

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
February 1, 2017 – 3:00 P.M.
Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Jim Wagoner, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
Members Present: Catarina Echols, Nick Holmes III, Steve Stone, Jim Wagoner, Carolyn Hasser, Robert Allen and David Barr.
Members Absent: Robert Brown, Harris Oswald, and Kim Harden.
Staff Members Present: Cartledge W. Blackwell, Paige Largue, and Bridget Daniel.
2. Mr. Stone moved to approve minutes from the January 18th meeting. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
3. Mr. Stone moved to approve midmonth CoA's granted by staff for the February 1st meeting. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED

1. **Applicant:** Rameh Khazen
 - a. Property Address: 204 Rapier Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/30/2016
 - c. Project: Repair and replace exterior wood siding as needed to match in dimension, profile, and material. Repair existing shutters. Install framed wood lattice per MHDC Guidelines. Repaint exterior the following: Main body-Hardwick White; Trim: Soft and Sympathetic White; Porch Deck: Soft Moodiness Grey; Accent: Black Blue.
2. **Applicant:** John Wink
 - a. Property Address: 501 Eslava Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/9/2016
 - c. Project: Repair lapsiding, fascia boards as needed to match existing in dimension, profile, and material. Remove metal awning. Repaint white. .
3. **Applicant:** Bo Stacy
 - a. Property Address: 56 S. Catherine Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/9/2016
 - c. Project: Repair and replace existing wooden stairs on rear of building to match existing.
4. **Applicant:** Jennifer L. Roselius
 - a. Property Address: 1556 Bruister Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/10/2017
 - c. Project: Work on exterior walls - Repair and/or replacement of deteriorated wooden elements to match the existing in profile, dimension and material. Reglaze and caulk windows and trim where deteriorated. Repaint eastern side facade and deteriorated elements on rear and western side facade per existing color scheme.
5. **Applicant:** K.I.M. Kearley
 - a. Property Address: 110 S. Claiborne
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/12/2017
 - c. Project: Install decorative iron gate to match existing adjacent iron fencing on east perimeter of lot.

- 6. Applicant:** Andy Scott
 - a. Property Address: 1151 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/12/2017
 - c. Project: Install 4' x 8' routed wood sign with routed letters to match existing in design and to meet MHDC Guidelines.
- 7. Applicant:** Charles Heyer
 - a. Property Address: 1356 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/12/2017
 - c. Project: Repair and replace lapsiding to match existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint to match existing color scheme. Cover window with lapsiding in rear east elevation out of public view.
- 8. Applicant:** Freddie and Virginia Sigler
 - a. Property Address: 500 Canal Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/13/2017
 - c. Project: Install metal fence starting at corner of garage and running 13'7" southwest of lot terminating at brick pier. Install gate 27'7" wide along south perimeter of lot between brick piers. Gate and fence will not to exceed 6' in height.
- 9. Applicant:** Rebecca P. Shaw
 - a. Property Address: 111 Garnett Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/16/2017
 - c. Project: Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Repair and when necessary wooden tongue-and-groove porch decking to match the existing. Remove plyboard mothballing measure from windows. Repair windows (removing pieces of plexi-glass found in a few panes and replacing them with glass). Repaint the house. Reroof the house with asphalt shingles. Install a six-foot tall interior lot privacy fence. Said fence will not extend beyond the front plane of the house.
- 10. Applicant:** Coulson Roofing and Sheet Metal
 - a. Property Address: 8 S. Ann Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/23/2017
 - c. Project: Reroof with architectural shingles in approved color (weatherwood or slate).
- 11. Applicant:** Jim Jeffries
 - a. Property Address: 1706 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/23/2017
 - c. Project: Install three foot dog eared fence to tie in to existing privacy fence. Install six foot gate at corner of building in driveway.
- 12. Applicant:** Melissa Shaver
 - a. Property Address: 1136 Montauk Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/23/2017
 - c. Project: Repaint body Frappe from NTHP chart, trim white, door natural, porch deck dark gray.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2017-02-CA: 153 South Monterey Street: APPROVED

- a. Applicant: Eric S. Payne, Sr. for Emanuel Gazzier
- b. Project: Ancillary Related – Obtain after-the-fact-approval for the demolition of an ancillary building (non-contributing), construct a new ancillary building on the same location, and construct a carport.

2. 2017-03-CA: 30 Blacklawn Street: APPROVED

- a. Applicant: Fred Bauer
- b. Project: Rear Addition and Ancillary Related – Construct a rear addition and extend the roof of the same over earlier rear additions; Construct a porch addition atop of an existing deck located to the side of an ancillary building and make minor alterations to the body of said ancillary building.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Midmonth Approvals – Mr. Allen raised a query. Mr. Blackwell agreed to follow up on that query with the City's Legal Department.
2. Bi-Laws – Mr. Blackwell followed up by saying that other one comment had been provided to staff as per the provision of an emergency situation clause.
3. Mr. Holmes addressed his fellow Board members. He stated that in light of comments made at two recent Board meetings, he wanted to provide perspective on the past and current actions of the Architectural Review Board and Historic Development staff. Mr. Holmes said that his current tenure on the board was his second time to serve the preservation community in that fashion. He stated that during the end of his last time on the Board that there inconsistencies in actions, but that at the present time the Board and Staff were making a positive impact in their community. Citing the screen wall behind the Van Antwerp Building and the Cooley Building on St. Francis Street, Mr. Holmes articulated that situations arise and the Board responds to them.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2017-02-CA: 153 South Monterey Street
Applicant: Eric S. Payne, Sr. for Emanuel Gazzier
Received: 1/10/17
Meeting: 2/1/17

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing Main House (not impacted); Non-Contributing Ancillary Related.
Zoning: R-1
Project: Ancillary Related – Obtain after-the-fact Approval for the demolition of an ancillary building (non-contributing), construct a new ancillary building on the same location, and construction of a second ancillary building

BUILDING HISTORY

This larger “Midtown” dwelling is informed by a combination of Dutch Colonial and Georgian Revival currents of the Colonial Revival Movement. The triple-pitch gambrel roof and prominent wall dormer convey a Netherlandish air that early 20th Century home builders, tastemakers, and homeowners considered to be representative of the Low Countries in spirit if not exacting detail. The symmetrical form, brick construction, and classical details are tell-tale signs of the more pervasive Georgian Revival vein of the Colonial Revival Movement.

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 November 10, 2003. At that time, the Board denied a request to install cementitious siding on a principle residence. The application up for review calls the after-the-fact approval of a non-contributing ancillary building,

construction of a new ancillary building on the location as the aforementioned structure, and construction a carport

- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
1. "When considering demolition of later portions of a building, the following criteria are taken into account "significance, condition, impact on the street and the district, and nature of proposed development."
 2. "A new accessory or ancillary structure should be compatible with those in the district."
 3. "Design an accessory or ancillary structure to be subordinate in scale to that of the primary structure."
 4. "Locate a new accessory or ancillary structure in line with other visible accessory structures in the district. These are traditionally located at the rear of the lot."
 5. "Cement-based fiber siding" is listed as acceptable material for ancillary new construction."

C. Scope of Work:

1. Authorize the after-the-fact-approval of the demolition of a non-contributing ancillary building.
2. Construct a new ancillary building (per submitted plans).
 - a. The ancillary building will be situated 3' from the East lot line and 3' from the South line (replicating pre-existing setbacks).
 - b. The will measure 42' in width and 24' in depth.
 - c. The building will rest atop either brick-faced or stucco-faced foundation piers.
 - d. The building's walls will be faced with Hardiboard siding.
 - e. The wall heights will be 8'.
 - f. The building will feature nine-over-one wooden windows. Other window configurations are specified in section C-2-i.
 - g. A hipped roof will surmount the building.
 - h. Timberline shingles will sheath the roof.
 - i. West (facing rear of dwelling) Elevation
 - i. The West Elevation will be defined by an open (porch) northernmost portion and an enclosed westernmost portion.
 - ii. The porch (open) portion of the West Elevation will be defined by two square section posts interspersed by picketed railings (MHDC stock pattern).
 - iii. One of the staggered bays engaging the porch will feature a six-over-one window.
 - iv. The enclosed southernmost portion of the West Elevation will feature two nine-over-nine windows.
 - j. North (a side, facing proposed carport) Elevation
 - i. The North Elevation will be defined by an enclosed easternmost portion and open (porch) westernmost portion.
 - ii. The enclosed easternmost portion will not feature fenestration.
 - iii. The porch (open) portion situated to the west of the enclosed portion will be situated in advance of two staggered bays.
 - iv. Two square section posts interspersed with a picketed railing (MHDC stock pattern) will define the porch bays.
 - v. The easternmost of the staggered bays engaged by the porch will feature a six-over-one window.
 - vi. The westernmost of the staggered bays fronting the porch will feature a double French wood framed door.
 - k. East (rear) Elevation
 - i. The East Elevation will feature two nine-over-one wooden windows.

1. South (a side) Elevation
 - i. The South Elevation will feature two nine-over-one windows.
 - ii. A transom window will be located between the aforementioned windows.
3. Construct a carport.
 - a. The carport will be situated 3' from the North lot line and well in advance of the East (rear) lot line
 - b. The carport will measure 22' in width by 22' in depth'.
 - c. The carport will be constructed atop a concrete slab.
 - d. The carport will feature four sets of supports.
 - i. The supports will be bifurcated in nature.
 - ii. A hardi-sided plinth-like base will comprise the lower portion of the supports.
 - iii. Tapered piers resting atop the aforementioned plinth-like bases will comprise the upper portions of the columns.
 - e. A hardi-sided frieze will extend around the building.
 - f. A hipped roof will surmount the carport.
 - g. The roof will be sheathed with Timberline shingles.
4. Install paving (Recourse site plan.).

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the after-the-fact approval of the demolition of a deteriorated ancillary building, the construction of a new ancillary building on the location of the earlier ancillary building, and the construction of a carport.

With regard to the after-the-fact approval for the removal of the ancillary building, the same criteria by which Board reviews the demolition of principle buildings are taken into account. According to the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts, the considerations taken into account are as follows: significance, condition, impact on the street and the district, and nature of proposed development (See B-1.). The ancillary building was not of the same architectural importance and construction quality. As with many accessory structures, the attendant building was intended and did serve the main building. Based on Sanborn Maps, the building was not contemporaneous with the main building. In combination, the design detailing, physical materials, and later construction of the building caused it to not to contribute the architectural significance of the property. The building was in a bad state of repair. While the building was located behind the main dwelling and not directly engaged to the passerby, the structure added built density and rhythm to early 20th Century suburban lot. Deferred maintenance of the inferior construction prompted the unauthorized demolition. As evidenced by the work commenced (stop work order issued by other municipal departments) and plans provided, the applicant proposes the construction of a new ancillary building. The proposed building would reestablish a density within the back lot. See below as per the Staff Analysis of the proposed new construction as it relates to the redevelopment plans – new ancillary construction atop the location of the non-contributing building which was demolished.

New ancillary construction involves review of considerations pertaining to placement, scale, massing, design, and material. The building proposed to replace the deteriorated ancillary building which was demolished will occupy a portion of the footprint of the earlier structure. The rear setback of the building will remain the same. The side setback of three feet is permissible by reason of the Historic District

Overlay, a planning regulation authorizing in certain cases the employment of traditional setbacks within Midtown's four locally designated National Register Districts (Old Dauphin Way being one). As witnessed by surrounding properties and Midtown back lots in general, ancillary buildings were generally placed on or close to lot lines so the lot. In accord with The Design Review Guidelines, the building is in line with the specific and the same general location as traditional ancillary construction (See B-4.). With regard to scale, the Design Review Guidelines state that new ancillary construction should be compatible with that found within the district (See B-2.). Given the period of significance for Old Dauphin Way (1820s – 1940s), compatibility takes many forms. Scale is a crucial factor for compatible infill in a historic landscape. While ancillary installations for on grade construction are allowed for garden sheds other reversible interventions, permanent construction should reference and be subordinate to the scale of the principle building when visible from the public view (two story garages structures are in cases an exception) (See B-3.). The building which was under construction rests atop traditional raised piers. The proposed wall height (under the 12/4 pitch of roof) is 8'. For new construction of principle buildings, a minimum ceiling height of 10' is specified. Taking account into the elevation (raised pier construction) of the building, secondary use of the building and the varied wall heights of the house (10' and 9'), and subordinate scaling requirements of the building in relation to the overall design impact, the scale is commiserate with the Guidelines. The layering affords a reference to the scale of the house in general and how it lowers in height as it extends into the lot. With regard to design, compatibility of features serves as means to preserve the character of a property and district. The proposed ancillary building features nine-over-one wooden windows like the main residence. The employment of design features such as the windows and raised elevation complement the house. With regard to materials, the Design Review Guidelines authorize the use of composite materials such as cementitious siding (See B-5.) on new construction. The deteriorated building which was demolished featured wooden siding. The employment of hardiboard siding on a replacement would retain the material relations which previously informed the property. Many ancillary buildings, even those behind masonry residences, were constructed of wood.

In addition to the ancillary building discussed above, a carport is proposed for the site. The same criteria for review which informed the analysis of the proposed back house, condition the review of the proposed carport. As per placement, the proposed building is situated on sight with an existing drive way and beyond an original porte cochere. Taking into account the use and location of other ancillary buildings of the same function, the building is located in the traditional physical situation on the lot, in the block, and for the period (See B-4.). With regard to scale, the on grade construction affords a subordinate relationship between the proposed carport and the main dwelling (See B-3.). Compatibility is engendered by way of employment of carport supports that echo those found on the adjacent principle buildings and nearby ancillary buildings (See B-2.).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-5), Staff does not believe this application for the after-the-fact approval of the demolition of a non-contributing ancillary construction and new construction of two ancillary buildings would impair the architectural or the historical character of the property or the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Eric S. Payne, Sr. and Mr. Emanuel Gazzier were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner welcomed the applicant, Mr. Gazzier, and his representative, Mr. Payne, and asked if they had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make. Both Mr. Gazzier and Mr. Payne responded no.

Mr. Wagoner asked the applicants to clarify the ancillary building's use. Mr. Payne replied it was to be used as an office.

Mr. Roberts asked for further clarification since the floor plan included a kitchen. He noted that the property was zoned for R-1 and the ancillary building would not be able to be utilized as a rental unless rezoned. Mr. Payne replied he and Mr. Gazzier were made aware of these zoning regulations of the City of Mobile. Mr. Blackwell stated the City of Mobile Planning Department had referred Mr. Payne and Mr. Gazzier to Historic Development. Mr. Wagoner reiterated for purposes of awareness and public record that the property would need to be rezoned if used as multi-family and that the applicant had stated that space would not be employed for rental purposes.

Mr. Roberts asked what the circle on the draft the elevation symbolized. Mr. Stone replied it was a call out for the siding. Mr. Payne replied that the siding was to be hardiplank upon being queried by Mr. Roberts. Mr. Blackwell noted that hardiplank is listed as an approved material for new construction.

Mr. Stone noted that the ancillary building, while not visible from Monterey Street, was visible from Laurel Street.

Mr. Wagoner asked if there was anyone from the audience who wanted to speak either for or against the application. No one comment was made.

Mr. Allen asked if any pictures existed of the original ancillary building. Mr. Blackwell replied that a photo showing a portion of the one-story structure taken in the 1980s.

Mr. Allen asked if the building was of contributing or non-contributing status. Mr. Blackwell stated that unless stated as being contributing in National Register nomination, ancillary buildings are generally considered to be non-contributing. He noted that the Design Review Guidelines allow protection via renovation and demolition criteria.

Mr. Allen also asked if the ancillary building was to have the same windows as the house. It was confirmed that it would.

Mr. Stone asked if the application should be voted on in its entirety or split and voted into two parts (after the fact demolition and then construction). Mr. Wagoner noted it was in the scope of the report to vote on the application in its entirety.

No further Board discussion ensued.

Mr. Wagoner turned the discussion to the audience for a second time. Upon hearing no response, Mr. Wagoner 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 amended noting that hardiboard siding would feature either hardiplank or wooden siding.

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

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 passed with one opposing.

The motion received a second and was approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 2/2/2017

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2017-03-CA: 30 Blacklawn Street
Applicant: Fred Bauer
Received: 1/17/17
Meeting: 2/1/17

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Rear Addition and Ancillary Related – Construct a rear addition and extend the roof of the same over earlier rear additions; Construct a porch addition on the location of an existing deck situated to the side of an ancillary building and make minor alterations to the body of said ancillary building.

BUILDING HISTORY

Blacklawn was one of the numerous upper middle class suburban developments which the George Fearn family created in Mobile during the early 20th Century. As with nearby Fearnway, a none too subtly named development of the same family, Blacklawn is lined with an impressive collection of Arts & Crafts Movement dwellings. The subject dwelling represents a quintessential expression of a “bungalow”. First appearing in Northeastern watering holes and West Coast suburban landscapes in the 1880s, bungalows went mainstream during the 1920s. This example features a prominent porch, hunkering roof forms, and sturdy construction associated with the still popular architectural typology.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Design an addition so that that the overall character of the site are retained.”
 - 2. “Design an addition to be compatible with the material and character of the property, neighborhood, and environment.”
 - 3. “Differentiate an addition from a historic structure using changes in material, color, and/or wall plane. Alternative materials such as cement fiberboard, are allowed when the addition is properly differentiated from the original structure.”
 - 4. “Place an addition so that it is subordinate to the historic residence.”
 - 5. “Design an addition to be compatible with in massing and scale with the original historic structure.”
 - 6. “Design the building components (roof, foundations, doors, and windows) of the addition to be compatible the historic architecture.”

7. “A new accessory or ancillary structure (or addition to) should be compatible with those in the district.”
8. “Locate a new accessory or ancillary structure (or addition to the same) in line with other visible accessory structures in the district. These are traditionally located at the rear of the lot.”

C. Scope of Work:

1. Construct a rear addition.
 - a. The addition will take the form of enclosed living space, patio space, and carport.
 - b. The enclosed living and raised porch spaces will rest atop brick foundation piers that will be painted to match the treatment of those of the existing side elevations.
 - c. Framed and recessed latticed lattice skirting panels will extend between the foundation piers (side elevations).
 - d. The patio and carport will be feature concrete paved floors.
 - e. Wooden siding will match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material.
 - f. The eave treatments will match existing (albeit for a gable not a hip)
 - g. Existing rear fenestration (a door) will be salvaged and reemployed on the addition.
 - h. The addition will be surmounted by two gabled roofs.
 - i. The building will be reroofed with asphalt shingles.
 - j. South Elevation (a side – that engaged to the driveway).
 - i. The North Elevation will feature an advance enclosed addition located preceding a recessed open, albeit roofed, addition. The latter will serve as a carport and roofed patio.
 - ii. The enclosed portion of the addition will not feature fenestration.
 - iii. The recessed on open portion of the addition will be defined by square section posts that will demarcate the vehicular stalls of that carport portion of the addition.
 - iv. A concrete entry will be located in advance of the vehicular bays.
 - k. West (rear) Elevation
 - i. Two vehicular bays defined by square section posts will front staggered enclosed bays.
 - ii. The smaller enclosed bay will feature a salvaged door.
 - l. North Elevation (a side)
 - i. The easternmost section of the South Elevation will feature two telescoped sections of the addition.
 - ii. Three covered bays will be located in advance of and to the west of the aforementioned interior volumes.
 - iii. The aforementioned sequence is from east to west: covered patio bay and two carport bays.
 - iv. The aforementioned bays will be defined by square section posts.
2. Remove a later raised deck located off the side of an existing ancillary building.
3. Construct a new roofed porch and construct a new eave between the first and second levels of the ancillary building’s principle (East Elevation).
 - a. The portion addition will measure 14’ in width and 20’ in depth.
 - b. The construction will extend and square out an existing construction.
 - c. A staircase will be reconstructed.
 - d. Six square section piers per two tier will employed be employed as the buildings bay sequencing and structural support systems.

- e. Two bays (a smaller and larger) will define each elevation.
 - f. The roof structure of the existing building will be extended over the porch addition.
 - g. Stairs will be reconstructed.
4. Repair and when necessary replace siding on the main house when and where necessary to match the existing.
 5. Repaint the house.

CLARIFICATIONS

1. What is the design of the ancillary addition's railings – bay defining and stair?
2. What is the design of the eave that will be employed the floors on the ancillary building's principle elevation?

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Employ a corner board at the juncture of the old/commencement of the work on the North Elevation. See * in Staff Analysis. See B-3 for rationale.
2. Employ faux fenestration on the West (rear) Elevation. See * in Staff Analysis. See B-6 for rationale.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of a rear addition onto a contributing residential building and the removal and construction of an addition onto an ancillary building.

With regard to the addition proposed for construction to the main residence, the proposed addition would be located to the rear of the contributing building. For reasons of the situation behind the main building, situation on the opposite side of the driveway, location of the house on the lot, and landscaping conditions, the proposed addition would not be visible from the public view. On account of the aforementioned site conditions, the overall character of the site would be retained and thus in accord with the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts (See B-1.). The situation of the proposed addition to the rear of the dwelling affords a subordination and differentiation between historic fabric and new work (See B-4.). The addition is so situated and designed to be both compatible with the scale and massing of the main dwelling, but also so differentiated as to read as a later alteration (See B-5.). Said addition features both enclosed and open spaces. The enclosed spaces maintain foundation and ceiling heights. The building components complement the main house (See B-6.). Certain constructions and elements match the existing, such as siding and eaves. A door is proposed for salvage and re-use. Given the rear location and utilitarian function of the additions, fenestration was not employed. On the North Elevation (driveway side), absence of fenestration on the proposed addition would afford symmetry on a wall expanse combining old and new fabric. The North Elevation (a second side) is close to the lot line. Additionally, that portion of the addition is largely open in nature. The West Elevation could benefit from the appearance of fenestration. Staff recommends the employment of a faux shuttered and cased window (*See Recommendation 1.). A corner board is recommended for the use at the juncture between the old and new on the South Elevation (*See Recommendation 2.) as means of differentiating old and new fabric. The gabled roof, while not matching the jerkin head roofs of the house and the porch represents a typical roof form for rear elevations. Said gable roof would extend over an existing series of additions as well as the proposed addition. A gable surmounts the garage/back house so the employment on the addition is contextual.

With regard to the proposed addition to the ancillary building, the location of the proposed changes is not visible from the public view on account of the structure's placement on the lot, location behind the main building, and other site considerations (fencing, landscaping, etc...). A deck occupying a portion of the proposed addition would be removed. Stairs would be reconstructed. Both deck and stairs represent non-original and recent constructions. The proposed addition to the building would take the form a tiered porch/deck. The roof structure would extend over the expanded footprint and be in line with the existing building (See B-8.). The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that additions to accessory or ancillary buildings should be compatible with district. Instead of a Gulf Coast deck attached to an Arts & Crafts building, there would be roofed structure whose overall form (rectilinear), roof structure (extension of the gable), and detailing (replication of gable fascia and rafter detail) would match the existing building. The new work would be differentiated from the existing by reason of the open nature of the addition while still maintaining characteristics of massing and detail (See B-8.). Clarifications are requested as per design of the railings on the addition and the design of umbrage over the existing door bays. Railings are not shown in the drawings. On account of the height, protective measures would be required. Staff recommends a simple picket railing with outward facing bottom rails. The MHDC stock design for a picketed railing could employed or modified. The overhang above the doors constitutes an understandable request. Other ancillary buildings feature similar constructional devices.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-8), Staff does not believe that either the construction of the addition to the main house or the addition to garage would impair the architectural or the historical character of the property or the surrounding district. Pending the clarifications and recommendations cited above, Staff recommends approval of this application in full.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Fred Bauer was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Blackwell noted that Mr. Bauer was receptive to all recommendations articulated in the Staff Report.

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner welcomed the applicant, Mr. Fred Bauer and asked if he had any questions. Noting that Mr. Blackwell had addressed the application in full, Mr. Bauer answered no.

Mr. Stone stated the drawings were difficult to read. He asked the applicant if the deck was to be one or two stories.

Mr. Bauer clarified alterations and repairs would match in kind. He explained that an existing rotten deck would be removed and the new deck would extend the full width of the building. Mr. Bauer also noted that the overhang over the porch-like deck would keep the elements from damaging the wood, a problem impacting the deck as constructed

Mr. Stone inquired about the proposed extended eave on the ancillary building. Mr. Bauer replied it would be both decorative and functional. The eave would shed water away from the garage doors. He stated the proposed new roof on the rear of the main residence and proposed addition is a response to the poor condition and low pitch of the current roof.

Mr. Stone and the Board viewed of photo of the western elevation (front) of the house which employs mitered corners. Mr. Bauer clarified that he was using corner boards at the rear of the house for the addition. Mr. Blackwell asked if he would amenable to constructing mitered corners instead. Mr. Bauer replied he would. Mr. Blackwell stated currently cornerboards are employed on the rear of the main residence.

No further Board discussion ensued.

Mr. Wagoner turned to the discussion to the audience. No one was present who could speak either for or against the application. Mr. Wagoner closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Stone moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending facts to note that the corners of the rear addition would be either mitered in construction or employ corner boards. The facts were also amended to note that a corner board would be employed at the juncture between the existing & proposed additions and faux fenestration (shuttered & framed) would be employed on the East (rear) Elevation,

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 2/2/2017

DISCUSSION

MID MONTHS

Mr. Blackwell stated that post the last ARB meeting no comments were regarding the latest mid month resolution which was sent via email. He noted staff has still been operating under this resolution when writing Certificates of Appropriateness to constituents.

BI-LAWS

Mr. Blackwell noted that since the previous ARB meeting one member sent remarks regarding emergency meetings in the ordinance. These have been sent to Melissa Mutert, the MHDC legal representative.

GENERAL

Mr. Roberts and Mr. Stone inquired of the repercussions if after the fact approval of an application was denied. Mr. Blackwell responded the applicant has the right to file an appeal with the city clerk and go before City Council.

Mr. Wagoner proposed a hypothetical situation in which an application for after the fact approval for demolition and new construction came before the board similar to of an application of S. Monterey Street. He asked in that situation what would happen if you denied the after the fact approval of demolition. He also asked if the worked would be denied as well.

Mr. Blackwell responded you could deny, then a Stop Work Order (SWO) would be issued on the new construction, and then it would have to come back to the board for approval.

Mr. Allen asked what the repercussions were if a building was demolished without approval. Mr. Blackwell responded a ticket is issued and cited the example of 522 Dauphin Street.

Mr. Roberts implored Mr. Blackwell to call the City of Charleston and inquire what there city policy is in this situation.

Mr. Allen sated a midmonth concern was expressed to Mr. Oswald. As he understood, the first time a CoA is publicly seen is when it is noted on the agenda and posted to the website. He asked about how the CoA's written applied to the "Open Meeting Law" of Alabama. Mr. Blackwell responded to Mr. Allen. He informed the board he called Ms. Mary Shell of the Alabama Historic Commission and Ms. Robin Zeigler of the Metropolitan Historic Zoning Commission in Nashville. Both assured that if the board if operating within the ordinance then it is legal.

Mr. Allen stated the ordinance says the board can delegate to staff but yet it does not have to. His concern was about giving notice over mid months to the public. He wanted to know the ARB ordinance was not violating the "Open Meeting Law".

Mr. Blackwell asked Mr. Allen to forward him an email Mr. Allen had sent to Mr. Harris. Mr. Blackwell would then inquire into the answer. Mr. Blackwell also stated notice is given by way of agenda and minutes being posted on the MHDC website. Mr. Allen noted this was after the CoA's has been issued.

Mr. Blackwell then informed the board of the next meeting, February 15th and its three applications on its agenda.

Mr. Roberts inquired about the estimated date of the balcony installation at Hargove. Mr. Blackwell stated a goal of Memorial Day.

Mr. Nick Holmes then spoke to the board. He spoke of former boards of past, when agenda items were being denied and appeals were being seen at City Council and being overturned. He also spoke of other issues with Board members and former Directors. Mr. Holmes stated the current board is a "vast improvement." Noted other structures had political pressure involved such as Old City Hall North Wing, RSA Iron Front Building, similar to issues the board has been faced with recently.

Mr. Allen said he agreed with Mr. Holmes statement. However, he did not want to the board to hold back on disapproving an item on the agenda to avoid City Council appeal.

Mr. Roberts stated remarked all cities have similar preservation issues. He noted the board was doing a good job.

Mr. Allen noted every board is different in each city, and noted it is helpful with mayor and upper level city support.

Mr. Blackwell thanked the ARB members for their time and commitment over the years. He noted that just in the past eight and a half months the Design Review Guidelines have been updated, and the MHDC is no longer often seen as the "hysterical" but more often historic.

Mr. Roberts remarked how tourist to the city our noting the positive changes and revitalization in Mobile. He stated how enamored each passing visitor becomes, and gave thanks to the leaders of the preservation movement in Mobile such as Mrs. Nancy Holmes.

Mr. Wagoner moved to adjourn the meeting. The meeting was adjourned.