

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
August 5, 2015 – 3:00 P.M.
Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, James Wagoner, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
Members Present: Bob Allen, David Barr, Catarina Echols, Kim Harden, Nicholas H. Holmes, III, L. Craig Roberts, Steve Stone, James Wagoner
Members Absent: Carolyn Hasser, Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswald, and Robert Brown.
Staff Members Present:
2. Mr. Holmes moved to approve the minutes for the A meeting. The motion received a second and was unanimously approval.
3. Mr. Holmes 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. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED.

1. **Applicant: Steve Stone of dakinstreet**
 - a. Property Address: 50 South Lafayette Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/9/15
 - c. Project: Reroof the house with asphalt shingles. Construct a shed roof dormer off of the rear elevation. The two windows therein match the light pattern of the house. Said windows will be either wood or aluminum clad wood. The siding will match that on the main roof.
2. **Applicant: NRP**
 - a. Property Address: 450 Charles Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/8/15
 - c. Project: Remove existing concrete block chain wall (infill between historic masonry piers) and add a pier to the southern elevation between two existing piers in place of the concrete block. The pier will be concrete block faced with old brick (salvaged from the site).
3. **Applicant: D & D Construction & Remodeling**
 - a. Property Address: 1058 Elmira Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/6/15
 - c. Project: Reroof the building with either asphalt or building appropriate metal roofing (either standing seam metal or 5-V crimp panels). Repair deteriorated woodwork and touch up the paint per the existing color scheme.
4. **Applicant: Mr. & Mrs. Randall Hayes**
 - a. Property Address: 1223 Selma Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/8/15
 - c. Project: Construct an ancillary building. The ancillary building, which will be constructed according to setbacks approved by Planning (as informed by the Historic District Overlay), will take the form of two MHDC stock garage designs. Said designs will be modified to reflect the detailing of the main residence. A hyphen will extend between the two units. Extend a concrete drive to access the building. Install brick pavers for a patio. The proposed work will either be invisible or minimally visible from the public view.
5. **Applicant: Geri Moulton**

- a. Property Address: 1673 Selma Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/7/15
 - c. Project: Paint the house one of two Behr color schemes: 1.) the Rye Bread, body; Moroccan Sky, shutters; Aging Barrel, eaves/rafters; Totally Black, ironwork OR 2.) the Rye Bread, body; Golden Cactus Flower, shutters; Aging Barrel, eaves/rafters; Totally Black, ironwork OR 2.). Repair deteriorated stuccowork, when and where necessary to match the existing in finish and composition. Replace missing balusters on the terrace to match the existing. Repair any deteriorated woodwork, when and where necessary, to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Reinstall and repaint original screens. Clean the roofing tiles. Replace tiles in those instances where they are too deteriorated to match the existing. Clean pavers. Repaint and make the same repairs to the garage and the garden pavilions. Re-expose pavers in the gardens. Remove later doors infilling the rear loggia.
- 6. Applicant: Hedge Law Firm**
- a. Property Address: 1206 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/9/15
 - c. Project: Construct a handicap access ramp off the back porch. Reroof the main building.
- 7. Applicant: Deborah Pelt**
- a. Property Address: 108 North Pine Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/13/15
 - c. Project: Paint house from Valspar chart colors, body gray, trim white.
- 8. Applicant: Autry Greer & Sons**
- a. Property Address: 851 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/14/15
 - c. Project: Paint the building. Retain murals.
- 9. Applicant: Integrity Remodeling**
- a. Property Address: 354 McDonald Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/14/15
 - c. Project: Underpin house with brick, recessed from piers.
- 10. Applicant: Ameer Platt**
- a. Property Address: 1209 Elmira Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/15/15
 - c. Project: Reroof the house with asphalt shingles.
- 11. Applicant: Lela Bennett**
- a. Property Address: 1012 New St. Francis Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/15/15
 - c. Project: Repair foundations piers and chimney stacks to match the existing using the appropriate mortar. Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated woodwork and siding to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Repair windows. When sashes and casings have to be replaced, they will be replaced to match the existing as per light configuration, construction, and material. Reroof the house with asphalt shingles. Repaint the house per the existing color scheme. Reinstall a picketed railing (per MHDC stock design) on the upper gallery.
- 12. Applicant: Janet Clute**
- a. Property Address: 305 South Georgia Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/16/15
 - c. Project: Reroof with 30 year architectural shingle, pewter gray.
- 13. Applicant: Douglas Kearley for John Switzer**
- a. Property Address: 210 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/16/15

- c. Project: Construct a CMU coated (scored to resemble ashlar block) block wall (per submitted plans – site and elevation). The wall will feature a cap and extend between buildings located on either side of the lot. Vehicular and pedestrian gate entrances will access the lot beyond. The entrances will feature iron gates possessing a diamond and picketed panels.

14. Applicant: Mary Hunter Slaton

- a. Property Address: 2301 Ashland Place Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 7/20/15
- c. Project: Install an iron railing on the front steps.

15. Applicant: Teague Constructions

- a. Property Address: 1209 Selma Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/22/15
- c. Project: Reroof the building to match the existing.

16. Applicant: Sondra Dempsey

- a. Property Address: 261 North Jackson Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/23/15
- c. Project: Paint the house per the submitted Benjamin Moore color scheme: siding, Golden Stray; shutters, Knoxville Gray; door, Phillipsburg Blue; and detailing Slate Blue. Install a wooden railing with balusters matching those employed on the porch. The carport will be painted with colors complementing the house. Install Wrought Iron looking fence across the front of the lot. The overall height of fencing will not exceed four feet.

17. Applicant: Joe Hughey

- a. Property Address: 206 Marine Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/24/15
- c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork and siding to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Replace columnar posts to match those documented in historic photographs. Reconstruct a picketed railing with the appropriate engagements to the bottom and top rails. Repaint the house per the existing color scheme. Possibly paint the door red or green. Replace porch decking to match the existing.

18. Applicant: John Cocks

- a. Property Address: 1055 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/24/15
- c. Project: Remove brick veneer, replace any rotten wood to match, repaint house, light blue (body), white (trim).

19. Applicant: Wes Lambert

- a. Property Address: 167 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/28/15
- c. Project: Retain a wooden sign that meets the design and material standards.

20. Applicant: John Cocks

- a. Property Address: 1055 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/23/15
- c. Project: Remove brick veneer, replace any rotten wood to match and repaint the house.

21. Applicant: S. & S. Construction Solutions

- a. Property Address: 69 South Lafayette Streets
- b. Date of Approval: 7/28/15
- c. Project: Reroof the building with asphalt shingles.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. **2015-28-CA: 604 Eslava Street**
 - a. Applicant: Linda Snapp with Greer Clark & Latham on behalf of Margaret McGovern
 - b. Project: Addition and Ancillary Construction – Construct a rear addition and a carport.
APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
2. **2015-29-CA: 113 Dauphin Street**
 - a. Applicant: Elise Poche
 - b. Project: Commercial Remodeling – Remove later alterations, construct a new storefront, construct new upper-story fenestration, and construct a gallery.
APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
3. **2015-30-CA: Mardi Gras Market and Park (block bound by Government Street (N), Royal Street (E), Church Street (S), and Saint Emanuel Street (W)).**
 - a. Applicant: Nicholas H. Holmes, III, of Holmes & Holmes Architects for the City of Mobile
 - b. Project: Downtown Revitalization – Redevelop an urban Renewal altered lot as a urban ensemble featuring a Mardi Gras market and park.
APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. National Association of Preservation Councils (NAPC)
2. Local District Updates
3. MHDC Staff

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2015-28-CA: 604 Eslava Street
Applicant: Linda Snapp with Clark Greer & Latham on behalf of Margaret M. McGovern
Received: 7/13/15
Meeting: 8/5/15

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: T3
Project: Addition and Ancillary Construction – Construct a rear addition and a carport.

BUILDING HISTORY

This building is the last surviving component of Widows' Row. A terrace-like development which originally extended the whole length of the block (one bound by Warren and Dearborn), Widows' Row was a philanthropic initiative of Henry Hitchcock, a prominent figure in Mobile's early American history, and the Female Benevolent Society, a charitable concern. The ensemble was constructed in the 1830's. Each of the twelve one-room unit attached dwellings featured a cooking fireplace and a private garden. Separate, but collected the individual residences afforded independence and connectivity for widows with limited financial means.

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 February 4, 1982. At that time, the long neglected remnant of institutional residential outreach was approved for restoration and adaptive reuse. The current owners propose the construction of a rear addition and carport that will make it possible for the dwelling to be used a primary residence.
- B. 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 the historic materials that characterized the property. 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. "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 plans):

1. Construct a rear addition.
 - a. The addition will extend from the eastern portion of the Rear (North) Elevation.
 - b. The addition will measure 30' 6" in depth and 12' 8" in width.
 - c. The addition will be faced with stucco matching that facing the body of the building.
 - d. The addition will be surmounted by hipped roof sheathed with roofing shingles to match the existing.
 - e. The eave treatment will be constructed and articulated so to match that found on the body of the building.
 - f. The East (a side) Elevation will not feature fenestration.
 - g. The North (rear) Elevation will feature two four-over-four sash windows. Said windows will either be wood or aluminum clad wood in construction/material.
 - h. The West Elevation will two sets of double French doors with surmounting transoms. The glazed and paneled multi-light doors and three-light transoms will be wood or aluminum clad wood in construction/material.
2. Adapt (if necessary) a concrete parking pad.
3. Refresh a shell paved vehicular drive.
4. Construct an ancillary building.
 - a. The ancillary building will take the form of a carport
 - b. The design is the MHDC "stock" design.
 - c. The single stall vehicular structure will measure 13' in width and 24' in depth.
 - d. The gable-roofed structure will afford space for vehicular parking and secure storage.
 - e. Siding will match that employed on the main building's gabled ends.
 - f. Roofing shingles will match those found on the main building.
 - g. The open vehicular bay informing the South Elevation will feature a gable punctured by a lunette.
 - h. The East Elevation will feature three open bays with terminating siding-faced bays. The posts defining the open bays will be square section in construction.
 - i. The gabled North (rear) Elevation will not feature fenestration.
 - j. The West Elevation will feature three open bays with terminating siding-faced bays. The posts defining the open bays will be square section in construction.
5. A concrete walk will extend from the addition to the ancillary building.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of an addition to a contributing building and an ancillary building on property of the same. The proposed addition would be located to the rear of the building. The ancillary building would be recessed behind the main building. The addition would be positioned in a location that would afford the least impact to historic fabric and the proposed carport would be at best be minimally visible from the public view.

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic state that additions shall be differentiated from the old and compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment (See B-1.). In concert with the Design Review Guidelines, the proposed rear addition is distinct from, yet complementary to the historic structure. The addition's gabled roof, one set perpendicular to the body of the building will afford differentiation, as will the fenestration. Wall facing (stucco), eave treatment, and overall massing are based on the historic building. Additionally, the addition is so designed as to respect two character defining features of the building - the cabinet-porch-cabinet Rear Elevation and the project walls extending from the side Elevations (surviving portions

of the immediately adjacent and demolished units that once comprised the larger complex). Both of these distinctive components are respected in plan and elevation by the proposed addition.

With regard to ancillary construction, the Design Review Guidelines state that the appropriateness of accessory structures shall be measured by the guidelines applicable to new construction and that the structure should complement the design and scale of the main building (See B-2.). The proposed ancillary building, a design based upon the MHDC “stock” design, is modified to reflect the site specifics of the property though for the set back location, material selection (siding to match the gables), and proportional correlation to the main building are all responsive to the historical and architectural context.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Margaret McGovern, Geoffrey McGovern, and Linda Snapp were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner welcomed the applicant and her representative. He asked Mrs. McGovern, Mr. McGovern, and Ms. Snapp if they had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make. The applicants and their representative answered no.

Mr. Wagoner asked his fellow Board members if they had any questions to ask the applicants or their representative.

Mr. Roberts asked Mr. Blackwell to clarify statements regarding the treatment of the addition’s East Elevation. Mr. Blackwell addressed Mr. Roberts’ query.

Mr. Stone noted two corrections to the scope of work. Mr. Blackwell noted that the dimensions and roof type were written incorrectly. Mr. Stone said the omissions were minor, but they should be corrected.

Ms. Harden clarified further the rationale behind the treatment of East Elevation of the addition.

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, amending facts to note the correct dimensions of the addition and use of gabled roof over surmounting the same.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 8/5/16

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2015-29-CA: 113 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Elise Poche
Received: 7/13/15
Meeting: 8/5/15

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: T5-2
Project: Commercial Remodeling – Remove later alterations, construct a new storefront, construct new upper-story fenestration, and construct a gallery.

BUILDING HISTORY

The façade of this building dates from 1935. The party walls once defined a three-story building which was reduced in height and refaced during the same remodeling. The streamlined detailing of the terracotta surrounds framing both the upper-story and lower-story is indicative of a modernistic design aesthetic animating the period.

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 February 15, 1993. At that time, the Board approved the installation of new signage and other modification to the ground floor signboard. The application up for review calls for the construction a new storefront, the alteration later upper-story fenestration, and the construction of a balcony.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and the Lower Dauphin Commercial District state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.”
 - 2. “Many changes have occurred to storefronts in the Lower Dauphin Commercial District. Lacking knowledge about the original storefront, a new design can be introduced taking into account the scale, style and properties of the adjacent buildings and context of the district into consideration.”
 - 3. “Should there be documentation that a balcony or gallery existed, a balcony or gallery appropriate to the age and character of the building may be added.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
 - 1. Remove a later ground-floor storefront.
 - 2. Construct a new ground-floor storefront.

- a. The new storefront will afford both ground and upper-story access.
 - b. A centrally located ground-floor entrance will be set within a canted bay. Said glazed and paneled door will be double in form.
 - c. A single occupying half of the easternmost portion of the storefront will allow ingress to and egress from the upper-story.
 - d. Both doorways will be glazed and paneled in construction.
 - e. A stuccoed bulkhead will extend beneath a wood framed storefront comprised of display window and transom.
 - f. A stuccoed expanse located above the storefronts will be punctuated by four metal goosenecks.
3. Remove a later glass block expanse from the second-story.
 4. Construct a new upper-story fenestration and wall sequence within the aforementioned.
 - a. The wooden upper-story storefront will feature two pairs of double doors and flanking windows.
 - b. A stuccoed dado will be located beneath the fenestration.
 - c. The doors will match those employed at on the lower-story.
 - d. Flanking windows and surmounting transoms will be treated in the same manner as the lower-story storefront.
 - e. A stuccoed expanse will extend above the fenestrated units.
 5. Construct a cast-iron balcony
 - a. Four circular section posts with molded bases and capitals will support uncovered gallery.
 - b. Cast-iron railings of a traditional design will enclose the gallery.
 6. Clean the terracotta façade elements.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the removal and alteration of later treatments informing a ground-floor storefront and upper-story fenestration, as well as the construction of a gallery.

The building occupying this lot features party walls from 1850s, but the façade dates from 1935. As evidenced by surviving physical fabric and documentary photographs both the lower-story storefront and upper-story fenestrations have been altered. Terracotta walls surrounding them survive and only require cleaning. As evidenced by physical remains and period photographs, the 1935 storefront was originally defined by a much deeper alley-like entrance featuring large window displays. The Design Review Guidelines for the Lower Dauphin Commercial Historic District realize the evolutionary reality of commercial architecture when they state that properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved (See B-1.). The proportions and scaling of the storefront's bulkhead, window display, and transom take into the building and storefront treatments of nearby unaltered historic buildings. The adoption of a curved entrance would be more responsive to the historic character of the building.

Umbrages such as galleries and balconies have proven successful vehicles at recapturing historic integrity and introducing street level energy. These experiential constructions shelter the passerby from rain and rays alike. The Lower Dauphin Commercial District possesses numerous buildings which did not originally feature galleries and balconies, but have benefitted from their construction. The Design Review Guidelines for the Lower Dauphin Commercial District state that should there be documentation that a balcony or gallery existed, a balcony or gallery appropriate to the age and character of the building may be added (See B-3.). Though the balcony is designed to take into the relationship the ground-floor storefront, an intermediate sign belt, the upper-story, the railings are not reflective the streamlined design. A simpler railing would better reflect the original design.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

While the removal of later features and the renovation of the storefront do impair either the historical or architectural character of the building and the surrounding district in conceptual terms, the proposed balcony and entrance do take into account more streamlined features defining the surviving historical components of the façade. Based on B (1) and B (2), staff recommends the reintroduction a curvilinear element to the main entrance and the adoption of a simpler railing treatment. Those modifications would allow the design to not impair the building or the historic district.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Elise Poche was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Stone recused himself and departed the meeting room.

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner welcomed the applicant. He asked Ms. Poche if she had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Ms. Poche stated that she had sentimental attachment to the proposed ironwork and would like to incorporate said panels into the proposed gallery. Mr. Roberts noted that building's present façade was not the same date as the ironwork. Ms. Poche acknowledged Mr. Robert's realization, but noted that there existed earlier facades that predated the present one. Mr. Roberts asked Mr. Blackwell to clarify the intent behind the Staff Recommendation. Mr. Blackwell explained that while a gallery was not impairment in concept, the proposed railing treatment was not responsive to the modernistic design treatment of the façade's character defining features.

A discussion ensued as to the use of a curved entrance. Mr. Blackwell explained that the use of curved entrance was encouraged, but not required.

Mr. Holmes, Mr. Roberts, and Ms. Harden discussed the ironwork with regard to relief, design, and compatibility.

Ms. Poche provided the Board with renderings of a compromise design featuring isolated usage of some of the decorative panels. Said panels would be located between pickets of a more streamlined design. Mr. Blackwell stated that proposed design was responsive to the context.

Mr. Blackwell expressed his appreciation for what the applicant had accomplished for downtown at her previous establishment and thanked her for relocating to an even more prominent location.

Mr. Holmes and Ms. Harden entered into discussions regarding the swing of the door accessing the upper-story and the height of the gallery railings. Mr. Blackwell mentioned discussions of an earlier predevelopment meeting. Mr. Holmes explained that he wanted the applicant to be aware of possible concerns. Ms. Harden expressed a similar wish to help the applicant plan now for possible use.

No further Board discussion ensued.

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

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Holmes 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 not the use of revised gallery railing.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts 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.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 8/5/16

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2015-30-CA: Mardi Gras Market and Park (block bound by Government Street (N), Royal Street (E), Church Street (S), and Saint Emanuel Street (W)).

Applicant: Nicholas H. Holmes, III, of Holmes & Holmes Architects for the City of Mobile

Received: 7/13/15

Meeting: 8/5/15

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East

Classification: Non-Contributing

Zoning: Open

Project: Downtown Revitalization – Redevelop an urban Renewal altered lot as the site of a Mardi Gras themed market and park.

BUILDING HISTORY

This block has served Mobile and Mobile County in civic capacity for over 180 years. Courthouses constructed in the 1830’s, 1850’s, 1890’s, and 1950’s previously occupied portions and ultimately the whole of the block. Upon the demolition of the fifth Mobile County Courthouse, a regionally informed Modernist design by architect Thomas Cooper Van Antwerp, the lot has stood vacant.

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 6, 2010. At that meeting, the Board approved an application calling for the installation of bollards with suspended chains that would have encircled the grassed enclosure. The application up for review calls for the redevelopment of the site as a Mardi Gras themed municipal market and park.
- B. The New Construction Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The goal of new construction should be to blend into the historic district but to avoid creating a false sense of history by merely copying historic examples. The choice of materials and ornamentation for new construction is a good way for a new building to exert its own identity. By using historic examples as a point of departure, it is possible for new construction to use new materials and ornamentation and still fit into the historic district.”
 - 2. “Historic buildings feature the use of a variety of materials for roofs, foundations, wall cladding and architectural details. In new buildings, exterior materials – both traditional and modern - should closely resemble surrounding historic examples. Buildings in Mobile’s historic districts vary in age and architectural styles, dictating the materials to be used for new construction. Traditional building materials which are not present on nearby historic buildings or buildings in the area that contains only Victorian-era frame houses, a brick ranch-style house would be conspicuous and disrupt the area’s visual

continuity. Modern materials which have the same textural qualities and character as materials of nearby historic buildings may be acceptable.”

3. “PLACEMENT: Placement has two components: setback, the distance between the street and a building; and spacing, the distance between its property lines and adjacent structures. New construction should be placed on the lot so that setback and spacing approximate those of nearby historic buildings. New buildings should not be placed too far forward or behind the traditional “facade line”, a visual line created by the fronts of buildings along a street. An inappropriate setback disrupts the facade line and diminishes the visual character of the streetscape. Current setback requirements of the City of Mobile Zoning Ordinance may not allow the building to be placed as close to the street as the majority of existing buildings. If the traditional facade line or “average” setback is considerably less than allowed under the Zoning Ordinance, the Review Boards will support an application for a Variance from the Board of Adjustment to allow for new construction closer to the street and more in character with the surrounding historic buildings.”
4. “MASS: Building mass is established by the arrangement and proportion of its basic geometric components - the main building, wings and porches, the roof and the foundation. Similarity of massing helps create a rhythm along a street, which is one of the appealing aspects of historic districts. Therefore, new construction should reference the massing of forms of nearby historic buildings.”
5. “FOUNDATIONS: The foundation, the platform upon which a building rests, is a massing component of a building. Since diminished foundation proportions have a negative effect on massing and visual character, new buildings should have foundations similar in height to those of nearby historic buildings. In most historic residential areas, buildings are usually elevated above a crawl space on a pier foundation. Pier foundations are encouraged for new residential construction. When raised slab foundations are constructed, it is important that the height of the foundation relate to that of nearby historic buildings. For this reason, slab-on-grade foundations are not allowed for single family residences. For multi-family, where slab-on-grade is most practical, other design elements such as water tables and exaggerated bases can be effective in creating the visual appearance of a raised foundation.”
6. “MAIN BODY AND WINGS: Although roofs and foundations reinforce massing, the main body and wings are the most significant components. A building’s form or shape can be simple (a box) or complex (a combination of many boxes or projections and indentations). The main body of a building may be one or two stories. Secondary elements, usually porches or wings extend from the main building. These elements create the massing of a building. Interior floor and ceiling heights are reflected on the exterior of a building and should be compatible with nearby historic buildings.”
7. “ROOFS: A building’s roof contributes significantly to its massing and to the character of the surrounding area. New construction may consider, where appropriate, roof shapes, pitches and complexity similar to or compatible with those of adjacent historic buildings. Additionally roof designs of new residential buildings may incorporate eave overhang and trim details such as exposed rafters, soffits, cornice, fascia, frieze board, molding, etc. as those of nearby buildings.”
8. “SCALE: The size of a building is determined by its dimensions - height, width, and depth - which also dictate the building’s square footage. SCALE refers to a building’s size in relationship to other buildings - large, medium, and small. Buildings which are similar in massing may be very different in scale. To preserve the continuity of a historic district, new construction should be in scale with nearby historic buildings.”

9. “FAÇADE ELEMENTS: Facade elements such as porches, entrances, and windows make up the “face” or facade of a building. New construction should reflect the use of facade elements of nearby historic buildings.”
10. “Some architectural styles, such as those dating from the Victorian period, featured decorative elements in gables like barge boards and louvered vents. Later styles such as bungalows used decorative cornice brackets or show rafters as design elements. Depending on the character and style of new construction and its relation to surrounding historic structures, similar gable elements should be used.”
11. “The number and proportion of openings - windows and entrances - within the facade of a building creates a solid-to-void ratio (wall-to-opening). New buildings should use windows and entrances that approximate the placement and solid-to-void ratio of nearby historic buildings. In addition, designs for new construction should incorporate the traditional use of window casements and door surrounds. Where a side elevation is clearly visible from the street, proportion and placement of their elements will have an impact upon the visual character of the neighborhood and must be addressed in the design.”
12. “The degree of ornamentation used in new construction should be compatible with the degree of ornamentation found upon nearby historic buildings. Although new buildings should use decorative trim, window casings, and other building materials similar to nearby historic buildings, the degree of ornamentation should not exceed that characteristic of the area. Profile and dimensions of new material should be consistent with examples in the district.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

1. Redevelop a vacant municipal block into facility featuring a market and park.
2. Construct a market building.
 - a. The market building will be tripartite in composition.
 - b. A two-story central pavilion will be flanked by open wings.
 - c. The CMU stuccoed central pavilion will scored to resemble ashlar block.
 - d. The central pavilion’s roof will be concave in construction/pitch and sheathed with metal roofing panels.
 - e. Brackets will punctuate the blind entablature spread from the flared eaves.
 - f. The pavilion will be T-shaped in plan.
 - g. Decorative steel railings will extend around the North, East, and South Elevations and serve to enclose the more elevated portions of the building.
 - h. East Elevation
 - i. The East Elevation will extend the length of Royal Street.
 - ii. The elevated platform upon which the East Elevation rests will afford seating and obscure handicap access. The aforementioned base will be treated to resemble ashlar block and the seating will be concrete.
 - iii. A flight of steps flanked by antipodia will access the central pavilion.
 - iv. Steel handrails will be employed.
 - v. A shed-roofed porch will extend from the central pavilion. Metal roofing panels will sheath the porch.
 - vi. The three-bay porch will feature decorative steel colonettes and downward cresting-like valences.
 - vii. Three arcuated doors will define the wall of the central pavilion. All three doors will feature fanlights distinguished by steel grilles. Said doors will be cased in simple architraves or surrounds.

- viii. The central pavilions outer bays (recessed stems of the “T”-shaped composition) will not feature fenestration.
- ix. Five main and two smaller bays will extend to either side of the main central pavilion.
- x. These flanking and open pavilions will be supported by steel posts and feature downward cresting-like valances.
- xi. Truncated hipped roofs with clerestories will surmount these flanking wings.
- xii. The iron paneled clerestories will be punctuated by openings, surmounted by hipped roofs, and crowned by aluminum cresting-like railings.
- i. South Elevation
 - i. A flight of steps with flanking antipodia will front the South Elevation.
 - ii. A three bay advanced open form occupied by the market space will extend before the pavilion.
 - iii. The open bays will be defined by posts and downward cresting-like valances.
 - iv. The ashlar treated CMU faced body of the South Elevation will feature a two-story center section of the pavilion with flanking ramped wings.
 - v. Closed openings matching those on the East Elevation will provide access to the wings.
 - vi. The stepped hipped roof sequence of the open pavilion will inform the roofline.
- j. West Elevation
 - i. The West Elevation will extend the length of the inner block facing expanse.
 - ii. A shed-roofed porch will extend from the central pavilion. Metal roofing panels will sheath the porch.
 - iii. The three-bay porch will feature circular section cast-iron colonettes and downward cresting.
 - iv. Three arcuated bays will be defined the main pavilion. All units will feature fanlights distinguished by cast-iron grilles and will be cased in simple architraves or surrounds.
 - v. The central pavilion’s outer bays (recessed stems of the “T”-shaped composition) will not feature fenestration.
 - vi. Five main and two smaller bays will extend to either side of the main central pavilion.
 - vii. These flanking and open pavilions will be supported by iron posts and feature downward cresting-like valances.
 - viii. Truncated hipped roofs with clerestories surmount these flanking wings.
 - ix. The iron paneled clerestories will be punctuated by openings, surmounted by hipped roofs, and crowned by aluminum cresting-like railings.
- k. North Elevation
 - i. A flight of steps with flanking antipodia will front the South Elevation.
 - ii. A three bay advanced open form occupied by the market space will extend before the pavilion.
 - iii. The open bays will be defined by steel posts and feature downward cresting-like valances.
 - iv. The ashlar treated CMU faced body of the South Elevation will feature a two-story center section of the pavilion with flanking ramped wings.

- v. Arcuated doors matching those on the East Elevation will provide access to the wings.
 - vi. The stepped hipped roof sequence of the open pavilion will inform the roofline.
3. Develop a park.
 - a. The park will occupy the western portion of the site.
 - b. Flights of new steps with railings will offer access from the Government and Church Streets rights of way to the park.
 - c. Railings will extend along the park's Northern and Southern expanses.
 - d. Planters fronting the Market's West Elevation will define views into and from the park
 - e. The park will be centered on rectangular green space with concaved corners. Said green provides a North-South axis from Government to Church Streets and an East-West axis from Royal to Saint Emanuel Streets.
 - f. Cast-iron streetlights will punctuate and illuminate the park.
 - g. Mardi Gras Sculpture from Kern's Mardi Gras World of New Orleans will enliven plinths accessing/within the park.
 - h. A fountain will anchor the southern portion of the park. The fountain will defined by a curvilinear simulated ashlar wall.
 4. Install signage.
 5. Redefine the Urban Renewal altered the right of way.
 - a. Replace parallel parking with angled parking.
 - b. Repave and re-curve the right of way.
 - c. Brick accents emanating from and directing attention to architectonic features will enliven the right of way.
 - d. Install handicap access ramps.
 - e. Install a vehicular drop off of Government Street.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The New Commercial Construction Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that goal of sympathetic infill is to blend with the historic district, while avoiding creating a false sense of history by merely copying historic examples. The use of historic examples as a point of departure, it is possible for new construction use new materials and ornamentation and still fit into the historic district (See B-1.). To the aforementioned effect, the proposed design takes inspiration from, yet departs from the form, detail, and traditions of urban context, nearby historic buildings, and artisanal culture that typify downtown Mobile. The building's placement, massing, proportions, materials, and ornamentation exhibit a responsiveness to the historic (be it present or not) context.

With regard to placement, the New Commercial Construction Guidelines note that placement, the location of a building upon a lot, has two components: setback, the distance between the street and the building and spacing, the distance between buildings (See B-3). As per the former, the proposed Mardi Market respects the traditional "façade" line, which was the lot line for Government, Royal, and Church Streets. Such placement recaptures built density, while anchoring three major thoroughfares. A built presence extending the whole length of the Royal Street expanse also serves to bridge the gap between two historic districts and tie the Dauphin Street corridor to Fort Conde Village. The setback from Saint Emanuel Street offers respect to Christ Church Cathedral, the oldest Protestant Episcopal parish in the State of Alabama. The landscaped inner lot expanse stands opposite that noted house of worship and to one of side of a dead end ending a single block expanse of St. Emanuel Street. Coping walls (existing and proposed), walkways, and axes will provide definition to the landscaped portion of the ensemble.

Massing, which is established by the arrangement of basic parts geometric parts of a building, should reference that of nearby historic buildings (See B-4 and B-6.). Immediately opposite the proposed market stands Mobile's old City Hall and Southern Market. One of Mobile's two National Historic Landmarks (the highest form of recognition awarded a building by the National Parks Service), this highly significant Italianate compound features a façade informed by seven part compartmentalized plan. The three part plan of the proposed market responds in plan, elevation, and spirit to that earlier market standing just opposite. The mural nature of the central pavilion with its faux ashlar surfaces and the openness of flanking wings recapture built density, while still providing glimpses of historic buildings and street activity. The solid-to-void ratio is both symmetrical and regular. That traditional order is benefitted by compositions and casings sanctioned by tradition and expectation (See B-11.). The use of metal posts and ornamentation, as well as metal fencing, ties into Mobile's long tradition of and association with that early artisanal craft/industry. These façade and site elements reflect and recapture traditional forms (and by consequence experiences). The resulting street "faces" are historically informed (See B-9.).

As with old City Hall and Southern Market, the proposed market buildings would rest atop slightly raised foundations. The grade of the building would be adapted to the site. (See B-5.).

Roof shapes, pitches, and complexity may consider historic examples (See B-7.). The flaring roof structure reflects the whimsical spirit of the ensembles thematic association and the historical nature of the architectural sources. Mobile's "iron lace" galleries and pavilions were typically roofed with concave or convex metal roofing panels. Most surviving 19th-Century townhouses featured metal roofed galleries. The Bower and Huger House on nearby South Conception Street and the LeClede are just two nearby historic buildings that employ metal roofs. The iron pavilion that served as a focal point of Monroe Park, one of Mobile's early pleasure parks, featured a roof parapet and balustrade.

The arrangement of a building's parts ultimately informs a building's scale or its relationship to nearby buildings. New construction should be in scale with nearby historic buildings (See B-8.). From foundation to floor, floor to ceiling, and ceiling to roof, the proposed market building is so scaled to reflect the historic context.

The degree of ornamentation used in new construction should be compatible with the degree of ornamentation found on nearby historic buildings (See B-12.). The form and nature of the market building's ornamentation is at once geographically immediate and specific, as well as reflective and (at one time) pervasive to the historic context. Just as the massing and proportions of the old City Hall and Southern Market informed the massing of the proposed building so does that older building provide direction for the ornamentation. The classical picturesque use of arcuated forms, flaring eaves, bracketed elements on the new building is a direct response to its neighborhood opposite. These same motifs informed surviving townhouses. The use of cast constructions (porches), supports, and decorations, along with other metal components in the park, respects and builds upon a characteristic feature of Mobile's architectural patrimony.

While the preceding account largely takes into the built dimension of the proposal, the open space is equally important in potential improve recapture historical character and benefit future experience. From the reduction of right of way and access reengagement with Government Street, the site improvements bring users into ensemble. Sculptural components and signage attuned to the thematic association of the ensemble will serve provide direction and diversion. The brick and concrete hardscaping are appropriate the area.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-12), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the historic district. Staff recommends approval the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Carrie Maurin of Holmes and Holmes, Shayla Beaco with the City of Mobile were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Holmes recused himself from the discussion and departed the meeting room.

Ms. Harden recused herself from ruling on the application and joined the two other representatives so answer questions regarding the application.

Mr. Blackwell explained that the feature along the southern boundary of the park was not a fountain, but an enclosure surrounding excavated remains of the old fort.

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner welcomed the the City of Mobile's representative. He asked Ms. Maurin if she had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Ms. Beaco explained to the Board that the proposal before them was based on community feedback and assessment of other municipal markets. She stated that Mayor had visited complexes similar to proposed in Charleston, Savannah, and New Orleans. Ms. Beaco said that the intention was to provide Mobile with a market and park which builds upon strengths of the aforementioned examples. She noted that vision was to serve both locals and visitors alike.

Mr. Roberts praised the Mayor's office for taking the initiative to redevelop the property. He informed his fellow Board members that he had attended both of the public meetings that informed the proposal up for review. Mr. Roberts stated that much feedback was provided from a diverse group of stakeholders. He said that while the proposal was not what was originally intended, it was a good one. He noted that there was no one present to object to the application.

Ms. Beaco informed the Board that the complex was so designed and would be constructed so as to allow the ensemble to develop in a manner responsive to monies and usage.

Discussion ensued as to the some of the materials proposed.

Elevations, specifications, and renderings were consulted.

Mr. Stone inquired about the signage. Mr. Blackwell said the signage was not up for review at the present juncture.

Mr. Allen asked for clarification as to main pavilion's roof. Mr. Blackwell cited the sources. Ms. Maurin explained that the pitch had changed.

Discussion ensued as to the timing of construction.

No further Board discussion ensued.

Mr. Wagoner asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no comments from the audience, Mr. Wagoner 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, amending facts to note that feature defined the southern portion of the park would enclose remnants of the old fort.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts 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.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 8/5/16