

**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES**  
**December 18, 2013 – 3:00 P.M.**  
**Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street**

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

1. The Chair, Bradford Ladd, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:  
**Members Present:** David Barr, Carolyn Hasser, Nick Holmes, Thomas Karwinski, Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswalt, Craig Roberts, and Steve Stone,  
**Members Absent:** Bob Allen, Kim Harden, Jim Wagoner, and Janetta Whitt-Mitchell.  
**Historic Development and City Legal Staff Members Present:** Devereaux Bemis, Cart Blackwell, and Keri Coumanis.
2. With the exception of midmonth #3, Mr. Karwinski moved to approve the minutes of the November 6, 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 (WITH THE EXCEPTION OF #3)**

1. **Applicant: Kate and Joe McNeel**
  - a. Property Address: 7 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 11/26/13
  - c. Project: Pressure wash the building. Repaint per the existing color scheme.
2. **Applicant: Lewis Golden**
  - a. Property Address: 22 South Monterey Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 11/27/13
  - c. Project: Reroof house using architectural shingle, dark gray in color. Fascia boards to be replaced as needed. Paint new wood to match existing.
3. **Applicant: Fred Hoffmeyer**
  - a. Property Address: 207 South Georgia Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 11/26/13
  - c. Project: Place iron post with linking chain fence between two and three feet high on south property line alongside 205 S. Georgia driveway.
4. **Applicant: Mark Anderson**
  - a. Property Address: 1117 Selma Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 12/2/13
  - c. Project: Make repairs to a rear porch. The woodwork will be replaced to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. The work will be repainted to match the existing as per the color scheme.
5. **Applicant: Ronald Leslie**
  - a. Property Address: 167 South Dearborn
  - b. Date of Approval: 12/2/13
  - c. Project: Replace existing wheelchair ramp on south side of house. Width is 40 inches and length 26 feet. Wood.
6. **Applicant: Andrew Grabner with Scott Services**
  - a. Property Address: 1510 Government Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 12/4/13
  - c. Project: Construct a monument sign. The aluminum stepped aluminum sign will feature the name of the franchise and a directional device. The sign meets size and material conditions. The sign will not feature illumination.

7. **Applicant: Jose Antonio Chavez**
  - a. Property Address: 1107 Oak Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 12/5/13
  - c. Project: Make repairs to a fire-damaged house. Replace deteriorated siding (when and where necessary) to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Replace (when and where necessary) deteriorated windows to match the existing in light configuration, material, and construction. Reroof with roofing shingles matching the existing. Repaint per the existing color scheme.
8. **Applicant: Vicky Rye**
  - a. Property Address: 259 South Georgia Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 12/5/13
  - c. Project: Construct a picket fence enclosing the property's front yard. The wooden fence will be three feet in height.
9. **Applicant: Teague Construction, Inc.**
  - a. Property Address: 22 South Conception Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 12/4/13
  - c. Project: Replace roofing shingles to match the existing.
10. **Applicant: Cheryl Zafaris**
  - a. Property Address: 1711 Hunter Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 12/5/13
  - c. Project: Demolish collapsed shed in rear of property.
11. **Applicant: Richard Brown with Building and Maintenance Company**
  - a. Property Address: 1155 Church Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 12/6/13
  - c. Project: Repaint the house per the existing color scheme. Repair and when necessary replace any deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Make minor repairs to the roof. The work will match the existing.
12. **Applicant: Randolph Ryaland**
  - a. Property Address: 1367 Brown Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 12/9/13
  - c. Project: Paint the orange porch deck and shutters: Benjamin Moore Cream.
13. **Applicant: Michael Barber**
  - a. Property Address: 1751 Hunter Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 12/9/13
  - c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repair eaves and reconstruct porch roofs.
14. **Applicant: Southern Foundation Repair**
  - a. Property Address: 105 Levert Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 12/9/13
  - c. Project: Make repairs to the foundation. The work will match the existing.
15. **Applicant: Haberdasher**
  - a. Property Address: 451 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 12/3/14
  - c. Project: Retain two hanging signs. The composite board hanging signs (one suspended from the other) feature the name of the establishment and a directional emblem. The signs meet required heights for the passerby (7' above the sidewalk). The total square footage of the signage meets size requirements.

## C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2013-86-CA-: 551 Dauphin Street

- a. Applicant: Tony Atchison with Atchison Home
- b. Project: Remodel an altered ground floor storefront.  
**APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**
- 2. **2013-87-CA-: 109 Levert Avenue**
  - a. Applicant: Lucy Barr with Lucy Barr Designs for Mr. & Mrs. Lyle Hutchison
  - b. Project: Construct a side porch, a hyphen, and a second story on top of a garage.  
**APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**
- 3. **2013-88-CA-: 1555 Fearnway**
  - a. Applicant: Robert Dueitt with Robert Dueitt Construction for Christopher Agee
  - b. Project: Addition and Roofing - Construct a rear addition and alter a roof Pitch.  
**APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**
- 4. **2013-89-CA-: 960 Government Street**
  - a. Applicant: Mr. & Mrs. J. Daly Baumhower, III
  - b. Project: Construct a second story umbrage atop the façade's upper story balcony.  
**WITHDRAWN.**
- 5. **2013-90-CA-: Kimberly Curtis-Williams**
  - a. Applicant: 361 George Street
  - b. Project: Fenestration – Install a security door.  
**DENIED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**
- 6. **2013-91- CA: 8 North Lafayette Street**
  - a. Applicant: John Stimpson
  - b. Project: Demolition – Demolish non-contributing multi-family housing.  
**APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

**D. OTHER BUSINESS**

- 1. Serda's Signage – The Board reviewed imagery of the signage installed at 26 South Royal Street (Serda's Coffee Company). Fred Rendfrey with the Downtown Mobile Alliance was present to discuss the signage. Mr. Rendfrey thanked the Board for approving the sign and complimented the design. He stated that during Mardi Gras beads and other items thrown from parade floats damage signage and that signage such as the example under discussion represented an improvement over existing lighted signage in terms of repair, maintenance, and appearance. The test case approval involving a limited amount of LED plastic-faced portions of signage was discussed. Mr. Blackwell was instructed to meet with Mr. Rendfrey with regard to formulating possible parameters for reviewing applications for similar sign.
- 2. Attendance – Mr. Bemis spoke to the Board on attendance and notifications thereof.
- 3. Mr. Karwinski was congratulated on his many years of service to Mobile's historic districts.

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

**2013-86-CA: 551 Dauphin Street**  
**Applicant: Tony Atchison with Atchison Home**  
**Received: 12/2/13**  
**Meeting: 12/18/13**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: B-4  
Project: Remodel an altered ground floor storefront.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

551 Dauphin Street (known as the Chamberlain Building) dates from 1865. The Postbellum building's plan and elevations adopt the urban residential/commercial formula established during the decades leading up to the Civil War - a commercial space was surmounted by upper story residential areas. The occupying tenants had the use of both floors of rear 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, 2013. At that time, the applicant, at the encouragement of the Board, withdrew an application calling for the removal of a later ground floor storefront. The withdrawal was prompted by code-related concerns. The applicant and Staff met with representatives from Right of Way, Fire Safety, Permitting, and Planning. The owner/applicant returns to the Board with an application that reflects input from the previous Review Board meeting and the interdepartmental meeting/follow ups. This application calls for the removal of a historically inappropriate storefront and the construction of new storefront more in keeping with the style and period of the building.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. "Replacement doors should reflect the age and style of the building."
  - 2. "New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment."
  - 3. "Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence."
  - 4. "The size and placement of windows for additions and alterations should be compatible with the general character of a building."
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

1. Remove a later ground floor storefront.
2. Install a new storefront.
  - a. The storefront will be constructed on the location of the existing storefront.
  - b. The cast iron grilles located within the storefront's lunettes will remain in place.
  - c. The spacing of the storefronts bays will respect the arcuated bays of the surviving columnar screen.
  - d. Four pairs of glazed and paneled doors will be centered within the storefront's bays.
  - e. Intervening paneled fields will extend between the operable fenestrated units.
3. Construct a six-over-six window within the location of the East (side) Elevation's northernmost fenestrated bay. Surrounding masonry expanses will be faced with stucco.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

As is the case with many 19<sup>th</sup>-Century commercial buildings, the ground floor storefront of this building has been altered. The textured brick bulkhead and aluminum windows represent late 20<sup>th</sup>-Century alterations. Original cast iron columns and lunettes that characterize the storefront have survived. In accord with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, the aforementioned historic features will remain in place (See B-2.). Unlike the existing storefront, the proposed replacement would respect the original bay system. While photographic evidence depicting the original doors does not survive, glazed and paneled doors, as recorded by surviving and documented buildings, were the typical door type for commercial buildings of this period and style (See B-1 and 3.).

The late 20<sup>th</sup>-Century alterations to the storefront also included the alteration of the East (side) Elevation's northernmost bay. A door was converted into a window. The applicants proposed the installation of a six-over-six wooden window. Said window would match proportions and casing of the windows approved for the original six-over-six windows located elsewhere on the building. In accord with the Design Review Guidelines, said alteration of modified fenestrated bay is compatible with the general character of the building (See B-4).

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

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

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Tony Atchison was present to discuss the application.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant. He asked Mr. Atchison if he had any clarifications to address, comments to make, or questions to ask. Mr. Atchison stated that Mr. Blackwell had addressed the application in full.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any questions to ask the applicant.

Mr. Karwinski asked Mr. Atchison for clarification as to width of the doors. Mr. Atchison answered Mr. Karwinski's query.

Mr. Karwinski voiced code-related concerns. Reiterating Mr. Blackwell's introduction, Mr. Bemis reminded the Board that Fire & Safety and Right of Way had given positive feedback as to ingress and

egress and other code-related requirements during interdepartmental meetings and consequent emails. Mr. Ladd reminded his fellow Board members that while code-related discussions are beneficial to applicants, code is a part of the Board's direct purview.

A discussion of egress-related codes ensued.

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

No further Board discussion took place.

### **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 unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 12/18/14**

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

**2013-87-CA: 109 Levert Avenue**  
**Applicant: Lucy Barr with Lucy Barr Designs for Mr. & Mrs. Lyle Hutchison**  
**Received: 12/2/13**  
**Meeting: 12/18/13**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Ashland Place  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Construct a side porch, a hyphen, and a second story on top of a garage.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This Colonial Revival house dates from 1927. The façade is distinguished by Serliano-inspired entrance porch.

**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 14, 2006. At that time, the Board approved the installation of fencing. The application up for review calls for the construction of a side porch, a hyphen (connecting to the main house to the garage) and the construction of a second-story atop the garage. An earlier proposal calling for the construction of a second-story atop the garage was approved on July 25, 2005.

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation state, in pertinent part:

1. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”
2. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

1. Construct a side/rear porch.
  - a. The porch will be located off the main house’s South Elevation.
  - b. The porch will measure approximately 14’ in depth and 39’ 8” in length.
  - c. The porch will rest atop a brick veneered foundation that will match the existing.
  - d. The columnar supports, fascia, and eaves will match those on the body of the house.
  - e. Five columnar piers will define the porch’s South Elevation.
  - f. A brick chimney will occupy one of the aforementioned bays.

- g. The roof pitch will match the existing.
- h. The shingles will match the existing.
- 2. Alter fenestration on South Elevation (These units access the porch.).
  - a. Remove two windows.
  - b. Replace the aforementioned windows with glazed and paneled doors.
- 3. Construct a connector between the house and the garage.
  - a. The connector will be located over the existing walkway that extends between the main house's back door and the garage.
  - b. The wooden connector will feature fascia and eave treatments matching those employed on the house and garage.
  - c. The roofing shingles will match those employed on the body of the main house.
- 4. Add a second story to the garage.
  - a. The second story will feature wooden siding matching that employed on the lower-story.
  - b. The eave treatment of the addition will match the existing.
  - c. The roofing shingles will match those employed on the main house and connector.
  - d. Six-over-six wooden windows will be employed.
  - e. The window casings will match those employed on the main house.
  - f. The roof configuration will replicate the existing.
  - g. East Elevation
    - i. The ground floor's later six paneled door will be replaced by a glazed and paneled door.
    - ii. Two six-over-six windows will be located on the upper-story
  - h. South Elevation
    - i. Install a glazed and paneled garage door within the building's vehicular bay.
    - ii. The window and double door on the ground floor will be replaced by a glazed and paneled door with accessed by a stoop with picketed railings.
    - iii. A bracketed overhang will extend over the stoop.
    - iv. The overhang will feature a rafter treatment and roofing shingles that will match the existing.
    - v. The second story will feature a bank of three six-over-six wooden windows and a four light window.
  - i. West Elevation
    - i. The West Elevation will not feature fenestration.
  - j. North Elevation
    - ii. The North Elevation's upper-story will feature three fenestrated bays. The aforementioned bays will take the form of faux windows featuring fixed shutters matching those employed on the body of the house.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application calls for the construction of a porch off the south (side) elevation, a hyphen-like connector off the rear of the building, and a second-story atop the garage.

With regard to the proposed porch, said porch would extend an existing rear porch around the south side of the building. The existing rear porch was approved on June 13, 2005. The porch extension would be minimally visible from the public view. In accord with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, the massing, size, scale, and architectural features are compatible with house's historic fabric (See B-1.). The Historic District Overlay allows for setback from the southern lot line.



The proposed connector would afford covered access between the house and the garage. Located off an earlier addition, the hyphen's massing, size, scale, and architectural features are compatible with that of the main house. (See B 1-2).

As evidenced by photographs in the MHDC's property files, the garage has been modified on several occasions. On June 25, 2005, an earlier proposal calling for alterations to the first-story and construction of a second-story was approved by the Board. Minus alterations to fenestration, the design up for review is identical to the approved design. In accord with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, the massing, size, scale, and architectural features are compatible with house's historic fabric (See B-1.).

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-2), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district. Staff recommends approval of this application. Staff does recommend that the original windows that were removed, be kept on the property.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Lyle Hutchison and Lucy Barr were present to discuss the application.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

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

Mr. Hutchison and Ms. Barr answered no.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any questions to ask the applicant or his representative.

Mr. Karwinski stated that he had given Ms. Barr some possible suggestions. Ms. Barr thanked Mr. Karwinski.

No other Board members voiced questions or concerns.

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

### **FINDING OF FACT**

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Mr. Holmes 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.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 12/18/14**

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

**2013-88-CA: 1555 Fearnway**  
**Applicant: Robert Dueitt with Robert Dueitt Construction for Christopher Agee**  
**Received: 12/2/13**  
**Meeting: 12/18/13**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Non-Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Addition and Roofing - Construct a rear addition and alter a roof Pitch.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This house dates from first third of 20<sup>th</sup>-Century. An front addition was constructed in the 1950s.

**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 was last reviewed on September 4, 2002. At that time, the Old Dauphin Way Review Board approved the removal of jalousie windows and their replacement with wooden windows. This application calls for the construction of a rear addition and the alteration of a portion of the building’s roof.
- 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. With regard to additions, “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. “A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Original roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof should be maintained. Materials should be appropriate to the form, pitch, and color.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
  - 1. Construct rear addition.
    - a. The addition will square out the southeast corner of the house.
    - b. Corner boards will be employed to demarcate the transition between the old and new.
    - c. The addition will rest atop brick foundation piers.
    - d. The walls of the addition will be faced with wooden shingles matching those employed on the body of the house.
    - e. The addition will employ three-over one wooden windows matching those employed on the body of the house.
  - 2. Alter the pitch of a portion of the roof.

- a. The roof over the center portion of the rear elevation will be raised and extended over the addition.
- b. The fascia treatment will match the existing.
- c. The roofing shingles will match the existing.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the construction of a rear addition. The proposed addition would square out the southeast portion of the dwelling. While the materials and architectural features of the addition are in keeping with the existing historic fabric (See B-1.), construction of the addition would alter the pitch of the original roof. The Design Review Guidelines state that original roof forms should be maintained (See B-2.).

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

In concept, Staff does not object to the construction of the addition, but on account of the roof design, Staff believes the application would impair the architectural and historical character of the district (See B-2). Staff does not recommend approval of the application but suggests a new design incorporating the original porch of the roof be submitted.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Tony Atchison was present to discuss the application.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

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

Mr. Dueitt explained to the Board that he had discussed the application with Mr. Bemis in the MHDC office and encountered Mr. Blackwell when the latter made a site visit to the subject property. He explained that while he understood the concerns articulated in the Staff Analysis, continuing an existing flat roof over the proposed addition would only augment issues that plague flat roofs in general and this roof in particular. Mr. Dueitt explained that the northernmost (street-facing) gable would not be impacted, only the rear gable. He stated that the rear gable would be altered on one slope so to extend over the proposed addition. Mr. Dueitt said that he was trying to right previous wrongs.

Mr. Karwinski stated that the existing roof was the problem. Mr. Dueitt concurred. Mr. Karwinski said that he would address the existing roof in addition to addressing the new construction. Mr. Dueitt said that he was doing just that, but the changes to the existing roof were restricted to the rear elevation out of respect to the façade and for reasons of economics. Mr. Karwinski suggested the use of gable set perpendicular to the rear gable.

Further discussion ensued as to extending the proposed alteration to the roof pitch in a northerly direction so to mitigate repair issues caused by the existing flat roof.

Mr. Karwinski reiterated that an east-facing gable would serve to preserve the roof pitch and address runoff. Mr. Dueitt concurred, but stated that another valley would be created for water from the aforementioned alternative would pour onto the existing flat roof. Mr. Stone noted the same.

Ms. Hasser stated that while she would defer to the architects, she had experience with flat roofs. After reiterating previous comments, the steps the applicant's representative had taken to address the issue, and the problems affecting flat roofs in a city like Mobile, Ms. Hasser stated that she felt comfortable in approving the proposed work. Turning to Mr. Blackwell, she asked if the subject building was a contributing structure. He answered no. Ms. Hasser stated that the application as proposed would not impair the historic district.

Mr. Stone stated that the proposed work would be minimally visible from the public view. Mr. Dueitt agreed.

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

No further Board discussion took place.

### **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: 12/18/14**

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

**2013-89-CA: 960 Government Street**  
**Applicant: Mr. & Mrs. J. Daly Baumhower, III**  
**Received: 12/2/13**  
**Meeting: 12/18/13**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Oakleigh  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: B-1  
Project: Construct a second story umbrage atop the façade's upper story balcony.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

When constructed in 1911, the Antoinette Building was Mobile's first luxury apartment house. The Renaissance Revival style building features classical details, monumental proportions, and a tiled roof. Featuring a plan four spacious units distinguished by parquet floors, marble mantels, and built in furniture, the interior lives up to the exterior. The building is attributed to Stone Brothers of New Orleans (for reasons of style and association). Portions of the interior were later remodeled by Mobile architect William March.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

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

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on June 21, 2000. At that time, the Board approved the reroofing and the replacement of terracotta roofing tiles. The application up for review calls for the construction of umbrages atop the façade's upper story balconies.
- 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. With regard to additions, "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. "The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details."
  - 3. "A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Original roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof should be maintained. Materials should be appropriate to the form, pitch, and color."

- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
1. Construct covered extensions over the façade's second-story balconies.
    - a. The wooden overhangs will be supported by 2' x 2' beams
    - b. 2' x 12" beams will comprise the fascia.
    - c. Terracotta roofing tiles matching those employed on the body of the building will be employed on the roof.
    - d. The shed roof will continue the downward pitch of the principle hipped roof surmounting the building.

### **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the construction of roofed umbrages atop the façade's second-story balconies.

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that porches are a historic regional characteristic of Mobile architecture (See B-1.). The façade of this building, a grandly scaled four unit apartment house, features lower-story galleries defined by columns and columnar piers and upper-story balconies. While the materials of the proposed porch umbrages (wood) would serve to differentiate the new work from the historic fabric, the original design intent would be lost. Additionally, construction of the proposed umbrages would obscure detailing and elements that characterize roof's fascia and rafters. These are character-defining features of the building, particularly the roof structure. The Design Review Guidelines state that original roof forms should be maintained (See B-2.).

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-2), Staff believes this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building and the district. Based on B (1-2), Staff does not recommend approval of the proposed covering. Staff encourages the applicants to consider an awning or another reversible solution that would afford shelter without altering historic fabric or obscuring historic details.

**WITHDRAWN PRIOR TO THE MEETING.**

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

**2013-90-CA: 361 George Street**  
**Applicant: Kimberly Curtis-Williams**  
**Received: 12/2/13**  
**Meeting: 12/18/13**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden  
Classification: Listed as Contributing (Downgraded to Non-Contributing)  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Fenestration – Install a security door.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This house dates from last quarter of the 19<sup>th</sup>-Century. As originally constructed, the dwelling was a shotgun with a side 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 April 3, 1991. At that time, the Board approved the construction of a rear addition and alterations to the body of the building. This application calls for installation of a metal security door.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “Metal storm or screen doors are not allowed on front doors.”
- C. Scope of Work (Per Submitted materials):
  - 1. Remove a storm door.
  - 2. Install a metal security door in front of the principle entrance.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the installation of a metal security door on the front elevation of residential building. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic District state that metal doors are not allowed on front entrances (See B-1.).

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

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



## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

No one was present to discuss the application.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

After reviewing the imagery shown in the PowerPoint presentation and referencing the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts, the Board discussed where metal doors had been approved. Mr. Bemis and Mr. Blackwell stated that metal doors had been approved on commercial buildings and on some rear elevations. Mr. Roberts asked if a metal door could be approved if it was of a good design. Mr. Bemis stated that the design would be subject to Board's Review. Mr. Bemis stated that burglar bars and security doors have been repeatedly denied by the Board. The Design Review Guidelines were consulted for a second time.

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

No further Board discussion took place.

## **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 impair the historic integrity of the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness not be issued.

The motion received a second and was approved.

**DENIED.**

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

**2013-89--CA: 8 North Lafayette Street**  
**Applicant: John Stimpson**  
**Received: 12/2/13**  
**Meeting: 12/18/13**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Non-Contributing  
Zoning: R-2  
Project: Demolition – Demolish a non-contributing condominium complex.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This multi-family complex was constructed in the 1970s.

**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 up for review calls for the demolition of an apartment complex.
- 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 non-contributing apartment complex (now condominiums) dates from the 1970s. With a first-story resting on a slab foundation and upper story defined by a mansard-like roof, the building is resembles numerous multifamily complexes constructed during the last third of the 20<sup>th</sup>-Century.
    - iii. The importance of the structures to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
      - 1. While affording for built density and adopting a traditional setback, this infill construction does not contribute to the historical character of the historic district.

- iv. 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. With exception of salvaged cast iron elements employed in the security bars and the stair railings, all of the materials date from the 1970s.
  - v. 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. Examples of this type and style of construction can be found across the Southeast. Several examples are located in the Oakleigh and Old Dauphin Way Historic Districts.
  - vi. 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. The owner is in the process of selling the property. The sale of the property is contingent on the demolition of the building.
  - vii. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
    - 1. The owner acquired the first units in the building in 2004. The purchase prices have varied from \$25,000 to \$40,000.
  - viii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
    - 1. Not provided.
  - viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
    - 1. The sale of the property is being negotiated. Sale is contingent on the demolition of the property.
  - 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. See the above.
  - x. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
    - 1. Not given.
  - xi. Financial proof of the ability to complete the replacement project, which may include but not be limited to a performance bond, a letter of credit, a trust for completion of improvements, or a letter of commitment from a financial institution; and
    - 1. Application submitted.
  - xii. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.
    - 1. See submitted 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 application).
- 1. Demolish a multi-family residence.
  - 2. Remove the debris.
  - 3. Level the site.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the demolition of a non-contributing apartment complex. When reviewing demolition applications, the Board takes into account the following considerations: 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.

The building proposed for demolition is a non-contributing apartment building dating from the 1970s. The design - a two-story structure featuring a first-story on slab and second-story within a mansard-like roof - is one that was employed across the country. While typical of its period, the infill building does not contribute to either the architectural or the historical character of the surrounding district. With the exception of salvaged cast ironwork, the building materials are of no significance.

The building's exterior does not exhibit signs of disrepair.

Though the building does add to the built density of the district and adopts a traditional setback, the demolition of the structure would not adversely impact the architectural or the historical character of the area.

No redevelopment plans have been provided.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Staff does not believe the demolition of the non-contributing building will impair the architectural or the historical character of the streetscape and the district. However, the ordinance clearly states that a post demolition must be presented. Since there are no plans for the site presented, the Board cannot approve the demolition. The staff recommends denial of the application and the Board instructs the staff to allow the request to return once a plan for the property is submitted.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

John Stimpson and Ben Cummings were present to discuss the application.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant and the additional representative. He asked Mr. Stimpson and Mr. Cummings if they had any clarifications to address, comments to make, or questions to ask.

Mr. Stimpson stated that at the time of submission he had not provided a site plan because the sale of the property was contingent on the approval of the demolition of the subject building and that he has no intention to build anything on the property. Mr. Stimpson stated that since submitting the application he had procured renderings depicting what the purchasers wanted to do with the site.

Mr. Roberts stated the building possessed neither architectural nor historical significance. He asked why there was opposition to the building's demolition.

Mr. Bemis reminded the Board that the ordinance requires the submission of a redevelopment proposal with applications entailing the demolition of given property's principle building. He also reminded the

Board that they had regretted not having plans provided up front when approving the infill construction on southern portion of the Van Antwerp Complex.

Mr. Ladd spoke to the aforementioned project. He stated that all would agree that the Van Antwerp project was singular in nature. Mr. Ladd stated that the subject application, the demolition of a non-contributing building, was clear cut.

Mr. Roberts asked to see renderings of the proposed redevelopment plan.

Mr. Cummings distributed plans. As copies of the plans, one schematic in form, were being circulated, Mr. Cummings spoke of the nature of the proposed redevelopment. He stated that McGill-Toolen Catholic High School was the purchaser. Mr. Cummings said that the McGill-Toolen was not interested in the non-contributing building, but only the site upon which it stands. He said that while the building would not immediately be torn down, it would eventually be removed. Referencing the two plans submitted for the Board's review (an existing site plan of the area and one showing the redeveloped site) he stated that it was McGill-Toolen's intention to extend the parking lot to the south of the property over the site under discussion.

Mr. Blackwell reminded the Board that several year's previously, they had approved the construction of a new Student Center further North on Lafayette Street. He stated that parking lot occupies that site. He asked Mr. Cummings if the parking for the proposed site would absorb the spaces lost for the construction of the Board approved building. Mr. Cummings answered yes.

Mr. Karwinski spoke to Mr. Cummings. He said that as a resident of Lafayette Street he was glad of the direction the McGill-Toolen had taken. That said, he thought the School needed to address long term plans. Mr. Karwinski stated that he did not object to demolition of the non-contributing buildings. He stated that he sketched alternative proposals that afforded parking and improved the appearance of street. He also made suggestions and encouraged the removal of street side parking. Mr. Karwinski reiterated his general favor of the project.

Mr. Holmes stated that submitted parking plan was a good schematic rendering and that he was not opposed to approved the project. He said that the approval should require the submission of more complete plans upon the demolition of the building.

The timing of the demolition was discussed.

Mr. Cummings encouraged the approval of the demolition and stated that he fully understood that more finished plans should and would be provided for the redevelopment once the project was ready to move forward.

Mr. Bemis stated that the submission of the schematic plan satisfied the requirements for redevelopment at this state.

## **FINDING OF FACT**

Mr. Holmes moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending facts to note the submission of the schematic plan and the demolition of the ancillary building. It as further noted the submission of the schematic plan received reversed the Staff Recommendation.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

#### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Mr. Holmes 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 and that more precise parking and landscape plans would be required for reviewing the redevelopment of the property.

The motion received a second and was approved. Mr. Stone voted in opposition.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 12/18/14**