

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
February 15, 2017 – 3:00 P.M.
Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Harris Oswalt, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:

Members Present: Catarina Echols, Nick Holmes III, Harris Oswalt, Craig Roberts, David Barr, and Robert Allen.

Members Absent: Kim Harden, Carolyn Hasser, Jim Wagoner, Robert Brown, and Steve Stone.

Staff Members Present: Cartledge W. Blackwell, Paige Lague, and Melissa Mutert.

2. Mr. Roberts moved to approve the minutes for the February 1, 2017 meeting. The motion received a second and was unanimously approval.

3. Mr. Roberts moved to approve midmonth COA's granted by Staff. The motion received a second and was approved with one in opposition, Mr. Allen. Mr. Allen explained the Mid-Month process did not conform to the Alabama Opening Meeting Law. He further clarified the the Architectural Review Board Ordinance did not over ride the Alabama Open Meeting Law. Mr. Blackwell replied that he had forwarded a previous email from Mr. Allen addressing his concerns to the City of Mobile legal department. He further explained Ms. Mutert would be present to discuss the concern.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED.

1. **Applicant:** Robin Rockstall on behalf of the Archdiocese of Mobile
 - a. Property Address: 404-406 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/24/2017
 - c. Project: Install 10'W x 6'H chain link fence at North and South entrance of alley between properties. Temporary fence would be in place for Mardi Gras season from February 3rd until March 17th, 2017.
2. **Applicant:** Sara Copeland
 - a. Property Address: 10 McPhillips Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/25/2017
 - c. Project: Repaint in following Sherwin Williams colors: body white dove; trim old prairie, porch deck and lattice Gray Area, porch ceiling Breaktime
3. **Applicant:** Nick Holmes III
 - a. Property Address: 260 St. Anthony Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/26/2017
 - c. Project: Remove a later concrete wall and metal gate located to the rear of the property.
4. **Applicant:** Jeanette Shaw
 - a. Property Address: 456 Charles Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/26/2017
 - c. Project: Place frame lattice panels between piers, install black screen door, put down brick driveway.
5. **Applicant:** Melissa Kyle
 - a. Property Address: 906 Church Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/26/2017

c. Project: Repair and replace wood work including lapsiding, eaves, soffits, trim, to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Repair and rework wooden windows. Install gas lantern over center of front door.

6. Applicant: Joe Faris

a. Property Address: 659 Government Street

b. Date of Approval: 1/26/2017

c. Project: Install temporary construction fence for period of 9 months. Remove once construction ends.

7. Applicant: Patrick Setterstrom

a. Property Address: 205 Dauphin Street

b. Date of Approval: 1/27/2017

c. Project: Repaint cornice, trim, and balcony black. Repaint doors, lettering and transom flagstone gray.

- 8. Applicant:** Patrick Setterstrom
 - a. Property Address: 207 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/27/2017
 - c. Project: Repaint body of building Olympic Paint Patches (Taupe) and trim, molding in Swirling Smoke (Gray). Repaint Security Doors in Black.
- 9. Applicant:** Fred Bauer
 - a. Property Address: 30 Blacklawn
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/30/2017
 - c. Project: Restucco pediment and install wooden rectangular vent in central location. Install kneebraces underneath eaves. Repair and replace deteriorated soffit and eave wood to match existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint to match existing.
- 10. Applicant:** Charles Hunt Griffith
 - a. Property Address: 955 Palmetto Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/30/2017
 - c. Project: Construct a rear deck not visible from the public view and install interior lot privacy fence (wooden paling not exceeding 6' in height) which will not extend beyond the front plane of the house.
- 11. Applicant:** E. Bradford & Francie A. Ladd
 - a. Property Address: 2301 DeLeon Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/30/2017
 - c. Project: Construct a stucco-faced wall around an existing mechanical court located to the side of the house. See site plan. The wall will be five feet in height and setback from the front plan of the house. The stucco treatment will match that employed on the body of the house.
- 12. Applicant:** Fleet Belle
 - a. Property Address: 53 N. Broad Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/30/2017
 - c. Project: Temporary modular concession building for Mardi Gras.
- 13. Applicant:** Hagan Fences
 - a. Property Address: 118 N. Lafayette Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/30/2017
 - c. Project: Construct 8' wooden fence, capped and trimmed, along southern perimeter of lot line turning at a ninety degree angle along western lot line and terminating at front façade plane.
- 14. Applicant:** Ricky and Sharon Dixon
 - a. Property Address: 1327 Spring Hill Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/31/2017
 - c. Project: Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated woodwork (siding, porch decking, and detailing) to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Paint the body of the dwelling Coventry White and the trim white.
- 15. Applicant:** Society of 1842
 - a. Property Address: 110 South Claiborne Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/1/2017
 - c. Project: Install protective device in advance of historic windows for the remainder of the Carnival season. Said reversible interventions are easily removable and will not damage historic fabric.

16. **Applicant:** David and Michon Trent
- a. Property Address: 162 Roper Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/1/2017
 - c. Project: Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Remove later 1980s wooden appliques so as to restore original frieze and gable treatments (substantiated by old photographs and earlier approvals). Replicate original columnar supports. Repaint the house.
17. **Applicant:** William Bowman with Doster Construction
- a. Property Address: 101 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/1/2017
 - c. Project: Reroof the building to match.
18. **Applicant:** K.I.M. Kearley
- a. Property Address: 919 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/1/2017
 - c. Project: Construct an iron trellage on a side elevation employing salvaged ironwork.
19. **Applicant:** Joe Cortopassi
- a. Property Address: 1452 Brown Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/2/2017
 - c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork as needed including lapsiding, trim, soffits to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Remove 4x4 post supporting later addition porch and construct piers of CMU units faced with brick. Install framed lattice between piers. Install brick stairs leading to front porch. Replace three (3) unoriginal windows with 2/2 aluminum clad windows. Replace rear metal window with aluminum clad. Replace existing solid metal front door with four panel metal or wood door. Replace rear door with French door. Repair balustrade using MHDC stock design.
20. **Applicant:** Bernhardt Roofing
- a. Property Address: 50 N. Monterey Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/2/2017
 - c. Project: Repair section of roofing to match existing asphalt shingles.
21. **Applicant:** Rashawn Figures
- a. Property Address: 404-406 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/3/2017
 - c. Project: Install 10'W x 6'H temporary wooden fence at North and South entrance of alley between properties. Fence would be in place for Mardi Gras season from February 3rd until March 17th, 2017.
22. **Applicant:** Alver Carlson
- a. Property Address: 1653 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/3/2017
 - c. Project: Repaint house in existing color scheme. Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Reroof rear porch addition (currently rolled roof) to asphalt shingles in autumn brown.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2017-04-CA: 1002 Dauphin Street

- a. Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley of Douglas Burtu Kearley Architect on behalf of Michael Smith and Kalen Carr
- b. Project: Addition Related – Construct a two-tiered gallery off of the North (rear) Elevation.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2017-05-CA: 205 George Street

- a. Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley of Douglas Burtu Kearley Architect on behalf of Joanna Colby
- b. Project: Fenestration, Rear Addition, and Ancillary Related –Alter a later door; Alter secondary fenestration; Enclose a portion of a rear porch; Extend a rear porch; and Alter an ancillary building.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

3. 2017-06-CA: 558 St. Francis Street

- a. Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley of Douglas Burtu Kearley Architect on behalf of Temple Lodge Development
- b. Project: Restore and Rehabilitate a Historic Commercial Building – Restore and make alterations to ground floor storefront fenestration; Remove and replace later non-conforming fenestration with aluminum clad fenestration; Construct a wrap-around canopied gallery; Remove a later fire escape occupying a portion of the location of the aforementioned gallery; Install a cornice; and Install new prefinished heads and rain headers.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Discussion

MID-MONTHS: Mr. Allen raised concern regarding the legality of the mid-months. Ms. Mutert from the City of Mobile legal department was present to discuss and address concerns, as well as Mary Shell from the Alabama Historical Commission. Ms. Mutert was present to address concerns over mid-month practices.

Mr. Allen noted that the current MHDC Ordinance allows the Board to delegate certain powers to staff. He questioned whether the mid-months needed to be placed before the Board for a Certificate of Appropriateness (CoA) so as to conform to the Alabama Open Meeting Law. He was concerned that midmonths do not meet the open meeting legislation since the public do not receive notice of the mid-months until until agenda was posted.

Ms. Mutert reassured the Board it the midmonth process was not in violation of any laws. She cited ordinance and the 2012 ARB resolution to the mid-months, which enumerated certain powers to the staff regarding the mid-months.

Mr. Roberts reiterated that the resolution in place gave the public notice and therefore is legal since the ARB passed it. Mr. Holmes noted the staff of the Mobile Planning Commission authorizes City staff to approve certain approvals administratively.

Ms. Mutert noted that the current resolution is business and family friendly. She also stated the Board has the power to review and amend the 2012 resolution. She further stressed the Board was not in violation of any laws.

Mr. Allen responded he was still concerned. He said that he was of the opinion that the ARB ordinance could override the Open Meeting Law and it could open the Board to lawsuit. Ms. Mutert assured the Board they were not in violation, and her job is to protect them from legal action. She further explained that there was no deliberation involved since the ARB had made a public resolution. Mr. Allen stated the staff was making a deliberation even on items that seemed miniscule. Ms. Mutert stated the actions performed within the confines of the resolution become perfunctory and so do not violate or rob any constituent of their right to notice.

Mr. Roberts asked if an attorney could affirm the details articulated by Ms. Mutert. Ms. Mutert responded that she as the Board's legal representation provided the professional explanation.

Ms. Shell agreed with Ms. Mutert. She stated that after a board adopts expedited review for items it is not deliberation. Ms. Shell also noted that a board can always review previous resolutions for expedited review.

Mr. Allen replied there was still no notice given for the mid-months until it was posted on the agenda and had possibly been permitted. Ms. Shell noted that the Design Review Guidelines are published with public notification, and therefore those items do not require deliberation. Mr. Allen stated that was assuming the public knows of the Design Review Guidelines.

Ms. Mutert stated if the Board unauthorized administrative approvals expedited by staff then all items would be brought before the Board for review.

Mr. Roberts reminded his fellow Board members that they at onetime reviewed up to fifteen (15) projects at a given meeting. He expressed his general approval and appreciation of the midmonth process.

Mr. Allen stated he did not understand why the Open Meeting Law did not apply to midmonths. Ms. Mutert explained there was no deliberation necessary since the resolution expediting administrative review was in place.

Mr. Holmes asked if any other boards had been challenged to the effect mentioned. Ms. Shell replied no other board has been challenged to that effect. Mr. Neely noted there was clear precedent for and authorization of midmonth or administrative approval across the state. Mr. Allen responded he did not want the ARB to be the first board challenged.

Ms. Shell asked if an ethics committee ruling would be appropriate. Mr. Allen replied he did not think this was an ethics discussion.

Mr. Oswalt stated the agendas for the ARB were published online one week in advance. Mr. Allen stated although the mid-months are posted a week before, many CoAs approved by Staff are already permitted prior to that date.

Mr. Blackwell noted that the 311 system is in place for concerned constituents to call in and concerns property. He went on to say that if any constituent was executing actions outside an approved scope of work granted, action could be taken.

Mr. Allen then restated the Open Meeting Law requires notice on items of deliberation.

Mr. Holmes replied that in this midmonth situation, there are multiple precedents of Board delegating duties for staff to perform on the administrative level. Mr. Allen replied the situation has never been challenged.

Ms. Shell assured the board against any fear wrongdoing in their current operations.

Mr. Allen noted a neighbor who complained to him about work being executed on a house with midmonth approval. Ms. Shell stated the neighbor has the opportunity to come to the office or the Board with a complaint and have it can be considered. Mr. Oswalt reiterated that the 311 system was in place for these types of situations. Mr. Allen replied that if the mid-months were on agenda, given public notice, and discussed publicly at meetings, the concerned party could address the issue with the Board before it is approved.

Mr. Roberts stated that precedent and policy are seen across the state and on other types of boards and commissions.

Mr. Allen stated that he had heard from some constituents who believed that the Board was operating in secret. Ms. Mutert encouraged Mr. Allen and the Board to tell these concerned parties to voice their concerns. Mr. Allen stated the parties he talked did not believe they had a voice. Mr. Blackwell noted that staff welcomes any form of inquiry.

Mr. Oswalt asked if there were any more questions, comments or concerns from other Board members.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2017-04-CA: 1002 Dauphin Street

Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley of Douglas Burtu Kearley Architect on behalf of Michael Smith and Karen Carr

Received: 1/30/17

Meeting: 2/15/17

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way

Classification: Contributing

Zoning: R-1

Project: Addition Related – Construct a two-tiered gallery off of the North (rear) Elevation.

BUILDING HISTORY

The classically detailed Arts and Crafts Movement dwelling was built in 1913. The house's more pervasive relation, the single-story "bungalow" is found in many variations across the larger Midtown landscape. This dwelling is an expanded Foursquare in typology. Distinguishing features on this structure include its blocky massing, low pitched roof, and full length porch.

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 April 24, 2006. At that time, the Board approved a two phase application. The first phase consisted of the construction of a tool shed, while the second phase involved the construction a two car garage with studio and screened porch above. The application up for review calls for the construction of a two-story screened porch addition off of the rear elevation.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 1. "Design a rear porch so that its height and slopes are compatible with the original historic structure."
 2. "Design the scale, proportion and character of a porch addition element, including columns, corner brackets, railings and pickets, to be compatible with the existing historic residential structure."

3. "Match the foundation height of a porch addition to that of the existing historic structure."
4. "Design a porch addition roofline to be compatible with the existing historic structure. However, a porch addition roofline need not match exactly that of the existing historic building. For example, a porch addition may have a shed roof."
5. "Use materials for a porch addition that are appropriate to the building."

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

1. Construct a two-tiered rear gallery
 - a. The porch addition will measure 17'6" in width and 12'0" in depth.
 - b. The addition will rest atop brick foundation piers.
 - c. Framed and recessed latticed lattice skirting panels will extend between the foundation piers. Both constructions are found on other portions of the house.
 - d. Both porch decking frames will be topped by tongue-and-groove wooden porch decking.
 - e. The porch will feature square section and box framed columnar supports featuring capitals and necking.
 - f. Wooden picketed balustrades will extend between the columnar piers.
 - g. Wooden framing will secure the black-coated aluminum porch screening.
 - h. The East and West (both side-facing) Elevations will be two bays in depth.
 - i. The four bay North (rear-facing) Elevation will feature a door in its westernmost lower-story bay.
 - j. The first-story ceiling height will be 8'9" and the second-story ceiling height will be 7'0".
 - k. A shed roof will surmount the building. The slop will be 12/1.5.
 - l. The terminating shed-ends of the porch will be faced with wooden siding.
 - m. The roofing shingles will match those atop the house.
 - n. The work will be painted so as to reflect the color scheme found on the body of the house.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of a two-story porch addition. The location is minimally visible from public view on account of the principle elevation of the proposed changes (rear), composition of the house (very deep), situation of the house on the lot (wide house for lot), and landscape features.

The proposed porch addition would extend from a previously infilled porch. The hipped roof encompassing the whole of the body of the house extends over that earlier porch. The porch addition is so situated and designed as to be both compatible with the main dwelling, but also differentiated from it. (See B-1 & B-4.). Original and later rear porches often feature shed roofs. The roof slopes (proposed and existing) are compatible and adopt the inner lot descending pattern which typifies most rear portions of buildings. The elevation, scale, proportion, materials, and character of the porch are conditioned by the earlier rear porch (See B 2-3 & B-5.). As with many rear porches, the original back porch featured square sections columnar posts such as those employed on the proposed design. Simple picketed railings are appropriate to the period, style, and construction (See B-2.).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-5), Staff does not believe this application would impair the architectural or the historical character of the property or the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of this application in full.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Douglas B. Kearley was present to discuss the application on behalf of Mr. Michael Smith and Ms. Karen Carr.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed Mr. Kearley and asked him as the applicant’s representative if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make. Mr. Kearley stated that Mr. Blackwell addressed the application in full.

Mr. Oswalt then asked if any of his fellow Board members had any questions germane to the application which to ask Mr. Kearley. No questions ensued.

Mr. Oswalt opened the application to public comment. No one was present to speak either for or against the application. Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public discussion.

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.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 2/15/2018

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2017-05-CA: 205 George Street

Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley of Douglas Burtu Kearley Architect on behalf of Joanna Colby

Received: 1/30/17

Meeting: 2/15/17

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden

Classification: Contributing

Zoning: R-1

Project: Fenestration, Rear Addition, and Ancillary Related –Alter a later door; Alter secondary fenestration; Enclose a portion of a rear porch; Extend a rear porch; and Alter an ancillary building.

BUILDING HISTORY

This classically detailed dwelling was built in 1887 by the Slatter family. At once a survival of earlier Greek Revival predilections within the region and traditional building patterns, the building is also an early expression of a new Colonial Revival impulse that became popular following the American Centennial and the World’s Columbian Exposition. Extensive restoration and renovations took place in the 1990s that further nuanced the classical flavor of the dwelling.

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 January 23, 2006. At that time it was approved for the construction of a rear addition on the location of a deck. The application up for review calls for the alteration of a later front door, the alteration of secondary fenestration, the construction of a rear addition, and the alteration of a non-contributing ancillary building.
- 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.”
 - 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. "Design the scale, proportion and character of a porch addition element, including columns, corner brackets, railings and pickets, to be compatible with the existing historic residential structure."
8. "Match the foundation height of a porch addition to that of the existing historic structure."
9. "Design a porch addition roofline to be compatible with the existing historic structure. However, a porch addition roofline need not match exactly that of the existing historic building. For example, a porch addition may have a shed roof."
10. "Use materials for a porch addition that are appropriate to the building."
11. "Do not use a contemporary deck railing for a porch addition placed at a location visible from the public street."
12. "For most contributing window properties in historic districts, the windows on the front elevation and those on the sidewalls that are most visible from the street will be the most important to preserve."
13. "A door should be in character with the building."
14. "Historic accessory structures should be preserved."

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

1. Alter a later front door.
 - a. Remove the solid upper panels from the door.
 - b. Replace the aforementioned panels with glass.
2. Make fenestration changes to the main dwelling.
 - a. A sash window that was shortened on the southern portion of the East (rear) Elevation will be reconfigured to match the rest of the windows found on the body of the house. Said window will be six-over-six in configuration and wood in construction.
 - b. A later octagonal window on the South (a side/driveway facing) Elevation will be removed and a Mobile diamond window will be constructed in its place. The four-light diamond window will be framed like windows on rest of the house.
 - c. Add an additional six-over-six wooden window on the South Elevation.
3. Construct a rear addition.
 - a. The addition will take the form of enclosed living space, and porch space.
 - b. The addition will "square out" the rear wing, an recent addition in part.
 - c. The addition will rest atop brick foundation piers matching those encircling and supporting the body of the house and the recent addition.
 - d. Framed and recessed lattice skirting panels will extend between foundation piers.
 - e. Wooden siding will match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material.
 - f. Wooden French doors (single) will be employed.
 - g. A window from already employed on the East (rear) Elevation will be salvaged and reemployed on the reconfigured addition.
 - h. Reroof the existing rear wing (existing and pertinent addition) with a 5V crimp galvanized metal roof.
 - i. South Elevation (a side – that engaged to the driveway).
 - i. The side slope of the gable roof will extend from and square out existing roof/addition.
 - ii. The aforementioned roof extension will be supported by a new wooden paneled square section columnar that will match existing columnar posts on said porch.
 - iii. Picketed railings matching the existing will extend to new wooden boxed columnar post.
 - iv. The wall opening onto the porch will feature two multi-light French doors.

- v. A brick fireplace will be located between the French doors.
- j. East (rear) Elevation
 - i. Extend the roofline over rear porch to align symmetrically with northern porch side. The resulting gable will be half enclosed and half open.
 - ii. The aforementioned construction will square out the rear wing.
 - iii. A square section paneled columnar porch post will support an extended roofline (See C-2-i-i.)
 - iv. Install existing handrails, post and newels, and steps where porch has been extended.
 - v. Replace an existing door with a wooden multi-light door.
 - vi. The northernmost portion of existing porch will be enclosed.
 - vii. The earlier and new additions will be differentiated by corner boards.
 - viii. Install a repurposed window within the enclosed addition.
- 4. Repaint the house per the existing color scheme.
- 5. Make alterations to a non-contributing concrete block ancillary building (garage).
 - a. Remove existing roof and install new 8:12 pitch 5V crimp galvanized metal roof.
 - b. West (front/street-facing) Elevation
 - i. Remove a metal roll up garage door.
 - ii. Install a tripartite window grouping comprised on six-over-six wooden windows.
 - iii. Wooden siding will be located in the filed below and wall spaces above the windows.
 - iv. Clad the heightened gable with wooden siding.
 - v. Install 2'0" half round louver.
 - c. North (side) Elevation
 - i. Install 3'0" x 6'5" multi-light wooden door on westernmost portion of elevation.
 - d. Repaint per the existing color scheme.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The application up for review calls for the alteration of a later front door, the alteration of secondary fenestration, the construction of a rear addition, and the alteration of a non-contributing ancillary building.

As per the front door, material in the property file recounts that said door is not original to the building. The door is still period appropriate. Given that the proportional relationships of the later door will remain the same and that many period doors featured glazed upper portions, the overall character of the building will not be impaired (See B-13.).

The fenestration proposed for alteration on rear of the body of the house and side of the rear wing does not directly impact the public view. The Design Review Guidelines prioritize the public view, but do not neglect less visible portions of buildings (See B-12.). The single window on the southern portion of the East (rear) Elevation is proposed to be returned to a size and configuration matching those found elsewhere on the body of the house. The fenestration on the South (inner lot/drive facing) Elevation of the rear wing which is proposed for alteration comprises two units. A six-over-six window would be added and historically inappropriate octagonal window would be replaced with a traditional Mobile diamond window. Based on the physical evidence and stylistic rationales informing the proposed changes to the South Elevation window, the later form of the diamond window, and historically attuned nature of the diamond and six-over-six window, the overall character of the property would be not be impaired.

Regarding the new addition for the proposed residence, the enclosure and extension of the porch, said work is located in the rear of the contributing building. For reasons of its situation on the lot, abutting buildings (ancillary on same property and next door buildings) and proposed location on the residence, the overall character of the property and environs would be retained and thus would be in keeping with Mobile's Historic Districts Design Review Guidelines (See B 1-2.) The proposed addition would be located off of a recent addition so would not disturb historic fabric. Said work would subordinate to the body of the house (See B-4.). The lower height of the addition which the proposed work engages is observed and serves to further differentiate that which is recent and that is historic (See B-5.) The addition maintains foundation heights (See B-8.) and in one instance improves foundation treatments (to match historic). The building components of enclosed and open portions of the addition compliment the main house and match the existing (See B 6-9.). Materials are salvaged and employed where they can be. For example, an infilled window is repurposed. As well as current handrails, post and newels (B 1-2.). Rear and front porch treatments were already designed to be complementary.

This property possesses a non-contributing concrete block ancillary building. The Design Review Guidelines state that contributing ancillary building should be preserved (See B-14.). The regulating document goes on to outline criteria for new ancillary construction and provide direction for commercial-related ancillary construction. The proposed changes to the subject ancillary building would cause it to better complement the main dwelling. Window types, door types, construction materials, and roof pitches would reflect the structure which gives the property significance.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-14), Staff does not believe that this application would impair either the architectural or the historical character of the property or the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of this application in full.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Douglas B. Kearley was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswald asked Mr. Kearley if he as the applicant's representative had any questions, clarification to address, or comments to make. Mr. Kearley clarified that one window on the southern portion of the East elevation was to be moved and shifted to the North.

Mr. Oswald then asked if the board had anything they would like to address. No questions emanated from the Board.

Mr. Oswald opened the application for public comment. No one was present to speak either for against the application. Mr. Oswald closed the period of public discussion.

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 note the shift of a window.

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.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 2/15/2018

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2017-06-CA: 558 St. Francis Street
Applicant: Temple Lodge Development
Received: 1/30/17
Meeting: 2/15/17

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: T5.1
Project: Restore and Rehabilitate a Historic Commercial Building – Restore and make alterations to ground floor storefront fenestration; Remove and replace later non-conforming fenestration with aluminum clad fenestration; Construct a wrap-around canopied gallery; Remove a later fire escape occupying a portion of the location of the aforementioned gallery; Install a cornice; and Install new prefinished heads and rain headers.

BUILDING HISTORY

The Temple Lodge typifies in its materials, construction, and evolution some of the dominant development patterns that informed downtown Mobile during the latter half of the 19th and early parts of the 20th centuries. Originally built in the 1860s as a two-story corner building, the building underwent significant expansions and renovations circa 1900. The façade was almost doubled in length, a third floor was added, and a rear addition was constructed. Several prominent African American fraternal organizations occupied the building for fraternal purposes. A portion of the building at one time held the offices of John LeFlore, an instrumental community leader and Civil Rights activist.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The application up for review constitutes a well-considered and conscious adaptive reuse. The scope of work embraces the following: restoration and/or sympathetic alteration of ground floor storefront fenestration; removal and replacement of later non-conforming fenestration with aluminum clad fenestration; construction of a wrap-around canopied gallery; removal a later fire escape occupying a portion of the location of the aforementioned gallery; installation of a cornice; and installation of new prefinished heads and rain headers.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part as per historic commercial buildings:

1. "Preserve elements, both structural and decorative, that contribute to a building's historic character."
2. "Preserve key features of a historic commercial façade."
3. "Repair and altered storefront."
4. "Retain the original bulkhead."
5. "Retain the original shape of the transom in a historic storefront."
6. "Design a gallery or balcony to reflect the overall character of the building."
7. "Preserve the size and shape of upper-story windows."
8. "The removal of substandard alterations which are not compatible to the original building are allowed."
9. "Repair or replacement of missing architectural features should be substantiated by historic, physical, or pictorial evidence."

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

1. Remove aluminum storefront and storefront windows on ground level.
2. Restore and replicate historic storefronts on South (façade/St Francis Street facing) Elevation.
3. Remove and replace ground floor fenestration on the West Elevation (Warren Street facing).
4. Remove later one-over-one aluminum windows from the upper stories.
5. Install two-over-two single hung aluminum clad wooden windows to fit original opening and reveal (based on historic photographs) within the upper-stories.
6. Remove a later fire escape from the West Elevation
7. Install new canopied gallery that will wraparound the South (façade/St. Francis Street facing) Elevation and West (Warren Street facing) Elevation.
 - a. The gallery will be seven (7) bays in length on the South Elevation and eleven (11) bays in length along the West Elevation.
 - b. The canopied gallery will feature circular colonettes with simple bases and capitals.
 - c. The canopied roof will feature a blind architrave.
 - d. A metal roof (ribbed galvalume) will surmount the canopy.
8. Refinish existing masonry and repaint (color scheme yet to be determined).
9. Install a pre-finished aluminum cornice that will wrap around the South and West Elevations, as will a pre-finished metal parapet coping.
10. Relocate downspouts as necessary.
11. South Elevation (façade/St. Francis Street).
 - a. Remove six (6) later aluminum ground floor storefront units.
 - b. Re-expose & restore OR replicate wooden storefront fenestration on the ground floor.
 - c. The westernmost portion of the façade's original wooden storefront fenestration (bulkhead, display window, and transom) will be restored.
 - d. Of the three westernmost bays, the second from the West will be converted from an entrance to window bay. The retreatment will match that of the surviving wooden storefronts.
 - e. The easternmost portions of the ground floor storefront's fenestration will be replicated so as to match that of the surviving westernmost portions.
12. West (a side; Warren Street abutting) Elevation
 - a. Remove later aluminum ground floor storefront bays from the southernmost bay of the West Elevation.
 - b. Install a new aluminum store front sequence within the aforementioned bay

- c. Expand an existing ground floor doorway located three bays north of the aforementioned bay.
 - d. Remove and replace fenestration. A metal door will be removed. New aluminum fenestration will be instated.
 - e. Remove masonry infill from a (roughly) centrally located bay.
 - f. Re-expose the earlier dimensions of the aforementioned bay. Install simple picketed iron gates therein.
 - g. Remove existing boarding and aluminum ground floor storefronts located on West Elevation's two (2) northernmost storefront commercial bays.
 - h. Install two (2) new aluminum storefront fenestration systems in the two (2) aforementioned bays.
11. North (rear) Elevation
- a. Remove later aluminum windows.
 - b. Install aluminum clad wooden windows.
12. East (inner lot side) Elevation
- a. Remove concrete block infill from two fenestrated bays.
 - b. Install glass block within the aforementioned bays.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves changes to a prominently situated historic commercial building. The building is situated at Northeast corner of Warren and St. Francis Streets. The building began its existence a two-story and corner-oriented building dating circa 1860. Around 1900, the façade was almost doubled, a rear addition constructed, and third floor added. The building's exterior was unsympathetically remodeled in the 1970s.

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts divide the review of commercial work into four categories: alterations to contributing buildings; additions to contributing buildings; alterations to non-contributing buildings; and new commercial construction. This project falls with the realm of alterations – restoration and/or rehabilitation – a contributing building. The Design Review Guidelines go further by differentiating between projects involving changes to commercial buildings as follow: those whose original design is intact; those whose original designs have been slightly altered; and those situations where the original design has been considerably altered. This project involves aspects of all three levels of review.

The scope of work calls for the following: restoration and/or sympathetic alteration of ground floor storefront fenestration; removal and replacement of later non-conforming fenestration with aluminum clad fenestration; construction of a wrap-around canopied gallery; removal a later fire escape occupying a portion of the location of the aforementioned gallery; installation of a cornice; and installation of new prefinished heads and rain headers.

In both the general and the specific, this comprehensive restoration and rehabilitation project preserves elements, both structural and decorative, that contribute to a building's historic character (See B-1.). In concert with the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts, a combination of historical, physical, and pictorial evidence has informed the project (See B-9.).

Later metal storefront units and bulkheads fronting surviving wooden storefront fenestration on the façade (South or St. Francis Street Elevation) would be removed (See B-8.). The intact storefront units would be repaired and replicated thereby recapturing earliest extant and most traditional form of commercial storefront fenestration (See 2-5.). The entrance bay proposed for conversion into a fenestrated bay exhibits signs of physical alteration that its recess has extended. Old photographs show the building as

having two-over-two windows on the upper stories. Additionally, the National Parks Services encourages the employment of simple light configurations in rehabilitations of this nature. The later inferior aluminum windows currently occupying the upper-story fenestration would be removed (See B-8.) and replaced with aluminum clad wooden windows. Aluminum clad wooden windows are listed as acceptable window replacement construction/material. Commercial storefront units and in some cases only boarding found on the West (a side/Warren Street facing) Elevation would also be removed and replaced. New aluminum storefront units with a traditional display and transom zones above the existing bulkhead are proposed. Said treatment would reinstate historic placement and division of elements of proportional and visual nature. Two infilled window bays on the East (a side/inner block) Elevation would be reopened. Said reinstated openings would be infilled with glass block.

The devices directing water from the building are stylistically appropriate and reversible interventions.

As evidenced by the 1901 Sanborn Map, this building originally featured a wraparound gallery (See B-9.). While the gallery depicted in the Sanborn Map was not as long as the proposed gallery, the Design Review Guidelines allow for reconstruction and, at times, the extension of galleries. The Design Review Guidelines state that new galleries or balconies should be designed to reflect the overall character of the building (See B-6.). The simple detailing would not detract from building and their placement acknowledges historical conditions germane to the site. Said work would recapture historical integrity through the reinstatement of one of Mobile's most distinctive architectural traditions - "iron lace". Between the 1850s and the 1940s, downtown Mobile was lined by iron umbrages. It was recounted by Dr. Eugene B. Sledge - Mobile born War Hero, academic, and memoirist - that one could walk from Broad Street to docks in a downpour without becoming drenched for reason of the galleries, balconies, and awnings. The gallery would enliven the streetscape.. A later fire escape would be removed (See B-8.) and no historic material jeopardized.

When the building was remodeled in the 1970s, the cornice was removed. Surviving physical evidence is being employed as a basis of the cornice's reinstatement (See B-9.).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-9), Staff does not believe this application would impair either the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district. Pending final the Downtown Development District's (DDD) Consolidated Review Committee's (CRC) approval, Staff recommends approval of this application in full.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Douglas B. Kearley was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

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

Mr. Oswald then asked his fellow Board members if they any question germane to the work proposed which to ask Mr. Kearley

Mr. Allen asked the applicant the material of the proposed windows. Mr. Kearley responded aluminum clad woode. Mr. Blackwell noted original windows were not in place. He referenced the Design Review

Guidelines, which allow for the use of aluminum clad wooden windows in situations where original windows are not in place.

Mr. Allen asked if the application was being reviewed before it had received a Letter of Decision from the Consolidated Review Committee (CRC). Mr. Blackwell referenced the staff report noting that the application was recommended for approval pending CRC review. He further clarified that the Architectural Review Board Agenda was posted shortly in advance of the CRC review. Mr. Blackwell further explained the application had originally been approved in concept by the CRC and for reasons of accommodating a project that met the DDD Code (regulating document informing the CRC process) in a timely manner, the CRC was amenable to having the project move forward on ARB level in advance of CRC approval. It was noted that a Certificate of Appropriateness would not be issued until final approval from the CRC was given.

Mr. Holmes asked for further clarification regarding the entranceways accessing the side doors which as drawn were one (1) foot short of the curb. Mr. Kearley responded it was a draftsman error. Following additional inquiry from Mr. Holmes, Mr. Kearley also addressed concerns with fire safety by noting the ramp in question will slope to the fire stair and that the building has a sprinkler system throughout. Mr. Holmes thanked Mr. Kearley. He allowed that his questions were intended to prevent possible issue at Permitting.

Mr. Roberts asked for clarification as per the number of restrooms on the first floor commercial tenant space. Mr. Kearley stated although male and female handicapped restrooms would be necessary, the plans of those interior volumes would only be finalized once the spaces are leased. He also cited a current project 1 S. Royal Street where the City of Mobile Office of Code Enforcement allowed one (1) ADA restroom due to the structure being a historic building.

Mr. Holmes then asked for clarification regarding the doors at the tenant floor space swinging inward as opposed to outward in case of greater occupancy. Mr. Kearley responded it would be addressed when tenant has leased space. Mr. Kearley, Mr. Holmes, and Mr. Blackwell discussed regulations regarding the swing of doors.

No further board discussion ensued.

Mr. Oswalt opened the application up for public comment. No one was present to speak either for or against the application. Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public discussion.

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 not draftsmen errors.

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.

