

**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES**  
**December 19, 2012 – 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, Nick Holmes III, Thomas Karwinski, Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswalt, Craig Roberts, and Jim Wagoner.  
**Members Absent:** Gertrude Baker, Carlos Gant, Kim Harden, Carolyn Hasser, and Janetta Whitt-Mitchell.  
**Staff Members Present:** Devereaux Bemis, Cart Blackwell, and John Lawler.
2. Mr. Karwinski moved to approve the minutes of the December 5, 2012 meeting. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
3. Upon clarification of midmonth #s 1 and 5, 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: Eugene Caldwell**
  - a. Property Address: 911 Dauphin Street (should read 911 Selma Street)
  - b. Date of Approval: 12/3/12
  - c. Project: Demolish the fire gutted remains of a house. This staff level approval was authorized by the Architectural Review Board on 20 November 2012.
2. **Applicant: Hunter Adams**
  - a. Property Address: 354 ½ Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 11/27/12
  - c. Project: Hang sign below existing Holmes & Cunningham sign, but still above minimum height. Dimensions 9 inches by 36 inches wide.
3. **Applicant: Haven of Rest Funeral Residence**
  - a. Property Address: 352 State Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 11/28/12
  - c. Project: Install three signs replacing signs that were previously installed by Azalea Funeral Home. The three signs are a free standing (60" x 40"); a large wall sign (72" x 48"); and a small door sign (20" x 20"). The signs will be aluminum with a corrugated plastic interior. All per the submitted design. New exterior wall wash lighting per the submitted photograph will also be installed.
4. **Applicant: Ed Hunter**
  - a. Property Address: 213 Lanier Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 11/30/12
  - c. Project: Install new slate color Timberline HD roof.
5. **Applicant: Caine Roofing and Repairs**
  - a. Property Address: 213 Lanier Avenue (should read 123 Parker Street)
  - b. Date of Approval: 11/27/12
  - c. Project: Reroof the house with asphalt shingles.
6. **Applicant: Charlie B. Hudson**
  - a. Property Address: 1205 Elmira Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 12/3/12

- c. Project: Demolish the fire gutted remains of a house. This staff level approval was authorized by the Architectural Review Board on 20 November 2012.
- 7. Applicant: Historic Mobile Preservation Society**
- a. Property Address: 350 Oakleigh Place
- b. Date of Approval: 12/3/12
- c. Project: Install a portelet and POD on the Oakleigh property for the period of the Cook's House Restoration Project.
- 8. Applicant: Historic Mobile Preservation Society**
- a. Property Address: 1115 Palmetto Street
- b. Date of Approval: 12/4/12
- c. Project: Remove existing signage and install upgraded signage (per submitted packet and explications). A single-face 18' x 26' aluminum sign will be placed on the lawn. Located in front of the house, but nestled close to the shrubbery, the sign will inform visitors of the house museum, but not interfere with the sight lines of the house.
- 9. Applicant: Historic Mobile Preservation Society**
- a. Property Address: 350 Oakleigh Place
- b. Date of Approval: 12/4/12
- c. Project: Remove existing signage and install upgraded signage (per submitted packet and explications). The total square footage of the signage will measure approximately 40' square feet. Green in color to match to the main house's shutters, the consists of the following: one main identity sign (to be placed on the lawn), one secondary signs (to be place before the Cook's House), five directional signs, three hours of operations signs, four miscellaneous signs (like please use the front door), one sandwich board sign, and one counter sign. The signage will be made of either aluminum or appropriate composite materials.
- 10. Applicant: Anne and Hastings Read**
- a. Property Address: 1225 Selma Street
- b. Date of Approval: 12/4/12
- c. Project: Reconstruct the house's front steps. The wooden steps will feature the same flared configuration and railing. Repaint per the existing color scheme. Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material.
- 11. Applicant: Chip Nolan**
- a. Property Address: 107 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 12/5/12
- c. Project: Replace rotten wood to match, repaint to match.
- 12. Applicant: Gregory Ball**
- a. Property Address: 1221 Selma Street
- b. Date of Approval: 12/4/12
- c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Touch up the affected areas per the existing color scheme.
- 13. Applicant: Diversified Roofing**
- a. Property Address: 806 Government Street
- b. Date of Approval: 12/6/12
- c. Project: Replace current roof on Bestor building to match the adjoining annex with a 30 year Timberline roof, Slate in color.
- 14. Applicant: CC&G Construction**
- a. Property Address: 220 South Dearborn Street
- b. Date of Approval: 12/6/12
- c. Project: Replace rotten siding and corner boards matching the existing in profile dimension and materials.
- 15. Applicant: Chris Wheeler**

- a. Property Address: 7 North Lawrence Street
- b. Date of Approval: 12/7/12
- c. Project: Repair south side door and window upstairs south side.

**16. Applicant: Noel Bochow**

- a. Property Address: 1102 Oak Street
- b. Date of Approval: 12/10/12
- c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Remove later aluminum windows. Replace said windows with six-over-six wooden windows matching those found elsewhere on the house. Touch up the paint per the existing color scheme.

**17. Applicant: Eugene Caldwell**

- a. Property Address: 355 Marine Street
- b. Date of Approval: 12/6/12
- c. Project: Demolish the fire gutted remains of a house. This staff level approval was authorized by the Architectural Review Board on 20 November 2012.

**APPLICATIONS**

**1. 2012-71-CA: 17 South Lafayette Street**

- a. Applicant: Thomas Karwinski
- b. Project: Fenestration – Relocate a window.

**APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

**2. 2012-72-CA: 1062 Texas Street**

- a. Applicant: Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund
- b. Project: Demolish a later connector.

**APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

**3. 2012-73-CA: 1263 Selma Street**

- a. Applicant: John Dendy with John Dendy and Associates for Mr. and Mrs. Greg Cavo
- b. Project: Renovate an ancillary building.

**APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

**4. 2012-74-CA: 257 Saint Anthony Street**

- a. Applicant: Barry A. Friedman of Barry A. Freidman & Associates
- b. Project: Door Replacement – Remove and install a front door.

**APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

**5. 2012-75-CA: 1357 Old Shell Road**

- a. Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley with Douglas B. Kearley Architecture for Cindy and Warren Tyon
- b. Project: Reconstruct a front porch.

**APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

**6. 2012-76-CA: 1658 Laurel Street**

- a. Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley with Douglas B. Kearley Architecture for Michael and Kelly Smith
- b. Project: New Construction – Construct a rear addition.

**APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

**D. OTHER BUSINESS**

- 1. 213-219 Dauphin Street

The Board re-examined an application calling for the use of a limited amount of LED signage located beneath plastic lettering. Mr. Blackwell reminded the Board of the application. Stating that it had appeared before them at the December 5, 2012 meeting, he said that Board members had been requested to drive by a location with signage similar to one of the alternatives proposed for installation at the subject property. Mr. Roberts said that while he admired the sign, it did not resemble neon as the applicant's representative had initially stated. Mr. Ricky Armstrong with Modern Signs, the applicant's representative spoke to the design. Alternative options were discussed. Mr. Holmes admired another sign that had recently been proposed by Modern Signs, one to have been located at Serda's Coffee Shop. Discussion ensued as to the status of that application. Mr. Bemis told the Board that it is not the type of lighting that causes concern, but the sign facing that is in violation of the Sign Design Guidelines. He stated that plastic signs are not allowed. Further discussion as to alternative courses of actions ensued. Mr. Bemis suggested that that aluminum backed LED sign be submitted. Mr. Roberts encourage the submission of a sample. Mr. Armstrong said he could accommodate the Board.

## 2. Oakleigh Fires

Mr. Blackwell addressed the Board. He reminded them of an application involving 454 South Broad Street. Mr. Blackwell explained that a demolition request for this property had been reviewed on November 7, 2012. He said that since that time the fire damaged residence had experienced a second fire. Mr. Blackwell told the Board that this second arson related fire had further damaged the structural stability and historic architectural integrity of the building. Mr. Blackwell asked the Board to consider a resolution involving staff or midmonth level approval of the fire gutted building. He showed the Board imagery of damages inflicted by the fire and then spoke to the number of and circumstances surrounding eighteen fires that have occurred in the southern portion of the Oakleigh Garden District. Upon reviewing the photographs of the building and listening to the explications, the Board unanimously approved the resolution allowing Staff to issue midmonth approvals authorizing the demolition of the building buildings.

## 3. Chain Link Fencing

The Board discussed chain link fencing located around the Mardi Gras park and behind the Admiral Semmes

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

**2012-71-CA: 17 South Lafayette Street**  
**Applicant: Thomas Karwinski**  
**Received: 11/20/12**  
**Meeting: 12/19/12**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Fenestration – Relocate a window.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This Arts and Crafts informed bungalow dates from the first third of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century. The house features an asymmetrically composed façade and a multi gable roof configuration.

**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 10, 2001. At that time, the Board approved the restoration of the front porch and the installation of paving.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “The type, size and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on a building help establish the historic character of a building. Original window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing.”
  - 2. “The size and placement of new windows for additions and alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building”
- C. **Scope of Work (per submitted drawing):**
  - 1. Fenestration – Relocate a window.
    - a. Remove a six-over-one window from the West Elevation of the house’s recessed wing.
    - b. Relocate the aforementioned window to recessed wing’s North Elevation.
    - c. Replace siding in and around the window’s existing location.
  - 2. Continue repainting per the existing color scheme.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the relocation of a window. The Design Review Guidelines state that the location and configuration of windows help to establish the historic character of a building and that original window openings should be retained (See B-1.).

The window proposed for relocation and re-facing bears both interior and exterior evidence of later insertion. While having unrelated work done on the house, the applicant had an engineer examine the proposed location of the window. The portion of wall where the window would be relocated, the North Elevation's rearmost gable, showed evidence of structural alteration. The lack of fenestration within the gabled bay would seem to indicate the same. The relocation of the window and the re-facing of the existing opening would be compatible with the general character of the building (See B-2.).

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

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

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Thomas Karwinski 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. Karwinski if he had any comments to make, questions to ask, or clarifications to address.

Mr. Karwinski recused himself from the discussion. He moved from the Board's seating area to the applicant's table in order to answer questions.

Mr. Ladd asked Mr. Karwinski who executed his renderings.

Mr. Roberts asked Mr. Karwinski if the lines were correct.

Mr. Ladd asked the remainder of the Board if they had any questions to ask or comments to make. No further Board discussion 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.

### **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: 12/19/13**

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

**2012-72-CA: 1062 Texas Street**  
**Applicant: Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund (OVRF)**  
**Received: 12/3/12**  
**Meeting: 12/19/12**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Oakleigh  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Demolish a later connector/infill.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This complex located at northeast is a rare surviving example of early 20<sup>th</sup> Century residential/commercial architecture. Comprised a house, a corner store, a kitchen building, and later connector, the building represents one of a once numerous building typology.

**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, the demolition of a later rear connector, constitutes the first phase of the building’s restoration and property’s redevelopment.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation, the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts, and the Guidelines for Mothballing Historic Buildings state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy the historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with massing, 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 way that the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.”
  - 3. “Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.”
  - 4. “Mothballing is only applicable to vacant historic buildings. For inhabited buildings, the International Property Maintenance Code, 2000 edition, will be used by Urban Development Inspectors to ensure the health, safety and welfare of the building’s inhabitants and to preserve the historic structure. In some instances where a more in-depth mothballing plan may be necessary, Preservation Brief 31, published by the

National Park Service, addresses more comprehensive mothball plans. Copies of this brief are available upon request. Some buildings may require phased work depending on the extent of disrepair. The scope of work on these buildings will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

C. Scope of Work (See submitted materials):

1. Demolish a later connector.
2. Mothball the re-exposed fenestration with OSB panels fitted and secured within the reveals of said openings.
3. Reconstruct the boxed eaves and fascia extending around the southern and northern sides of the re-exposed walls.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the demolition of later infill construction. Removal of the infill constitutes the first phase of the building's restoration. The infill is located to the rear of the property and joins the back portions of two parts of the building. Taking the form of a connector between the ensemble's kitchen and dwelling, the infill is not of the same quality design and construction as the other portions of the complex. The location and the roof design of the connector have caused structural and cosmetic damage.

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation state that replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence (See B-3.). Original siding is found on and original openings survive within the infill. The siding and the opening will be retained. The latter will be faced with mothballing measures that will be measured to fit the reveal. Lost sections of the fascia and eaves will be reconstructed to match existing.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on (B 1-3), Staff does not believe this application would impair the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district. Staff recommends approval of this application noting the panels must fit the windows and doors, be secured and painted dark green or black.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

No one was present to discuss the application.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Mr. Bemis notified the Board that in the interest of full disclosure Staff had involvement in this application on account of the property being owned by the Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund, a MHDC revolving fund.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any comments to make or questions to ask.

Mr. Roberts asked for clarification regarding the history and parts of the building.

Mr. Ladd asked the remainder of the Board if they had any questions to ask or comments to make. No further Board discussion 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.

### **FINDING OF FACT**

Mr. Oswalt 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. Oswalt 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: 3/19/13**

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

**2012-73-CA: 1263 Selma Street**  
**Applicant: John Dendy with John Dendy and Associates for Mr. and Mrs. Greg Cava**  
**Received: 11/29/12**  
**Meeting: 12/19/12**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden  
Classification: Contributing (primary building)  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Renovate an ancillary building.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This Colonial Revival house was constructed between 1905 and 1906. Built for Mr. John T. Schley, the classically detailed and grandly proportioned residence remained in the hands of the family for whom it was built until 2011.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

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

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. This property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The applicants propose the renovation of the property’s garage.
- B. The Design Review 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 the design and scale of the main building.”
- C. Renovate the property’s garage (per submitted plans):
  - 1. Elevate the building 5’ 1 ½”.
    - a. The heights of the two vehicular bays will increase from 8’ 6” to 11’ 10” in height.
    - b. Elevate the building’s west-facing doorway.
  - 2. Construct a flight of wooden steps with an intervening stoop as the means of accessing the west-facing door.
    - a. A simple picket balustrade will be employed on the aforementioned steps and stoop.
    - b. Install a concrete land pad at the foot of the stairs.
  - 3. Box the existing rafters.

4. Repair and replace deteriorated wooden siding and details to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material.
5. Reroof the garage with roofing shingles matching those employed on the main residence.
6. Repaint per the existing color scheme.
7. Locate an additional pedestrian entrance within the interior lot fencing. Said gate will match one already accessing the rear portion of the lot.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves raising the height of an ancillary building. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts do not specifically address the alteration of existing ancillary buildings. Construction of new ancillary buildings should complement the principle building located on the property (See B-1.).

The building, an early garage, dates from the first quarter of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century. Constructed either contemporaneously with or shortly after the main residence, the building's vehicular entrances do not accommodate the height of 21<sup>st</sup>-Century vehicles. Located in the most isolated corner of the rear lot and set back from the street, the alteration would not be immediately visible from Ann Street, the side street which extends along the western expanse of this corner lot. Existing fencing and plantings located to the west of the building would for the most part shield the increased height from the public view. The vehicular area is located within the inclusion. The articulation of the other elevations only becomes readily apparent when accessing the alleyway. Staff suggests that the applicant consider employing transom windows as a means of breaking up the East Elevation. Staff recognizes the necessity of having a garage that accommodates modern vehicles but notes that the early age of the garage is important to the history of the overall site. Staff encourages that the owners consider either increasing the height of the vehicular bays (if possible structurally) rather than raising the entire building five feet or minimize the proposed or minimizing the proposed increase in height.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

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

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

No one was present to discuss the application.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Mr. Blackwell clarified the height of the openings.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any comments to make or questions to ask.

Mr. Karwinski and Mr. Roberts entered into a discussion regarding the boxing in of the exposed rafter tails.

## **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 amended by the Board, the application does impair the historic integrity of the district or the building, but that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued with the condition that exposed rafter tails remain exposed and that the height of the vehicular bays reflect the measurements specified in the drawings.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 3/19/13**

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

**2012-74-CA: 257 Saint Anthony Street**  
**Applicant: Barry Friedman with Barry Friedman & Associates**  
**Received: 12/3/12**  
**Meeting: 12/19/12**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: DeTonti Square  
Classification: Non-Contributing  
Zoning: R-B  
Project: Door Replacement – Remove and replace a door.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This building was constructed as a two-story, four unit apartment house. The building’s second story was removed in the 1980s.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

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

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on February 16, 2011. At that time, the Board approved the construction of handicap access ramp and an overhanging umbrage. In this submission, the applicant proposes the removal and replacement of a front door.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “Often one of the most important decorative features of a house, doorways reflect the age and style of a building. Original doors and openings should be retained along with any moldings, transoms, or sidelights. Replacements should respect the age and style of the building.”
  - 2. “Doors with leaded or art glass may be appropriate when documentation exists for their use, or when they are compatible with the design and style of the building.”
- C. Scope of Work (See submitted materials.):
  - 1. Remove the front door.
  - 2. Install a new front door.
    - a. The door will be fiberglass in composition.
    - b. The door will be either Light Oak or Medium Oak in finish and graining/texture.
    - c. The door will feature a six paneled configuration with leaded glass lunette.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the removal and replacement of a front door. The Design Review Guidelines state that replacements should respect the age and style of the building (See B-1).

This non-contributing building has been undergone numerous alterations over the course of the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century. The original entrance and door are no longer present. The present door is a wooden door. The Design Review Guidelines do not prohibit fiberglass doors on non-contributing buildings and Staff does not believe the request will impair the historic integrity of the district. However, Staff does believe that this is not the best choice for the DeTonti Square neighborhood and suggests that the applicant consider a more traditional four or six panel wood door. The proposed door features leaded glass. Leaded glass is allowed when either documentation exists for its use or when it is appropriate to the building's style or period. No record of art or leaded glass survives for this building but since the door is so difficult to see Staff's only suggestion would be that clear leaded glass be used in place of any colored glass(See B-2.).

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Staff has no objection to the application but suggests a more traditional wood door would be a better solution for the neighborhood.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Barry Friedman 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. Friedman if he had any comments to make, questions to ask, or clarifications to address.

Mr. Friedman provided the Board with another illustration of a door that differed from the one submitted for review. A rendering of the door was circulated among the Board. Mr. Friedman asked for clarification regarding the meaning of clear glass.

Mr. Bemis addressed Mr. Friedman and the Board. He explained that the building is non-contributing and the location minimally visible. Mr. Ladd concurred.

Mr. Roberts made some observations regarding the design of the door.

Mr. Ladd reiterated that the door occupies an inconspicuous location.

## **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, amending facts to approve newly submitted door design.

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: 12/19/13**

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

**2012-75-CA:** 1357 Old Shell Road  
**Applicant:** Douglas B. Kearley with Douglas B. Kearley Architecture for Cindy and Warren Tyon  
**Received:** 12/3/12  
**Meeting:** 12/19/12

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Reconstruct a porch.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This house dates from 1912. In plan, proportion, and detail, this house demonstrates the transition from the Aesthetics Movement inspired Queen Anne style of the late 19<sup>th</sup> Century (as seen in the plan and the massing) to simpler more classically attuned spirit of the second decade of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century (as observed in the detailing).

**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. The house’s front porch was removed without the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness or the pulling of building permit. A stop work order was issued on May 3, 2012. The applicants immediately contacted Staff and suspended work on the project. After conducting research as to the original appearance of the porch and contacting several architects, the applicants submit an application calling for the reconstruction of the 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. “New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a way that the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.”
  2. “Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.”
  3. “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.”
  4. “The form and shape of the porch should maintain their historic appearance. The materials should blend with the style of the building.”



### **C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):**

1. Reconstruct the front porch.
  - a. The porch will rest atop the original foundations and decking structure.
  - b. A boxed, recessed, and framed lattice panel will be inserted within the porch's west-facing grille.
  - c. The existing flight of steps accessing the porch will be leveled if possible. The steps will be repaired and repainted.
  - d. Wooden handrails and newel posts will be employed on the step.
  - e. A wooden skirt board matching the original skirt board will extend around porch structure. Said skirting will be aligned with and match the skirting found on the body of the house.
  - f. Tongue-and-groove wooden porch decking will be employed.
  - g. Four paneled piers will support the porch's entablature. The pier treatment will match that of the salvaged pilasters.
  - h. A three part wooden entablature will be employed.
  - i. The cornice treatment will be based on surviving "ghost" marks of the original.
  - j. A wooden balustrade with pickets and newels matching those employed on the front steps will enclose the porch's slightly pitch roof. The railing's 1"x1" pickets will be spaced on 4" centers. The railing will be of an MHDC stock design.
  - k. Surviving pilasters will be reinstalled.
  - l. Repair, refinish, and if necessary reinstall the ogee-profiled gutter and related downspout.
  - m. Reconstruct a full-length window that will overlook the porch's wooden balcony. The location of said window was determined by "ghost mark." Said window will be centered within the porch's recessed wall bay.
  - n. Paint the work to match the existing color scheme.

### **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the reconstruction of a front porch. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that porches are an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture and that historic porch should be maintained and repaired to reflect their period (See B-3 of the Staff Report.). This porch had been altered during the middle third of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century. A second story was constructed. At some point both upper and lower stories were enclosed.

The proposed reconstruction would rest atop the original foundations and decking structure. In accord with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation, the detailing and proportions of the elements and details is substantiated by documentary, physical, and pictorial evidence (See B-2 of the Staff Report.). The foundation skirting and porch entablature will align with the location and match the profile of the original porch. Pilasters will be replicated and porch will piers will be constructed that will match the profiles and tapers of the same. An upper story window will be reinstalled in the location of an original opening.

### **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 the district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Douglas B. Kearley was present to discuss the application.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Blackwell notified the Board that a second full length window would open onto the second floor gallery. Mr. Kearley told the Board that ghost marks had been discovered for the door.

Mr. Ladd 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.

## **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, amending facts to note that a second full length window would open onto the second floor gallery.

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: 12/19/13**

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

**2012-76-CA:** 1658 Laurel Street  
**Applicant:** Douglas B. Kearley with Douglas B. Kearley Architecture for Michael and Kelly Smith  
**Received:** 12/3/12  
**Meeting:** 12/19/12

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: New Construction – Demolish a later rear addition and construct a new rear addition.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This vernacular level “bungalow” dates from the first third of the 20<sup>th</sup> 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 application up for review calls for the demolition of a later addition and the construction of a new addition.
- 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. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy the historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with massing, 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 way that 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.”
- C. Scope of Work:
  - 1. Demolish a later addition.
  - 2. Construct a new addition.
    - a. The addition will occupy the site of and extend the footprint of the earlier addition. Said new construction will square out the rear elevation.

- b. The addition will rest atop painted, stucco-faced brick foundation piers. Boxed and recessed lattice screening will be located between the foundation piers.
- c. The walls of the addition will be faced with hardiboard siding.
- d. Three-over-one windows will be employed.
- e. A hipped and gabled roof configuration will surmount the addition.
- f. A gable roof will extend over the addition's East Elevation and will tie into the East Elevation's existing gable.
- g. The East Elevation will feature a single three-over-one window.
- h. A four bay porch accessed by a flight of wooden steps will be centered on the North or Rear Elevation.
- i. The porch's wooden decking will be tongue-and-groove in construction.
- j. Four wooden columns will support the porch's hipped roof.
- k. The West Elevation's hipped roof will extend over the addition and over the rear portion of the house.
- l. The West Elevation will not feature fenestration.

### **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the construction of a rear addition. Construction of the proposed addition would necessitate the demolition of an earlier non-conforming addition. Removal of the aforementioned addition would serve to recapture additional architectural and historical integrity.

Construction of the proposed addition would entail alterations to the roof structure that surmounts the body of the house. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that original or historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof should be maintained. The roof of the proposed addition would extend over and would be higher than the original roof.

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation state that new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with massing, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment (See B-1 of the Staff Report.). Staff finds that the overall design, one more classical in its proportions and in its detail is not keeping with the Arts and Crafts character of the house. Hardiboard siding constitutes the proposed exterior sheathing. While hardiboard siding is allowed for use on additions, the Board ordinarily encourages the use of stucco or masonry additions when the main building is constructed of brick.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-3), Staff believes this application would impair the architectural and the historical character of the building. Staff does not recommend approval of this application.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Douglas B. Kearley was present to discuss the application.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Mr. Blackwell notified the Board that Mr. Kearley had submitted revised plans that took into account the recommendations found within the Staff Report. During the course of the PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Blackwell showed imagery of the revised proposal.

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant. He asked Staff if the revised proposal had a Staff Recommendation for approval.

Mr. Bemis answered no on account of the materials and the detailing. He said that the Board ordinarily requests that stucco or masonry be employed on additions to brick buildings and that the porch treatment was more in keeping with a classical building than a Mission influenced design.

Mr. Kearley said that siding had been employed on additions to brick buildings. Mr. Blackwell cited an example located at the northeast corner of Bradford Avenue and Brown Street.

Mr. Kearley said that while the moldings could be removed from the porch posts, no one would see them or any Mission attuned supports on account of the location.

Mr. Holmes asked Mr. Kearley if there would be a break or transition between the old and new work. Mr. Kearley responded by saying that a corner board would be employed. Mr. Holmes said the addition would then not be set back. Mr. Kearley answered no. He told the Board that it would largely occupy the footprint of the earlier non-conforming addition.

Mr. Wagoner asked for clarification regarding hardiboard. Mr. Blackwell stated that hardiboard is approved for additions and new construction.

Mr. Karwinski said that for the record additions should be set in from not in plan with existing historic fabric.

Mr. Holmes stated that the proposed addition represents an improvement over the existing addition.

#### **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 roof form would reflect the revised drawings.

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.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 12/19/13**