

**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES**  
**December 4, 2013 – 3:00 P.M.**  
**Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street**

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

1. The Chair, Bradford Ladd, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:  
**Members Present:** Bob Allen, David Barr, Kim Harden, Carolyn Hasser, Bradford Ladd, Thomas Karwinski, Harris Oswald, Craig Roberts, and Steve Stone,  
**Members Absent:** Nick Holmes, Jim Wagoner, and Janetta Whitt-Mitchell.  
**Historic Development and City Legal Staff Members Present:** Cart Blackwell, and Keri Coumanis.
2. Mr. Karwinski moved to approve the minutes of the November 6, 2013 meeting. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
3. Mr. Karwinski moved to approve the midmonth COA's granted by Staff. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.

**B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED.**

1. **Applicant: John King**
  - a. Property Address: 8 South Hallett Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 10/30/13
  - c. Project: Repaint the house per the existing color scheme. The body will be Alexandria Biege, the trim will be Pole Staw, and the Accents/Door will be Holle Blue. Repair deteriorated woodwork (when and where necessary) to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repair and repaint the fence.
2. **Applicant: Jeffrey and Meleah Jurasek**
  - a. Property Address: 61 North Monterey Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 10/28/13
  - c. Project: Repaint the chimney to match the existing color scheme. Reroof the old garage. Reinstall garage doors to match those documented in older photographs.
3. **Applicant: Sondra Dempsey**
  - a. Property Address: 261 North Jackson Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 10/28/13
  - c. Project: Replace cracked concrete paving to match the existing. Repave an existing driveway.
4. **Applicant: Jack Zieman**
  - a. Property Address: 701 Saint Michael Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 10/28/13
  - c. Project: Repair a damaged wall. The masonry work and painting will match the existing treatments. Remove chain link fencing from the back lot's vehicular entries. Install wooden gates at the aforementioned locations. The swing or slide of the gates will not intrude into right of way.
5. **Applicant: Melanie Bunting**
  - a. Property Address: 1759 Old Shell Road
  - b. Date of Approval: 10/30/13
  - c. Project: Paint the house per the submitted Valspar color scheme. The body will be Woodland Dewkist and the trim will be Mark Twain Ombra Grey. Repair any deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material.

- 6. Applicant: Liberty Roofing**
  - a. Property Address: 909 Church Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 10/30/13
  - c. Project: Reroof six squares asphalt shingle to match existing.
- 7. Applicant: Vicki Rye**
  - a. Property Address: 259 South Georgia Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 11/1/13
  - c. Project: Install interior lot fencing. A section of 8' high fence will extend along the rear lot line (which abuts multifamily housing) and 6' high fencing that will coordinate with fencing on adjoining properties. Construct a deck off the rear elevation. The deck will feature a simple picketed railing.
- 8. Applicant: Nofio Pecararo**
  - a. Property Address: 14 Kenneth Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 11/4/13
  - c. Project: Repaint the house per the submitted Sherwin Williams color scheme: body, Restful; trim, Alabaster; and porch, Country Squire. Repair any deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material.
- 9. Applicant: Harry Thames**
  - a. Property Address: 1451 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 11/4/13
  - c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated porch decking to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint the work per the existing color scheme.
- 10. Applicant: Chris McGough**
  - a. Property Address: 308 Chatham Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 11/6/13
  - c. Project: Replace any sill rot and install concrete piers underneath house (not visible to the passerby).
- 11. Applicant: Melanie Bunting**
  - a. Property Address: 101 North Hallett Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 11/12/13
  - c. Project: Repaint per the existing color scheme. Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repair damaged windows to match as per construction and light configuration.
- 12. Applicant: Rose McPhillips**
  - a. Property Address: 60 South Conception Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 11/12/13
  - c. Project: Install storm windows, rainhoods, and canvas awnings..
- 13. Applicant: Rebecca Chadwell**
  - a. Property Address: 1651 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 11/12/13
  - c. Project: Construct a new picket fence to match the back and front of the existing.
- 14. Applicant: Marie Robinson**
  - a. Property Address: 1655 Laurel Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 11/12/13
  - c. Project: Paint the house per the submitted color scheme. The body will be Sage and the trim will be Roycroft Bottle Green.
- 15. Applicant: Kimberley Knowles**
  - a. Property Address: 16 South Lafayette Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 11/13/13
  - c. Project: Repair any deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile and dimension. Repaint the house per the existing color scheme.

- 16. Applicant: Sondra Dempsey**
- Property Address: 261 North Jackson Street
  - Date of Approval: 11/13/13
  - Project: Install a four foot tall aluminum fence enclosing the front yard. Install a six foot high aluminum gates that will be engaged to the interior lot fencing. Said gates will be located behind the front plane of the house.
- 17. Applicant: Kimberley Knowles**
- Property Address: 453 Dauphin Street
  - Date of Approval: 11/13/13
  - Project: Place 3x2 foot metal hanging sign per app in file; place business name on narrow plate on wall alongside door.
- 18. Applicant: Sherwood Lynn**
- Property Address: 603 Church Street
  - Date of Approval: 11/13/13
  - Project: Pressure wash, replace rotten wood, paint, replace handrail and paint, paint stairs and porch.
- 19. Applicant: Martha Henken**
- Property Address: 111 South Dearborn Street
  - Date of Approval: 11/13/13
  - Project: Repaint the house per the existing color scheme. Repair and replace deteriorated (when and where necessary) woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material.
- 20. Applicant: Andrew Brown**
- Property Address: 1502 Brown Street
  - Date of Approval: 11/18/13
  - Project: Remove a later railing enclosing the front porch.
- 21. Applicant: Tom Andrews**
- Property Address: 363 Flint Street
  - Date of Approval: 11/15/13
  - Project: Power wash and paint the house to match the existing in a Benjamin Moore color scheme: Body: Saber grey1482; Trim: Ashwood Moss 1484; Porch Deck: Cabot 1600 Series Stain – Slate Gray; Doors: El Cajon Clay 1260; and Porch Ceiling: Crystal Spring 764.
- 22. Applicant: Donal and Jean Cieutat**
- Property Address: 154 South Warren Street
  - Date of Approval: 11/18/13
  - Project: Repaint per thee existing color scheme.
- 23. Applicant: John Gilliam**
- Property Address: 214 South Cedar Street
  - Date of Approval: 11/18/13
  - Project: Replace rotten siding to match and repaint to match existing colors.
- 24. Applicant: Wintzell's**
- Property Address: 601-605 Dauphin Street
  - Date of Approval: 11/20/13
  - Project: Remove deteriorated planters enclosing the rear patio. Install a six foot tall aluminum around the patio (per submitted plan and imagery).
- 25. Applicant: Janie Dunlap**
- Property Address: 55 North Georgia Street
  - Date of Approval: 11/25/13
  - Project: Replace sections of deteriorated wooden privacy fencing to match the existing with regard to height, design, and material.

- 26. Applicant: Robin Strickland**
- a. Property Address: 303 South Ann Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 11/22/13
  - c. Project: Repair rotten wood on dormer to match existing and repaint to match existing color.
- 27. Applicant: Building and Maintenance Company**
- a. Property Address: 308 Congress Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 11/21/13
  - c. Project: Replace rotten boards as needed matching the original in profile, dimension and materials. Paint entire house in the existing color scheme.
- 28. Applicant: Kiker Corporation**
- a. Property Address: 1356 Government Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 11/21/13
  - c. Project: Reroof to match existing.
- 29. Applicant: Jestine Brasley**
- a. Property Address: 1556 Monroe Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 11/21/13
  - c. Project: Reroof the building's flat-roofed rear ell.

### C. APPLICATIONS

- 1. 2013-82-CA: 259 North Jackson Street**
- a. Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley with Douglas Burtu Kearley Architect for Tim Lloyd and James Gilbert
  - b. Project: Alteration of Previously Approved Plans – Modify the design of a tiered gallery.
- APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**
- 2. 2013-83-CA: 206 Levert Avenue**
- a. Applicant: Robert McCown with McCown Designs for Mr. & Mrs. John Mostellar
  - b. Project: Remodeling - Modify an Altered façade and Construct a Rear Porch.
- APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**
- 3. 2013-84-CA: 404 Marine Street**
- a. Applicant: Kenneth Kiser
  - b. Project: Demolition – Demolish a fire-damaged single-family residence.
- WITHDRAWN PRIOR TO THE MEETING. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**
- 4. 2013-85-CA: 50 Le Moyne Place**
- a. Applicant: Dr. & Mrs. Jake Epker
  - b. Project: Door Replacement – Remove an unauthorized door unit and replicate a historical door unit.
- WITHDRAWN PRIOR TO THE MEETING. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

## **D. DISCUSSION**

### **1. Mardi Gras Park Fence Removal**

The Board discussed the recent removal of the chain-link fencing that enclosed the proposed Mardi Gras Park (block bound by Government, South Royal, Church, and Saint Emanuel Streets). The removal of fence received favorable comment among the Board.

### **2. Local Districts**

A discussion of possible local districts ensued.

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

**2013-82-CA: 259 North Jackson Street**  
**Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley with Douglas Burtu Kearley Architect for Tim Lloyd and James Gilbert**  
**Received: 11/18/13**  
**Meeting: 12/4/13**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: DeTonti Square  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Alteration of Previously Approved Plans – Modify the design of a tiered gallery.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This masonry side hall dwelling was constructed during the middle third of the 19<sup>th</sup> Century. The Italianate residence is a surviving example of what were scores of free-standing and attached row houses that once lined downtown Mobile’s fashionable northern thoroughfares.

**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 Board on June 19, 2013. At that time, the Board approved the construction of a rear wing and a two-tiered gallery. While the rear wing has been constructed according to the approved plans, the applicants have reconsidered the design of the front gallery. Instead of the cast iron supports and continuous masonry foundation, the applicants would like to substitute columnar porch posts and brick pier foundations.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation and the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.”
  - 2. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massings, 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. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture.”
  - 5. “Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, post/columns, proportions, and decorative details.”
  - 6. “The form and shape of the porch and its roof should maintain their historic appearance.”

7. "The balustrade of the stairs should match the design and materials of the porch."
8. "Foundation screening should be recessed from the front of the foundation piers. Lattice, if used, should be hung below the skirt board or siding, between the piers and framed with trim. Lattice secured to the face of the building is inappropriate. Solid infill should be recessed and screened."

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

1. Remove a later flight of steps and stoop accessing the front entrance.
2. Modify the design of a two-tiered gallery.
  - a. The reconstructed porch will be 8' in depth and will be set 8" in from the side planes of the body of the house.
  - b. The two-tiered porch will be set atop brick foundation piers.
  - c. Framed and recessed wooden lattice panels will extend between the foundation piers.
  - d. A flight of "Old Mobile" brick steps will access the three bay porch. The steps will measure 6' in depth.
  - e. Cast iron railings will flank the steps.
  - f. Four columnar posts will define the porch bays on the both upper and lower galleries. The columnar posts will feature bases and capitals.
  - g. Cast iron railings matching those employed on the porch will extend between the porch posts.
  - h. The porch decks will feature a downward slope so to dispense with rainwater.
  - i. The porch decks will feature tongue-and-groove wooden porch decking.
  - j. The two-tiered gallery will be surmounted by a hipped roof.
  - k. The roofing shingles will match those employed on the body of the house.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the modification of designs for a reconstructed front porch. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic District state that porch's are an important regional characteristic defining Mobile architecture (See B-4.).

According to 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup>-Century Sanborn Maps, this house featured a single-tiered gallery. Previously approved plans called for the construction of two-tiered gallery featuring cast iron supports and a continuous masonry foundation. The revised plans call for the substitution of wooden porch posts for iron supports and the use of free-standing brick piers instead of a continuous brick foundation. Surviving and documented examples of masonry buildings with wooden galleries are known. Physical evidence in the form of full-length windows located on the both the lower-story and the upper-story determined the proportions of the proposed reconstruction (See B-1). In accord with the Design Review Guidelines, particular attention has been paid to the handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, columnar posts, proportions, and details (See B-5.). The foundation screening will be treated in the prescribed manner (See B-8.).

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-8), Staff does believe this application will not impair the architectural or historical character of the building or the district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Douglas B. Kearley was present to discuss the application.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

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

Mr. Kearley answered no.

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

Mr. Karwinski stated that he had several comments to make. First, he complimented Mr. Kearley on the proposed substitution of wooden columns for iron supports. Mr. Karwinski went on to state that the original porch was single-story in height. He said that by adopting a two-story format the porch's roof would be squeezed too close to dentils. He stated that upper likely took the form of an open deck with enclosing balustrade.

Mr. Kearley concurred with Mr. Karwinski with regard to likely appearance of the original porch. He stated that the porch which had been by the Board was two-story in construction and the applicants still wanted a two-tiered porch.

Mr. Karwinski reiterated concerns regarding the cornice detail and stated that it in his personal opinion that the porch might not work well.

Mr. Allen asked for clarification regarding the substitution of wood columns for the approved cast iron posts on the proposed porch. Mr. Blackwell provided the Board with several examples of historic buildings that feature the combined use of wooden columnar supports and iron railings.

## **FINDING OF FACT**

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

## **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 12/4/14**



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

**2013-83-CA: 206 Levert Avenue**  
**Applicant: Robert McCown with McCown Designs for Mr. & Mrs. John Mostellar**  
**Received: 11/18/13**  
**Meeting: 12/4/13**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Ashland Place  
Classification: Non-Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Remodeling - Modify an Altered façade and Construct a Rear Porch.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This house dates from 1925. The house was extensively remodeled in 1986.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

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

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. This property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The alterations made in 1986 were conducted prior to the certification of the Ashland Place Historic District. The applicants propose construction of front porch, the alteration of doors, the reconfiguration of dormers, and the construction of a rear porch.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation and the Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture.”
  - 2. “Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, post/columns, proportions, and decorative details.”
  - 3. A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Original or historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof should be maintained. Materials should be appropriate to the form and pitch and color.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
  - 1. Construct a front porch.
    - a. Remove the existing tiered terrace.
    - b. Salvage “Old Mobile” bricks from the aforementioned terrace.
    - c. Construct a new porch foundation measuring approximately 23’ in width and 8’ in depth atop the location of the terrace. The bricks will be reused when and where possible.
    - d. Four chamfered porch posts resting atop the advanced cheeks will support the porch’s hipped roof.
    - e. Brackets will extend between the porch posts (and between the posts and the house).
    - f. The porch’s hipped roof will feature exposed rafter tails.

- g. The hipped roof will be sheathed with asphalt shingles matching those employed on the body of the house.
2. Remove three later deteriorated French doors and their surmounting segmental transoms.
3. Install glazed and paneled French doors with rectilinear transoms.
4. Modify the dormer's configuration.
  - a. The west-facing gabled dormer will be centered above the porch proposed for the façade.
  - b. The dormer will be faced with wooden siding matching that employed on the body of the house.
  - c. A pair of six over six wooden windows will puncture the gable.
  - d. Two hipped roofed side dormers will project from the dormer's side elevations. The West Elevations of the aforementioned secondary dormers will be set at oblique angles.
  - e. The roofing shingles will match those employed on the body of the house.
5. Construct a rear porch.
  - a. The porch will measure approximately 19' in depth and 15' in width.
  - b. The porch will take the form of an extension of the rear elevation's east-facing gable.
  - c. The porch will feature two engaged and two freestanding wooden chamfered posts.
  - d. Brackets will extend between the freestanding and engaged posts.
  - e. The porch will rest atop a slab foundation (on the same level as the rear elevation).
  - f. Slate pavers matching those employed on the rear patio will be employed.
  - g. An existing interior chimney will be enlarged to accommodate an outdoor fireplace.
  - h. The aforementioned fireplace will feature a hearth and mantel shelf.
  - i. The roofing shingles will match those employed on the body of the house
6. Repaint the house per the existing color scheme.
7. Repair any deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material.

## **REQUESTS/CLARIFICATIONS**

1. Provide a roof plan depicting how the proposed dormers engage the principle roof and relate to each other.
2. Provide a side elevation of the dormer.
3. Provide details of the porch posts and brackets.
4. Provide a rear elevation of the proposed back porch.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the remodeling of single family residence. While the house dates from 1925, it was extensively altered in 1986. The Design Review Guidelines state that porches are an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture (See B-1.). The façade's present entry sequence and dormer configuration reflect changes made during the 1980s. The proposed porch, door units, and dormer reflect the Arts and Crafts impulses that informed the house's original design. The rear elevation has also undergone alterations. The proposed rear porch also adopts proportions, elements and details that are sympathetic to the earlier design impulse (See B-2.). Staff notes that the house uses a boxed eave yet the front [check rear] have exposed rafters.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-2), Staff does not believe the two porch and door/fenestration alterations of this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the historic district. Staff also believes the general repairs and painting are appropriate. Staff does believe that clarification of the porch details is needed to confirm this opinion. Staff is unsure how the triple dormer on the roof will actually work and cannot determine their effect on the structure. Staff does recommend that the porch[es] utilize a matching

cornice treatment as the main house. Considering that this building has been altered significantly the Board should decide if the alterations have an adverse impact on the neighborhood by determining the overall changes to the building. Pending the clarifications listed above, Staff recommends approval of the application.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Robert McCown was present to discuss the application.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Blackwell explained to the Board that the applicants wished to amend their application to include the use of a standing seam metal roofing sheets over the work proposed work affecting the facade (instead of asphalt shingles). He referenced supplemental materials provided for the meeting, as well as informing the Board of Mr. McCown's delivery of the clarification drawings.

Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant's representative. He asked Mr. McCown if he had any clarifications to address, comments to make, or questions to ask.

Mr. McCown answered no.

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

Mr. Roberts complimented Mr. McCown on the proposal. He asked the applicant's representative if shutters were to remain or be removed. Mr. McCown responded by saying that existing shutters would be retained.

Mr. Stone asked Mr. McCown if the proposed metal roofing would be used only above the porch. Mr. McCown answered yes. Mr. Stone stated the isolated use might make for juxtaposition.

Mr. Karwinski asked if the French doors accessing the location of the proposed rear porch featured transoms. Mr. McCown answered no. He stated that if finances allowed, the applicants would like to install transoms. It was noted that the plans as submitted did not depict transoms. The aforementioned clarification drawings were only delivered the morning of the meeting.

Mr. Karwinski asked for clarification regarding the treatment of the façade's recessed porch. He stated that the drawings were unclear as to how it would be affected by the proposed scope of work. Mr. Karwinski mentioned the railing in particular. Mr. McCown explained that a railing would be removed from the porch.

Mr. Karwinski stated that while the building is listed as non-contributing, he personally was not in favor of the design. He stated that as it stands, the building has clean lines and adopts a quasi Creole Cottage appearance. Mr. Karwinski encouraged the applicant to adopt a design that would be more in keeping with the building's existing character.

Mr. Allen stated that though he did not have issue with the proposed work, he had procedural concerns regarding the handling of a revised application. He stated that public notice had not been given as to the changes to the roof. Mr. Blackwell explained that the Board generally approves minor design changes and other amendments discussed at the time of the meeting. Ms. Coumanis reiterated the same. Mr. Stone

noted that since no concerned parties had come to the meeting in order to object to the overall proposal, it was doubtful anyone would take issue with a small design change.

A discussion of siding and corner boards ensued.

Mr. Karwinski redirected the discussion to the proposed use of exposed rafter tails. Mr. McCown stated that he adopts of policy varying rafter treatment among primary and secondary elements.

### **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 amended to include the removal the railing from the northwest corner porch, the substitution of a standing seam metal roof over the work proposed for the façade, and the use of transoms over the doors accessing the rear porch (all reflected in drawings and visual materials submitted).

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

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

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

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 12/4/14**

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

**2013-84-CA: 404 Marine Street**  
**Applicant: Ken Kiser**  
**Received: 11/18/13**  
**Meeting: 12/4/13**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Demolition – Demolish a fire damaged house.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This single story side hall house dates from circa 1897. The gabled roof dwelling originally featured full-length windows that opened onto a three bay front gallery. The house originally featured a recessed south-facing gallery that has since been enclosed.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

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

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on February 6, 2013. The property up to that point had never appeared before the Board. The applicant proposed the demolition of a fire damaged residence. While the Board acknowledged the condition of the building, they requested that the building be mothballed and advertised for sale for a three month period. With this application, the owner/applicant resubmits a proposal calling for the demolition of the building.
- B. The regards to demolition, the Guidelines read as follows: “Proposed demolition of a building must be brought before the Board for consideration. The Board may deny a demolition request if the building’s loss will impair the historic integrity of the district.” However, our ordinance mirrors the Mobile City Code, see §44-79, which sets forth the following standard of review and required findings for the demolition of historic structures:
  - 1. *Required findings; demolition/relocation.* The Board shall not grant certificates of appropriateness for the demolition or relocation of any property within a historic district unless the board finds that the removal or relocation of such building will not be detrimental to the historical or architectural character of the district. In making this determination, the board shall consider:
    - i. The historic or architectural significance of the structure;
      - 1. This one-story side hall dwelling is a contributing structure in the Oakleigh Garden District. Smaller and less expensive than two-story brick counterparts located closer to the city center, single-story side hall

- houses were constructed both by middle class families or as rental/speculative properties.
- iii. The importance of the structures to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
    - 1. Located on stretch of Marine Street already altered by earlier demolitions and recent fires, this mid-block residential building contributes to the built density and historical character of Marine Street and the Oakleigh Garden District.
  - iv. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
    - 1. The building materials are capable of being reproduced.
  - v. Whether the structure is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood, the county, or the region or is a good example of its type, or is part of an ensemble of historic buildings creating a neighborhood;
    - 1. One-story side hall dwellings are found in and around Mobile's historic districts (Examples featuring recessed side porches are far fewer.). Fire, neglect, and demolitions are reducing their numbers.
  - 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 applicants would salvage the remaining materials from the building, demolish the building, level the site, and plant grass on the vacant lot.
  - vii. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
    - 1. The then unoccupied property was acquired by the present owner in 1998. No purchase price was provided.
  - viii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
    - 1. Following the fire, the applicant states that he was informed not to work on the property.
  - viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
    - 1. A for sale sign has been placed and several times replaced on the property.
  - ix. Description of the options currently held for the purchase of such property, including the price received for such option, the conditions placed upon such option and the date of expiration of such option;
    - 1. Not applicable.
  - x. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
    - 1. Not given.
  - xi. Financial proof of the ability to complete the replacement project, which may include but not be limited to a performance bond, a letter of credit, a trust for completion of improvements, or a letter of commitment from a financial institution; and
    - 1. Application submitted.
  - xii. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.
    - 1. See submitted materials.

2. *Post demolition or relocation plans required.* In no event shall the board entertain any application for the demolition or relocation of any historic property unless the applicant also presents at the same time the post-demolition or post-relocation plans for the site.”

- C. Scope of Work (per submitted application).
1. Demolish a fire-damaged residence.
  2. Remove the debris.
  3. Level the site.
  4. Plant sod.

## **CLARIFICATIONS**

1. What is the asking price for the property?
2. Will the cleared lot be placed on the market for sale and how much will be asked?

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

When reviewing demolition applications, the Board takes into account the following: the architectural significance of the building; the condition of the building; the effect the demolition will have on the streetscape; and the nature of any proposed redevelopment.

This building is a contributing residential structure in the Oakleigh Historic District. The house type - a one-story, wood framed, side hall house – was one that was constructed across Mobile’s urban areas during the latter half of the 19<sup>th</sup>-Century. This example featured a recessed side porch located on the South Elevation. The building was added to and altered at a later date.

Prior to the fire, this building was affected by demolition by neglect. The house had been unoccupied for a number of years. Portions of the roof had given way. The fire caused extensive damage to the West Elevation and the roof structure. Vandals have broken windows and removed architectural components. The building is capable of being restored.

The house is located one lot south of the intersection of Marine and Selma Streets. A vacant lot is located to the south of the house. Two additional vacant lots are located to the east of the property on the other side of Marine Street. If granted demolition approval, the applicant would demolish the house, remove the debris, level the lot, and plant sod.

When the property last appeared before the Board the application was denied. While the Board was sympathetic to the applicant’s request, the applicant was instructed to post a sign on the property that provided the contact information of the owner. The Board further stipulated that property was to have been listed for sale for a period of three months and that all openings were to be secured by mothballing measures. The applicant placed a for sale sign on the property and placed plyboarding over all openings. He received no purchase offers. Following this property’s last appearance before the Review Board, the Board has established a policy of requiring that properties proposed for demolition not only be listed for sale, but also officially listed on MLS.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

On account of the significant improvements made on Marine Street in recent decades and the number of vacant lots existing in the area, Staff recommends that the applicant list the property on MLS for three months in an effort to reach a larger number of potential buyers. If after a three month period with no offers, Staff would recommend approval of the demolition. During the interim time period, Staff and City

Legal will work with the applicant regarding citations. At present and based on B (1-2), Staff believes this application would impair the architectural and historical character of the building and the district. Staff does not recommend approval of the application.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

No one was present to represent the application

Mr. Blackwell notified the Board that the applicant had withdrawn the application prior to the meeting. He stated that after having reviewed the Staff Report, the applicant had contacted Staff and informed them that he intended to officially list the property on MLS.

**WITHDRAWN PRIOR TO THE MEETING.**



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

**2013-85-CA: 50 Le Moyne Place**  
**Applicant: Dr. & Mrs. Jake Epker**  
**Received: 11/18/13**  
**Meeting: 12/4/13**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Conditionally Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Door Replacement – Remove an unauthorized door unit and replicate a historical door unit.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to literature located within this property’s MHDC file, this American Foursquare type dwelling dates circa 1905.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

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

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on August 21, 2013. At that time, the Board denied a request which called for the after-the-fact approval of the installation of an unauthorized replacement door unit. The applicants appealed the Board’s ruling before the City Council. On October 22, 2013, the City Council upheld the Board’s ruling. With this application, the applicants appear before the Board with a request to replace the existing door in such a manner that would replicate the original treatment of the door unit.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “Often one of the most important decorative features of a house, doorways reflect the age and style of a building. Original doors and openings should be retained along with any moldings, transoms or sidelights. Replacements should respect the age and style of the building.”
  - 2. “Doors with leaded or art glass may be appropriated when documentation exists for their use, or when they are compatible with the design and style of the structure.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted photographs):
  - 1. Remove an unauthorized door unit.
  - 2. Reconfigure the door opening to fit the original treatment (a pair of glazed and paneled double doors with a surmounting transom).

## **CLARIFICATIONS**

1. Will the jambs be reinstated?
2. How will the intermediate (door) lintel be treated?
3. Will the glazing feature leaded or beveled glass?

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application, the replication of an original door configuration, appears before the Board as a consequence of the Mobile City Council's upholding of a Board ruling. The applicants have submitted a photograph of the original door. Said original door unit, a double glazed and paneled configuration, would be replicated as closely as possible.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Pending clarification regarding the treatment of the door jambs and lintel, Staff recommends approval of this application. This is conditioned on the staff being notified when the works commences in order to monitor the work and the doors to be approved by staff before installation. These conditions are placed on the project in lieu of measured drawings being provided.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

No one was present to discuss the application.

Mr. Blackwell notified the Board that the applicant had withdrawn the application prior to the meeting.

## **WITHDRAWN PRIOR TO THE MEETING.**