

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

February 17, 2016 – 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: Robert Allen, Robert Brown, Carolyn Hasser, Nick Holmes II, Craig Roberts, and Harris Oswalt
Members Absent: Steve Stone, Catarina Echols, Bradford Ladd, Kim Harden.
Staff Members Present: Cartledge W. Blackwell, Melissa Mutert, and Paige Largue.
2. Mr. Roberts moved to approve the minutes for the February 3, 2016 meeting. The motion received a second by Mr. Allen and was unanimously approval.
3. Mr. Roberts moved to approve midmonth COA's granted by Staff. The motion received a second and was unanimously approval. The motion received a second and was unanimously approval.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED.

1. **Applicant: Danny Clark**
 - a. Property Address: 9 Common Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/1/16
 - c. Project: Replace two column bases to match original, repair/replace rotten wood, repaint house per existing color scheme. Cover dirt ribbons with small rocks.
2. **Applicant: Doria Durham for Verizon Wireless**
 - a. Property Address: 104 Saint Francis Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/1/16
 - c. Project: Following issuance of a renewal of an expired variance, reissue approval of an expired CoA.
3. **Applicant: Jessika Kirkland for Michael McDuffie**
 - a. Property Address: 115 South Dearborn Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/28/16
 - c. Project: Install a yard blade per submitted design. Said sign meets the height, size, material, and other requirements.
4. **Applicant: Jessika Kirkland for Alexander Shunnarah**
 - a. Property Address: 204 Conti Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/28/16
 - c. Project: Install a hanging blade per submitted design. Said sign meets the height, size, material, and other requirements.
5. **Applicant: Charles B. Hunter**
 - a. Property Address: 210 Lanier Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/25/16
 - c. Project: Replace rotten boards on an ancillary building.
6. **Applicant: Bo Stacy**
 - a. Property Address: 354 Charles Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/2/16
 - c. Project: Reroof the back portion of the house (a later addition) with three tab shingles.

- 7. Applicant: Reginald Chambliss, Sr.**
- a. Property Address: 1167 Texas Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/1/16
 - c. Project: Remove later siding from below the windows. Replace said siding to match the existing, which serves about, as per profile, dimension, and material. Remove four metal windows. Install wooden or aluminum clad wooden windows in the location of later jalousie windows. Said windows will be one-over-one in configuration. The windows will be properly framed. Paint the house and foundations (already painted) white. Install a canvas awning before the front entrance.
- 8. Applicant: Mike Henderson**
- a. Property Address: 1410 Old Shell Road
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/1/16
 - c. Project: Reroof with 30 year charcoal gray shingles.
- 9. Applicant: Alabama School of Math & Science**
- a. Property Address: 1255 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/3/16
 - c. Project: Construct a new canopy over the student recycling center.
- 10. Applicant: Ron Emmorey**
- a. Property Address: 960 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/3/16
 - c. Project: Level the house. Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Replace a missing porch post to match the existing. Infill a rear window. Make roof repairs to match the existing.
- 11. Applicant: Richard Brown with Building and Maintenance**
- a. Property Address: 1210 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/4/16
 - c. Project: Reinstate a copper finish on an existing metal roof.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2016-04-CA: 1710 McGill Avenue

- a. Applicant: Andrew Alley
- b. Project: New Construction – Construct a single family residence.

CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2016-05-CA: 304 South Broad Street

- a. Applicant: Taylor Atchison for Pace Burt & Associates
- b. Project: Fenestration - Replace later windows.

CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

3. 2016-06-CA: 1706 Old Shell Road

- a. Applicant: Taylor Atchison for Pace Burt & Associates
- b. Project: Fenestration – Replace later windows.

CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

4. 2016-07-CA: 8 LeMoyné Place

- a. Applicant: Edwin Curran for the estate of Eloyd Murphy
- b. Project: Demolition – Demolish a deteriorated dwelling.

Heldover for next meeting per constituent's request.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

- 1. Discussion

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2016-04-CA: 1710 McGill Avenue
Applicant: Andrew Alley
Received: 1/25/16
Meeting: 2/17/16

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing (vacant lot)
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct a single family residence

BUILDING HISTORY

This property is currently a vacant lot in the Old Dauphin Way Historic District.

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

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

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

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

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

1. Construct a single family residence atop a vacant lot.
 - a. The façade (South Elevation) of the residence will be set back 13' from the inner edge of the side walk.
 - b. The raised slab foundation will measure 3' feet in height.
 - c. The aforementioned foundation will feature simulated brick piers spaced at equidistant intervals with intervening stucco-faced fields.
 - d. The ceilings will be 10' in height.
 - e. The walls will be clad with hardiboard siding.
 - f. The walls will be Valspar's Betsy's Linen in color.
 - g. The trim will be Valspar's Garden Gate.
 - h. The windows will be aluminum clad wood in construction and multi-light in configuration.
 - i. A continuous entablature (described in the drawings as a frieze) will extend around the whole of the building.
 - j. A fascia with mouldings will extend around the house.
 - k. Hipped roofs will surmount the building.
 - l. 5-V crimp metal roofing panels will sheath the hipped roofs.
 - m. South Elevation (Façade)
 1. A three bay porch will extend the length of the façade.

2. Said porch will extend seven feet in depth.
 3. A flight of steps will access the central bay of the three bay porch.
 4. Four paneled and battered (tapered) square section columnar piers resting atop brick pedestals will define the porch bays.
 5. Four fenestrated bays will define the façade.
 6. A glazed and paneled wooden door will be flanked by aluminum clad wood French doors.
 7. Two ten light units of double French doors will be located to the right of the main entrance and one larger twenty light double door will be located to the left of the same.
 8. A hipped roof dormer will be centered on the façade's roof.
 9. The hardiboard clapboard sided dormer will feature three four light windows.
- n. East (a side) Elevation
1. Two six-over-six windows will define the southernmost portion of the East Elevation.
 2. A two bay screened porch featuring square section wooden porch post and wooden framing distinguish an inner portion of the East Elevation.
 3. Said porch bays will be subdivided into tripartite divisions by the intermediate framing for the metal screening.
 4. A flight of steps will access the porch's southernmost bay.
 5. A two car vehicular door will punctuate the recessed garage portion of the East Elevation.
- o. North (Rear) Elevation
1. The tripartite end bay of the side porch described above will inform the eastern portion of the North Elevation.
 2. The remainder of the North Elevation (a garage not visible from the public view) will not feature fenestration.
- p. West (a side) Elevation
1. Three nine-over-six windows, one four-over-four window and one twelve light transom window will distinguish the West Elevation.
4. Instate a concrete walkway that will access the front porch.
 5. Instate a curbcut.
 6. The aforementioned curbcut will engage a concrete driveway that will afford access to the garage.

CLARIFICATIONS/REQUESTS/CONSIDERATIONS

1. What is the color proposed for the metal roofing panels?
2. Will the front and side steps be constructed of brick, concrete, or wood?
3. Provide a detail of the garage bay.
4. Consider extending the porch in depth (a suggestion for purposes increased usability and enjoyment).

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction residential infill. The subject lot, 1710 Old McGill Avenue, is located within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. When reviewing the applications for new residential construction, the following criteria are taken into account: placement, mass, scale, building elements, and materials.

With regard to placement, two components are taken into account – setback from the street and between buildings. The Design Guidelines for New Residential Construction in Mobile’s Historic Districts state that new buildings should be responsive to the traditional “façade line”, a visual line created by the fronts of buildings along a street for an inappropriate setback disrupts the façade line and diminishes the visual character of the streetscape (See B-1.). In accord with Design Guidelines, the setbacks reflect the historical character of built landscape. The lot, an inner block situation, is located adjacent to/in the vicinity of sidewalk abutting non-contributing construction, rear access to an institutional complex, street-facing contributing buildings, and side elevations of contributing buildings fronting other streets. The expanse of lawn fronting the building and the distance from the sides of the buildings to lot line reflect traditional residential construction in addition to adding built density to the streetscape.

The Design Guidelines for New Residential Construction state that building mass is established by the arrangement and proportion of its basic geometric components – the main building, wings and porches, the roof and the foundation. The Guidelines go on to articulate that similarity of massing helps create a rhythm along a street, which is one of the appealing aspects of historic districts, and new construction should therefore reference the massing of forms of nearby historic buildings (See B-2.). This house adopts the form of a traditional Mobile dwelling – a porch fronted domicile. An engaged garage, one not visible from the public view, will be integrated into the dwelling so as to realize as part of the residential whole. The successful orchestration of massing exhibiting by the design starts with the foundations. While a raised slab in construction, they will be and compartmentalized in articulation. The three foot height of the simulated pier treatment is reflective of traditional foundation elevations (See B-3.). The box-like massing of the structure, one informed by 10’ ceilings is compatible with the architectural context of the contributing landscape which it is amidst (See B-4.) The hipped roof form and informing slope is typical of many bungalows looked in the vicinity (See B-5.).

Whereas a building’s size and massing are determined by its dimensions which also dictate square footage, scale refers to a building’s size in relationship to other buildings. The Design Review Guidelines for New Residential Construction state that new construction should be in scale with nearby historic buildings (See B-6.). The elevation of the foundations, height of the ceilings, and pitch of the roof combine to form a whole that is compatible with surrounding architectural landscape of the contributing or historic variety.

Façade elements such as porches, entrances, and windows make up the “face” or façade of a building. The Design Review Guidelines state that infill should the employ of façade elements of nearby historic buildings (See B-7.). The façade (South Elevation) features a full length gallery. Porches are a characteristic regional construction typifying Southern architecture. The porch references historic porches in its location, proportion, rhythm, roof form, supports, and ornamentation. (See B-8.). Staff encourages the applicant to consider adding additional footage to the porch depth for reasons of usability and enjoyment. Said observation is a recommendation and not a requirement. The New Construction Guidelines state that new buildings should use windows and entrances that approximate the placement and solid-to-void ratio of nearby historic buildings (See B-9.). The rhythmic spacing and selection of windows for the dwelling’s façade exhibits a study of nearby bungalows.

While the massing, scale, and façade elements are informed by the past, the new construction reads of its period. In accord with the Design Guidelines for New Construction, the design is one which blends into the historic district but to avoid creating a false sense of history by merely copying historic examples. The choice of materials – hardiboard – and the handling of practicalities of present day life – an instance being the treatment of the garage reflect the present day without sacrificing the look and experience of the past. The exterior materials closely resemble surrounding historic examples (See B-10.). The degree of ornamentation employed is compatible with the degree of ornamentation found upon nearby historic

buildings. Said ornamentation is characteristic of the area. Profiles and dimensions are consistent with the examples in the district (See B 11-15.).

The Design Review Guidelines for New Residential construction stat that modern paving materials are acceptable in Mobile’s historic districts (See B-16.). The vehicular parking and access areas are located in spaces that typical of surrounding historic dwellings. Said paving is respectful of the historic context.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-16), Staff does not believe this application for new residential construction will impair either the architectural or historical character of the surrounding district. Pending the clarifications listed above, Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

_Andrew and Ada Alley were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Roberts explained that the front and rear handrails were not to code, and that once this change was made it should brought to staff for approval. Mr. Roberts then asks about the use of a French door off the master bedroom. Mrs. Alley responds it is in place for fire code. Mr. Roberts expresses opinion to add more detail above windows and door moldings for more historic character. Mrs. Alley is agreeable. Mr. Oswalt welcomed public input.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Craig 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 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: February 17, 2017

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2016-05-CA: 304 South Broad Street
Applicant: Taylor Atchison for Pace Burt & Associates
Received: 2/1/16
Meeting: 2/17/16

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-3
Project: Fenestration – Replace windows.

BUILDING HISTORY

The Russell School dates from 1915. Along with nearby and contemporaneous Old Shell Road School, Russell School is similar to thousands of schools constructed across the country during the first three decades of the 20th Century. The plan and elevation of these institutional buildings are bricks and mortar affirmations of the Beaux Arts design method. Informed by a study of a building’s use and historical precedent, the arrangement of rooms, proportional observations, and architectural components respond to educational function, climatic conditions, and institutional mission of the building.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board almost eight years ago. The Architectural Review Board literature relating to an earlier conversion from institutional to residential use is not located in the property file. The application up for review calls for the removal of later in-compliant windows with new windows that would match the light configuration and constructional type of the original windows.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The type, size, and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration &rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building.”
 - 2. “The size and placement of new windows for additions or alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
 - 3. Aluminum is listed as an inappropriate window material.
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
 - 1. Remove later six-over-six aluminum windows.
 - 2. Install six-over-six aluminum windows.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application calls for the removal of later aluminum windows and their replacement with new windows.

The Design Review Guidelines state that the type, size, and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration & rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building (See B-1.). The window locations will remain the same and the light configuration – six-over-six – will match the lost original windows. While said replacement windows are compatible with the general character of the building with regard to type and design, the windows material- aluminum - is listed as unacceptable for use in Mobile's Historic Districts (See B-2 and B-3.).

Staff notes that the developer is pursuing federal historic tax credits for the building's restoration. His firm has employed aluminum window replacements in other tax credit projects. Said applications have involved the removal of later windows and the installation of windows that matched the original in appearance, but not material. Those applications were reviewed approved by the National Parks Service. Staff further notes the recent window replacements at Barton and Yerby Schools. Those successful window replacements are aluminum in composition.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (3), Staff cannot recommend approval of this application. On account of the material specifications listed in the Design Review Guidelines, the proposal would impair the architectural and historical character of the building and the district.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Taylor Atchison on behalf of Pace Burt and Associates was present to discuss the application. Alongside Mr. Atchison, was Ray Vanness of Seal Craft, manufacturer representative for the proposed replacement windows. These windows had been granted Federal historic tax credit projects across the Unites States.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed the applicant's representation. He asked Mr. Atchison and Mr. Vanness if he had any questions to ask or comments to make. Mr. Atchison and Mr. Vanness stated they were present to address any possible concerns.

Nick Holmes III stated that three-story buildings must meet wind-bearing code requirements of 147-159. As an architect, he said that he did not know of a wooden window tested to meet such a requirement. The Board was assured by Mr. Vanness that the custom Seal Craft aluminum windows would be tested to meet the windload requirements. Mr. Vanness stated that each job is approached by replicating the historic windows on a case by case basis, therefore it requires new tools specific to each job. Mr. Atchison and Mr. Vanness showed example of specific and detailed moldings can be handled/achieved. The Board was then provide with a list and

photographs of eight examples of uses over the United States which were approved for tax credits by the National Park Service.

Mr. Holmes stated that if the National Parks Service, the official federal preservation office and keeper of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, approves windows extruded metal windows that replicate windows with regard to profile and dimension the Board should do the same. Mr. Atchison stated that while Old Shell Road School has wooden components that would be rehabilitated, the Russell School does not have the original windows and will need a whole new window system. Mr. Vanness stated that the windows would be insulated, double pane. It was noted that both Barton Academy and the Yerby School have similar window systems.

Mr. Oswalt asked if anyone from the audience had any questions for the applicant's representatives. Mr. Jamie Betbeze stated on behalf of the Oakleigh Garden District Society, the neighborhood was very enthusiastic as to the redevelopment. However, he voiced concerned with regard to the broader issue of setting a precedent allowing the Board to bend the current guidelines. He noted that Barton Academy and Yerby did not have to get permission to use aluminum windows by the ARB. Mr. Holmes and Mr. Blackwell voiced the same, but added that they were exempt from the process. Mr. Reed Hastings, another resident in the Oakleigh Garden District and owner of Oakleigh Custom Woodworks, expressed as to quality and windloads. Mr. Hastings contended that businesses such as his offered a viable option to non-historical windows. He also stated that he was concerned about issuing approval on this matter too. Lastly, Mr. Kevin Cross, a resident and owner of multiple properties in the Oakleigh Garden District, voiced concerns as to the quality of work in historic projects. Mr. Cross was concerned that approval of the Russell School aluminum windows would begin a downhill trend in both commercial and residential buildings for historic districts.

Mr. Blackwell clarified that if a building has wooden windows, then wooden windows must be replaced in the structure. Currently, "aluminum clad" windows are allowed per the guidelines.

Mr. Roberts explained allowed that aluminum clad windows afford the depth of real wood windows, but with the advancement in technology over the past twenty years aluminum windows have been shown in cases to simulate the same effect. He noted that aluminum clad wooden windows had been approved and utilized on both the Van Antwerp Building and the Battle House. Mr. Roberts asked Mr. Atchison why Pace Burt & Associates was not proposing aluminum clad windows. Mr. Atchison responded by stating it is easier to replicate the profile of the window with just the aluminum medium, and the aluminum is more durable as well as there was no wood-rotting issue in the future. Mr. Hastings a briefed the audience on the two types of aluminum clad windows: "rolled-clad" and "extruded-clad".

Mr. Allen acknowledged that National Park Serve (NPS) allows this type of window use, but the current guidelines do not allow this type of window construction. Mr. Roberts and other Board members acknowledge this as well, but added that the Board had voted against Staff suggestions before this matter and may do so again if the case is worth the precedent. He and Mr. Holmes reiterated that original wooden windows had been removed, metal windows are currently in place, and spoke to the advances in the field of aluminum window manufacture. Mr. Atchison voiced his concern over the application being denied. He said it could halt the project altogether.

Mr. Oswalt suggested moving forward to discuss 1706 Old Shell Road and then voting on both applications.

Discussion continued.

FINDING OF FACT

Ms. Hasser 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 approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Nick Holmes III 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 for reason of the loss of the original windows, the existence of metal windows, the advances in the manufacture of aluminum windows, the customization of the extruded construction of the windows, and approval by the National Parks Service of the such a higher quality aluminum window product.

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

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: February 17, 2017

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2016-06-CA: 1706 Old Shell Road
Applicant: Taylor Atchison for Pace Burt & Associates
Received: 2/1/16
Meeting: 2/17/16

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning:
Project: Fenestration – Replace windows.

BUILDING HISTORY

The Old Shell Road School dates from 1915. Along with nearby and contemporaneous Russell School, Old Shell Road School is similar to thousands of schools constructed during the first three decades of the 20th Century. The plan and elevation of these institutional buildings are bricks and mortar affirmations of the Beaux Arts design method. Informed by a study of a building’s use and historical precedent, the arrangement of rooms, proportional observations, and architectural components respond to educational function, climatic conditions, and institutional mission of the building.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on August 16, 1993. At that time, the board approved the construction of a rear addition to the main building. The application up for review calls for the removal of later incompliant windows with new windows that would match the light configuration and constructional type of the original windows.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The type, size, and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration &rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building.”
 - 2. “The size and placement of new windows for additions or alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
 - 3. Aluminum is listed as an inappropriate window material.
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
 - 1. Remove later six-over-six aluminum windows.
 - 2. Install six-over-six aluminum windows.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application calls for the removal of later aluminum windows and their replacement with new windows.

The Design Review Guidelines state that the type, size, and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration & rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building (See B-1.). The window locations will remain the same and the light configuration – six-over-six – will match the lost original windows. While said replacement windows are compatible with the general character of the building with regard to type and design, the windows material- aluminum - is listed as unacceptable for use in Mobile's Historic Districts (See B-2 and B-3.).

Staff notes that the developer is pursuing federal historic tax credits for the building's restoration. His firm has employed aluminum window replacements in other tax credit projects. Said applications have involved the removal of later windows and the installation of windows that matched the original in appearance, but not material. Those applications were reviewed approved by the National Parks Service. Staff further notes the recent window replacements at Barton and Yerby Schools. Those successful window replacements are aluminum in composition.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (3), Staff cannot recommend approval of this application. On account of the material specifications listed in the Design Review Guidelines, the proposal would impair the architectural and historical character of the building and the district.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Taylor Atchison was present to discuss the application. Mr. Atchison explained the window jambs and sills were still in tact for the 6/6 windows. Several of the vinyl and aluminum windows present were to remain, as were a considerable amount of original wooden transoms. Mr. Vanness stated that Russell School and Old Shell Road School window profiles are identical and can be replicated. Mr. Atchison closed by saying the owner may pull out of both projects, pending approval.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. See the preceding application as the discussion therein forms the beginning of this one.

Ms. Hasser stated that based on the earlier discussion she believed it makes sense to move forward with both the Russell School and Old Shell Road projects for the sake of the advances for preservation, progress, and common sense. Mr. Brown agreed. He stated that the Historic District Guidelines are outdated and impeding advancement for the City and its historic resources. He said that he was glad the Guidelines are being revised. Mr. Holmes reiterated the custom construction, extruded fabrication, and National Parks Service sanction of the windows being proposed.

The discussion returned to the audience. Mr. Cross asks the Architectural Review Board to adhere to the Guidelines and hand the matter over to the Council.

Ms. Mutert asked the Board if they would entertain tabling the applications for 304 South Broad Street and 1706 Old Shell Road until the next ARB meeting. Mr. Reed Hastings reiterated his stance that wooden windows are available to bear wind load.

Ms. Mutert stated you must go through the proper channels to change Guidelines. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Allen voiced that the ARB is bound by the guidelines. Mr. Oswalt expressed that it is the Board's duty to interpret the Guidelines as each case is considered individually as well as in the light of precedent. The evolution of the field, lack of original windows, and quality of the proposed replacements was highlighted.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Nick Holmes III 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.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Nick Holmes III 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 for reason of the loss of the original windows, the existence of metal windows, the advances in the manufacture of aluminum windows, the customization of the extruded construction of the windows, and approval by the National Parks Service of the such a higher quality aluminum window product.

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

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: February 17, 2017