

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

December 2, 2015 – 3:00 P.M.

Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Bradford Ladd, Jr., called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
Members Present: Robert Allen, David Barr, Carolyn Hasser, Nick Holmes, II, Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswald, II, Craig Roberts, and Steve Stone,
Members Absent: Robert Brown, Catarina Echols, Kim Harden, and Carolyn Hasser,
Staff Members Present: Cartledge W. Blackwell.
2. Mr. Stone moved to approve the minutes for the October 21, 2014 meeting. The motion received a second and was unanimously approval.
3. Mr. Oswald moved to approve midmonth COA's granted by Staff. The motion received a second and was unanimously approval. The motion received a second and was unanimously approval.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED.

1. **Applicant: Wayne Morgan**
 - a. Property Address: 1311 Brown Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/6/15
 - c. Project: Repaint the house as per existing color scheme.
2. **Applicant: Todd Fowler**
 - a. Property Address: 1161 New St. Francis Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/30/15
 - c. Project: Install a cast iron fence that will enclose the front lawn.
3. **Applicant: Reginald Lee Lamar**
 - a. Property Address: 1103 Elmira Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/2/15
 - c. Project: Replace rotten wood to match, repaint body of house white, trim same, patch roof as necessary with shingles to match, replace porch columns to match.
4. **Applicant: Brian Douglas Doyle**
 - a. Property Address: 1752 Hunter Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/2/15
 - c. Project: Install a wooden privacy fence. Said interior lot fence will be located in advance of an existing chain-link fence, but behind the front plane of the house. The fencing will be six feet in height. An aluminum gate will be used at the vehicular entrance.
5. **Applicant: Yancey Leeth**
 - a. Property Address: 50 Hannon Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/5/15
 - c. Project: Reroof with 20 year architectural shingle, slate gray.

- 6. Applicant: Donald Quigley**
 - a. Property Address: 255 Michigan Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/4/15
 - c. Project: Jack and level; remove non-historic exterior stair north elevation; add French door and deck at rear elevation; paint to match.
- 7. Applicant: Matt McDonald**
 - a. Property Address: 1260 Selma Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/3/15
 - c. Project: Reroof with 25 year architectural shingle, black color.
- 8. Applicant: Keep Mobile Beautiful**
 - a. Property Address: 1451 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/6/15
 - c. Project: Install a storage unit to the rear of the main building. Said installation will not be visible from the public view.
- 9. Applicant: Kevin Beuk with Mobile Fence for Brian Douglas Doyle**
 - a. Property Address: 1752 Hunter Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/2/15
 - c. Project: Install a wooden privacy fence. Said interior lot fence will be located in advance of an existing chain-link fence, but behind the front plane of the house. The fencing will be six feet in height. An aluminum gate will be used at the vehicular entrance.
- 10. Applicant: Davis & Associates**
 - a. Property Address: 1967 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/9/15
 - c. Project: Install an aluminum walls sign to the building's façade. The signage meets the size, material, and other historical requirements.
- 11. Applicant: Fast Signs**
 - a. Property Address: 204 Conti Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/9/15
 - c. Project: Install window graphics per submitted plan and as approved by the CRC.
- 12. Applicant: Sign Pro**
 - a. Property Address: 202 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/10/15
 - c. Project: Install a metal blade sign and a wall sign. Said signage meets size, material, design, and other requirements as per the Sign Design Guidelines and the DDD Code.
- 13. Applicant: Admiral Semmes**
 - a. Property Address: 251 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/10/15
 - c. Project: Install the remainder of a signage package. All signage received approval from the ARB, CRC, and BZA.

- 14. Project: Applicant: Enen Yu**
- a. Property Address: 1111 Church Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/10/15
 - c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Paint the trim, windows, detailing, etc... Government Street Olive. Reroof to match the existing. Extend sections of existing fencing. Install an inward opening vehicular gate. Resurface existing parking.
- 15. Applicant: Mike Matthews**
- a. Property Address: 62 Fearnway
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/12/15
 - c. Replace window north elevation bump out with historic wood window, paint to match.
- 16. Applicant: Qullias Mitchell**
- a. Property Address: 325 State Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/12/15
 - c. Project: Replace one free standing sign with wood per design in MHDC file; add aluminum sign on wall where one was affixed earlier.
- 17. Applicant: Charles H. Jones, Jr.**
- a. Property Address: 454 Conti Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/16/15
 - c. Project: Install storm windows. Said installation will fit within the window reveals.
- 18. Applicant: Hedge Law Firm**
- a. Property Address: 1206 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/16/15
 - c. Project: Paint the building per the submitted Sherwin Williams color scheme – walls (Colonial Revival Stone); trim (Classic White); and Porch (Tricorn Black). Reinstate brick lattice foundation screening. Said screening will be parched with stucco.
- 19. Applicant: Caldwell Whistler**
- a. Property Address: 8 Ann Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/16/15
 - c. Project: Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated porch decking to match the existing as per profile, dimension, construction, and material. Repair, reinstate, and when necessary replace (to match in all respects) porch railings. Reinstate missing window panes. If necessary repair and replace deteriorated window frames to match as per light configuration, material, and profiles.
- 20. Applicant: Brook Williams**
- a. Property Address: 112 South Dearborn Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/19/15
 - c. Project: Replace porch decking per existing, repaint to match.

21. Applicant: Jim Walker, III

- a. Property Address: 651 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 11/19/15
- c. Project: Repaint the building per the same color scheme as 550 Church Street.

22. Applicant: Jim Walker, III

- a. Property Address: 659 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 11/19/15
- c. Project: Repaint the façade in the Blue hues of the MHDC/BLP blue color scheme.

23. Applicant: Jim Walker, III

- a. Property Address: 661-663 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 11/19/15
- c. Project: Repaint the façade per the existing color scheme and paint the west elevation per the same.

24. Applicant: Gaines Zarzour

- a. Property Address: 963 Government Street
- b. Date of Approval: 11/18/15
- c. Project: Pressurewash the building. Repaint beltcourses, window sills, and windows. Repair and if necessary replace windows to match the existing as per profile, dimension, material, and light configuration. Repaint the front door. Install uplighting to be focused on the building's Government Street façade. Install landscaping (and sod). Repaint the building's cornice and fire escape. Remove later infill from within the parking enclosure. Reroof the parking enclosure.

25. Applicant: Custom Roofing

- a. Property Address: 963 Government Street
- b. Date of Approval: 11/23/15
- c. Project: Replace roof with Timberline roof, charcoal.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2015-40-CA: 8 South Conception Street

- a. Applicant: Carlos Gant for Thelma and Joia Juzang
- b. Project: Changes to Previously Approved Plans – Alter the ground floor of downtown infill construction.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2015-41-CA: 10-14 South Conception Street

- a. Applicant: Courtney C. Brett and William Appling for Dale Short
- b. Project: Commercial Restoration – Restore Storefronts, reinstate awnings, install signage.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

3. 2015-42-CA: 25 Blacklawn Street

- a. Applicant: Jonathan Boyer with Mr. HQ Metal Roofing Headquarters for Margaret Thigpen and Russell Travis
- b. Project: Demolition – Demolish a single family residence located within a larger urban family compound.

APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

4. 2015-43-CA: 27 Blacklawn Street

- a. Applicant: Jonathan Boyer with Mr. HQ Metal Roofing Headquarters for Keith and Jane Vrazel
- b. Project: Demolition – Demolish a single family residence located within a larger urban family compound.

APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

5. 2015-44-CA: 8 LeMoyne Place

- a. Applicant: City of Mobile
- b. Project: Demolition – Demolish a derelict residence.

DENIED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

6. 2015-45-CA: 10 Ann Street

- a. Applicant: Caldwell Whistler
- b. Project: Demolition – Demolish a single family residence located within a larger urban family compound.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. MHDC Guidelines
2. Discussion

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2015-40-CA: 8 South Conception Street
Applicant: Carlos Gant for Thelma and Joia Juzang
Received: 11/10/15
Meeting: 12/2/15

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: T5-2
Project: Changes to Previously Approved Plans – Alter the ground floor of downtown infill construction.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to materials found within this property’s MHDC file, the storefront that previously occupied this site dated circa 1905. Taking into account the age, size, dimensions, and composition of the bricks which were exposed by the building’s collapse/demolition, the façade was earlier than the attributed date.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on March 4, 2015. At that time, the Board approved the construction of a new commercial façade. Following feedback from the Downtown Mobile Alliance’s Grants Committee and additional review by the City of Mobile’s Certified Review Committee, the body which reviews designs in the Downtown Development District (DDD), and the applicants have revised the proposal so to better reflect historical precedent and architectural context.
- B. The New Commercial Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “New construction should reference the façade elements of nearby historic buildings.”

2. “Each façade has three main components: base (storefront), shaft (upper stories), and cornice. Where appropriate, new construction should utilize the three aforementioned elements. A storefront is further divided four elements: bulkhead, display windows, main entrance, and transoms. Where appropriate, these elements may be included in new retail construction.”
3. “Materials and ornamentation are important characteristics of a building. A range of decorative motifs can be seen in the historic districts. Both materials and ornamentation are important in creating continuity within the districts. New commercial construction should take these elements into consideration.”

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

1. Employ a continuous brick bulkhead on the ground floor instead of a combination of distinct brick and aluminum-fronted bulkheads.
2. Increase the height of the ground floor storefront windows and transoms.
3. Install wood framed and glazed doors on the ground-floor.
4. Remove horizontal brick paneled device from the ground-floor’s façade.
5. Employ glazing on both sides of the recessed storefront entry’s display reveals.
6. Adopt a six-light pattern for the upper-story’s glazed and paneled door instead of an eight light pattern.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves changes to previously approved plans. The subject lot featured a two-story storefront dating from the latter half of the 19th Century. During the course of repairs undertaken in the Fall of 2014, the façade partially collapsed and was removed. New infill construction was approved in March of 2015. Realizing upon direction from the Downtown Mobile Alliance’s Grants Committee and additional review by the City of Mobile’s Certified Review Committee (CRC), the applicants have revised their application in ways that better reflect the architectural and historical contexts of the prominent downtown location. The proposed changes are largely restricted to the building’s ground-floor storefront.

The approved façade elevation called for a bulkhead constructed of two materials. The revised plans up for consideration call for a uniform brick bulkhead. The New Commercial Construction Guidelines state that infill should reference the façade elements of nearby historic buildings (See B-1.). Bulkheads are traditional design/construction component. Most bulkheads were masonry. Said design element and construction material respond to the historical context (See B 2-3.).

Immediately above the bulkhead are found display windows with surmounting transoms. The New Commercial Construction Guidelines list display windows as a second defining feature of traditional early 20th Century commercial design (See B-2.). The approved designs called for a more compact design. The heights and nature of the display windows have been altered to better reflect height of the building. The display windows would continue around the window reveals and therefore adopting the traditional form and function of that spatial sequence, spaces intended to highlight goods and entice the passerby to enter the building.

The approved plans called for aluminum storefront units and doors. The revised plans call for wooden display windows, transoms, and doors. The material selection is keeping with the historical character of the location (See B-3.).

By increasing the height of the display windows, a horizontally oriented brick paneled located above the transoms would be reduced in such a way as to be detrimental to the design. The band would not be reconstructed. The more integrated window sequence represents a more important design component than the intermediate paneled register.

The original drawings depicted a second-story door that was not proportioned to match the flanking windows. The approved plans called for windows and doors to be located within openings of the same size. The proposed alteration to the light pattern of the glazed section of the doors is more responsive to the size of the opening and light configuration of the flanking windows.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-3), Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or historical character of the historic district. Staff recommends approval of the changes to previously approved plans.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Carlos Gant was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicants' representative. He applauded Mr. Gant and his clients for their efforts to successfully bring a positive result out of a tragic occurrence. Mr. Ladd then asked Mr. Gant if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make. Mr. Gant thanked Mr. Ladd. He stated that the applicant's decided to make the changes up for consideration and wanted to now move forward with the project.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if he had any questions to ask the applicants' representative.

Mr. Stone asked for clarification regarding the light configuration. Mr. Gant addressed Mr. Stone's concern. He apologized for a discrepancy. Mr. Stone said that he was simply checking and wanting to see if the muntins aligned.

No further discussion ensued among the assembled Board members.

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.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2015-41-CA: 10-14 South Conception Street
Applicant: William Appling for Dale Short
Received: 10/15
Meeting: 12/2/15

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: T5.2
Project: Restore and rehabilitate a three-unit 1920s commercial storefront – Clean and reinstate tile floors within the recessed entrances; repair/replace bulkhead facings; replace later door units; replace a security door with a wooden door; install a chalkboard; reopen and/or reconstruct intermediate transoms across the façade; reconstruct awnings; and install signage.

BUILDING HISTORY

The historical name of this building is the Lindsey Building. Dating from 1910, the design and form of the building represents the transition from traditional 19th Century commercial design to 20th Century commercial impulses. The two-story massing and mixed use nature of the structure represent the past, while the detailing and cosmetic components anticipate the future.

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 6, 2001. At that time, the Board, the installation of a new storefront sequence. The application up for review calls for the restoration and rehabilitation of the façade.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Districts, the Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts & Government Street, and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.”
 - 2. “Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and,

where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence”

3. “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 with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”
3. “New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.”
4. “Signs shall be mounted or erected so they do not obscure the architectural features or openings of a building.”
5. “The overall design of all signage including the mounting framework shall relate to the design of the principal building on the property. Buildings with a recognizable style such as Greek Revival, Italianate, Victorian, Queen Anne, Neo-classic, Craftsman, et al., should use signage of the same style. This can be done through the use of similar decorative features such as columns or brackets. For buildings without a recognizable style, the sign shall adopt the decorative features of the building, utilizing the same materials and colors.”
6. “The size of the sign shall be in proportion to the building and the neighboring structures and signs.”
7. “The total maximum allowable sign area for all signs is one and one half square feet per linear front foot of the principal building, not to exceed 64 square feet. A multi-tenant building is also limited to a maximum of 64 square feet.”
8. “The structural materials of the sign should match the historic materials of the building. Wood, metal, stucco, stone or brick, is allowed. Plastic, vinyl or similar materials are prohibited. Neon, resin to give the appearance of wood, and fabric may be used as appropriate.”
9. “Lighting can be an important element in the historic districts. Therefore, where lighting impacts the exterior appearance of a building or of the district in which the building is located, it shall be reviewed for appropriateness as any other element.”

C. Scope of Work:

1. Restore and rehabilitate a three-unit 1920s commercial storefront.
 - a. Clean tiled floor surfaces from within the two southernmost unit’s recessed entrances and reinstate the same tiles on the floor of the northernmost recessed entrance.
 - b. Restore the surfaces and appearances of the ground floor bulkheads.
 - i. Repair and when necessary replace the marble facing surfaces fronting the central unit.
 - ii. Remove later bulkhead surfaces from the outer units
 - iii. Reinstall marble facings on the bulkheads of the aforementioned units.
 - c. Remove later doors and transoms from the ground-floor’s three storefront units.
 - i. Construct wooden casings for all three units.

- ii. Install single eight-light glazed and wood framed doors in the casings of the two outer unit's entrances. A single light transom will surmount the units.
- iii. Install a wood framed large single light double door within the center unit's central entrance. A single light transom will surmount the double door unit.
- d. Redefine the ground floor access to the upper-story.
 - i. Remove a metal security door from the ground floor's northernmost fenestrated bay.
 - ii. Install a wooden door featuring flush horizontal boarding in the aforementioned fenestrated bay.
- e. Install a chalkboard to the right of the northernmost unit's entrance.
- f. Reopen and/or reconstruct the façade's intermediate level transoms bands.
 - i. The transom bands will be wood framed in construction.
 - ii. The bands will be five in number for each unit.
- g. Reconstruct awnings.
 - i. The sides of the three reconstructed awnings will be faced with metal.
 - ii. Traditional metal ties extending from the façade will secure the awnings.
 - iii. The ceilings of awnings will feature tongue-groove paneling.
 - iv. Can lights will be installed within the awnings.
- h. Install three hanging blade signs.
 - i. All three hanging blades signs will measure 2'6" in length and 1' in height.
 - ii. All three signs will be made of aluminum.
 - iii. All three signs will be double-faced.
 - iv. All three signs will feature the names of the respective tenants occupying each of the three units.

i.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the restoration and rehabilitation of a commercial façade dating from 1910. Aspects of the scope of work include the reconstruction of lost elements (a tiled entrance, bulkhead facings, transoms, and awnings), the construction of sympathetic features (doors and awnings), introduction of reversible interventions (a chalk board), installation of new signage (three blade signs), and provision lighting (can lights).

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards state that the replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence (See B-2.). Documentary, physical and pictorial evidence substantiates the reinstallation of tiled surfaces within the northernmost entrance and the repair/replacement of marble facings on the bulkheads fronting the two outer storefront units. The existing tiles surviving at the two other entrances shall be preserved, as well the marble facings fronting the central bulkheads. If replacement measures are required, the replacement materials and their treatment will match the existing as per design, color, texture, and other visual qualities (See B-2.).

The doors accessing the three ground floor commercial units are not original to the building. Replacement of the aforementioned units would not remove historic material that characterizes the property (See B-3.). The proposed doors and surrounding casements are respectful of the historic context. As with the doors opening onto the three storefront units, the security door accessing the stairs to the second-story is not original. The proposed door meets the material standards and is differential from, yet compatible with the historic fabric (See B-3.).

The area impacted by the proposed chalkboard dates from the recent decades. This interactive feature is represents an engaging irreversible intervention (See B-3.).

The reopening/reconstruction of the transom windows is substantiated by documentary, physical, and pictorial evidence (See B-2.).

While the proposed awnings are not of the same design as depicted in the 1950s photographs, these sympathetic introductions are appropriate to the period and style of the building. Similar awnings have been installed at 127 Dauphin Street and 56 St. Emanuel Street. Numerous other examples can be cited.

With regard to signage, the three proposed blade signs meet the size, material and design requirements outlined in the Signage Design Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts and the Government Street Corridor. The installation of the can lights will neither impact historic fabric nor take away from pedestrian or residential experiences (See B 5-9.).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-9), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building or the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

William Appling 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. Appling if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make. Mr. Appling replied that of the scope of work he only wanted to further explain the door accessing the upper-story. Mr. Appling relayed several considerations as per possible treatments, i.e. finishes, of said door.

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

Mr. Roberts complimented Mr. Appling on the design. He said the work up for consideration would be a wonderful improvement for the building and streetscape.

Mr. Roberts then asked Staff why construction drawings had not been submitted. He explained that why he and others could realize what was to transpire. More concrete explanation would be beneficial and should be expected.

Mr. Roberts and Mr. Blackwell entered into an exchange as per conceptual and construction drawings.

Mr. Stone further nuanced the construction and code aspects of review, as did Mr. Blackwell.

Mr. Blackwell said that construction drawings would be requested for future projects.

No further discussion ensued among the assembled Board members.

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. 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.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2015-42-CA: 25 Blacklawn Street

Applicant: Jonathan Boyer with Mr. HQ Metal Roofing Headquarters for Margaret Thigpen and Travis Russell

Received: 11/18/15

Meeting: 12/2/15

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

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

BUILDING HISTORY

According to materials in this property’s MHDC file, this Arts & Crafts informed house dates circa 1930. With its simple lines, anchoring roof structure, and substantial porch sequence, the dwelling possesses the quintessential ingredients of an American “bungalow”.

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. With this application, the owners propose the removal of existing asphalt shingles and the installation of metal roofing panels.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Original or historic roof forms as well as the original pitch of the roof should be maintained. Materials should be appropriate to the form, pitch, and color.”
- C. **Scope of Work (per submitted plans and submitted materials):**
 - 1. Remove existing asphalt shingles.
 - 2. Install a metal roof.
 - 3. The roofing metal panels would be 5-V in construction and profile.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the installation of metal roofing panels on a contributing Arts & Crafts residence. Metal roofing is among the approved roofing materials listed in the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts. With exceptions of certain house types (such as shotguns), constructions (such as cast iron galleries), and building typologies (such as industrial/commercial), individual applications for metal roofs are reviewed on a case by case basis.

Metal roofing is a traditional roofing material in Mobile. As the 19th-century progressed, metal roofs were employed more frequently. Both frame & brick and residential & commercial buildings featured metal roofs. Standing seam panels and individual shingles were the most common metal roofing types. 5-V crimp metal roofing was another alternative.

The Design Review Guidelines state that roofing materials should be appropriate to the form, pitch, and color of the roof(s) (See B (1) of the Staff Report.). The style of the building constitutes an additional and important consideration.

This house does not feature a complicated roof structure. Neither dormers, turrets, nor multiple projecting bays need to be addressed. A main gable roof structure and consequent form is set parallel from the street. A gabled dormer advances from the façade and over the main porch. Smaller hip and shed roof forms skirt the side and rear elevations.

The roof pitches are not overly pronounced.

No color has been specified for the metal panels. Galvalume has been approved. Bright colors such as green, red, or blue are not allowed as they were not traditional metal roofing colors. Brown or burnished panels could work, but fading could ensue.

In reviewing previous applications the Board has discussed the number and spacing of ridges. Standing Seam and 5-V crimp have been approved on account of the fewer number and lower height of dividing seams. 5-V crimp panels have been proposed.

This dwelling is a contributing Arts & Crafts Movement informed structure. While it relied upon mass production, the Arts & Crafts movement represented a reaction against industrialization. The dimensional component of a shingle is a characteristic feature of that "Craftsman" informed outlook.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1), Staff does not believe that a metal roof will in concept impair the architectural and historical integrity of the building or the district. The type and construction of said roofing material and its impact on the style of the building has to be considered. Staff recommends the consideration of metal panels that adopt the appearance of individual metal shingles and the use of panels of a bronze or an earth-colored hue.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Margaret Thigpen and Jonathan Boyer were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

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

Mr. Boyer explained that the applicants were pursuing the proposed roofing on account of its durability. He stated that the lifetime and construction of metal roofing far exceeds present day asphalt shingles.

Mr. Roberts agreed with Mr. Boyer, but he said that the type of roofing proposed was an issue.

Mr. Boyer said that he realized the historical concern in general and particular. He went on to address the dimensional aspect afforded by metal panels that are treated to appear as individual tiles. He stated that he first appeared before the Board with one such application, one for a house on Government Street. Mr. Ladd recalled the building. Mr. Allen mentioned another instance of success metal panel construction that appeared as an application of individual tiles. Mr. Boyer stated that he understood and appreciated the observation and direction, but went on to say that prices between metal panels and the recommended type are almost double.

Discussion ensued as to metal roofs in general and profiles in particular.

Mr. Boyer mentioned the existence of a metal roof on a bungalow on McPhillips Street. Mr. Blackwell explained the nature of that approval.

Discussion ensued as to options.

Mr. Boyer explained that he had discussed possible comprises with his clients and that they were amenable to employing a GulfLoc panel roofing panels that would be light grey in color. He explained that the GulfLoc profile was traditional and not industrial in appearance. Mr. Blackwell spoke to the color.

Mr. Blackwell explained that it would fall into previous precedent in terms of roofing profile design and stylistic concern.

Mr. Boyer made additional comments about review board processes in other cities as it related to Arts and Crafts homes.

Mr. Holmes stated that solution outlined above was more in keeping than that proposed.

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. Stone moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending facts to note the use of GulfLoc roofing panels which would be light grey in color.

The motion received a second and was approved. Mr. Allen opposed.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

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

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2015-43-CA: 27 Blacklawn

Applicant: Jonathan Boyer with Mr. HQ Metal Roofing Headquarters Keith & Jane Vrazel

Received: 11//15

Meeting: 12/2/15

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way

Classification: Contributing

Zoning: R-1

Project: Reroofing

BUILDING HISTORY

This Arts & Crafts informed dwelling dates circa 1930. The house features a full-length porch. In addition to the embracing porch, the dominant roof structure, simple lines, and substantial proportioning are characteristic features of the house and genre it represents – the American “bungalow”.

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. With this application, the owners propose the removal of existing asphalt shingles and the installation of metal roofing panels.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Original or historic roof forms as well as the original pitch of the roof should be maintained. Materials should be appropriate to the form, pitch, and color.”
- C. **Scope of Work (per submitted plans and submitted materials):**
 - 1. Remove existing tile shingles.
 - 2. Install a metal roof.
 - 3. The roofing metal panels would be 5-V in construction and profile.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the installation of metal roofing panels on a contributing Arts & Crafts residence. Metal roofing is among the approved roofing materials listed in the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts. With exceptions of certain house types (such as shotguns), constructions (such as cast iron galleries), and building typologies (such as industrial/commercial), individual applications for metal roofs are reviewed on a case by case basis.

Metal roofing is a traditional roofing material in Mobile. As the 19th-century progressed, metal roofs were employed more frequently. Both frame & brick and residential & commercial buildings featured metal roofs. Standing seam panels and individual shingles were the most common metal roofing types. 5-V crimp metal roofing was another alternative.

The Design Review Guidelines state that roofing materials should be appropriate to the form, pitch, and color of the roof(s) (See B (1) of the Staff Report.). The style of the building constitutes an additional and important consideration.

This house does not feature a complicated roof structure. Neither dormers, turrets, nor multiple projecting bays need to be addressed. A principle gable with secondary porch gable both oriented perpendicular to the street surmount the one-story dwelling. Side and rear hip and shed roofs complete the whole.

The roof pitches are not pronounced.

No color has been specified for the metal panels. Galvalume has been approved. Bright colors such as green, red, or blue are not allowed as they were not traditional metal roofing colors. Brown panels could work, but fading could ensue.

In reviewing previous applications the Board has discussed the number and spacing of ridges. Standing Seam and 5-V crimp have been approved on account of the fewer number and lower height of dividing seams. 5-V crimp panels have been proposed.

This dwelling is a contributing Arts & Crafts Movement informed structure. The dimensional component of a shingle is a characteristic feature of that "Craftsman" informed aesthetic.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1), Staff does not believe that a metal roof will in concept impair the architectural and historical integrity of the building or the district. The type and construction of said roof would have to be considered. Staff recommends the consideration of metal panels that adopt the appearance of individual metal shingles and the use of panels of a bronze or an earth-colored hue.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Keith Vrazel and Jonathan Boyer were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant and his representative. He asked Mr. Vrazel and Mr. Boyer if either of them had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Mr. Boyer raised the same points which he and the Board mentioned previously. He explained that the applicant was considering amending the application to employ GulfLoc panels which would be cocoa brown in color.

Mr. Vrazel spoke to the rationale behind the metal roofing panels. He stated that not only would the roofing be more maintenance friendly, but also pleasing to the eye. Mr. Vrazel said that the roof would do anything that would take away from maintenance and appearance of his home.

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. Stone moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending facts to note the use of GulfLoc panels which would be cocoa brown in color.

The motion received a second. Mr. Allen and Mr. Roberts voted in opposition.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

The motion received a second. Mr. Allen and Mr. Roberts voted in opposition.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2015-44-CA: 8 Lemoyne Place
Applicant: Gary Jackson with the City of Mobile (Architectural Engineering) for Ms. Eloyd Murphy
Received: 8/24/15
Meeting: 0/16/15

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Demolition – Demolish a single-family residence which is an extremely advanced state of decay.

BUILDING HISTORY

This classically detailed foursquare type dwelling dates circa 1910

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. According to the contents of this property’s MHDC property file, 8 LeMoyne Avenue has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The property, one which has been on the City’s Nuisance List for a number of years. The house is in extremely advanced state of structural decay and is proposed for demolition by the City of Mobile. If granted demolition approval, the derelict house will be demolished, the site will be cleared, grass will be planted, and the property will be listed for sale.
- B. With 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 house dates circa 1910. The building is listed as a contributing structure in the Old Dauphin Way National Register Historic District. A grandly proportioned dwelling of the American Foursquare typology it is among the finest and oldest houses located on LeMoyne Place.

- ii. The importance of the structures to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
 - 1. The dwelling contributes to the built density, rhythmic spacing, and historical character of the surrounding Old Dauphin Way Historic District.
 - iii. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
 - 1. The building materials are capable of being reproduced. Most of the exterior surface materials and elements would have to be replaced. The interior structure is even more periled condition. The roof has collapsed.
 - iv. Whether the structure is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood, the county, or the region or is a good example of its type, or is part of an ensemble of historic buildings creating a neighborhood;
 - 1. Foursquare dwellings are located within all of Mobile's seven locally designated National Register Historic Districts. Old Dauphin Way contains a large number of this uniquely American residential typology. Examples are found across the United States.
 - v. Whether there are definite plans for reuse of the property if the proposed demolition is carried out, and what effect such plans will have on the architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological, social, aesthetic, or environmental character of the surrounding area.
 - 1. If granted demolition approval, the debris would be removed, the lot would be leveled, and sod would be planted.
 - vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 - 1. -
 - vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 - 1. The property has stood vacant for -
 - viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 - 1. The property has been listed for sale.
 - ix. Description of the options currently held for the purchase of such property, including the price received for such option, the conditions placed upon such option and the date of expiration of such option;
 - 1. N.A.
 - x. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
 - 1. N.A.
 - 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.
 - 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 materials and communications):
1. Demolish a contributing residence.
 2. Remove debris from the property.
 3. Clear the site formerly occupied by the demolished dwelling.
 4. Plant grass.
 5. Sell the property to an owner who will redevelop the site in a manner respectful of the architectural and historical character to streetscape and district.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application concerns the demolition of a contributing residential building. When reviewing demolition applications, the Board takes into the account the following considerations: the architectural significance of the building; the condition of the building; the impact the demolition will have on the streetscape; and the nature of any proposed redevelopment.

8 LeMoyne Place is a contributing building located within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The dwelling is a fine example of the American Foursquare residential typology. This uniquely American typology came into being in the 1890s and remained a popular housing choice into the 1920s. Examples of this building type are found within and without Mobile's National Register and locally designated historic districts. Several additional examples are found on LeMoyne Street itself. Some of Mobile's most notable instances of the typology line Dauphin Street. Examples of the typology are found across the United States.

This building is in an extremely advanced state of disrepair. Conditions extend far beyond cosmetic concerns. Sills are rotten and the roof structure has collapsed.

The house contributes to the built density, rhythmic sequencing, historic character, physical experience of LeMoyne Place. An inner block dwelling in an intact expanse of a block, the building is only viewed from head on or an oblique angle.

If granted demolition approval, the building would be demolished, debris would be carefully removed, the site would be leveled, sod would be planted, and the lot would be sold. Work would be done by a firm contracted by the City. A buyer would be obligated to redevelop the site in a manner fully in keeping with Mobile's Historic District Guidelines.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff believes this application would impair the architectural and the historical character of the building, compound, and district, but recommends approval of the demolition on account of the extremely advanced state of the disrepair.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

David Daughenbaugh was present to discuss the application. Mr. Ladd welcomed Mr. Daughenbaugh and asked him if he had any questions to ask, clarifications to address, or comments to make.

Considerable discussion ensued as to the past precedent informing demolitions and procedures informing the demolition of the building.

Mr. Daughenbaugh informed the Board of the City of Mobile's Property Maintenance procedures in relation to the property. He spoke of the late owner of the house.

Mr. Blackwell informed the Board of earlier nuisance informed demolitions.

Mr. Allen queried the procedure of the sale.

Mr. Blackwell explained that the property would fall under the purview of the Neighborhood Renewal Project.

Both Mr. Blackwell and Mr. Daughenbaugh spoke of the condition of the property. Mr. Daughenbaugh spoke of the condition of the rear portion of the building and the possibility of the walls of main part of the house collapsing.

Mr. Ladd asked Mr. Daughenbaugh if the concern was for public safety. Mr. Daughenbaugh answered yes. He said that life-safety concerns were not the only malady impacting the property.

The conditions and encumbrances of a sale were discussed.

Mr. Allen stated that he understood the situation, but concerns still existed.

He recommended mothballing the building instead of demolishing it.

Mr. Holmes said that mothballing in a building in the condition exhibited the subject dwelling would only prolong the deterioration of that which could not be restored.

Mr. Ladd reminded his fellow Board members of the importance of precedent.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. explained to the applicant

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 or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness not be issued.

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

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2015-36-CA: 10 South Ann Street
Applicant: Caldwell Whistler
Received: 11/13/15
Meeting: 12/2/15

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Demolition – Demolish a single-family residence located within a larger family complex.

BUILDING HISTORY

Materials in this property’s MHDC file date the dwelling to 1896. The building does not appear on the 1901 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map. It is possible that the house’s gable surmounted northern wing incorporates a vehicular shed depicted in the aforementioned map, but the probability is unlikely for reasons of elevation and construction. The footprint of the building is found within the 1955 Sanborn Maps.

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

- C. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on September 16, 2015. At that time, the application was heldover to allow the owner to clarify legal concerns impacting the Board’s consideration. The application first appeared before the Board on December 3, 2014. At that time the Board denied an earlier proposal calling for demolition of the deteriorated residence. The building suffers from long-term deferred maintenance. On September 21, 2011, the applicant’s received approval to demolish a later rear wing. The demolition caused structural damage to building, as well as opening up portions of the dwelling to the elements. At the December 3, 2014 meeting, the applicant was advised that the property could be reconsidered for demolition following six months of being listed on MLS. The Board also recommended that the applicant instigate mothballing measures.

B. With 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:

2. *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:

- v. The historic or architectural significance of the structure;
 1. Material found within this house’s MHDC property file dates the dwelling to 1895. The house does not appear in the Sanborn Fire Insurance Map of 1901. While the dwelling could incorporate a portion of a dependency, possibly a carriage house/servants quarter, depicted in the 1901 Sanborn Map, it is doubtful. The present configuration of the house appears on the 1955 Sanborn Map. The materials, massing, detailing, and scale of the dwelling are characteristic of the building’s period, style, and typology.
- vi. The importance of the structures to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
 1. This house is part of a larger family compound comprised of three principle residences and attendant ancillary structures. Setback within the boot of L-shaped compound, the building faces, but does not directly engage the street (on account of the presence of distance from the street and presence of the two other principle residences).
- vii. 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.
- viii. 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. Other frame dwellings of the same construction and articulation dating from the middle third of the 20th Century survive within and beyond Mobile’s westernmost historic districts (local and not).
- 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. If granted demolition approval, the owner would demolish the house, remove debris, and level the site.
- vii. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 1. The owner acquired the property by inheritance.

- viii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 - 1. After demolishing the 1970s rear additions, the applicant began to consider demolishing the whole dwelling.
 - ix. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 - 2. As the house is situated on property that is constricted by the two other properties forming the family compound, the applicant has not considered listing the property individually.
 - x. 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. N.A.
 - xi. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
 - 1. N.A.
 - xiii. 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.
 - 2. Application submitted.
 - xiv. 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 materials):

- 1. Demolish a contributing residence.
- 2. Remove debris from the property.
- 3. Clear the site formerly occupied by the demolished dwelling.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application concerns the demolition of a contributing residential building. When reviewing demolition applications, the Board takes into the account the following considerations: the architectural significance of the building; the condition of the building; the impact the demolition will have on the streetscape; and the nature of any proposed redevelopment.

This building is said to date from 1895. Sanborn Maps from 1901 through the 1920s do not depict the dwelling. While portions of an ancillary structure depicted on both documents could have aligned with the location of the house’s northern wing, it is highly on likely. The residence does appear on the 1955 Sanborn Map. The contributing house features traditional design components and materials.

Deferred maintenance is taking its toll on the building. Additionally, when the 1970s rear addition was removed, the structure was impaired and the building not properly mothballed. Windows and doors were faced with plyboard, but the roof structure was left exposed to the elements. Siding is rotting at certain locations. Formosan moths have infested and jeopardized the building's structure and facings. Resurrection fern carpets portions of the roof. Since the last meeting, no efforts have been made to maintain the building. Structural conditions have worsened. Additional professional reports have been submitted since the last meeting.

While the house is set back within the lot and minimally impacts the streetscape, the dwelling remains a character defining component of a rare surviving family compound.

When the property last appeared before the Board, the applicant was informed of the Board's policy regarding first demolition applications. If the property is not substantially damaged, applicants are required to list the property on MLS for period of six months. The property was not listed for sale. The aforementioned allowed, said property is located within compound that features a number of buildings and which have long been within the hands of the same family.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff believes this application would impair the architectural and the historical character of the building, compound, and district. Staff does not recommend approval of this application, but acknowledges the worsening condition of the building and encourages the listing

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Caldwell Whistler 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. Whistler if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Mr. Whistler explained that since the last time he appeared before the Board he had obtained an additional appraisal for renovating the building. Citing Chad Miles as the licensed contractor, he stated that the appraisal for renovation, more accurately reconstruction, amounted to \$246,000. Mr. Whistler explained that once he was able to address legal matters of a familial nature, he intended to reconfigure the three lot parcel into a two lot parcel thereby recreating the original lot configuration. The lots would then be put on the market.

Discussion ensued as to the listing the building. Mr. Allen outlined the legal impediments for listing the property on MLS.

Mr. Blackwell recommended the submission of an economic hardship request on account of the reconstruction appraisal.

Mr. Holmes spoke to the condition and location of the building.

Mr. Ladd informed Mr. Whistler that while the Board understands his predicament, precedent and procedure inform operating methods.

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. Holms moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, the application does impair the historic integrity of the district or the building, but taking into account the condition of the building, the provision of an appraisal for renovation/reconstruction, the cost of renovation/reconstruction, and the inability to sell the building in its current state (legal and physical, that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

The motion received a second and was approved. Mssrs. Allen, Ladd, and Stone voted in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 12/2/16