

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

August 3, 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, Kim Harden, Thomas Karwinski, Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswald, Craig Roberts, Jim Wagoner, and Janetta Whitt-Mitchell.

Members Absent: Carlos Gant, Bill James, and Barja Wilson.

Staff Members Present: Devereaux Bemis and Cart Blackwell.

2. Mr. Oswald moved to approve the minutes of the July 20, 2011 meeting. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.

After noting that a word had been omitted from midmonth #3, Mr. Karwinski moved to approve the midmonth COA's granted by Staff. The motion received a second and the minutes as amended by the Board were approved unanimously.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED AS AMENDED

1. Applicant: Bama Builders

- a. Property Address: 252 Rapier Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 7/11/12
- c. Project: Reroof the house using 3 tab 20 year shingles, charcoal black in color.

2. Applicant: Inside Up

- a. Property Address: 7 North Conception Street
- b. Date of Approval: 3/14/11
- c. Project: Affix a fabric valence from the building's balcony. The valence will measure 23' in length and 22" in height. The valence will feature a roughly 10" by 6' section of lettering including the name of the commercial establishment.

3. Applicant: Leigh Tacon

- a. Property Address: 16 South Ann Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/18/11
- c. Project: Install interior lot fencing along the northern lot line. The six foot wooden fence will not extend beyond the front plan of the house.

4. Applicant: Rebecca Dickerson

- a. Property Address: 1114 Old Shell Road
- b. Date of Approval: 7/18/11
- c. Project: This COA amends that of 24 June 2011. Door, shutters and lattice will be painted black.

5. Applicant: Caldwell Whistler

- a. Property Address: 12 South Ann Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/19/11
- c. Project: Install a 3 foot picket fence (or 1x1) along the south side of the property to the first angle of the property where it will become a 6 foot fence to match the 3 foot fence and extend the six foot fence across the back property line, all per the submitted sketch.

6. Applicant: Lucy Barr for Mr. & Mrs. Luckett Robinson

- a. Property Address: 65 North Monterey Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/20/11

- c. Project: Finish a partially completed carport that was approved on March 27, 2008.
- 7. Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley for Myles & Thelma Tunneau**
- a. Property Address: 1203 Selma Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/25/11
 - c. Project: Install two new garage doors on a former garage. The doors will feature transom windows. Install a new wooden paneled and glazed door on the garage. The door will match the existing. Install an awning over the door. Install a six-over-six wooden window on the garage's East Elevation. Repair, replace, and install siding.

C. APPLICATIONS

- 1. 2011-49-CA: 1204 Old Shell Road**
 - a. Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley for the Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund
 - b. Project: Renewal of an Expired Certificate of Appropriateness – Restore a house. **APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**
- 2. 2011-50-CA: 16 North Reed Avenue**
 - a. Applicant: Thomas Sarahan for Anne Everitt Little
 - b. Project: New Construction – Construct a carport. **APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**
- 3. 2011-51-CA: 104 South Ann Street**
 - a. Applicant: Wanda Vergos
 - b. Project: Demolition Request – Demolish a fire damaged apartment building. **APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**
- 4. 2011-52-CA: 202 South Broad Street**
 - a. Applicant: Mike Rost and Forrest McCaughn
 - b. Project: Rehabilitation/Removal of later alterations – Replace later front porch columns; alter the front porch roof; remove a later rear porch; construct a new rear porch; and alter fenestration. **APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**
- 5. 2011-53-CA: 156 State Street**
 - a. Applicant: Arthur Clarke
 - b. Project: Alternative Replacements on a Non-Contributing Building - Replace wooden siding and elements with Hardiplank substitutions. Replace aluminum columns and railings to match the existing. **APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**
- 6. 2011-54-CA: 109 Bradford Avenue**
 - a. Applicant: Murray Thames Contractor, Inc. for for L'Arche
 - b. Project: Window Replacement and New Construction – Replace unauthorized windows. Construct a new rear porch. **TABLED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Discussion

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

164-49-CA: 1204 Old Shell Road
Applicant: Douglas B Kearley for the Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund
Received: 7/15/11
Meeting: 8/3/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing Property
Zoning: R-1
Project: Restoration

BUILDING HISTORY

According to MHDC-conducted research, this 1-1/2 story center hall was constructed in the mid-1820s. The house definitively appears on the 1829 tax rolls, listing Madame Pollard as its owner. However, Madame Pollard purchased this property from Joshua Kennedy in 1826, when Kennedy was subdividing a large tract of land. Therefore, the house may be as early as 1826.

The front bay window appears on the 1904 Sanborn. Since the changes to the front façade and the roof are Victorian in nature, the house was most likely renovated in the late 1880s or 1890s. The north façade has also undergone several changes through the years including porch enclosures and shed room additions. The current north elevation and the garage-apartment most likely date to the 1910s or 1920s.

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 Board on November 5, 2008. At that time the Board approved the restoration of the house to it’s circa 1830 appearance. Staff is not authorized to reissue Certificates of Appropriateness that are older than three years. The applicant’s representative returns to the Board for the renewal of the Certificate of Appropriateness.
 - 1. **Restoration** is defined “as the act or process of accurately depicting the form, features, and character of a property as it appeared at a particular period of time by means of the removal of features from other periods in its history and reconstruction of missing features from the restoration period. The limited and sensitive upgrading of mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems and other code-required work to make properties functional is appropriate within a restoration project.”
- B. The National Park Service has determined restoration may be considered as a treatment restoration as a treatment is proper “when:
 - 1. the property's design, architectural, or historical significance during a particular period of time outweighs the potential loss of extant materials, features, spaces, and finishes that characterize other historical periods;

2. when there is substantial physical and documentary evidence for the work;
 3. and when contemporary alterations and additions are not planned,
 4. Prior to undertaking work, a particular period of time, i.e., the restoration period, should be selected and justified, and a documentation plan for Restoration developed.”
- C. The National Park Service Standards for Restoration state, in pertinent part, the following:
1. “A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use which reflects the property's restoration period.
 2. Materials and features from the restoration period will be retained and preserved. The removal of materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize the period will not be undertaken.
 3. Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Work needed to stabilize, consolidate, and conserve materials and features from the restoration period will be physically and visually compatible, identifiable upon close inspection, and properly documented for future research.
 4. Materials, features, spaces, and finishes that characterize other historical periods will be documented prior to their alteration or removal.
 5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize the restoration period will be preserved.
 6. Deteriorated features from the restoration period will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials.
 7. Replacement of missing features from the restoration period will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence. A false sense of history will not be created by adding conjectural features, features from other properties, or by combining features that never existed together historically. . .
 8. Designs that were never executed historically will not be constructed.”
- D. Per submitted plans, applicants intend to:
1. Uncover the original roof structure
 - a. remove the two-front facing gables from the south/front façade
 - b. reveal the double-pitch roof retained beneath the existing roof structure on the front façade
 - c. reveal the original dormer structure retained beneath the southeast dormer on the front façade
 1. original trim and pilaster details exist and will be copied for the dormer replacement elsewhere on the building
 - d. remove eave overhang on rear double hip roof
 - e. replace both north façade dormers by replicating details from southeast dormer
 - f. reroof with “royal pine” shingles
 2. Replace the original front porch fenestration
 - a. by removing Victorian era bay window
 - b. replacing front siding to match existing
 - c. installing two 6/6 windows west of entryway
 1. original; currently located on north facade
 3. Remove existing porch details
 - a. replace with wood handrail based on existing evidence
 - b. install 6 turned round Tuscan columns
 - c. install handrail and new front porch steps
 4. Remove infill and shed additions on north façade
 - a. restore back porch to mirror front porch
 - b. chamfered posts to be installed
 - c. glassed-in with fixed wood shutters

- d. double door installed
- 5. Additional details
 - a. Add operable shutters
 - b. repoint piers, matching mortar

SAFF ANALYSIS

As the applicants have demonstrated and Staff has ascertained, a “restoration” rather than “rehabilitation” approach to this project is highly desirable. In keeping with the restoration approach, this project calls for the removal of later additions to a building which have gained historic significance in their own right. Staff recommends approval for this demolition work and the replication of earlier features on the building for the several reasons. First, given its age and rarity, the 1820s appearance of the house is more historically valuable than its late-nineteenth century appearance. In order to recall its 1820s appearance, the late-nineteenth century changes (additional roof, front-facing gables and bay window) would be removed. Second, there is enough physical evidence to substantiate the building’s return to its 1820s appearance, as well as the replication of any details lost from this period. For instance, the existing dormer can be used as model for the replacement of the three missing dormers, the applicants will not be guessing as they seek to recreate these dormers. Furthermore, the original voids for the dormers can be found at all four points in the attic, thus there is no conjecture as to the original location of the dormers. Likewise, the original double pitch roof is intact (wood shingles and all) just beneath the later roof on the front façade. Finally, the original front porch 6/6 windows are currently located at the back of the house where they were reused when the porch was infilled; thus, the recreation of the porch fenestration will be accurate as well.

Staff has determined the proposed treatment to both the front and back porches is appropriate and therefore recommends approval of the application as presented.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Douglas B. Kearley was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant. He asked Mr. Kearley if he had any comments to add, questions to ask, or clarifications to make with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Kearley answered no, but added that the project had been previously approved, but the Certificate of Appropriateness had expired. He told the Board that the building had been mothballed. Mr. Kearley stated that funds were now available to facilitate the project.

Mr. Karwinski said that he had several comments to make with regard to the application and questions to ask with regard to the Staff Report. He stated that gutters were shown in the plans, but they were not specified in the Staff Report. Mr. Kearley said that gutters would be employed. Mr. Karwinski asked if latticed skirting extend between the foundation piers. Mr. Kearley answered yes. Mr. Karwinski asked Mr. Kearley about the proposed columns. Mr. Kearley told the Board that while all the other aspects of the restoration were based on physical evidence, no material or photographic documentation had yet to be located with regard to the columnar treatment. He said that columns proposed were temporally and stylistically appropriate. He cited two contemporary local examples. Mr. Kearley added that it was hoped that during the restoration more evidence of the columnar treatment and/or type would be discovered.

Ms. Whitt-Mitchell asked Staff if the application was appearing before the Board for the renewal of a Certificate of Appropriateness or redesign. Mr. Blackwell clarified that the application returned to the Board for reason of the former not the latter.

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, amending facts to note the use of both gutters and skirting.

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 approved. Mr. Karwinski voted in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 8/3/12

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2011-50-CA: 16 North Reed Avenue
Applicant: Thomas Sarahan for Anne Everitt Little
Received: 7/13/11
Meeting: 8/3/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

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

BUILDING HISTORY

This single-story Arts & Crafts-inspired dwelling was constructed shortly after 1900.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The applicant proposes the construction of a rear carport.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “An accessory structure is any construction other than the main building on the property. It includes but is not limited to garages, carports, pergolas, decks, pool covers, sheds and the like. The appropriateness of accessory structures shall be measured by the guidelines applicable to new construction. The structure should complement the design and scale of the main building.”
- C. **Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):**
 - 1. New Construction – Construct a carport.
 - a. The carport will rest atop an existing 23’ 6” by 19’ 6” concrete slab.
 - b. The carport will be located atop the slab so to meet setback requirements.
 - c. The carport will measure 18’ 6” in width and 18’ 6” in depth.
 - d. Square section wooden posts will support the carport.
 - e. The hipped roof carport will feature a 5’ wide by 13’ 6” deep storage room.
 - f. The storage room will occupy the southeast corner of the carport.
 - g. The storage room will be sheathed with board and batten wooden siding.
 - h. Six-over-six wooden windows will punctuate the northern and southern sides of the storage room.
 - i. The carport’s fascia and cornice will match those of the main house.
 - j. The carport’s hipped roof will be sheathed with shingles matching those found on the main house.
 - k. The carport will be painted the same color scheme as the main house.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of a carport. The ancillary structure will be located to the rear of the main house in the property’s backyard. The proposed carport will not be visible from the public right of way.

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state that ancillary construction will be reviewed according to the Guidelines for New Residential Construction in Mobile’s Historic Districts. The proposed carport meets the design and material standards outlined by the New Construction Guidelines. The design complements the main dwelling. The detailing, fascia treatment, roof sheathing, and color scheme will match that of the main house thereby engendering design harmony between the old and the new work.

Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or the historical integrity of the building or the district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1), Staff, 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

Anne E. Little and Thomas Sarahan were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant and her representative. He asked them if they had any comments to add, questions to ask, or clarifications to make with regard to the Staff Report. Both Ms. Little and Mr. Sarahan said they had nothing to add, correct, or explain.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any question to ask the applicant or her representative. No questions ensued from the Board. Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. 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: 8/3/12

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2011-51-CA: 104 South Ann Street
Applicant: Wanda J. Vergos
Received: 7/14/11
Meeting: 8/3/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-2
Project: Demolition Request – Demolish an apartment building.

BUILDING HISTORY

This two-story four unit apartment building appears on the 1955 Sanborn Maps. It was depicted behind a non-extant two-story residence. The lower floor of the building functioned as a garage while the upper floor served as living and storage space.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The applicant proposes demolishing the fire damaged building
- B. The 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;
This two-story wooden building served as an ancillary structure for a non-extant dwelling. It is one of the two surviving ancillary structures depicted in the 1955 Sanborn Map for this address. Many of Mobile’s grander turn-of-the-century residential properties possessed two story-dependencies comprised of ground level vehicular parking and upper level housing & storage. The altered non-contributing utilitarian building was not designed with thought toward architectural grandeur.
 - ii. The importance of the structures to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;

1. This building is a non-contributing structure in the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. Situated on an altered stretch of Ann Street, the former ancillary structure is setback within the northwest corner of a large lot. The wide expanse of lot fronting the building was formerly occupied by a larger dwelling. A second contemporary single story ancillary structure is located just south of the subject building. This second building has been enlarged and modified. A gas/convenience station is located immediately to the south of the property. A contributing residence is located to the north of the lot. Opposite the property stand the following structures: two recently restored contributing residences, a commercial strip development, and a non-contributing gas station. On account of the significant building setback, the demolition of the derelict, fire-damaged building would have no impact on the architectural or the historical integrity of the streetscape and the district.
- iii. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
 1. The building components are capable of being reproduced.
- 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. This building is one of many two-story ancillary structures located within and around Mobile's 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 owner/applicants would demolish the building, level the section of lot, and the plant grass.
- vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 1. The owner/applicant inherited the property in 2005.
- vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 1. The owners invested rehabilitating the house, but the extent of the fire damage and the cost replacing non-conforming elements proved cost prohibitive.
- viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 1. The property has not been listed 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. Not applicable.
- x. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
 1. Not given.
- 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; and
 1. Application submitted.
- xii. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.

1. See submitted application.
3. *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 site plan):

1. Demolition Request – Demolish a four unit apartment building.
 - a. Demolish the building.
 - b. Level the lot.
 - c. Plant grass upon the site of the building.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the demolition of a non-contributing building. Demolition applications entail the review of the following: the architectural significance of the building; the existing condition of the building; the impact of the demolition on the streetscape; and the nature of any proposed redevelopment.

This two-story building served as an ancillary structure for a demolished residence. Now comprised of four apartments, the lower floor functioned as vehicular storage & maintenance and the upper floor allowed for housing & storage. Constructed with utilitarian functions in mind, the non-contributing is not architecturally significant. Numerous later modifications altered both the appearance and structure of the fire-damaged building.

By virtue of its utilitarian function, this building was situated in the rear of the lot. Unlike the other ancillary building located on the lot, the building does not face the street. Neither building engages the street. The demolition of the subject building would have no impact on the historical integrity of the streetscape.

This building was damaged in arson-related fire. The fire resulted in both structural and cosmetic damage. If the applicant repaired the building, a number of the building components, such as doors and windows, would not be in compliance with the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts.

If granted demolition approval, the owner/applicant would demolish the building, level the lot, and plant grass.

Taking into account the building’s lack of architectural & historical significance, the structure’s setback from the street, the physical condition of the fire-damaged building, and nature of the redevelopment, Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical integrity of the streetscape or the surrounding historic district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-3), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural and the historical character of the building and the district. Staff recommends approval of the demolition request.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Wanda Vergos was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant. He asked Ms. Vergos if she had any comments to add, questions to ask, or clarifications to make with regard to the Staff Report. Ms. Vergos said the Staff Report addressed her intentions. She told the Board that she only wanted to demolish the building and level the site.

Ms. Harden asked Ms. Vergos if she any future redevelopment plans for the lot. Ms. Vergos explained that she had multiple options, but she was not committed to any one in particular. She stated that her sole concern at the moment was demolishing the derelict building.

Mr. Karwinski asked Ms. Vergos if she intended to demolish the other building on the lot. Ms. Vergos answered no.

Mr. Ladd asked if any other Board had any question to ask Ms. Vergos. No questions ensued from the Board. Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, Mr. Ladd closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Wagnoer 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. 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: 8/3/12

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2011-52-CA: 202 South Broad Street
Applicant: Mike Rost and Forrest McCaughn
Received: 7/18/11
Meeting: 8/3/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Rehabilitation/Removal of later alterations/Change fenestration – Replace later front porch columns; alter the front porch roof; remove a later rear porch; construct a new rear porch; alter and add fenestration.

BUILDING HISTORY

This house dates from circa 1900. The irregular massing is a vestige of Queen Anne planning while the simplicity of detail bespeaks the emerging Colonial Revival.

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 applicants proposed removing later features, constructing a new rear porch, and altering fenestration.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “A buildings base, or foundation, gives the building a sense of strength and solidity, and serves to “tie” the structure to the ground. Traditionally, residential buildings were raised on piers. Occasionally, certain early styles and mid-20th century styles used continuous masonry foundations.”
 - 2. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. Historic porches should be maintained and repaired to reflect their period. Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details.”
 - 3. Original doors and openings should be retained along with any moldings, transoms, and sidelights.”
 - 4. “The size and placement of new windows for additions and alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
 - 5. “The balustrade of the stairs should match the design and materials of the porch.”
 - 6. “Replacement of missing features should be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.”

7. “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.”
8. “New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.”

C. Scope of Work:

1. Rehabilitation/Removal of later alterations (per submitted plans):
 - a. Remove the later cast concrete trunk-like front porch pedestals/foundation piers.
 - b. Construct brick foundation piers on the location of the aforementioned pedestal/piers.
 - c. Install framed, suspended, and recessed wooden lattice skirting between the foundation piers. Said skirting will be utilized elsewhere on the building.
 - d. Install new Tuscan columns that will be set atop molded wooden pedestals.
 - e. Install wooden railings with caped upper and lower newels atop the front steps (within the flanking antipodia).
 - f. Install wooden tongue-and-groove porch decking.
 - g. Remove the façade’s second story door.
 - h. Install a window in the location of the aforementioned door. The window dimensions, framing, type, and composition will match the second floors other one-over-one wooden windows.
 - i. Install operable solid panel wooden shutters to either side of the façade’s windows.
 - j. Remove the later back porch from the West Elevation.
 - k. Construct a new rear porch.
 - l. The wrap around porch will extend two bays along the north elevation
 - m. The rear porch will rest atop brick foundation piers with intervening expanses of lattice skirting.
 - n. The rear porch will feature wooden tongue-and-groove porch decking.
 - o. Tuscan columns set atop molded piers will support the porch roof.
 - p. The porch will feature fascia and eave treatments matching those of the front porch.
 - q. The roofing shingles will match those employed on the body of the house.
 - r. A shallow-pitched clapboard gable will be located above the porch’s entrance bay.
 - s. The entrance bay will be accessed via a flight of wooden steps with flanking railings. Said railings will match those planned for the front porch.
 - t. Remove the three westernmost fenestrated bays (a single light window, a two-over-two window, and French door) from the Rear Elevation.
 - u. Install three three-over-one one wooden windows one the second floor of the rear elevation. Said windows will be relocated from the North Elevation.
 - v. Vertical pilaster strips will demarcate the upper story bays.
 - w. Install gutters.
 - x. Install a new fixed four light wooden transom window in the center bay of the North Elevation’s existing bay window. The window will fit within the existing transom window frame.
 - y. Paint the building per the submitted Sherwin Williams color scheme. The body will be Silver Plate. The trim will be Extra White. The porch decking will be Black Emerald. The window sashes and screens will be Bordeaux.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the removal of later features, the alteration of fenestration, and the construction of new rear porch.

The house's front porch was altered during the last third of the 20th Century. By the time of the initial survey of the Oakleigh Garden District, the present cast concrete tree trunk-like porch pedestals/foundation piers were in place. Lifetime residents of the Oakleigh Garden District recall that the replacement features were installed in the 1970s. Said pedestal/foundation treatments are neither a character defining feature of the original design nor are they a complementary feature of the building's existing aesthetic. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards state that replacement of missing features should be supported by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence. The original columnar treatment was likely in the form of a free standing column atop or a column a square pedestal proposed. This surmise is based on examination of similar residences of this style and period located in Mobile.

The proposed removal of the later cast concrete foundation/columnar pedestals and their replacement with wooden columnar posts would not impair the architectural or the historical significance of the building. The foundation treatment would be restored and columnar treatment would be more appropriate to the style and the period of the dwelling.

The installation of replacement wooden tongue-and-groove decking would result in the removal of a small section of non-original National American Tile Company Adamantile or Bellingrath pavers. Said pavers were installed at a date unknown. The porch originally featured wooden decking. Staff recommends that the pavers be salvaged.

The Design Review Guidelines state that original door openings be retained. Given the location of the prominent location of the door on the second floor, Staff believes the replacement of the door with a window would impair the architectural and historic integrity of the building. Unless evidence of a window is presented, Staff recommends either the replacement of the existing later door with a more historically appropriate door a full length multi-light window.

This building once featured wooden shutters. The proposed wooden shutters would be operable in nature and solid type. Residential shutters of this time and date were louvered in construction. Staff encourages the use of fixed or operable louvers as opposed to solid paneled design/construction.

The rear elevation has been extremely altered. The existing porch is located off an enclosed sleeping porch. The porch was constructed without the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness. The proposed porch would not be visible from the street and would be wrap-around in form. By virtue of being located off the sleeping porch and single story in height, the porch would read as a later sympathetic addition to an older building. The foundation treatment, decking substructure & treatment, columnar treatment, and fascia & soffit treatment would match that employed and/or proposed for the front porch.

The rear elevation's original fenestration pattern is no longer intact. The windows proposed for the infilled sleeping porch would be relocated from the space below the sleeping North Elevation. The location is not visible from the right of way. The relocation and alteration of these windows would not alter the integrity of the house or the district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval in part and denial in part.

Based on B (1-2, 4-8), Staff recommends approval of the replacement of the porch piers, columns, & foundations, the construction of a new rear porch, the alteration of rear & side fenestration, the installation of shutters, and the painting of the building. Staff does not believe these interventions would impair the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district. That said Staff encourages the use of louvered as opposed to solid paneled shutters

Based on B (3), Staff does not recommend approval of the replacement of the façade's second story door with a window. Staff believes such a prominent replacement would impair the architectural and the historical character of the building.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mike Rost and Forrest McCaughn were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicants. He asked them if he had any comments to add, questions to ask, or clarifications to make with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. McCaughn told the Board that the Staff Report addressed his and his business partner's proposed interventions. He stated that the house had undergone several renovations over the course of the past century. In trying to recapture additional period accuracy and historic integrity, McCaughn explained that he had contacted both the Mobile Historic Development Commission and the University of South Alabama's McCall Collection regarding photographic documentation of the building (the earliest dating from 1987). He said that no early photographs are to found in either repository.

Mr. Roberts stated that Staff recommended approval of the whole of the application excepting the conversion of the façade's second story door to window. He asked Mr. Blackwell the reasoning for said recommendation. Mr. Blackwell said that unlike the other proposed fenestration changes, the door in question is located on the façade. Given that the façade is the building principal elevation and no documentation existed that the fenestrated bay had been door, Staff recommended against the alteration of such a prominent feature. Mr. Bemis reiterated the same. Mr. McCaughn said that while he had no evidence to prove otherwise, he and Mr. Rost wanted to replace the door with a window.

Mr. Karwinski said that he had several observations to make with regard to the proposed project. Pointing to the submitted drawings which he had arranged on the wall and marked up, Mr. Karwinski stated that he had consulted the 1904 Sanborn Maps. The Sanborn Maps indicated the front porch originally extended the length of the façade. He said that the dimensions of the existing porch were not correct in the plan. He said that now was opportunity to recreate the porch. Mr. Blackwell reminded the Board that they were here to judge the application as submitted unless the applicants wished to amend their application. He asked the applicants if they wanted to amend their application. Mr. McCaughn answered no. He said that the intention of the proposed restoration-minded front porch interventions and the rehabilitative efforts of the rear elevation were aimed at recapturing lost integrity and engendering continuity on previously altered areas on the building.

Mr. McCaughn addressed the proposed porch detailing. He said that he believed that the house likely featured full length columnar supports not the columns atop pedestals proposed.

Discussion returned to the removal of the façade's second story door and the installation of window in its location. Ms. Whitt-Mitchell addressed those assembled. She said that she and her husband had investigated purchasing the property in 1986. She recalled that at that time the fenestration unit in question was a window not a door.

FINDING OF FACT

Ms. Baker 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

Ms. Baker 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 approved. Mr. Karwinski voted in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 8/1/12

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2011-53-CA: 156 State Street
Applicant: Arthur Clarke
Received: 7/18/11
Meeting: 8/3/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: DeTonti Square
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-B
Project: Alternative Replacements on a Non-Contributing Building - Replace wooden siding and elements with Hardiplank substitutions. Replace wooden columns and railings with aluminum substitutions.

BUILDING HISTORY

The upper story of this building dates from circa 1890. It was moved to the site in 1983. At that time, the building was placed atop a masonry ground floor

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on June 24, 2002. At that time, the Board approved the construction of a rear storage area. The applicant returns to the Board with a proposal calling for the substitution of wooden siding and components with Hardiplank replacements, the replacement of wooden columns and railings with aluminum replacements, and the repainting of the building.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The exterior of a building helps define its style, quality, and period. The original siding should be maintained and repaired. Replacement of exterior finishes, when required, must match the original in profile, dimension and material.”
 - 2. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. Historic porches should be maintained and repaired to reflect their period. Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Remove and replace the wooden siding from the building’s second story with Hardiplank siding.
 - 2. Remove and replace the wooden fascia, soffit, and frieze with Hardiplank substitutions.
 - 3. Replace the front porch’s wooden columns and railings with aluminum substitutions. Said replacements will match the existing.

4. Repaint the building per the existing color scheme.

CLARIFICATIONS/REQUESTS

1. Provide a brochure, specification, and/or sample of the railing substitutions.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the replacement of wooden components with Hardiplank substitutions and the replacement of wooden elements with aluminum elements.

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that original siding should be retained and repaired. This non-contributing building features the surviving massing of a relocated historic building as its second story. The ground floor was constructed in the 1980s. The side elevations of the relocated upper story were faced with stucco after the relocation. Only the front and rear elevations feature siding, which is likely not original. Hardiplank and other substitute materials are appropriate for new construction and additions but not appropriate replacement material for older buildings retaining their original treatments. The Design Review Guidelines state porches should be maintained and preserved. The existing columns and railings are wooden. Neither the columns nor the railings are original to the 1890s cottage. The replacement columns and railings would be aluminum.

Given the degree of alteration this non-contributing building has undergone and the limited location of the replacement, Staff does not believe the removal of wooden siding and its replacement with Hardiplank would impair the architectural or historical integrity of the district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

On account of the significant changes this relocated building has experienced, the Guidelines do not adequately address the non-contributing property. The original siding, porch posts, and railings are not present. On account of the degree of the alterations and the lack of original components, Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the historic district.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Arthur Clarke was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Bemis recused himself from the discussion on account of his being a neighbor and relation of the applicant. He added that he had not been involved with this Staff Report. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant. He asked Mr. Clarke if he had any comments to add, questions to ask, or clarifications to make with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Clarke answered no.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any questions to ask Mr. Clarke. Mr. Wagoner asked Staff for clarification why this application was recommended for approval. Mr. Blackwell explained that on account of the non-contributing status of the building and the numerous alterations made to the upper story after its relocation, Staff believes that the proposed scope of work would not impair the building. No further questions ensued from the Board.

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

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Wagoner 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: 8/3/12

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:
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 December 17, 2008. At that time the Board denied a request to retain unauthorized replacement windows. Said windows were installed without the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness or a Building Permit. New owners submit to the Board a proposal involving the replacement of the unauthorized windows and construction of a new rear porch.
- 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 (Note that the windows depicted in the elevation drawings are not those proposed by the applicants. The proposed windows are depicted in a separate drawing.).
 - 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 divided light replacement windows will feature aluminum exterior muntins and wooden interior muntins.
 - 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 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.

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, do not 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 believes the proposed windows would impair the architectural and the historical integrity of the district. Replacement windows should take into account the design, construction, and “fit” (how the units are secured within the window reveals or openings).

The original rear porches were removed at an unknown date. Though the proposed rear porch meets the material standards outlined by the Guidelines for New Residential Construction and addresses requirements for handicap access, certain aspects of the design are not in keeping with the architectural and the historical character of the contributing building. The Design Review Guidelines state that particular attentions should be given to the detailing of porches. Staff recommends that the applicants employ a picket railing as opposed to the simple rails depicted in the drawings.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Frank Lott, Murray Thames, and Harry Thames 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 reminded those assembled of the property's early appearance before the Board. Mr. Ladd told the Board that the property had been gifted to L'Arche. He said that the L'Arche wanted to do what was right and work with the Board. Mr. Ladd asked the applicant's representatives if he had any comments to add, questions to ask, or clarifications to make with regard to current application's Staff Report.

Murray Thames addressed the Board. He explained that since receiving the Staff Report, a new window proposal had been developed and a new railing treatment had been revised. He said that the railing design had been submitted to Staff. Mr. Thames distributed drawings of the proposed window treatment to the Board. He stated that the proposed would both replicate the original light pattern as well as meet fire and safety requirements.

Mr. Ladd asked if the original windows would have meet current ingress and egress requirements. Mr. Thames answered no. Mr. Roberts said that scenario was not necessarily so, but reinstallation to match would be very expensive. He asked Mr. Thames what type casement windows were proposed. Mr. Thames said that single casement windows were proposed. He reiterated that the light pattern would replicate that of the removed windows.

Mr. Karwinski asked about the proposed use of the building. Mr. Lott and Mr. Thames addressed Mr. Karwinski's query. Mr. Karwinski said that he believed that the project required the signature of a licensed architect. Discussion ensued upon which Mr. Roberts said that an architect's involvement was not necessary.

Mr. Lott said he knew that the rezoning, permitting, and code requirements would need to be meet. Mr. Ladd asked Mr. Lott if this application was the first hurdle the project needed to overcome in the larger redevelopment process. Mr. Lott said that in order to obtain a building permit for exterior work the answer was yes.

Mr. Karwinski said that he believed the revised railing would not meet code requirements. Mr. Thames addressed Mr. Karwinski's concerns. Mr. Karwinski stated that he hated the design of the proposed railings. Mr. Bemis interjected by suggesting the use of one the MHDC's stock railing designs.

Mr. Karwinski stated that the window heads were not drawn correctly in the elevations. Mr. Thames explained that the wall expanses and window openings would not be altered.

Mr. Bemis asked for clarification as to the composition of the revised window application. Mr. Thames said that the windows would be aluminum clad wood in composition and construction. Mr. Bemis stated he had visited Coastal Windows the previous week. He said that the revised window submission reflected discussions made while touring the facility and discussing the submission.

A discussion of muntins ensued.

Mr. Ladd addressed his fellow Board members. He said that they had two issues to consider, one the windows and two the rear porch.

Discussion as to whether to approve or table the application ensued.

The application was table for the resubmission of revised drawings (elevation and window) and a site plan.

TABLED