

**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES**  
**August 20, 2014 – 3:00 P.M.**  
**Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street**

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

1. The Chair, Harris Oswalt, Sr., called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:  
**Members Present:** Bob Allen, Catarina Echols, Robert Brown, Kim Harden, Harris Oswalt, Craig Roberts, Steve Stone, Jim Wagoner.  
**Members Absent:** Carolyn Hasser, Nick Holmes, III, and Bradford Ladd.  
**Staff Members Present:** Devereaux Bemis, Cartledge Blackwell, and Keri Coumanis.
2. Steve Stone moved to approve the minutes for the August 6, 2014 meeting as amended. The motion received a second and was unanimously approval.
3. Mr. Wagoner moved to approve midmonth COA's granted by Staff. The motion received a second and was unanimously approval. The motion received a second and was unanimously approval.

**B. CALL TO ORDER**

1. Roll Call
2. Approval of Minutes
3. Approval of Mid Month COAs Granted by Staff

**C. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED.**

1. **Applicant: P. L. Johnson**
  - a. Property Address: 7 North Pine Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 7/30/14
  - c. Project: Reroof with 30 year architectural shingle, gray color.
2. **Applicant: Karen and Todd Duren**
  - a. Property Address: 9 Macy Place
  - b. Date of Approval: 7/30/14
  - c. Project: Reissue of a CoA dating from 4 January 2014 calling for the construction of an ancillary building. Also, remove and replace concrete strips in the drive and concrete walkways accessing the house.
3. **Applicant: Jake and Melissa Epker**
  - a. Property Address: 2306 DeLeon Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 7/30/14
  - c. Project: Install a five foot aluminum fence per the submitted plan.
4. **Applicant: Peyton Harvill with PH Company for Sam and Hartley Winter**
  - a. Property Address: 22 South Lafayette Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 8/4/14
  - c. Project: Reroof with architectural shingles (gray in color). Repaint the house per the existing color scheme. Repair (if and where necessary) any deteriorated woodwork to match the existing as per profile dimension and material.
5. **Applicant: Jim Walker**
  - a. Property Address: 550 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 8/5/14
  - c. Project: Replace doors to match the existing.
6. **Applicant: Ruth Fremouw**
  - a. Property Address: 503 Government Street

- b. Date of Approval: 8/6/14
- c. Project: Repair and when necessary repair deteriorated woodwork and detailing to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Clean and paint cast ironwork. Reinstall ironwork. Repaint per the existing color scheme. Clean brickwork. Repair windows when and where necessary to match the existing.

**7. Applicant: Elizabeth S. Sanders**

- a. Property Address: 212 South Cedar Street
- b. Date of Approval: 8/7/14
- c. Project: Install wooden shutters on the house's north and south elevations. The shutters will be painted to tie into the color scheme.

**8. Applicant: Diversified Roofing**

- a. Property Address: 705 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 8/6/14
- c. Project: Reroof flat portion of roof using TPO Single ply membrane.

**9. Applicant: TCM Remodelers**

- a. Property Address: 251 Saint Anthony Street
- b. Date of Approval: 8/11/14
- c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing (porch decking/roofing particular). Remove (for repair purposes), repair, and reinstall ironwork. Touch up the work per the existing color scheme..

**D. APPLICATIONS**

**1. 2010-38-CA: 69 Fearnway**

- a. Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley with Douglas Burtu Kearley Architect for Richard a Lucy R. Wright
- b. Project: Addition - Construct a side/rear addition.

**APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

**2. 2010-39-CA: 159 Everett Street**

- a. Applicant: Andrew Thompson for A.R.C. LLC
- b. Project: Demolition – Demolish a fire-damaged apartment building located within an apartment complex.

**APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

**D. OTHER BUSINESS**

- 1. Guidelines
- 2. Discussion

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

**2014-38-CA:** 69 Fearnway  
**Applicant:** Douglas B. Kearley with Douglas Burtu Kearley Architect for Richard and Lucy R. Wright  
**Received:** 8/1/14  
**Meeting:** 8/20/14

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Non-Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Addition – Construct a side/rear addition.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This picturesquely situated dwelling dates from the 1920s. As originally constructed, the house constituted an Arts and Crafts informed “bungalow”. During either the 1950s or 1960s, the residence was remodeled. It was during that time that the house’s walls were faced with brick.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

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

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on April 16, 2014. At that time, the Board approved the removal and replacement of later iron porch supports with period appropriate battered posts, the replacement of later metal casement windows with period appropriate sash windows, and the exposure of woodwork. With this application, the owners propose the construction of a side/rear addition.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation and the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy the historic materials that characterize a 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. Construct a side rear addition.
    - a. The addition will be located off the northwest corner of the house.
    - b. The addition will measure approximately 15’ 8” by 26’ 8” in plan.
    - c. The addition will adopt the massing of an earlier 1960s addition.
    - d. The addition’s floor level will match that of the body of the house.
    - e. The concrete foundation will be parged with a skim coat and painted.

- f. The addition's walls will be faced with hardiboard board-and-batten siding.
- g. The North Elevation will feature four light windows.
- h. The West (Rear) Elevation will feature a four light window and a glazed door.
- i. The addition's roof pitch and eave treatment will match those of the 1960s addition.
- j. The membrane roof will match that found on the earlier addition.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the construction of a side/rear addition. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation state that new additions shall not destroy the historic materials that characterize a 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 (See B-1.). On account of its location, the proposed addition has to adapt to the nature of the inclined lot and take into consideration an earlier rear addition. The earlier addition was constructed at the same time the house was remodeled. The proposed addition would adopt both the massing and the roof pitch of the earlier addition. Board-and-batten siding would be employed as a means of differentiating the new construction from the historic body of the house.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

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

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Douglas B. Kearley was present to discuss the application.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

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

Mr. Kearley state responded that Mr. Blackwell had addressed the application in full.

Mr. Allen and Ms. Harden asked for clarification as to the location of the 1960s addition. Mr. Kearley addressed the queries.

Mr. Roberts asked for as to earlier addition's roof. Mr. Kearley addressed Mr. Robert's question.

No further Board discussion ensued.

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

## **FINDING OF FACT**

Mr. Stone 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. Stone moved that application as approved by the Board does not impair the historic integrity of the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 8/20/15**

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

**2014-39-CA:** 159 Everett Street  
**Applicant:** Andrew Thompson for A.R.C. LLC  
**Received:** 7/24/14  
**Meeting:** 8/20/14

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Leinkauf  
Classification: Contributing (only on account of its age)  
Zoning: R-3  
Project: Demolition – Demolish a fire-damaged apartment building located within an apartment complex.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to the 1955 Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps for Mobile, this building, one three two-story apartment blocks, stood on the subject lot.

**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 subject building was damaged in fire and the owner applicant proposes the demolition of the structure and the extension of the common onto the location of the building’s footprint.
- B. With regards to demolition, the Guidelines read as follows: “Proposed demolition of a building must be brought before the Board for consideration. The Board may deny a demolition request if the building’s loss will impair the historic integrity of the district.” However, our ordinance mirrors the Mobile City Code, see §44-79, which sets forth the following standard of review and required findings for the demolition of historic structures:
  - 1. *Required findings; demolition/relocation.* The Board shall not grant certificates of appropriateness for the demolition or relocation of any property within a historic district unless the Board finds that the removal or relocation of such building will not be detrimental to the historical or architectural character of the district. In making this determination, the Board shall consider:
    - i. The historic or architectural significance of the structure;
      - 1. This two-story apartment building is one of three structures comprising a larger apartment complex. The buildings are listed as contributing solely on account of being over fifty years old. Frame in construction, faced with asbestos siding, the buildings possess neither architectural nor historical significance.
    - ii. The importance of the structures to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;

1. Located within the Leinkauf (expanded local) Historic District, this particular apartment unit is the middle recessed unit of three buildings occupying the site. The other two building are more directly engaged the streetscape. A gas station/convenience store occupies the adjacent property to the North (SE of Government and Everett Streets). Apartment buildings occupy the two adjacent lots to the South (extending all the way to Church Street). A Church, house, vacant lot, and apartment building occupy the street frontage to the block to the South.
- iii. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
  1. The building materials are capable of being reproduced or acquired (asbestos tiles).
- iv. Whether the structure is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood, the county, or the region or is a good example of its type, or is part of an ensemble of historic buildings creating a neighborhood;
  1. As with the two other buildings located on this property, this apartment block is one of innumerable wood-framed, multi-family rental structures that were constructed in the 1930s through the 1960s. Be those structures Works Progress Administration (WPA) housing, World War II construction, or immediate postwar development, buildings of this use, construction, material, and appearance are found across the United States. In addition to similar examples found within Leinkauf, examples can be found in the nearby Oakleigh Garden and Old Dauphin Way Historic Districts. Many more examples can be found to the West and North of Mobile's established historic districts.
- v. Whether there are definite plans for reuse of the property if the proposed demolition is carried out, and what effect such plans will have on the architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological, social, aesthetic, or environmental character of the surrounding area.
  1. If granted demolition approval, the applicant would demolish the fire-damaged and structurally impaired building. The site would be leveled and planted with sod.
- vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
  1. The current owner acquired the property in 2005 for \$150,000.
- vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
  1. Following the fire, the applicant investigated repairing and updating the building. The renovation estimates proved cost prohibitive. Additional structural issues were encountered during the course of the removal of damage and assessment of fabric.
- viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
  1. The applicant has not listed the larger complex for sale.
- ix. Description of the options currently held for the purchase of such property, including the price received for such option, the conditions placed upon such option and the date of expiration of such option;
  1. N.A.
- x. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
  1. N.A.

- xi. Financial proof of the ability to complete the replacement project, which may include but not be limited to a performance bond, a letter of credit, a trust for completion of improvements, or a letter of commitment from a financial institution.
  - 1. Application submitted.
- xii. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.
  - 1. See submitted materials.
  - 2. *Post demolition or relocation plans required.* In no event shall the Board entertain any application for the demolition or relocation of any historic property unless the applicant also presents at the same time the post-demolition or post-relocation plans for the site.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plan):

- 1. Demolish a fire-damaged apartment building (the middle block of three on the subject lot).
- 2. Remove debris.
- 3. Level the lot.
- 4. Install sod.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the demolition of one of three apartment buildings located on the subject property. When reviewing demolition applications, the Board takes into account the following criteria: the architectural significance of the building, the condition of the building, the impact the demolition will have on the streetscape; and the nature of any proposed redevelopment.

This apartment block, the center of three block-like multi-family units occupying the property, first appears on Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps in 1955. Single family residential properties occupied the location in 1925. The most recent MHDC Survey gives a 1940 date for the three building complex. The three buildings were constructed after 1950. Frame in construction and faced with asbestos tiles, each of the two-story blocks contains three or more rental units. The buildings have a contributing status only on account of their age. While expressive of aesthetic established by Federal housing designs of the Works Progress Administration (WPA) of the 1930s and indicative of the demand for rental housing in Mobile during the 1940s – 1950s, the buildings possess neither architectural nor historic significance. The design and construction quality of buildings are not exemplar for their period.

The subject building was damaged by a fire. In the course of investigating the extent of the damage and planning required updates, the applicants encountered additional damage (structural) and further code related concerns. Extensive fire damage occupied within the second-story and the attic areas. The roof has been begun to collapse and is exposed in several locations.

This building is most recessed of the three principle structures occupying this lot. The other two units are located within a short distance of the sidewalk and have entrances facing a centrally spaced common area. The subject building is located at the rear of the common area and within a short distance of the rear lot line. While the building faces the street, it does not engage it.

If granted demolition approval, the applicant would demolish the building and expand the common area onto the site of said structure. Debris would be removed, the lot would be leveled, and sod would be planted.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

While this building is listed as a contributing structure, Staff does not believe the demolition of the building will impair the architectural or historical character of the surrounding district. Taking into the account the condition of the building, the quality of construction , and the lack of significance, Staff recommends approval of the what was listed as contributing building (on account of age not architectural or historical significance).

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

No one was present to discuss the application.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussed the condition of the building.

Ms. Harden asked for clarification as to the building's date of construction. Mr. Blackwell addressed Ms. Harden's query.

Ms. Harden asked for clarification as the wall facings. Mr. Blackwell explained that the building is faced with asbestos siding. He noted that asbestos siding is original to the building.

Ms. Harden raised concern as to the visibility of the rear wall of commercial building on property located behind the subject building.

No further Board discussion ensued.

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

## **FINDING OF FACT**

Mr. Stone 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 on the facts approved by the Board that the demolition does not impair the historic integrity of the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

The motion received a second and was approved.

Ms. Harden and Mr. Stone voted in opposition.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 8/20/15**

