

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
August 7, 2013 – 3:00 P.M.
Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Harris Oswalt, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
Members Present: Robert Allen, Thomas Karwinski, Harris Oswalt, Craig Roberts, Steve Stone, and Jim Wagoner.
Members Absent: Kim Harden, Carolyn Hasser, Nick Holmes III, Bradford Ladd, Craig Roberts, and Janetta Whitt-Mitchell.
Staff Members Present: Devereaux Bemis, Cart Blackwell, and John Lawler.
2. Mr. Karwinski moved to approve the minutes of the June 19, 2013 meeting. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
3. Mr. Karwinski moved to approve the midmonth COA's granted by Staff. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED

1. **Applicant: David Naman**
 - a. Property Address: 270 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/11/13
 - c. Project: Repair deteriorated stuccowork to match the existing in composition and plane. Repaint building per the submitted color scheme. The trim will be white. The body will be Fioli (yellow). The columns and faces will be gold.
2. **Applicant: Nofio Pecoraro**
 - a. Property Address: 14 Kenneth Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/11/13
 - c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork to match existing in profile, dimension, and material.
3. **Applicant: Joe Godwin**
 - a. Property Address: 951 Old Shell Road
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/13/13
 - c. Project: Powerwash the building and touch up the color scheme per the existing hue.
4. **Applicant: Randall and Cathy Hayes**
 - a. Property Address: 1223 Selma Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/12/13
 - c. Project: Put up all shutters. Repaint shutters black and porch/steps deck dark gray. Paint the front door black.
5. **Applicant: Alver Carlson**
 - a. Property Address: 1653 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/12/13
 - c. Project: Paint the house, body Hotel Street St Francis, the trim and accents Flaming Torch, and the shutters brown, columns and balustrade white. Repair/replace deteriorated woodwork to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Reroof to match the existing. Remove fretwork added in the 1980s.
6. **Applicant: Lea Verneuille with WAV Architects for Elizabeth S. Sanders**
 - a. Property Address: 212 South Cedar Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/15/13

- c. Project: Renew a Certificate of Appropriateness dated 11 July 2012. The COA calls for the construction of a rear addition, dormers, and an ancillary building. Repaint the house per the existing color scheme. Change the window color to match the trim.
- 7. Applicant: Irvin Grodsky**
- a. Property Address: 7 North Hamilton Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/15/13
- c. Project: Re-point deteriorated brickwork with appropriate mortar. Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint the woodwork per the existing color scheme. Secure and/or replace deteriorated mothballing measures. Reroof the building to match the existing.
- 8. Applicant: Irvin Grodsky**
- a. Property Address: 450 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/15/13
- c. Project: Repair gutters when and where necessary. Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Touch up the paint per the existing color scheme.
- 9. Applicant: Clarence and Gwen Henderson**
- a. Property Address: 1701 Church Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/17/13
- c. Project: Construct a wooden deck off the rear elevation per submitted plan.
- 10. Applicant: L Craig Roberts for Dr. John and Mrs. Joan Dixon**
- a. Property Address: 1059 Palmetto Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/18/13
- c. Project: Remove a six foot wooden wall located to the rear of the inner lot house. Construct a six foot tall stone wall on the location of the aforementioned wall. Construct a fountain before the wall.
- 11. Applicant: Michael Pittillo**
- a. Property Address: 1504 Brown Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/19/13
- c. Project: Replace porch decking to match, and then paint.
- 12. Applicant: Susan Caffer**
- a. Property Address: 117 Gilbert Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/19/13
- c. Project: Reroof a portion of the roof to match the existing.
- 13. Applicant: Jerry's Piping and Fabrication for David McConnell Contracting**
- a. Property Address: 150 Government Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/19/13
- c. Project: Replace the support posts (12 structural pipe columns) on 2nd floor. Paint repairs.
- 14. Applicant: Carl Freeman**
- a. Property Address: 160 South Cedar Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/19/13
- c. Project: Construct an 8' x 10' wood deck centered on rear of house. Deck will not be visible from the public right of way. There will be no handrail unless required by code.
- 15. Applicant: Ethel Keeble**
- a. Property Address: 259 Charles Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/22/13
- c. Project: Paint the two-story garage the same colors to match the existing. Repair rotten wood around windows and garage doors. Replace small side door and repair broken window. All repairs to match the exiting in profile, dimension and materials.

16. Applicant: Shannon Truly

- a. Property Address: 956 Church Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/22/13
- c. Project: Repaint body Olympic Dark Sage, the front door and sash Spanish Tile and the foundation black.

17. Applicant: Rennie Brabner on the behalf of Mary Ann and Laura Brabner

- a. Property Address: 316 North Conception Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/22/13
- c. Project: Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in composition, profile, and dimension. Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated window sashes to match the existing in composition, construction, material, and dimensions. Repaint per the existing color scheme.

18. Applicant: James Earl Robertson

- a. Property Address: 1004 Oak Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/24/13
- c. Project: Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint the house per the existing color scheme.

19. Applicant: Carrie Russell

- a. Property Address: 1562 Old Shell Road
- b. Date of Approval: 7/24/13
- c. Project: Remove a section of chain link fence. Install a six foot wooden privacy fence on the location of the aforementioned chain link fencing.

20. Applicant: Jerry Graham

- a. Property Address: 10-12 Saint Emanuel Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/24/13
- c. Project: Reroof the building to match the existing.

21. Applicant: David Calametti

- a. Property Address: 1710-1714 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/24/13
- c. Project: Change the color of the existing awning from green to black.

22. Applicant: Bryan Robertson

- a. Property Address: 153 South Jefferson Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/26/13
- c. Project: Replace earlier 6 foot fence with fence to match the new fence. Change metal gate to wood to match fence. Replace decking on rear porch to match existing.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2016-53-CA: 202 Roper Street

- a. Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley for John Holmes Smith, IV
- b. Project: Fenestration – Construct dormers on a side elevation.

APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2013-54-CA: 60 South Conception Street

- a. Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley with Douglas Burtu Kearley Architect for Rose McPhillips
- b. Project: Reconfigure a later balcony.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

3. 2015-55-CA: 168 Hannon Avenue

- a. Applicant: Anita Winn for Candace Harsany
- b. Project: Restore and alter a front porch – Construct a support post, install railings, and install another set of steps.

APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

4. 2013-56-CA: 257 North Jackson Street

- a. Applicant: Lucy Barr for Mr. and Mrs. Peter F. Burns
- b. Project: Alteration of previously approved plans – Infill portions of side galleries.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

5. 2014-58-CA: 1653 Spring Hill Avenue

- a. Applicant: Lon Lindquist for Marquette Development Corporation
- b. Project: Demolition – Demolish a non-contributing office building.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

6. 2017-59-CA: 25 McPhillips Avenue

- a. Applicant: Chris Meztista
- b. Project: Roofing – Install a metal roof.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

7. 2013-57-CA: 1001 Augusta Street

- a. Applicant: Kevin Cross
- b. Project: After-the-Fact-Approval - Retain an ancillary building.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

8. 2018-60-CA: 1051 Texas Street

- a. Applicant: Restore Mobile
- b. Project: New Construction – Construct a single family residence.

APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

9. 2018-61-CA: 1053 Texas Street

- a. Applicant: Restore Mobile
- b. Project: New Construction – Construct a single family residence.

APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

10. 2018-62-CA: 1055 Texas Street

- a. Applicant: Restore Mobile
- b. Project: New Construction – Construct a single family residence.

APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

- 1. Discussion

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2013-53-CA: 202 Roper Street
Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley with Douglas Burtu Kearley Architect for John Holmes Smith, IV
Received: 7/22/13
Meeting: 8/7/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Fenestration – Construct dormers off of a side elevation.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to research located within the MHDC's property files, this single-story side hall with a recessed rear wing was constructed in 1903. The house was enlarged during the 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 has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The application calls for the construction of dormers on the South (side) Elevation.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation and the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts and Government Street state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. "New additions, exterior alterations, and related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment."
 - 2. "New additions and adjacent 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."
 - 3. "A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Original or historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof should be maintained. Materials should be appropriate to the form and pitch and color."
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
 - 1. Construct three dormers of the South (side) Elevation.
 - a. The three side-facing dormers will feature gabled roofs.
 - b. The roofing shingles will match those found on the body of the house.
 - c. The dormers will be faced with wooden clapboards.

- d. The aforementioned clapboards will match those found on the body of the house.
- e. The two outermost dormers will feature six-over-six wooden windows.
- f. The central dormer will feature a six light transom window

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of three dormers. The dormers would be located off a side elevation. In accord with the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts, the original pitch and form of the roof existing roof will remain the same (See B-3). The siding and roofing materials will match those found on the body of the house. The construction of the dormers will have minimal impact on the public view.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Douglas Kearley was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed the applicant's representative. He asked Mr. Kearley if he had any comments to make, questions to ask, or clarifications to address. Mr. Kearley answered no.

Mr. Wagoner pointed out that the street address should be changed from 202 George Street to 202 Roper Street. Mr. Blackwell acknowledged the discrepancy on his part.

Mr. Oswalt asked his fellow Board members if they had any additional questions to ask the applicant's representative.

Mr. Karwinski asked Mr. Kearley what type of light configuration would be used on the windows. Mr. Karwinski made the observation that house has four-over-four windows. He said that the drawings of the proposed dormers depict the same. Mr. Kearley said that four-over-four light windows would be employed. Mr. Blackwell acknowledged the discrepancy on his part.

No further discussion ensued.

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

FINDING OF FACT

Steve 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 actual address and the use of four-over-four as opposed to six-over-six light windows.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 8/7/14

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2013-54-CA: 60 South Conception Street
Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley with Douglas Burtu Kearley Architect for Rose McPhillips
Received: 7/9/13
Meeting: 8/7/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Alter a later balcony.

BUILDING HISTORY

This 1854 residence is arguably among the most urbane of Mobile's extant 19th-Century townhouses. Located right off the street and possessing a London-informed distribution of rooms (dining room on the ground floor and "parlor" on the floor above), the three-story row house features a façade of pressed Philadelphia bricks and an extensive service wing.

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 16, 1989. At that time, the Board approved the removal of the original cantilevered balcony and the construction of the present balcony. The owner/applicant returns to the Board with a proposal calling for the alteration of the balcony.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. "New additions, exterior alterations, and related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment."
 - 2. "New additions and adjacent 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."
 - 3. "Changes that create a false sense of historical development such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings shall not be undertaken."
 - 4. "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."
 - 5. "The form and shape of the porch and its roof should maintain their historic appearance. The materials should blend with the style of the building."

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans and details):

1. Alter a later balcony.
 - a. Remove a later railing.
 - b. Install a new railing.
 - c. Install a concave standing seam copper roof over the balcony.
 - d. Four cast iron supports will support the roof.
 - e. Cast iron spandrels will bracket the posts.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves alterations to a later balcony. The proposed work includes the replacement of the existing railing and the construction canopied gallery. While the Design Review Guidelines do not specifically address alterations to later porches (See B 4-5), the Secretary of the Interior's Standards state that changes that create a false sense of historical development shall be avoided (See B-3). The building at one time featured a cantilevered gallery. Physical evidence indicates an overhang of some sort extended over said gallery. The installation of traditional detailing onto the present gallery could cause the gallery to "read" as a historical feature.

Staff notes the apparent remains of a covering at the second story level. However there is no indication what the configuration or design was. In creating the proposed historical covered balcony a false sense of history will be created. When the National Park Service reviewed the balcony for a tax credit, this was a major concern. In response, the Park Service required alterations to the balcony to indicated it was not historic. In this case with the complete change in decoration, the use of a contemporary design would meet the requirements of the Park Service and allow the owner to have the balcony she desires.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-3), Staff believes the proposed balcony would impair the architectural and historical character of the building and the district and violate the guidelines established by the Park Service. Staff does not recommend of the application as it is proposed, but encourages the applicant to consider the use of a more contemporary treatment to achieve the desired goal.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Douglas B. Kearley was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

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

Mr. Kearley distributed photographs of buildings that the Board has approved: the construction of balconies on buildings which historically never featured balconies; the (re)construction of historically informed galleries; and the construction of galleries on buildings that featured cantilevered balconies.

The Board discussed the earliest known treatment of the building's façade.

Mr. Bemis informed the Board of the history of the existing balcony. He told the Board that the applicant had encountered difficulties when she applied for a historic tax credit. Mr. Bemis said that a compromise

had been reached and pointed out that while the Board had approved balconies of many designs, the Secretary of the Interior's Standards provide the basis upon which decisions should be made.

A discussion on the degree to which an alteration should be differentiated from the historic fabric ensued.

Mr. Roberts stated that while others might take issue with the design, he did not.

No further Board discussion ensued.

Mr. Oswalt asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Two observers complimented the design.

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 approved. Mr. Karwinski voted in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 8/7/14

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2013-55-CA: 168 Hannon Avenue
Applicant: Anita Winn for Candace Harsany
Received: 7/22/13
Meeting: 8/7/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Install a middle support on the front porch and side steps. Alter treatments for the proposed for the front steps. Due to staff error, the applicant is amending her original application for treatment of the porch and front steps.

BUILDING HISTORY

This Arts and Crafts influenced “bungalow” dates from the first quarter of the 20th Century.

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 alterations to house’s front porch.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation and the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “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 the handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details.”
- C. Scope of Work :
 - 1. Restore and alter a front porch.
 - a. Remove the aluminum wrapping from the front porch’s two battered posts.
 - b. Repair and where necessary replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material.
 - c. Remove the existing center support (a later alteration).
 - d. Construct a new center support that will match the two original outer pier-topped pedestal posts with regard to design, proportion, material, and treatment.
 - e. Construct a new brick steps off the porch’s North Elevation. The steps will feature picketed railings.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves alterations to a front porch. The Design Review Guidelines state that historic porches should be maintained and repaired to reflect their period (See B-1). The proposed alterations are structural and aesthetic in scope. As with many “bungalows”, this house’s porch feature long extremely long and uninterrupted columnar bays. As the years have passed, bays such as this long single bay have sagged. The proposed intermediate support would match the two original end supports. Aluminum wraps have already been partially removed and by consequence exposing the original moldings and profiles. Later intermediate supports that are not of the same scale and quality as the house would be removed for the new supporting pier. Ordinarily staff would support a contemporary design to the porch column. However, staff believes that solution would create a jarring affect similar to what is now present. Therefore, staff believes that in this instance a support based on historic precedent is a better solution. The construction of a flight of side steps accessing the porch would not adversely impact the house.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Anita Winn was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

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

Ms. Winn informed the Board that based on communications from Staff, the applicant had agreed to alter the proposal. Ms. Winn distributed drawings depicting the application as amended. These revised drawings featured railings only at the existing and proposed steps.

Mr. Karwinski took issue with the Staff recommendation. He said that as proposed the application does impair the architectural and the historical character of the building and the surrounding district. He said that by changing the porch from a single to a double bay configuration a false sense of history would be created. He recommended removing the siding from the front gable and add two layers of plywood to the gable stud wall and existing beam to make that gable act as a truss between the two original existing columns instead of adding an additional support.

Ms. Winn stated that porch needed support. Mr. Roberts agreed with Ms. Winn as per the need for support. He noted that Mr. Karwinski takes a purist approach. Mr. Karwinski showed Ms. Winn and the board an alternative design that would prevent sagging.

Ms. Winn noted that she was simply following the Staff’s recommendation as per the railing. Mr. Roberts stated that the isolated use of handrails as proposed in the revised application would make for an awkwardness of appearance.

Mr. Bemis brought to the Board’s attention earlier Board rulings regarding the construction of railings on porches. Mr. Allan attested to one instance on North Reed in which one had been denied.

Mr. Roberts suggested the use of simple iron railings.

No further Board discussion ensued.

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

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. 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, amending facts to note that wooden railings would not be used and metal stair railings could be employed. Staff was authorized to review the railing.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Wagoner 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 was approved. Mr. Karwinski voted in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 8/7/14

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2013-56-CA: 257 North Jackson Street
Applicant: Lucy Barr for Mr. and Mrs. Peter F. Burns
Received: 7/22/13
Meeting: 8/7/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: DeTonti Square
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Alteration to previously approved plans – Infill portions of side galleries.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to early 20th-Century Sanborn Maps, a frame house occupied this vacant lot. The house was demolished sometime after 1955.

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 May 20, 2013. At that time, the Board approved the construction of a single family residence. The applicant’s representative returns to the Board with a proposal calling for the alteration to the approved plans. This altered application involves the installation of glazed infill in the approved side galleries.
- B. The Guidelines for New Residential Construction in Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. In order to coexist in harmony with adjacent structures in the historic districts, porches are strongly encouraged. Porches often create a visual cadence along the street. Designs of new porches should also reference porch locations, proportion, rhythm, roof form, supports, steps, rails and ornamentation. Porches of new buildings should be similar in height and width to porches of nearby historic buildings. Proper care should be taken in the detailing of new porches. Scale, proportion and character of elements such as porch columns, corner brackets, railings, pickets, etc... should be compatible to with adjacent historic structures.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Enclose a portion of the North Elevation’s lower gallery.
 - a. The first-story’s enclosure will be situated roughly at the midpoint of the gallery.
 - b. The East Elevation (Façade) will feature glazed double doors with flanking sidelights and transoms. This entrance bay will be slightly recessed from the front plane of the abutting porch pier.

- c. The North Elevation will be comprised of two bays featuring tripartite groupings composed of lower paneled fields and upper glazed (fixed) window units. The tripartite configurations will be slightly recessed from the front planes of the flanking porch posts/piers.
 - d. The West Elevation (Rear) will feature a single glazed and paneled window unit paired with a glazed door surmounted by a transom.
2. Enclose a portion of the North Elevation's upper gallery.
- a. The second-story's enclosure will be located in the back half of the gallery.
 - b. The East Elevation (Façade) will feature a glazed multi-light double door with a surmounting multi light transom. This entrance bay will be slightly recessed from the abutting porch post.
 - c. The North Elevation will be comprised of two irregular bays featuring tripartite and paired groupings composed of lower paneled and upper glazed multi-light casement window units. The tripartite
 - d. The South (Rear) Elevation will feature three multi-light casement windows.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application concerns alterations to previously approved plans. The approved plans for the construction of this residential building called for a wraparound porch. While the revised plans retain the porch, portions of the side galleries would be enclosed. Not directly impacting the public view and retaining the feel of porch (porch post will be retained in the design as pilaster-like piers and the wall expanses will be recessed between the aforementioned), the proposed changes do not adversely impact the historic district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Lucy Barr and Peter Burns were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed the applicant and his representative. He asked Mr. Burns and Ms. Barr if they had any comments to make, questions to ask, or clarifications to address.

Both Mr. Burns and Ms. Barr answered no.

No further Board discussion ensued.

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

FINDING OF FACT

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Stone moved that, 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 approved. Mr. Karwinski voted in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 8/7/14

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2013-57-CA: 1653 Spring Hill Avenue
Applicant: Lon Lindquist for Marquette Development Corporation
Received: 7/16/13
Meeting: 8/7/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Demolition – Demolish a non-contributing office building

BUILDING HISTORY

This building dates from the later third of the 20th Century.

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. Two arson-related fires gutted the interior and claimed portions of the roof of the vacant dwelling. The owner/applicant proposes the demolition of the 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;
 - 1. This expansive office building dates from the latter half of the 20th Century. The building is a non-contributing structure located within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District.
 - ii. The importance of the structures to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;

1. While this building contributes to the built density of the surrounding historic district, the area upon which it stands changed significantly over the over the latter half of the 20th Century.
 - iii. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
 1. The building materials are capable of being reproduced.
 - 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. Several notable office complexes and building were constructed during the period. This building does not rank among the better examples.
 - 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 building would be demolished, the debris would be removed, the site would be leveled, and sod would be planted.
 - vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 1. The owner acquired the property on November 5, 1993 for a purchase price of \$450,000.
 - vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 1. The owner attempted to sell the property with building still standing, but the building's condition proved a stumbling block for potential purchasers.
 - viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 1. The property is listed for sale at purchase price of \$450,000. No offers have been received.
 - 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 the submitted materials.
2. *Post demolition or relocation plans required.* In no event shall the board entertain any application for the demolition or relocation of any historic property unless the applicant also presents at the same time the post-demolition or post-relocation plans for the site."

C. Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):

1. Demolish a non-contributing office building.
2. Remove the debris.
3. Level the site.
4. Plant sod.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the demolition of a non-contributing office building. When reviewing demolition applications, the following considerations are taken into account: the architectural significance of the building; the condition of the building; the effect the demolition will have on the streetscape; and the nature of any proposed redevelopment.

While a number of distinctive modern office buildings and complexes were constructed and survive in this area, this building is not among the more significant of the genre. By virtue of its elevated placement and simple façade, the non-contributing structure does not engage the passerby.

The roof of the building requires repair. Vagrants have caused considerable damage to the interior. Despite repeated attempts to secure the building and sell the property, deterioration continues.

If granted demolition approval, the applicants would demolish the structure, remove the debris, level the lot, and plant sod.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Barbara Malkove was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

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

Ms. Malkove explained that the owner had attempted to sell the property. She noted the condition of the buildings, as well as issues caused by transients who have taken up residence there and looted it.

Mr. Karwinski asked if the parking lot would be removed. Ms. Malkove answered yes.

Mention of the lot maintenance was made. Ms. Malkove stated that the lot would be maintained. She said that she hoped that it would be purchased by someone interested in redeveloping the site.

No further Board discussion ensued.

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

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. 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: 8/7/14

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2013-58-CA: 25 McPhillips Street
Applicant: Chris Meztista
Received: 7/22/13
Meeting: 8/1/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Reroofing – Reroof the house with metal roofing panels.

BUILDING HISTORY

This Arts and Crafts informed bungalow dates from 1930.

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 August 12, 1987. At that time, the Board approved the construction of a rear addition.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Original or historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof should be maintained. Materials should be appropriate to the form and pitch and color.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
 - 1. Remove the asbestos tiles currently sheathing the roof.
 - 2. Install 5-V crimp metal roofing panels.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the installation of a metal roof. Applications for metal roofs are reviewed on a case by case basis. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s state that a roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Materials should be appropriate to the form, pitch, and color of the roof (See B-1).

This house is surmounted by two low-pitched gable roofs. One gable is perpendicular to the street and the second is positioned parallel to the street. The roofs intersect toward the front of the dwelling.

5-V crimp panels have been approved on previous applications on account of the fewer number and lower height of their dividing seams. The Board has also discussed the number of spaces of intermediate ridges. Metal roofs were employed throughout the late 19th Century and early 20th Century, but during 20th-

Century metal roofs were largely restricted to less high style dwellings. Houses influenced by national trends, such as this example, employed other alternatives. This house was sheathed in asbestos or concrete tiles. The dimensional nature of the shingle effect was at once a product of the market but also a trickledown effect of Arts and Crafts theory. Undifferentiated metal sheets would alter the visual integrity of the house. The Board has approved a metal roof on only one bungalow and that was due to the roof's configuration and its minimum visibility from the street. This house has neither condition to warrant an exception to its historic character.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Chris Meztista was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

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

Mr. Meztista answered yes. He distributed to the Board pictures of houses located on his street and in the general vicinity that feature metal roofs to the Board.

After referencing a portion of the Staff Report, Mr. Karwinski agreed with the applicant. He stated that the houses located at 18 and 20 McPhillips Avenue have metal roofs and that they had been approved by Staff. He posed the question why should the subject property be denied.

Mr. Stone referenced the quality and character of the building. Mr. Roberts noted that some of the buildings depicted in the photographs provided by the applicant were of the same quality as the subject dwelling.

Mr. Meztista noted several exceptions with the Staff Report. Mr. Blackwell noted and acknowledged the discrepancies on his part.

Mr. Bemis cited earlier Board rulings. He said that if the Board approved the project they would be affecting a policy shift. Mr. Allan mentioned the recent approval of a metal roof installed on Selma Street. It was noted that the aforementioned metal roof features individual panels.

Mr. Blackwell suggested (if financial feasible) that the applicant and the Board consider the a similar treatment for this application. Mr. Meztista told the Board that he had already investigated metal tiles, but they were cost prohibitive. He then stated that the proposed roof would match other roofs in the vicinity.

Mr. Oswalt asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. An observer stated that metal roofs were cost and environmentally effective.

Mr. Roberts said that the Board addresses concerns of architectural and historical integrity.

No further Board discussion ensued.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Robert 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 amended by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 8/7/14

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2013-59-CA: 1001 Augusta Street
Applicant: Kevin Cross
Received: 7/9/13
Meeting: 8/7/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: After-the-Fact-Approval – Retain an unauthorized ancillary structure.

BUILDING HISTORY

This wooden side hall with wing house dates from 1870.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on March 20, 2013. At that time, the Board approved the installation of fencing. This application involves the after-the-fact-approval of the construction of an ancillary building. This application appears before the Board as a result of a 311 call.
- B. The Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “An ancillary 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 design and scale of the main building.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted materials):
 - 1. Retain an unauthorized ancillary structure
 - a. The building expands upon the footprint of an earlier storage building.
 - b. The building is taller than the previous building that occupied the location due in part to a different roof configuration.
 - c. The building features a gabled roof which is sheathed with asphalt shingles.
 - d. The building feature fenestration salvaged from the earlier building. The North Elevation will feature a paneled door with flanking six-over-six windows.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the unauthorized construction of an ancillary building. An earlier shed roof outbuilding was demolished without approval. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic

Districts state that ancillary construction should complement the design and scale of the principle building (See B-1). This building sits atop the expanded footprint of an earlier ancillary building. Constructed during the latter half of 20th Century, the earlier building was lower in height and featured a shed roof. The scale and proportion of the building are more in keeping with the principle residence. It should be noted that building alters the view into the block when viewed from Augusta Street. The materials are appropriate for ancillary construction. Staff was concerned that the expansion of the building blocked the window of the neighboring house. However, the neighbor has made no complaint or contacted the office.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Kevin Cross was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

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

Mr. Cross explained the reasons motivating the construction of the new storage building, as well as how the building differs from its predecessor. He stated the earlier building featured a low-pitched roof that deteriorated the structure of not only the building, but also the adjacent garage. Mr. Cross added that building's footprint had expanded to the north and the west. He said the new building is taller and the roof pitch is higher.

Mr. Wagoner asked Mr. Cross if he had received a building permit. Mr. Cross answered no. Mr. Wagoner explained to Mr. Cross that if he had gone to Permitting he would have been informed that he needed to first receive approval from the Mobile Historic Development Commission.

Mr. Oswalt asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Kaye Cruthirds, a neighbor, addressed the Board. She explained that among the materials submitted by another neighbor was a statement that her view of Washington Square had been obstructed. Ms. Cruthirds assured the Board that it had not.

Upon hearing no further comments, Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

Steve Stone moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report as written.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Stone moved that, 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.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 8/7/14

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2013-60-CA: 1051 Texas Street
Applicant: Restore Mobile
Received: 7/22/13
Meeting: 8/7/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Non-Contributing (vacant lot)
Zoning: R-1
Project: New Construction – Construct a new house.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to the 20th-Century Sanborn Maps, a shotgun dwelling was located on the rear portion of this property.

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 vacant lot has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. Restore Mobile proposes the construction of a single family residence
- B. The Guidelines for New Residential Construction in Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “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 “façade line”, a visual line created by the fronts of buildings along a street. An inappropriate setback disrupts the façade line and diminishes the visual character of the streetscape.”
 - 2. “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.”
 - 3. “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. 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.”

4. “Although roofs and foundations reinforce massing, the main body and wings are the most significant components. A building’s form or shape (a box) or a 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.”
5. “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 compatible with those of adjacent historic buildings. Additionally roof designs of new residential construction may incorporate eave overhang or trim details such as exposed rafters, cornice, fascia, frieze board, mouldings, etc. as those of nearby buildings.”
6. “The size of a building is determined by its dimensions which also dictate square footage. SCALE refers to a building’s size in relationship to other buildings – large, medium, small. To preserve the continuity of a historic district, new construction should be in scale with nearby historic buildings.”
7. “Façade elements such as porches, entrances, and windows make up the “face” or façade of a building. New construction should reflect the use of façade elements of nearby historic buildings.”
8. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. In order to coexist in harmony with adjacent historic structures in the historic districts, porches are strongly encouraged. Designs for new porches should also reference historic porch location, proportion, rhythm, roof form, supports, rails, and ornamentation. Porches of new buildings should also be similar in height and width to porches of nearby historic buildings. Proper care should be taken in the detailing of new porches. Scale, proportion and character of elements such as porch columns, corner brackets, railings, pickets, etc. should be compatible with adjacent historic structures. Wood or a suitable substitute material should be used. In addition, elements such as balconies, cupolas, chimneys, dormers, and other elements can help integrate a new structure with the neighborhood when used at the proper scale.”
9. “The number of and proportion of openings – windows and entrances – within the façade 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 windows casements and door surrounds. Where a side elevation is clearly visible from the street, proportions and placement of their elements will have an impact upon the visual character of the neighborhood and must be addressed in the design.”
10. “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 districts. Historic buildings feature the use of materials for roofs, foundations, wall cladding and architectural details 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 buildings which are

not present on nearby historic buildings or buildings in the area that contain only Victorian-era houses, a brick ranch-style house would be inconspicuous and disrupts the area's visual continuity. Modern materials which have the same textural qualities and character as materials of nearby historic buildings may be acceptable."

11. "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 the 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 the examples in the district."
12. The type, size and dividing light of windows, and their location and configuration (rhythm) help establish historic character of a building and compatibility with adjacent structures. Traditionally designed windows openings generally have a raised surround on frame buildings. New construction methods should follow this method in the historic districts as opposed to designing window openings that are flush with the wall."
13. Often one of the most important decorative features, doorways reflect the architectural style of a building. The design of doors and doorways can help establish the character of a building and compatibility with adjacent facades. Some entrances in Mobile's historic districts have special features such as transoms and decorative elements framing the openings. Careful consideration should be given to incorporating such elements in new construction."
15. "New materials that are an evolution of historic materials, such as Hardiplank concrete siding or a simulated stucco finish, should suggest profile, dimension and finish of historic materials. True materials such as brick, wood siding, or stucco are encouraged. Some synthetic materials, such as fiberglass porch columns may be appropriate in individual cases as approved by the Review Board."
16. "Modern paving materials are acceptable in the Historic Districts. However, it is important that the design, location, and materials be compatible with the property. Landscaping can often assist in creating an appropriate setting. The appearance of parking areas should be minimized. "

C. Scope of Work (Per Submitted Plans):

1. Construct a single family residence.
 - a. The one-story residence will measure 30' in width and 52' in depth.
 - b. The building will measure 25' in height
 - c. 18" tall brick-veneered foundation piers will support the house
 - d. Boxed and recessed wooden lattice foundation panels will extend between the aforementioned foundation piers.
 - e. The house will feature hardiboard siding.
 - f. The house will feature one-over-one aluminum clad wooden windows.
 - g. The window and door bays will feature simple and molded surrounds.
 - h. The horizontal and raked portions of the cornice will feature simple moldings.
 - i. A north-south oriented gable roof will surmount the house.
 - j. Asphalt shingles will sheath the roof.
 - k. North Elevation (Façade)
 - i. The North Elevation will be fronted by a three bay porch.
 - ii. Four chamfered posts will define the porch bays.
 - iii. A flight of wooden steps featuring picketed railings will access the porch.
 - iv. The North Elevation will feature three fenestrated bays. A centrally located door will be flanked by one-over-one windows. The aforementioned door will either be two vertical lights over two panels.

- v. The North Elevation's gable will be faced with board-and-batten siding.
 - vi. Asphalt shingles will sheath the continuous return cornice.
 - vii. A louvered vent will punctuate the gable.
- l. East Elevation
 - i. The East Elevation will feature three one-over-one windows.
- m. South (Rear) Elevation
 - i. The South Elevation will feature three fenestrated bays. From east to west, the fenestration is as follows: a pair of double French doors; a transom window; and a one-over-one window.
 - ii. A small rear deck will be located off the French door unit. Support on wooden pier interspersed with boxed and recessed lattice skirting, the deck will feature as single flight of south-facing steps featuring a picketed railing.
 - iii. The South Elevation's gable will be faced with board-and-batten siding.
 - iv. Asphalt shingles will sheath the continuous return cornice.
 - v. A louvered vent will punctuate the gable.
- n. West Elevation
 - i. The West Elevation will feature a single transom window and two one-over-one windows.
- 2. Install hardscaping.
 - i. A concrete walkway will extend from the inner edge of the reinstated sidewalk to the front steps
 - ii. A 20' to 24' curb cut located off of Chatham Street will allow access to rear parking pad.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of a single family residence on a vacant lot. Applications for new residential construction must meet the criteria outlined in the Guidelines for New Residential Construction in Mobile's Historic Districts. The Goal of the New Residential Construction Guidelines is to integrate new buildings in historic settings.

The proposed new construction meets municipal setback requirements and adopts the traditional façade line of nearby residential buildings (See B-1). Porch fronted and gabled surmounted in design, the house adopts the form of popular late 19th Century/20th-Century residential typology. Comparable examples can be cited in and around Mobile's historic districts, as well as throughout the region. The overall massing is comparable to nearby historical examples and is in scale with the historic context (See B 2, 5, and 6). The materials are in compliance with the Design Guidelines (See B-10). The mass and scale of the buildings is in keeping with historic buildings. Along with a near twin proposed for the adjacent lot to the west (See 2013-60-CA: 1053 Texas Street), the three bay rhythm of the porch and fenestrated bays is in keeping with the appearance and experience of this section of the Oakleigh Garden District (See B 7, 8, 9, 12 and 13). Constructed in hardiboard, a material approved for new construction and additions in Mobile's Historic Districts, and simple in treatment, the building is traditional in appearance, yet contemporary in its simplicity (See B-15).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-16), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building. Staff recommends approval of this application.¹

¹ On account of his being a Board member of the Restore Mobile Revolving Fund, MDHD Executive Director Devereaux Bemis did not take a substantive part in the review of this application but did review for accuracy.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Debbie Coleman, Fred Rendfrey, and Tilmon Brown were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

At the start of the application, Mr. Karwinski recused himself from the discussion. Claiming previous involvement with the Texas Street project, he left the room. The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed the Restore Mobile's representatives. He asked Ms. Coleman, Mr. Rendfrey, and Mr. Brown if they had any clarifications to address, comments to make, or questions to ask.

Mr. Rendfrey and Mr. Brown informed the Board of the background of the application, as well as the two remaining and related applications comprising this agenda. Mr. Brown elaborated by saying that Restore Mobile hoped the design of the subject buildings would not only improve the neighborhood, but inspire developers and homeowners as to how to design infill historic areas.

Mr. Wagoner asked for clarification with regard to the windows. Ms. Coleman and Mr. Wagoner entered into a discussion regarding windows. Mr. Bemis interjected that the windows employed would be of the type mentioned in the Staff Report.

Speaking of Mr. Stone commented on the placement of the houses on the lots.

Discussion ensued as the front door design, the porch post dimensions, and the windows.

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

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 the windows would not be vinyl, the front door would be paneled and glazed, and the columns would BE 8" in section.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 8/7/14

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2013-60-CA: 1053 Texas Street
Applicant: Restore Mobile
Received: 7/22/13
Meeting: 8/7/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Non-Contributing (vacant lot)
Zoning: R-1
Project: New Construction – Construct a new house.

BUILDING HISTORY

An overlay in an early 20th-Century Sanborn Map indicates that a residence once occupied this vacant lot.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This vacant lot has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. Restore Mobile proposes the construction of a single family residence
- B. The Guidelines for New Residential Construction in Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “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 “façade line”, a visual line created by the fronts of buildings along a street. An inappropriate setback disrupts the façade line and diminishes the visual character of the streetscape.”
 - 2. “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.”
 - 3. “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. 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.”
4. “Although roofs and foundations reinforce massing, the main body and wings are the most significant components. A building’s form or shape (a box) or a 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.”
 5. “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 compatible with those of adjacent historic buildings. Additionally roof designs of new residential construction may incorporate eave overhang or trim details such as exposed rafters, cornice, fascia, frieze board, mouldings, etc. as those of nearby buildings.”
 6. “The size of a building is determined by its dimensions which also dictate square footage. SCALE refers to a building’s size in relationship to other buildings – large, medium, small. To preserve the continuity of a historic district, new construction should be in scale with nearby historic buildings.”
 7. “Façade elements such as porches, entrances, and windows make up the “face” or façade of a building. New construction should reflect the use of façade elements of nearby historic buildings.”
 8. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. In order to coexist in harmony with adjacent historic structures in the historic districts, porches are strongly encouraged. Designs for new porches should also reference historic porch location, proportion, rhythm, roof form, supports, rails, and ornamentation. Porches of new buildings should also be similar in height and width to porches of nearby historic buildings. Proper care should be taken in the detailing of new porches. Scale, proportion and character of elements such as porch columns, corner brackets, railings, pickets, etc. should be compatible with adjacent historic structures. Wood or a suitable substitute material should be used. In addition, elements such as balconies, cupolas, chimneys, dormers, and other elements can help integrate a new structure with the neighborhood when used at the proper scale.”
 9. “The number of and proportion of openings – windows and entrances – within the façade 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 windows casements and door surrounds. Where a side elevation is clearly visible from the street, proportions and placement of their elements will have an impact upon the visual character of the neighborhood and must be addressed in the design.”
 10. “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 districts. Historic buildings feature the use of materials for roofs, foundations, wall cladding and architectural details 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 buildings which are

not present on nearby historic buildings or buildings in the area that contain only Victorian-era houses, a brick ranch-style house would be inconspicuous and disrupts the area's visual continuity. Modern materials which have the same textural qualities and character as materials of nearby historic buildings may be acceptable."

11. "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 the 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 the examples in the district."
12. The type, size and dividing light of windows, and their location and configuration (rhythm) help establish historic character of a building and compatibility with adjacent structures. Traditionally designed windows openings generally have a raised surround on frame buildings. New construction methods should follow this method in the historic districts as opposed to designing window openings that are flush with the wall."
13. Often one of the most important decorative features, doorways reflect the architectural style of a building. The design of doors and doorways can help establish the character of a building and compatibility with adjacent facades. Some entrances in Mobile's historic districts have special features such as transoms and decorative elements framing the openings. Careful consideration should be given to incorporating such elements in new construction."
15. "New materials that are an evolution of historic materials, such as Hardiplank concrete siding or a simulated stucco finish, should suggest profile, dimension and finish of historic materials. True materials such as brick, wood siding, or stucco are encouraged. Some synthetic materials, such as fiberglass porch columns may be appropriate in individual cases as approved by the Review Board."
16. "Modern paving materials are acceptable in the Historic Districts. However, it is important that the design, location, and materials be compatible with the property. Landscaping can often assist in creating an appropriate setting. The appearance of parking areas should be minimized. "

C. Scope of Work (Per Submitted Plans):

1. Construct a single family residence.
 - a. The one-story residence will measure 30' in width and 52' in depth.
 - b. The building will measure 25' in height
 - c. 18" tall brick-veneered foundation piers will support the house
 - d. Boxed and recessed wooden lattice foundation panels will extend between the aforementioned foundation piers.
 - e. The house will feature hardiboard siding.
 - f. The house will feature one-over-one aluminum clad wooden windows.
 - g. The window and door bays will feature simple and molded surrounds.
 - h. The horizontal and raked portions of the cornice will feature simple moldings.
 - i. A north-south oriented gable roof will surmount the house.
 - j. Asphalt shingles will sheath the roof.
 - k. North Elevation (Façade)
 - i. The North Elevation will be fronted by a three bay porch.
 - ii. Four chamfered posts will define the porch bays.
 - iii. A flight of wooden steps featuring picketed railings will access the porch.
 - iv. The North Elevation will feature three fenestrated bays. A centrally located door will be flanked by one-over-one windows. The aforementioned door will either be two vertical lights over two panels.

- v. The North Elevation's gable will be faced with shingled siding.
 - vi. Asphalt shingles will sheath the continuous return cornice.
 - vii. A louvered vent will punctuate the gable.
- l. East Elevation
 - i. The East Elevation will feature three one-over-one windows.
- m. South (Rear) Elevation
 - i. The South Elevation will feature three fenestrated bays. From east to west, the fenestration is as follows: a pair of double French doors; a transom window; and a one-over-one window.
 - ii. A small rear deck will be located off the French door unit. Support on wooden pier interspersed with boxed and recessed lattice skirting, the deck will feature as single flight of east-facing steps featuring a picketed railing.
 - iii. The South Elevation's gable will be faced with shingled siding.
 - iv. Asphalt shingles will sheath the continuous return cornice.
 - v. A louvered vent will punctuate the gable.
- n. West Elevation
 - ii. The West Elevation will feature a single transom window and two one-over-one windows.
- 2. Install hardscaping.
 - iii. A concrete walkway will extend from the inner edge of the reinstated sidewalk to the front steps
 - iv. A 10' to 12' wide curbcut will allow access to driveway (located to the east of the house) that will extend from the inner edge of the reinstated sidewalk to the rear plane of the house.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of a single family residence on a vacant lot. Applications for new residential construction must meet the criteria outlined in the Guidelines for New Residential Construction in Mobile's Historic Districts. The Goal of the New Residential Construction Guidelines is to integrate new buildings in historic settings.

The proposed new construction meets municipal setback requirements and adopts the traditional façade line of nearby residential buildings (See B-1). Porch fronted and gabled surmounted in design, the house adopts the form of popular late 19th Century/20th-Century residential typology. Comparable examples can be cited in and around Mobile's historic districts, as well as throughout the region. The overall massing is comparable to nearby historical examples and is in scale with the historic context (See B 2, 5, and 6). The materials are in compliance with the Design Guidelines (See B-10). The mass and scale of the buildings is in keeping with historic buildings. Along with a near twin proposed for the adjacent lot to the east (See 2013-59-CA: 1051 Texas Street, the preceding application), the three bay rhythm of the porch and fenestrated bays is in keeping with the appearance and experience of this section of the Oakleigh Garden District (See B 7, 8, 9, 12 and 13). Constructed in hardiboard, a material approved for new construction and additions in Mobile's Historic Districts, and simple in treatment, the building is traditional in appearance, yet contemporary in its simplicity (See B-15).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-16), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building. Staff recommends approval of this application.²

² On account of his being a Board member of the Restore Mobile Revolving Fund, MDHD Executive Director Devereaux Bemis did not take part in the substantive review of this application but did review for accuracy.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Debbie Coleman, Fred Rendfrey, and Tilmon Brown were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Having recused himself from the discussion from the discussion and left the room, Mr. Karwinski did not take part in the review of this application. After examining the design, one almost identical to that approved in the previous application, the Board reiterated the same stipulations.

No one from the audience spoke either for or against the application.

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 the windows would not be vinyl, the front door would be paneled and glazed, and the columns would be 8" in section.

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.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 8/7/14

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2013-60-CA: 1055 Texas Street
Applicant: Restore Mobile
Received: 7/22/13
Meeting: 8/7/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Non-Contributing (vacant lot)
Zoning: R-1
Project: New Construction – Construct a new house.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to 20th-Century Sanborn Maps, a single-story wooden residence stood on this property.

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 vacant lot has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. Restore Mobile proposes the construction of a single family residence
- B. The Guidelines for New Residential Construction in Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “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 “façade line”, a visual line created by the fronts of buildings along a street. An inappropriate setback disrupts the façade line and diminishes the visual character of the streetscape.”
 - 2. “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.”
 - 3. “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. 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.”

4. “Although roofs and foundations reinforce massing, the main body and wings are the most significant components. A building’s form or shape (a box) or a 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.”
5. “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 compatible with those of adjacent historic buildings. Additionally roof designs of new residential construction may incorporate eave overhang or trim details such as exposed rafters, cornice, fascia, frieze board, mouldings, etc. as those of nearby buildings.”
6. “The size of a building is determined by its dimensions which also dictate square footage. SCALE refers to a building’s size in relationship to other buildings – large, medium, and small. To preserve the continuity of a historic district, new construction should be in scale with nearby historic buildings.”
7. “Façade elements such as porches, entrances, and windows make up the “face” or façade of a building. New construction should reflect the use of façade elements of nearby historic buildings.”
8. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. In order to coexist in harmony with adjacent historic structures in the historic districts, porches are strongly encouraged. Designs for new porches should also reference historic porch location, proportion, rhythm, roof form, supports, rails, and ornamentation. Porches of new buildings should also be similar in height and width to porches of nearby historic buildings. Proper care should be taken in the detailing of new porches. Scale, proportion and character of elements such as porch columns, corner brackets, railings, pickets, etc. should be compatible with adjacent historic structures. Wood or a suitable substitute material should be used. In addition, elements such as balconies, cupolas, chimneys, dormers, and other elements can help integrate a new structure with the neighborhood when used at the proper scale.”
9. “The number of and proportion of openings – windows and entrances – within the façade 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 windows casements and door surrounds. Where a side elevation is clearly visible from the street, proportions and placement of their elements will have an impact upon the visual character of the neighborhood and must be addressed in the design.”
10. “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 districts. Historic buildings feature the use of materials for roofs, foundations, wall cladding and architectural details 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 buildings which are not present on nearby historic buildings or buildings in the area that contain only Victorian-era houses, a brick ranch-style house would be inconspicuous and disrupts the

area's visual continuity. Modern materials which have the same textural qualities and character as materials of nearby historic buildings may be acceptable."

11. "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 the 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 the examples in the district."
12. The type, size and dividing light of windows, and their location and configuration (rhythm) help establish historic character of a building and compatibility with adjacent structures. Traditionally designed windows openings generally have a raised surround on frame buildings. New construction methods should follow this method in the historic districts as opposed to designing window openings that are flush with the wall."
13. Often one of the most important decorative features, doorways reflect the architectural style of a building. The design of doors and doorways can help establish the character of a building and compatibility with adjacent facades. Some entrances in Mobile's historic districts have special features such as transoms and decorative elements framing the openings. Careful consideration should be given to incorporating such elements in new construction."
15. "New materials that are an evolution of historic materials, such as Hardiplank concrete siding or a simulated stucco finish, should suggest profile, dimension and finish of historic materials. True materials such as brick, wood siding, or stucco are encouraged. Some synthetic materials, such as fiberglass porch columns may be appropriate in individual cases as approved by the Review Board."
16. "Modern paving materials are acceptable in the Historic Districts. However, it is important that the design, location, and materials be compatible with the property. Landscaping can often assist in creating an appropriate setting. The appearance of parking areas should be minimized. "

C. Scope of Work (Per Submitted Plans):

1. Construct a single family residence.
 - a. The one-and-one-half-story residence will measure 30' in width and 36' in depth.
 - b. The building will measure 25' in height
 - c. 18" tall brick-veneered foundation piers will support the house
 - d. Boxed and recessed wooden lattice foundation panels will extend between the aforementioned foundation piers.
 - e. The walls of the house will be face with board and batten siding.
 - f. The house will feature one-over-one aluminum clad wooden windows.
 - g. The window and door bays will feature simple and molded surrounds.
 - h. The horizontal and raked portions of the cornice will feature simple moldings.
 - i. A north-south oriented gable roof will surmount the house.
 - j. Asphalt shingles will sheath the roof.
 - k. North Elevation (Façade)
 - i. The North Elevation will feature five fenestrated bays the left two recessed which take the form of one-over-one windows.
 - ii. A two bay inset porch will be located at northeast corner of the façade.
 - iii. Two freestanding porch posts and one engaged post chamfered post will define the porch bays.
 - iv. A flight of wooden steps featuring picketed railings will access the porch.
 - v. The North Elevation's gable will be faced board and batten siding
 - vi. Asphalt shingles will sheath the continuous return cornice.

- vii. A single light window will punctuate the gable.
- l. East Elevation
 - i. The East Elevation will feature two one-over-one windows and a two light over two panels door.
- m. South (Rear) Elevation
 - i. The South Elevation will feature three fenestration bays. From east to west, the fenestration is as follows: a one-over-one clad window; a transom window; and double French doors.
 - ii. A small rear deck will be located off the French door unit. Supported on wooden piers interspersed with boxed and recessed lattice skirting, the deck will feature as single flight of south-facing steps featuring a picketed railing.
 - iii. The South Elevation's gable will feature a board and batten treatment.
 - iv. Asphalt shingles will sheath the continuous return cornice.
 - v. A single light window will punctuate the gable.
- n. West Elevation
 - i. The West Elevation will feature two one-over-one windows.
- 2. Install hardscaping.
 - i. A concrete walkway will extend from the inner edge of the reinstated sidewalk to the front steps
 - ii. A 10' to 12' wide curbcut will allow access to driveway (located to the east of the house) that will extend from the inner edge of the reinstated sidewalk to the rear plane of the house.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of a single family residence on a vacant lot. Applications for new residential construction must meet the criteria outlined in the Guidelines for New Residential Construction in Mobile's Historic Districts. The Goal of the New Residential Construction Guidelines is to integrate new buildings in historic settings.

The proposed new construction meets municipal setback requirements and adopts the traditional façade line of nearby residential buildings (See B-1). Featuring a corner inset porch located under the body of an all encompassing gable roof, the house is similar in design to several early 20th Century houses located elsewhere in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District (See B-8). Board and batten siding is a traditional siding treatment that was used on numerous vernacular buildings. Several houses located within the vicinity still feature board siding located beneath later clapboards (See B-15). The mass overall massing is comparable to nearby historical examples and is in scale with the historic context (See B 2, 5, and 6). The materials are in compliance with the Design Guidelines (See B-10). The mass and scale of the building are in keeping with historic buildings in the neighborhood (See B 2 and 6). Constructed in hardiboard, a material approved for new construction and additions in Mobile's Historic Districts, the design is both in keeping with the historic context and contemporary in its simplicity.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-16), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building. Staff recommends approval of this application.³

³ On account of his being a Board member of the Restore Mobile Revolving Fund, MDHD Executive Director Devereaux Bemis did not take part in the substantive review of this application but did review for accuracy.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Debbie Coleman, Fred Rendfrey, and Tilmon Brown were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Having reused himself from the discussion from the discussion and left the room, Mr. Karwinski did not take part in the review of this application. After examining the design, one almost identical to that approved in the previous application, the Board reiterated the same stipulations. The relocation of a flight of steps and the extension of the driveway were also discussed.

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 the windows would not be vinyl, the front door would be paneled and glazed, and the columns would be 8" in section, the rear steps would face the east, and the driveway would extend to the rear plane of the house.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 8/7/14