make it minimally visible from the public right of way. The 1925 Sanborn Maps indicate the presence of a single story wooden garage on the site of the current building. A two-story ancillary structure (located closer to the street) appears on the 1955 Sanborn Maps. Based on consultation of the Sanborn Maps, the present building therefore dates from after 1955.

The building's ground floor does not feature fenestration. The second story features aluminum windows. The side and rear elevation windows are six-over-six sash windows in type and configuration. The front windows, those proposed for replacement, are jalousie in type. Staff does not believe the replacement of jalousie type aluminum windows with six-over-six aluminum windows would impair the architectural or historical integrity of the property or the district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Murray Thames was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant's representative. He asked Mr. Thames if he had any comments to add, questions to ask, or clarifications to make with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Thames explained to the Board that he was representing the application at the owner's request. He told the Board that any window treatment would be more appropriate than the existing duck tape secured windows.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any additional questions to ask or comments to make. Mr. Karwinski made one comment.

Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, 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: 8/17/12

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2011-57-CA: 1500 Government Street
Applicant: Wrico Signs for One Main Financial
Received: 8/1/11
Meeting: 8/17/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Signage Approval – install wall signage.

BUILDING HISTORY

This development constitutes non-contributing commercial infill.

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 was on June 11, 2007. At that time, the Board approved the installation of signage.
- B. The Sign Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Internally lit signs are prohibited.”
 - 2. “Lighted signs shall use focused, low intensity illumination. Such lighting shall not shine into or create glare at the pedestrian or vehicular traffic, nor shall it shine into adjacent areas.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
 - 1. Install wall signage.
 - a. The aluminum-faced signage will be located above the unit’s easternmost entrance.
 - b. The company name and logo will comprise the signage.
 - c. The signage comprises a total of 55 square feet.
 - d. The signage will utilize LED lighting.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the installation of wall signage. Signage applications involve the review of sign placement, design, size, composition, and lighting. The proposed signage meets the size, composition, and design standards, but not the lighting requirements. The Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts prohibit internally lit signs utilizing LED due to the impact on surrounding historic landscapes. On account of the lighting, Staff believes this application would impair the architectural and the historical integrity of the historic district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff believes this application will impair the architectural and the historical character of the surrounding district. Staff does not recommend approval of this application on account of the proposed lighting. Staff recommends the use of alternative forms of illumination, such as either gooseneck lamps or reverse channel LED lighting.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Wade Wright was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant's representative. He asked Mr. Wright if he had any comments to add, questions to ask, or clarifications to make with regard to the Staff Report. He noted that the proposed lighting seemed to be the only component of the application that did not meet the Sign Design Guidelines for Mobiles Historic Districts.

Mr. Wright stated that while the application called for LED lighting the drawings stated the lighting would be reverse channel LED lighting. He apologized

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any comments to make or questions to ask. No questions or comments ensued from the Board.

Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, Mr. Ladd closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Oswalt moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending facts to note that the lighting would be reverse channel LED not LED.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 8/17/12

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2011-58-CA: 11 South Hallett Street
Applicant: John H. Seibert
Received: 8/1/11
Meeting: 8/17/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

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

BUILDING HISTORY

This house is one of four similar speculative houses that date from circa 1900. All of the houses originally featured plans borrowing from popular shotgun and side hall types. Each dwelling displayed so-called Queen Anne detailing.

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 owner/applicant proposes the construction of a small rear addition.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards 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 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 will remain unimpaired.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
 - 1. Construct a small rear addition
 - a. The addition will square out the southeast corner of the building.
 - b. The addition will measure 6’ 7 ½” in depth and 7’ 11 ½” in width.
 - c. The addition will rest atop brick foundation piers matching those found on the house.
 - d. The foundation piers will be interspersed with boxed, framed, and suspended lattice skirting.

- e. Wood siding removed from the affected walls spaces will be reutilized in the addition. If the Salvaged siding is insufficient in amount, Hardiboard siding will be employed to surface the remainder of the addition's wall surfaces.
- f. The South Elevation's corner board will remain in place.
- g. Corner boards will be employed on the addition.
- h. The walls and trim will be painted to match the existing color scheme.
- i. The addition will continue the downward pitch of the rear shed roof.
- j. The roofing shingles will match the existing.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of a small rear addition. The addition will not be visible from the right of way. The addition will square out the already altered rear elevation.

In accord with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation, the proposed design is differentiated from yet compatible with the existing building. Corner boards will remain in place thereby demarcating the original fabric and earlier alterations. The foundation, siding, and roofing will match the existing so as to engender design compatibility.

Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical integrity of the building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

John Seibert was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant. He told Mr. Seibert that it was his understanding that he had restored over six houses on the street. Mr. Seibert answered yes. Mr. Ladd thanked Mr. Seibert for his efforts. He asked Mr. Seibert if he had any comments to add, questions to ask, or clarifications to make with regard to the Staff Report.

Mr. Seibert said that the Staff Report adequately addressed the project. He explained that the subject property was the seventh property on Hallet Street which he had been involved in either restoration and/or renovation efforts. Mr. Seibert said that all the previous projects are now owner occupied residences. He noted the small size and minimal visibility of the small rear bathroom addition. Mr. Seibert told the Board that he wanted to follow proper procedure in obtaining approval for the work.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any comments to make or questions to ask. Mr. Karwinski said that he had several comments to make. Addressing his fellow Board members, Staff, and the applicant, he said that the Staff Report called for the use of corner boards but none were depicted the submitted plans. Mr. Karwinski also pointed out that the Staff Report called for the used of boxed, framed, and suspended lattice between the foundation piers while a continuous lattice was depicted the plans.

Mr. Blackwell addressed Mr. Karwinski's concerns. He told the Board that the Permitting Office reviews both the drawings and the scope of work. The two documents work in concert. He explained that the Staff Report was a result of discussion with the applicant and reflected the applicant's intentions.

Mr. Karwinski and Mr. Roberts discussed the plans and the elevations. Mr. Roberts reiterated Mr. Karwinski's concerns. He said the plans should be the same as the scope of work.

Mr. Karwinski's told the applicant that in any future projects architect drawn plans should be submitted.

Mr. Seibert told the Board that the plans adequately expressed his intentions.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Karwinski moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Karwinski 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: 8/17/12

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2011-59-CA: 454 Chatham Street
Applicant: Adam Woodworth
Received: 8/3/11
Meeting: 8/17/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Repair & Replacement, Alteration of Fenestration, and Site Improvements – Repair/Replace deteriorated features; alter existing fenestration; and install a walk and a drive.

BUILDING HISTORY

This house is marriage of a 1890s shotgun and a 1860s/1870s Creole cottage.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on October 21, 2009. At that time, the Board approved the demolition of the rear portion of the building. The new owner/applicant appears before the Board with a request entailing the repair & replacement of existing features, the alteration of fenestration, and installation of site improvements.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 1. “Original doors and openings should be retained along with any moldings, transoms, or sidelights.”
 2. “The type, size and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building. Original window openings should be retained as well as original sashes and glazing.”
- C. **Scope of Work (per submitted plans):**
 1. Alter fenestration on the façade’s recessed side porch.
 - a. Install a wooden French door in porch’s existing east-facing doorway.
 - b. Remove the porch’s east-facing six-over-six window.
 - c. Install a wooden French door on the location of the aforementioned window.
 - d. Install a wooden French door in the porch’s north-facing doorway.
 2. Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork and detailing as needed.
 - a. Repair and replace wooden siding to match the existing in profile and dimension.
 - b. Remove the current, later porch railing.
 - c. Repair and replace the wooden porch ceiling to match the existing.
 - d. Repair and replace the porch’s tongue-and-groove porch decking.

- e. Repair and when necessary replace windows to match the existing in type and configuration (excepting (C-1-B))
- 3. Reconfigure the Rear or West Elevation.
- 4. Paint the house per the submitted Valspar color scheme.
 - a. The body will be Cool Elegance.
 - b. The porch ceiling will be Grand Hotel Mackinac Blue.
 - c. The trim will be White.
 - d. The porch decking will be Beachcomber.
- 5. Install a brick walkway connecting the façade's principal porch and the sidewalk.
- 6. Install a crushed gravel drive.

Clarifications

- 1. What is the proposed treatment of the Rear or West Elevation
- 2. What is the configuration of the proposed driveway?
- 3.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves in kind repair & replacement of existing features, the alteration of existing fenestration, the reconfiguration of the rear elevation, and the installation of a vehicular drive & a pedestrian walkway.

The unique house was in an extreme state of demolition by neglect until the 2009 purchase and 2010 stabilization by the Restore Mobile revolving fund. The deterioration was to such an extent that a rear Creole cottage, one of two that comprised a portion of the three part building, was demolished on account of extreme damage incurred by demolition by neglect. The surviving Creole cottage and shotgun sections of the house retain significant portions of the decorative fabric.

The fenestrated bays accessing the façade's recessed side porch survive intact. The proposal calls for the installation of three wooden French doors. Two of the affected bays are door bays while a second is a window bay. All three units of fenestration retain their respective doors and sashes. The north-facing door is an interior door. Later alterations, which have since been removed, included the addition of a small room that occupied the southernmost portion of the porch. The existing south-facing door bay likely was a windows bay. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that original doors and openings, along with their accompanying elements, should be maintained. On account of the intact nature of and the location of the east-facing fenestration, Staff believes the proposed removal of the existing fenestrated units and their replacement with French doors would impair the architectural and the historical integrity of the building.

When the building was stabilized and mothballed by Restore Mobile, many restorative and rehabilitative interventions were made. The dwelling's foundations were leveled and raised. The building was reroofed. Many repairs remain. All repairs, and when necessary replacements, of existing features would match the existing.

The present rear elevation is currently faced with plywood on account of the demolition of the derelict rear portions of the dwelling. No elevations were submitted for review.

Gravel and brick are appropriate surfacing materials for vehicular and pedestrian pathways in Mobile Historic Districts.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval in part and denial in part.

Staff does not believe the in kind repair & replacement of existing features and the installation of the driveway & walkway would impair the architectural or the historical character of the building. Staff recommends approval of the aforementioned components of the application.

Based on B (1-2), Staff does believes the proposed alterations to the fenestration of the façade's recessed side porch will impair the architectural character of the building. Staff recommends that the historic windows and doors remain in situ. Staff does not recommend approval of work to West or Rear Elevation on account of lack of information

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

No one was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Speaking to his fellow Board members, Mr. Ladd said that this project was recommended for approval in part and denial in part. Discussion ensued. It was moved that the application be tabled for lack of information and representation.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2011-54-CA: 109 Bradford Avenue
Applicant: Murray Thames Contractor, Inc. for L'Arche
Received: 7/19/11
Meeting: 8/3/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Window Replacement and New Construction – Replace unauthorized windows.
Construct a new rear porch.

BUILDING HISTORY

This two-story four unit apartment building is one of number of similar designs found across the Old Dauphin Way Historic districts. Masonry in construction and four rooms in depth, the symmetrical building possess facades featuring tiered porches and French doors. This type of small scale early 20th multi-family housing can be seen in communities across the North and Southeast.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on July 3, 2011. At that time, the Board reviewed a revised submission calling for the replacement of unauthorized windows and the construction of rear galleries. The applicant’s representatives return to the Board with revised drawings of the proposed work.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The type, size, dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building. Original window opening should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing.”
 - 2. “Where windows cannot be repaired, new windows must be compatible to the existing. The size and placement of new windows for additions and alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
 - 3. With regard to porches “particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details.”
 - 4. “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.”
 - 5. “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 (per submitted plans):
1. Replace the front door to match the existing.
 2. Replace unauthorized replacement windows.
 - a. Remove the double-hung vinyl replacement windows.
 - b. Install single light casement windows.
 - c. The aluminum clad Kolbe Ultra Series replacement windows will be single casement in type.
 - d. The light configuration of the replacement windows will feature aluminum exterior muntins. Said light configuration will match the original light configuration.
 - e. Repair concrete window sills where necessary
 3. Construct a two story rear porch.
 - a. The porch will measure approximately 31’ in length and 12’ in depth.
 - b. The porch will rest atop stucco-faced concrete block foundation piers.
 - c. Boxed, framed, suspended, and recessed lattice skirting will extend between the porch’s foundation piers.
 - d. The three bay porch will feature square section wooden posts.
 - e. The porch will feature 2” x 6” wooden decking.
 - f. A dog-leg stair will be located in the porch’s larger central bay.
 - g. A 4’ wide wooden handicap access ramp will extend from the northeast corner of the porch.
 - h. A wooden picket railing matching those employed on the porch will enclose the ramp.
 - i. The porch will feature a simple wooden fascia.
 - j. The porch will be surmounted by a shallow shed roof whose sheathing will match that employed on the main house.
 4. Install six-paneled wooden doors on the rear elevation.
 5. Reroof to match the existing.
 6. Repair the concreted driveway strips.
 7. Install an asphalt parking pad in the rear lot.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the replacement of unauthorized windows and the construction of a rear porch.

The original windows were removed by a previous owner who donated the property to the current owner. The submitted replacement windows, while a form of casement, approximate the design of the original windows. The Design Review Guidelines state that windows should be repaired and if replaced they should be compatible to the existing. Staff has meet with and spoken to the applicant’s representatives on multiple occasions. At the August 3, 2011 meeting, the Board reviewed a revised application calling for the replacement of the non-conforming windows. The design solution submitted to the Board was a result of combined efforts made the applicant’s representatives and Staff. The Board reviewed the design, construction, and fit of the windows. The applicants were advised to return to the Board with revised elevation drawings depicting the windows as discussed. The proposed windows will match the originals in type (casement) and configuration (light pattern). On account of the design’s close resemblance to the original windows, Staff does not believe the windows will impair the architectural or the historical integrity of the building.

The original rear porches were removed at an unknown date. The revised rear porch meets the material standards outlined by the Guidelines for New Residential Construction and addresses requirements for handicap access. In response to Staff recommendation, the current proposal employs a picket railing which is more in keeping with historic porch design detail. Staff does not believe the proposed porch will impair the architectural or the historical integrity of the building or the district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Murray Thames and Frank Lott 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 Mr. Thames and Mr. Lott if he had any comments to add, questions to ask, or clarifications to make with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Thames and Mr. Lott both answered no.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any comments to make or questions to ask. Mr. Karwinski said that he had several comments to make and questions to ask. He stated that site plan called for the resurfacing of the driveway's existing concrete ribbons and the installation of rear parking pad. Mr. Karwinski said that neither the plan nor the Staff Report specified how or if they would be linked. He noted that no parking plan was indicated. Mr. Karwinski stated that the parking and hardscaping portions of the plan needed to be better developed. He said that landscaping should be included.

Mr. Blackwell reminded the Board that the application did not call for landscaping.

Mr. Karwinski asked several questions as per the proposed rear porch and the existing front porch. He suggested the use of a railing on the side elevations of the proposed rear porch.

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: 8/17/12