

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
December 3, 2014 – 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: Bob Allen, David Barr, Catarina Echols, Carolyn Hasser, Kim Harden, Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswalt, Craig Roberts, Steve Stone, and James Wagoner.
Members Absent: Robert Brown and Nick Holmes, III.
Staff Members Present: Cartledge Blackwell.
2. Mr. Stone moved to approve the minutes for the November 19, 2014 meeting. The motion received a second and was unanimously approval.
3. Mr. Wagoner 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

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED

1. Applicant: Robert F. Lee, III

- a. Property Address: 50 North Reed
- b. Date of Approval: 11/17/14
- c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork, siding, decking, and detailing to match the existing as per profile, dimension, design, and material. Repaint per the existing color scheme. Remove later replacement porch columns. Construct and install square section posts documented by survey photographs found within the MHDC property files. Remove later alterations to fenestration on the side and rear elevations. Reconstruct deteriorated wooden windows (to match) on the North (side) elevation. Remove a later period and stylistically inappropriate door from the East (rear) Elevation. Install a period appropriate wooden door. Infill a window on East (Rear) Elevation. Remove later railings (Lowe's type) from the front porch. Repair/replace roofing shingles to match the existing. Repave the front walk from the sidewalk's inner edge to the front steps. Remove a chainlink fence. Install a six foot privacy fence on the locations of the aforementioned fencing.

2. Applicant: Lisa Windish-Gregg

- a. Property Address: 159 South Warren Street
- b. Date of Approval: 11/17/14
- c. Project: When and where necessary, repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Repaint the house per the existing color scheme. Repair/replace window panes to match the existing (glazing specific). Replace deteriorated roofing shingles to match the existing.

3. Applicant: Leroy Anderson

- a. Property Address: 1055 Elmira Street
- b. Date of Approval: 11/18/14
- c. Project: Tarp the building's roof. Repair and when necessary replace siding. The siding will be wood in composition and match surviving sections of wooden siding. Securely mothball exterior openings. The plywood coverings will be applied in such a manner as not to damage door and window casings.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2014-58-CA: 451 Government Street

- a. Applicant: Yoko Allen for the Mobile Area Chamber of Commerce
- b. Project: Signage – Remove and replace banners.

DENIED IN PART AND APPROVED AS AMENDED (PENDING THE ISSUANCE OF A VARIANCE.). ATTACHED.

2. 2014-59-CA: 551 Dauphin Street

- a. Applicant: Robert Maurin with Pete Vallas Architect for Tony and Sylvia Atchison of Atchison Home
- b. Project: Restoration and Renovation – Restore, Renovate, and Adaptively Reuse a 19th-Century commercial building.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

3. 2014-60-CA: 1107 Elmira Street

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

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

4. 2014-61-CA: Restore Mobile

- a. Applicant: 1017 Old Shell Road
- b. Project: Stabilize, Restore, and Renovate a Contributing Residence – Make in kind repairs/replacements and reconfigure roofs.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

5. 2014-62-CA: 10 South Ann Street

- a. Applicant: Caldwell Whistler
- b. Project: Demolition - Demolish a contributing residence.

DENIED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Window Guideline

The Board reviewed and discussed a draft guideline addressing the repair and replacement of historic wooden windows.

2. Meeting Cancellation

The Board was notified that the 17 December 2014 meeting would be cancelled.

3. Thanks

The Board was thanked for their contributions of talent and time the City of Mobile and historic preservation.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2014-58-CA: 451 Government Street
Applicant: Yoko Allen for the Mobile Area Chamber of Commerce
Received: 11/17/14
Meeting: 12/3/14

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: T-4 and T5-2
Project: Signage – Remove and replace banners.

BUILDING HISTORY

The building housing the Mobile Chamber of Commerce dates from the 1960s. The building was constructed atop a block that had previously been distinguished by residential buildings. The McCartney and Russell houses were among the prominent dwellings once occupying the block. The aforementioned houses, along with others, were demolished for the construction of an unrealized hostelry. A car lot occupied the lot prior to the construction of the Chamber Building.

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 in December of 2011. At that time, the Board approved the installation of banners. The application up for review calls for the removal and replacement of the aforementioned banners.
- B. The Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and the Government Street Corridor state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Signs shall be mounted and erected so they do not obscure architectural features.”
 - 2. “The overall design of all signage including mounting and framework shall relate to the principle building on the property.
 - 3. “For buildings without a recognizable style, the sign shall adopt the decorative features of the building.”
 - 4. “The size of the sign shall be in proportion to the building and the neighboring structures and signs.”
 - 5. “The total maximum allowable sign area for all signs is one and one half square feet per linear front foot of the building, not to exceed sixty (64) square feet.”
- C. **Scope of Work (per submitted materials):**
 - 1. Remove the existing wall and lamppost banners.

2. Install new banners of the same size, material, and design on the location of the existing banners.
 - a. The two (2) wall banners will measure 25' x 10' in dimension.
 - b. The eight (8) lamp post banners will measure 2' x 3' in dimension.
 - c. The banners will be canvas in composition.
 - d. The banners will feature the Chamber's tag line.
 - e. The banners will be affixed to walls of the building and lampposts.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the removal and replacement of banners. The banners will match the existing with regards to size, material, design, and location. In accord with the Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts and Government Street, the banners will not obscure architectural features (See B-1). The banners will work in concert with the proportions of the building and the nature of the site (See B-4.). While the total size of the proposed banners exceed the maximum signage size allotment (See B-5.), they are reversible interventions that would not permanently impact the historic surroundings. In addition to the size of the building, building's singular presence on the block informs the size of the signage. It should be noted that the banners constitute the property's principle signage. Variances would be required for the replacement of the banners.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-4), Staff does not believe this application would impair the architectural and historical character of the surrounding district. Pending the issuance of a variance from the Board of Zoning Adjustment, Staff recommends approval of the removal and replacement of the banners on account the absence of signage, lack of impact on historic fabric, size of the building, and said building's stand alone nature on the block.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Yoko Allen was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the Chamber's representative. He stated that the application appeared to be a simple updating of an existing feature - banners. Mr. Ladd asked Ms. Allen if she had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Ms. Allen answered no.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any questions to ask the Chamber's representative.

Mr. Roberts addressed Ms. Allen. He stated that he considered the banners to be likable to litter on Government Street. He asked Ms. Allen how long would the Chamber like the banners to be in place. She responded by saying three years. Mr. Roberts again voiced his unfavorable opinion of the banners. He expressed his surprise at a favorable Staff Report.

Ms. Allen asked for direction. She asked if freestanding banners could be approved if the Board was not amenable replacements of the existing banners. Roberts stated that freestanding features would be even

more egregious. Ms. Allen again asked for direction. Mr. Roberts replied by saying that no signage or banners would be preferable.

Mr. Roberts stated aesthetic/architectural and timing concerns as the reasons behind his objection. In reference to the latter, he mentioned that the existing signage was installed for specific anniversary event.

Ms. Allen once again asked for direction. She said that the Mobile Area Chamber of Commerce is a commercial enterprise that interacts, shapes, and requires the community and needs some form of visibility.

Mr. Roberts stated that the Board had grappled with banners on several other notable buildings and/or institutions. He cited Government Street Presbyterian Church and the Center of the Living Arts.

Mr. Blackwell cited how the Sign Design Guidelines protect historic building as well non-contributing structures. With regard to banners, he cited the constant installation, removal, and replacement of banners on cultural institutions. He cited the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York as one example of building (one of historical cultural significance) that is ordinarily festooned with banners that do not detract from its character or mission.

Ms. Harden said that the non-contributing status of the building coupled with overall design made the banners not necessarily objectionable, but the recurring nature and advertising nature of the banners proved were matters on concern.

Ms. Allen said that the signage could be redesigned to work in concert with an upcoming 180th anniversary. Mr. Roberts informed Ms. Allen to apply for those celebratory banners closer to the anniversary date.

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

FINDING OF FACT

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. 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. Ms. Hasser and Mr. Ladd voted in opposition.

The Board then reconsidered 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, but that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued for the lamp posts banners (whose signs will not exceed sixty-four square feet and match the dimensions of the existing banners) pending the issuance of a variance from the Board of Adjustment.

The motion received a second and passed unanimously.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 12/3/15

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2014-59-CA: 551 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Robert Maurin Pete Vallas Architect for Tony and Sylvia Atchison of Atchison Home
Received: 11/17/14
Meeting: 12/3/14

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: T5-2
Project: Restoration and Renovation – Restore, Renovate, and Adaptively Reuse a 19th-Century commercial building.

BUILDING HISTORY

Though completed in the mid 1860, this two-story two-commercial building perpetuates the form and function of its Antebellum predecessors. Italianate in style, the building’s ground floor commercial, upper-story residential and rear service spaces observe the functional divisions and traditions of earlier store buildings.

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 December 18, 2013. At that the time, the Board approved the first phase of the building’s restoration. The first round of work concerned the restoration of the body of the principle portion of the building. With this application, the applicants restoration and renovation of the rear portion of the property thus completing the adaptive reuse of the property. Uncompleted, but still approved portions of the scope of work have been included for reasons of reasons of timing and permitting.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation and the Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and the Government Street Corridor state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy the historic materials that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”
 - 2. “A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Original or historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof should be maintained. Materials should be appropriate to the form and pitch and color.”
 - 3. “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 plans):

1. Restoration and Renovation – Restore, Renovate, and Adaptively Reuse a 19th-Century commercial building.
 - a. Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material.
 - b. Continue the repainting the building.
 - c. Complete the reconstruction of the ground floor storefront (previously approved).
 - d. Stabilize and repair cantilevered roof overhangs. All repairs will match the existing as per design, profile, pitch, and material.
 - e. Reinstall wooden brackets on the aforementioned overhangs.
 - f. Convert a window bay into a door bay on East Elevation of the one-story infill.
 - g. Reroof and construct a deck atop the later one-story rear addition.
 - h. Install galvanized steel and iron wire railing atop the reroofed one-story rear addition.
 - i. Construct a rooftop deck atop the former service wing. Said deck will serve as an upper-story utility area.
 - j. Install railings matching those installed around the rooftop of reroofed one-story wing around the aforementioned utility deck.
 - k. The former of the aforementioned railings will railing will rest atop a two extension of the existing perimeter wall. Said extension will constructed of stucco-faced concrete blocks.
 - l. When and where necessary, reroof to match the existing.

CLARIFICATIONS/REQUESTS

1. Provide a more detailed rendering of the proposed railings.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the restoration, renovation, and adaptive reuse of a historic commercial building. Portions of the project, namely the reconstruction of the storefront, have already been approved. The aforementioned portions of the scope of work are included so as to keep the work up-to-date for permitting purposes.

This project, the final phase of multi-designer informed restoration and renovation of a historic building, focuses on the rear portion of the building. Defined by a two-story service wing fronted by one-story infill, the subject area faces a north-south running street (Cedar Street). The proposal involves the retention of historic fabric and the installation of present day features aimed at better realizing the potential of those spaces and features.

The single-story infill would be reroofed and a roof top mechanical enclosure would be constructed. A modern iron railing would enclose both the deck surmounting the reroofed one-story infill and the utility deck. In accord with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Preservation, the new work would be differentiated from the old, yet compatible with (in terms of proportions and material) the existing fabric (See B-1.). The original roof forms will be retained (See B-2.). The increase in the height of the one-story infill's wall would read as a parapet wall. The materials employed would serve to differentiate the new from the old. Said extension would be in keeping the parapet walls characterizing the building. The alteration of the fenestration on the infill portion of the building would not impact historic fabric. In keeping with the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts, said alteration is compatible with the character of that portion of the building (See B-3.).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-3), 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

Taylor Atchison and Robert Maurin 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. Atchison and Mr. Maurin if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make. Mr. Maurin replied that Mr. Blackwell had addressed the application in full.

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

Mr. Roberts complimented Mr. Maurin on the submission for reasons of the design and the submittals illustrating the same.

Mr. Atchison explained to the Board the particulars of the project and his interest in moving forward with the adaptive reuse.

Ms. Harden complimented Mr. Atchison for participating in a predevelopment meeting.

Mr. Allen asked for clarification as to what had been approved at previously. Ms. Harden and Mr. Blackwell addressed Mr. Allen's concerns.

Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, he 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: 12/3/15

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2014-60-CA: 1107 Elmira Street
Applicant: Restore Mobile
Received: 11/17/14
Meeting: 12/3/14

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: New Construction – Construct a single family residence.

BUILDING HISTORY

Until 2008, a circa 1880 workman’s cottage occupied this lot. The single-story, hipped roof dwelling was damaged during and dismantled after Hurricane Katrina.

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 19, 2008. At that time, the Board approved the reconstruction of a historic dwelling and the construction of an addition off the rear elevation of said residence. The application up for review calls for the construction of a new single family residence.
- B. The Guidelines for New Residential Construction in Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Placement has two components: setback, the distance between the street and a building; and spacing, the distance between its property lines and adjacent structures. New construction should be placed on the lot so that setback and spacing approximate those of nearby historic buildings. New buildings should not be placed too far forward or behind the traditional “façade line”, a visual line created by the fronts of buildings along a street. An inappropriate setback disrupts the façade line and diminishes the visual character of the streetscape.”
 - 2. “Building mass is established by the arrangement and proportion of its basic geometric components – the main building, wings and porches, the roof and the foundation. Similarity of massing helps create a rhythm along a street, which is one of the appealing aspects of historic districts. Therefore, new construction should reference the massing of forms of nearby historic buildings.”
 - 3. “The foundation, the platform upon which a building rests, is a massing component of a building. Since diminished foundation proportions have a negative effect on massing and visual character, new buildings should have foundations similar in height to those of nearby historic buildings. Pier foundations are encouraged for new residential

- construction. When raised slab foundations are constructed, it is important that the height of the foundation relate to that of nearby historic buildings.”
4. “Although roofs and foundations reinforce massing, the main body and wings are the most significant components. A building’s form or shape (a box) or a complex (a combination of many boxes or projections and indentations). The main body of a building may be one or two stories. Secondary elements, usually porches or wings extend from the main building. These elements create the massing of a building. Interior floor and ceiling heights are reflected on the exterior of a building and should be compatible with nearby historic buildings.”
 5. “A building’s roof contributes significantly to its massing and to the character of the surrounding area. New construction may consider, where appropriate, roof shapes, pitches and complexity similar to compatible with those of adjacent historic buildings. Additionally roof designs of new residential construction may incorporate eave overhang or trim details such as exposed rafters, cornice, fascia, frieze board, mouldings, etc. as those of nearby buildings.”
 6. “The size of a building is determined by its dimensions which also dictate square footage. SCALE refers to a building’s size in relationship to other buildings – large, medium, small. To preserve the continuity of a historic district, new construction should be in scale with nearby historic buildings.”
 7. “Façade elements such as porches, entrances, and windows make up the “face” or façade of a building. New construction should reflect the use of façade elements of nearby historic buildings.”
 8. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. In order to coexist in harmony with adjacent historic structures in the historic districts, porches are strongly encouraged. Designs for new porches should also reference historic porch location, proportion, rhythm, roof form, supports, rails, and ornamentation. Porches of new buildings should also be similar in height and width to porches of nearby historic buildings. Proper care should be taken in the detailing of new porches. Scale, proportion and character of elements such as porch columns, corner brackets, railings, pickets, etc. should be compatible with adjacent historic structures. Wood or a suitable substitute material should be used. In addition, elements such as balconies, cupolas, chimneys, dormers, and other elements can help integrate a new structure with the neighborhood when used at the proper scale.”
 9. “The number of and proportion of openings – windows and entrances – within the façade of a building creates a solid-to-void ratio (wall-to-opening). New buildings should use windows and entrances that approximate the placement and solid-to-void ratio of nearby historic buildings. In addition, designs for new construction should incorporate the traditional use of windows casements and door surrounds. Where a side elevation is clearly visible from the street, proportions and placement of their elements will have an impact upon the visual character of the neighborhood and must be addressed in the design.”
 10. “The goal of new construction should be to blend into the historic district but to avoid creating a false sense of history by merely copying historic examples. The choice of materials and ornamentation for new construction is a good way for a new building to exert its own identity. By using historic examples as a point of departure, it is possible for new construction to use new materials and ornamentation and still fit into the historic districts. Historic buildings feature the use of materials for roofs, foundations, wall cladding and architectural details and architectural details. In new buildings, exterior materials – both traditional and modern – should closely resemble surrounding historic examples. Buildings in Mobile’s historic districts vary in age and architectural styles, dictating the materials to be used for new construction. Traditional buildings which are

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

11. “The degree of ornamentation used in new construction should be compatible with the degree of ornamentation found upon nearby historic buildings.” Although new buildings should use the decorative trim, window casings, and other building materials similar to nearby historic buildings, the degree of ornamentation should not exceed that characteristic of the area. Profile and dimensions of new material should be consistent with the examples in the district.”
12. The type, size and dividing light of windows, and their location and configuration (rhythm) help establish historic character of a building and compatibility with adjacent structures. Traditionally designed windows openings generally have a raised surround on frame buildings. New construction methods should follow this method in the historic districts as opposed to designing window openings that are flush with the wall.”
13. Often one of the most important decorative features, doorways reflect the architectural style of a building. The design of doors and doorways can help establish the character of a building and compatibility with adjacent facades. Some entrances in Mobile's historic districts have special features such as transoms and decorative elements framing the openings. Careful consideration should be given to incorporating such elements in new construction.”
15. “New materials that are an evolution of historic materials, such as Hardiplank concrete siding or a simulated stucco finish, should suggest profile, dimension and finish of historic materials. True materials such as brick, wood siding, or stucco are encouraged. Some synthetic materials, such as fiberglass porch columns may be appropriate in individual cases as approved by the Review Board.”
16. “Modern paving materials are acceptable in the Historic Districts. However, it is important that the design, location, and materials be compatible with the property. Landscaping can often assist in creating an appropriate setting. The appearance of parking areas should be minimized. “

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

1. Construct a single family residence.
 - a. The house will be set back – feet from the street.
 - b. The distance to the eastern lot line will measure –
 - c. The distance to the western lot line will measure –
 - d. The one-story residence will measure 30' in width and 52' in depth.
 - e. The building will measure 25' in height
 - f. 18” tall brick-veneered foundation piers will support the house
 - g. Boxed and recessed wooden lattice foundation panels will extend between the aforementioned foundation piers.
 - h. The house will feature hardiboard siding.
 - i. The house will feature one-over-one aluminum clad wooden windows.
 - j. The window and door bays will feature simple and molded surrounds.
 - k. The horizontal and raked portions of the cornice will feature simple moldings.
 - l. A north-south oriented gable roof will surmount the house.
 - m. Asphalt shingles will sheath the roof.
 - n. North Elevation (Façade)
 - i. The North Elevation will be fronted by a three bay porch.
 - ii. Four chamfered posts will define the porch bays.
 - iii. A flight of wooden steps featuring picketed railings will access the porch.

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

CLARIFICATIONS

- 1. Clarify the front and side setbacks.

STAFF ANALYSIS

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

The proposed new construction meets municipal setback requirements and adopts the traditional façade line of nearby residential buildings (See B-1). Porch fronted and gabled surmounted in design, the house adopts the form of a popular late 19th Century/20th-Century residential typology. Comparable examples can be cited in and around Mobile's historic districts, as well as throughout the region. Two houses of the same design were approved by this Board for construction at 1051 and 1053 Texas Street. The overall massing of the dwelling is comparable to nearby historical examples and is in scale with the historic context (See B 2, 5, and 6). The materials are in compliance with the Design Guidelines (See B-10). The mass and scale of the buildings is in keeping with historic buildings. The three bay rhythms of the porch and fenestrated bays are in keeping with the appearance and experience of this section of the Oakleigh Garden District (See B 7, 8, 9, 12 and 13). Constructed in hardiboard, a material approved for new construction and additions in Mobile's Historic Districts, and simple in treatment, the building is traditional in appearance, yet contemporary in its simplicity (See B-15).¹

¹ On account of his involvement with Restore Mobile, Devereaux Bemis was not involved in the review of this application.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Jenny Laurent was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

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

Ms. Laurent stated that Mr. Blackwell had addressed the application in full.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any questions for Restore Mobile's representative.

Mr. Allen voiced concern as to the replication of existing infill design. Ms. Laurent and Mr. Blackwell spoke to the concern. Ms. Laurent explained that Restore Mobile's board had discussed the replication matter. She informed the (Review) Board that Restore considered the design to be both a historically sympathetic and marketable intervention. Mr. Blackwell stated the Oakleigh Garden District is filled with numerous instances of repeated house types. He noted that developers and speculators constructed houses of the same design across of the whole of the present district and across the country throughout the 19th Century. Mr. Roberts noted that variation could be introduced in detailing and color.

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, he 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

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 upon Staff's approval of the building setbacks.

The motion received a second and passed unanimously.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 12/3/15

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2014-61-CA: 1017 Old Shell Road
Applicant: Restore Mobile
Received: 11/17/14
Meeting: 12/3/14

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Stabilize, Restore, and Renovate a Contributing Residence – In kind repairs/replacements and Roof Reconfiguration.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to materials located within this lot’s MHC property file, the core of this residence dates circa 1859. An overlay in the 1901 City of Mobile Sanborn Fire Insurance Map depicts rear additions and alterations impacting the body of the house.

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. Restore Mobile proposes the stabilization, restoration, and renovation of the deteriorated building.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The exterior of a building helps define its style, quality, and historic period. The original siding should be retained and repaired. Replacement of exterior features, when required, must match the original in profile, dimension, and material.”
 - 2. “The type, size, and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building. Original window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing.”
 - 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. “A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Original roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof, should be maintained. Materials should be appropriate to the form pitch and color.”

C. Scope of Work:

1. Repair and replace (when necessary) deteriorated wooden siding, elements, and details to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material.
2. Repair and re-glaze (when necessary) windows to match the existing as per construction, material, and light configuration.
3. Remove burglar bars from windows.
4. Stabilize the front porch and rear porches.
5. Repair and replicate (when necessary) porch railings and posts to match the existing as per design, profile, material, and construction.
6. Repair doors as required.
7. Stabilize, reconstruct/reconfigure, redeck, and reroof (asphalt shingles) the building's roof structure. A knee wall on the East Elevation (rear portion) will be constructed.
8. Reroof the dwelling with asphalt shingles.
8. Repaint the building per the existing color scheme.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the stabilization, restoration, and renovation of a contributing residential building.

Much of the work specified in the application and in the Staff Report concerns the in kind repair and replacement of historic features. In accord with the Design Review Guidelines, the deteriorated wooden siding, elements, and details will be either repaired or replaced to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material (See B-1.). Windows will be repaired and re-glazed to match the existing (See B-2.). Burglar bars will be removed. The front and rear porches will be stabilized. The porch posts and railing will be repaired and replicated as required (See B-3).

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that "original roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof, should be maintained" (See B-4). As mentioned in the Building History found above, this house is said to date from the late 1850s. The house has been added to on at least three different occasions. On account of the additions, the dwelling's roof structure is complicated and at times ineffective. Multiple roof constructions surmount the whole. Low pitches and awkward constructions have resulted in the deterioration of not only roof surfaces, but also the roof structure. This application calls for the reconfiguration of the roof structure.

Two dominant hip roofs would surmount the whole dwelling. While the defining slopes will remain the same, heights would be increased. Increases would be proportionate with the overall massing of the house. When viewed from the street, the house's façade features a hipped roof with an extremely shed. The shed extends over house's wrap around side porch, a well-designed later addition. The tell-tale juncture line of the original cornice will remain in place thereby allowing recording the evolution of the dwelling. The roof reconfiguration would result in the construction of single roof covering both the body of the house and the side porch. The roof slope would remain the same. The rear portion of the house is informed by a series additions and infills. Corner boards would remain in place. An all encompassing hipped roof with subsidiary east-facing pent over a knee would roof the rear portions of the dwelling.²

² On account of his involvement with Restore Mobile, Devereaux Bemis was not involved in the review of this application.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Jenny Laurent was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

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

Ms. Laurent stated that Mr. Blackwell had addressed the application in full.

Mr. Ladd, Mr. Oswalt, and Mr. Wagoner applauded the acquisition and the house.

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, he 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 fact

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 12/3/15

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2014-62-CA: 10 South Ann Street
Applicant: Caldwell Whistler
Received: 11/12/14
Meeting: 12/3/14

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Demolition – Demolish a contributing residence.

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

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on September 21, 2011. At that time the Board approved the demolition of rear portions and additions to said dwelling. With this application, the owner proposes the demolition of the dwelling.
- 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. 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 carriage house 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.
- ii. 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).
 - iii. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
 1. The building materials are capable of being reproduced.
 - iv. Whether the structure is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood, the county, or the region or is a good example of its type, or is part of an ensemble of historic buildings creating a neighborhood;
 1. 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).
 - 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 owner would demolish the house, remove debris, and level the site.
 - vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 1. The owner acquired the property by inheritance.
 - vii. 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.
 - viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 1. 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.
 - 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):

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 a vehicular structure 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 house was 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. Resurrection fern carpets portions of the roof.

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.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), 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

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 explained to Mr. Whistler that his application was not being singled out in any fashion. Mr. Ladd elaborated by saying that the Board takes demolition requests very seriously. He asked Mr. Whistler if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Mr. Caldwell informed the Board that the house exhibits more signs and conditions of deterioration than the photographs showed. He shared imagery on his mobile device with the Board. Mr. Whistler told the Board that termites had infested the building.

Mr. Ladd asked Mr. Whistler if he had obtained estimates for repairs. Mr. Whistler answered no.

Ms. Hasser asked Mr. Whistler if the house had a termite bond. Mr. Whistler answered no.

Mr. Allen asked for clarification as to the building's location within the block and compound.

Mr. Ladd asked Mr. Whistler if he had considered listing the house on the open market.

Mr. Wagoner encouraged Mr. Whistler to consider the aforementioned alternative alternative.

Mr. Ladd explained to Mr. Whistler that placing the property on the market served to ends. First, the building could be sold and restored. Secondly, it would show good faith to the Board that he was doing due diligence and investigating all options.

Mr. Whistler voiced his amenability to listing the house, as well as other dwelling comprising the compound.

Mr. Ladd stated for reason of clarification that it would be in all parties' best interest if the property was officially listed on MLS.

Mr. Whistler explained that he was familiar with real estate process. He stated that he was due to appear before environmental court on the property. Mr. Blackwell informed Mr. Whistler that he would provide documents and correspondence that would facilitate matters.

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

FINDING OF FACT

Ms. Harden 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 applicant was requested to list the property on MLS for a six month period and properly mothball any exposed openings.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 12/3/15