

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
February 19, 2014 – 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 P.M. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
Members Present: Robert Allen, David Barr, Kim Harden, Carolyn Hasser, Nick Holmes III, Harris Oswalt, Craig Roberts, Steve Stone, and Jim Wagoner
Members Absent: Bradford Ladd.
Staff Members Present: Devereaux Bemis, Cart Blackwell, and Keri Coumanis.
2. Mr. Roberts moved to approve the minutes of the January 22, 2014 and February 5, 2014 meetings. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
3. Mr. Roberts moved to approve the midmonth COA's granted by Staff and listed within the February 5, 2014 and February 19, 2014 Agendas.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED.

1. **Applicant: Jason Fowler**
 - a. Property Address: 30 South Lafayette Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/4/14
 - c. Project: Reroof the house with 30 year architectural shingle, Iko color Weatherwood.
2. **Applicant: John C. Bell**
 - a. Property Address: 122 Ryan Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/4/14
 - c. Project: Paint the house's trim Dragon's Breath by Benjamin Moore. Repair any woodwork (when and where necessary) to match the existing.
3. **Applicant: Rose Ellen Stanberry**
 - a. Property Address: 262 McDonald Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/4/14
 - c. Project: Install a plain black metal railing down center of front steps.
4. **Applicant: Kevin Cross**
 - a. Property Address: 308 Charles Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/3/14
 - c. Project: Place helper sills underneath house. Repoint some brick on piers.
5. **Applicant: Susanna Beique**
 - a. Property Address: 412 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/31/14
 - c. Project: Install a metal sign. Said sign will feature the name of the occupying tenant. The sign meets the size, lighting, material, and design requirements.
6. **Applicant: Mike Dow**
 - a. Property Address: 1012 Palmetto Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/4/14
 - c. Project: Replace columnar bases and some porch decking and repaint porch to match. Clean siding, repaint house to match.
7. **Applicant: Sean Porter**
 - a. Property Address: 1706 McGill Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/4/14

c. Project: Repair fire damage at the rear of house. Reframe rear wall, reside, reroof portion of rear to match. Paint wood to match.

8. Applicant: Figures Investments, Inc.

a. Property Address: 307 Conti Street

b. Date of Approval: 2/10/13

c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork (when and where necessary). The repair work will match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Powerwash the building and touch up the paint per the existing color scheme.

9. Applicant: Mr. & Mrs. John T. Mostellar

a. Property Address: 206 Levert Avenue

b. Date of Approval: 2/3/14

c. Project: Stabilize and make repairs to an ancillary building. Replace siding to match the existing (when and where necessary). Replace windows to match the existing. Install doors appropriate to the age and period of the building. Reroof to match the existing.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2014-08-CA: 2250 DeLeon Avenue

a. Applicant: Lucy Barr with Lucy Barr Designs for Mr. & Mrs. Tom Warren

b. Project: Construct a rear addition and Alter fenestration.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2014-07-CA: 10 Saint Emanuel Street

a. Applicant: J. Barrett Penney with Penney Design Group for Will Dumas

b. Project: Renovate a commercial storefront.

APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Discussion

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2010-4-08-CA: **2250 DeLeon Avenue**
Applicant: **Lucy Barr with Lucy Barr Designs for Mr. & Mrs. Tom Warren**
Received: **2/3/14**
Meeting: **2/19/14**

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct a rear addition and alter fenestration.

BUILDING HISTORY

This Arts and Crafts Movement inspired house dates from 1921.

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 July 2, 2008. At that time, the Board approved the construction of a two-story rear addition. Work never commenced. The approved scope of work included the construction of a rear porch. This application calls for the construction of a modified version of the porch portion of the addition and the alteration of fenestration.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation and the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “New additions, exterior alteration, or related new construction shall not destroy the historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”
 - 2. “New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.”
 - 3. “The size and placement of new windows for additions or alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
 - 1. Construct a Rear Addition.
 - a. The addition will measure 12’ in depth and 30’ 10” in length.
 - b. The enclosed portion of the addition will rest atop a brick-veneered foundation
 - c. The aforementioned foundation treatment will match that employed on the body of the house.

- d. Foundation vents will match the existing.
- e. Existing corner boards will remain in place.
- f. The enclosed portion of the addition will feature a skirting board that will match the one encircling the body of the house.
- g. The enclosed portion of the addition will be faced with wooden siding matching that employed on the body of the house with regard to profile, dimension, and material.
- h. The addition will feature six-over-six wooden windows matching those found on the body of the house.
- i. Window shutters and casings will match those employed on the body of the house.
- j. A hipped roof will surmount the addition.
- k. The eave treatment will match that employed on the body of the house.
- l. The roofing shingles will match those employed on the body of the house.
- m. East Elevation (Ryan Avenue facing)
 - 1. The East Elevation will be defined by a fixed unit window.
- n. North Elevation (alley facing)
 - 1. The enclosed portion of the North Elevation will feature a pair of six-over-six wooden windows with flanking shutters and measure.
 - 2. The porch portion of the North Elevation will feature two compound piers flanking a brick chimney stack. The lower portion of the compound piers will be brick in composition. The upper portion of the compound piers will take the form of square section wooden posts featuring base moldings and capitals.
- o. West Elevation (inner lot facing)
 - 1. The West Elevation will feature a paneled and glazed multi-light door.
 - 2. A flight of bricks steps with an iron railing will afford access to and from the door.
 - 3. The porch floor will also be paved with brick.
- 2. Alter fenestration on the Sun Porch.
 - a. West (Side) Elevation
 - 1. Remove the inner windows from the lower and upper story window banks.
 - 2. Install paired shutter units that will replicate the rhythm of the aforementioned windows.
 - 3. The shutters will match those employed on the body of the house.
 - b. North (Rear) Elevation
 - 1. Remove the three window units from the upper story.
 - 2. Install paired shutter units that will replicate the rhythm of the aforementioned windows.
 - 3. The shutters will match those employed on the body of the house.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of a rear addition and the alteration to side and rear fenestration.

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards state that new additions shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment. The adoption of a single story format and the retention of a corner boards would provide a visual break from the old and the proposed fabric. The use of matching materials, elements, and proportions would allow for compatibility between the same.

With regard to the proposed alterations to the sun porch's fenestration, the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that the size and placement of new windows for additions or alterations

should be compatible with the general character of the building. The proposed shuttered expanses would adopt the proportions and fit within the locations of the window units. Said shutters would match those employed on the body of the house.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval in part and denial in part.

Based on B (1-2), Staff believes that the addition portion of the application will not impair the architectural or the historical character of the building and the district. Staff recommends approval of that portion of the application.

Based on B (3), Staff believes proposed alteration of the fenestration will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building and the district. Staff recommends that the applicants construct interior wall behind the windows and install operable shutters in front of the windows. If the Board approves the removal of the windows, Staff recommends that the windows be salvaged and retained on site.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Lucy Barr with Lucy Barr Designs was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

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

Ms. Barr answered yes. In addressing the Staff recommendation regarding the windows, she stated that the construction of an inner wall was her first idea to bring about a desirable design solution. Ms. Barr said that she had reconsidered the approach to handling the fenestration on account of both accessibility and maintenance related concerns of constructing a wall behind the windows. She said that in her opinion the removal of the windows and the installation of shutters constituted the best possible solution. Ms. Barr said that the applicants were amenable to Staff's recommendation as to salvaging the windows and storing them on the property.

Mr. Roberts asked for clarification as to reasons behind the removal of the windows. Ms. Barr addressed Mr. Roberts' query by referencing the floor plans submitted for the Board's Review and found within their packets.

Mr. Bemis asked Staff as to the reasoning behind the recommendation. Mr. Bemis stated that the windows remain in situ and should remain.

Mr. Holmes stated that he could not count the number occasions which the Board had approved similar interventions as that proposed with this project.

Mr. Bemis said that the Board had approved both approaches (proposed and recommended). He stated that if the Board approves the project, Staff recommends that the windows be salvaged and retained on site.

Mr. Holmes stated that the proposed solution was not only more reasonable, but also sanctioned by precedent.

Mr. Allen stated that in addition to shutters, he knew of instances where siding had been used in similar interventions.

Ms. Barr reiterated that the applicants were amenable to storing the windows.

Mr. Bemis stated that the proposed shutters, which would match those found on body of the house, featured cut-outs in their upper panels. He voiced maintenance related concerns and suggested the use of shutters not employing cut-outs.

Mr. Roberts disagreed. He stated that the shutters should blend with those found on the house.

Mr. Wagoner addressed the applicant and redirected the discussion to the proposed addition. He said that in previous applications involving the construction of chimneys the height of the chimney had been a matter of concern. Ms. Barr and Ms. Holmes stated that since the proposed chimney would be located ten feet from the house, it would meet code requirements. Ms. Barr noted that the initial concept had been to position the chimney in an alternative location, but consultation of building codes resulted in the selection of the proposed location.

Ms. Hardin said that while she understood the reasoning behind the alteration to the first-story fenestration, she encouraged the use of blackout shades on the upper-story.

Mr. Oswalt asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. No comments ensued from the audience. Mr. Oswalt 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 to reflect the retention of the shutters on the property.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

The motion received a second and was approved. Mr. Allen, Ms. Hardin, and Mr. Roberts voted in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 2/19/15

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2014-07-CA: 10 Saint Emanuel Street
Applicant: J. Barrett Penney with Penney Design Group for Will Dumas
Received: 1/21/14 – first version; 2/10/14 - revised submission
Meeting: 2/19/14

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Renovate an unoccupied commercial building.

BUILDING HISTORY

This three-story stucco-faced commercial building dates circa 1907.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on February 5, 2014. At that time the Board reviewed a project calling for the following: construction of a new ground-floor fenestration (both a pedestrian and vehicular entrance), the conversion of four upper-story windows to door units and the installation of new windows. The proposal was slated for a Design Review Committee. The applicant’s representative requested and received a copy of the Minutes from the February 5, 2014 meeting. With this application, the applicant submits a revised submission based on feedback from the meeting and the minutes.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation and the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state and the Lower Dauphin Commercial District Guidelines state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. **“2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.”**
 - 2. **“6. Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.”**
 - 3. “Residential type doors are not allowed as a primary storefront entrance.”
 - 4. “Preserve the size and shape of upper-story windows.”

C. Scope of Work:

1. Renovate a ground floor storefront.
 - a. Remove a later storefront system.
 - b. Face the in plane façade wall with stucco.
 - c. Construct a vehicular entrance featuring aluminum overhead door.
 - d. Construct a new pedestrian entrance taking the form of a double door. A stuccoed architrave will surround a glazed and paneled mahogany (stained) door unit. A fanlight will surmount the door.
2. Alter upper-story fenestration.
 - a. Remove any remaining upper-story fenestration.
 - b. Convert the two outer window bays of the second and third floors to full-length openings.
 - c. Install aluminum framed windows (Pella Architect Series) within all the fenestrated bays.
 - d. Surrounding masonry and stucco will be altered and repaired to accommodate the aforementioned window units.
3. Clean, repair, feather, and replace (to match the existing) stucco work.
4. Remove existing headers and downspouts.
5. Install new copper headers and downspouts.
6. Paint the body of the building per the submitted Benjamin Moore color scheme. The body will be “Bleeker Beige” and the fascia will be ‘Fairview Taupe’.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the renovation of a commercial façade. The Board has set a precedent of allowing balconies in the LDSCD, and this was taken into account in the earlier approval to alter the façade. However, since these plans do not include the installation of balconies at this time, the exception normally granted for alterations does not apply.

The Lower Dauphin Commercial District Guidelines state that the size and shape of upper-story windows should be preserved (See B-4.). The units proposed for the upper-story fenestration would alter the size of the four units. The plans approved on July 16, 2008 called for the installation of balconies beneath the enlarged fenestrated bays. The applicant has provided a revised elevation drawing depicting new pedestrian entrance, vehicular entrance, and upper-story fenestration. Additionally, the applicant has also provided an additional elevation depicting the aforementioned revisions as well as those alterations in relation to the balconies and their railings. Said balconies would not be installed immediately. Without the construction of the balconies, the proposed alterations would introduce too much of a contemporary element to the intact upper-stories. Additionally, said alterations would also jeopardize the property’s eligibility for future historic tax credits.

In this case, the building should maintain its original fenestration in size and design and the garage door should be more in keeping with a historic commercial entrance similar to that across the street from the building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-4), Staff believes the application (as submitted) would impair the architectural and the historical character of the building and the district. Staff does not recommend approval of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Will Dumas with Dumas Realty and Barrett Penney with Penney Design Group were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Blackwell addressed the Board. He stated that by taking into account the revised submission, Staff recommends approval of the application. He said that the balconies would be installed as initially approved and the design had been made more cohesive. Taking into the aforementioned concerns (both reflections of previous Board comments and the Staff Recommendations), Mr. Blackwell said that the project would not impair the architectural or historical character of the district.

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

Mr. Penney addressed the Board. He explained that he was present to explain (if necessary) how the revised design was an effort to satisfy both the requirements of modern life and historic concerns.

Mr. Roberts and Mr. Wagoner thanked the applicant and his representative for their efforts and complimented the revised design.

Ms. Hardin asked for clarification as to the proposed vehicular doors. Mr. Penney addressed Ms. Hardin's queries.

Discussion ensued as to the proposed gooseneck lamps.

Mr. Hardin asked for clarification as to the projection of the balconies. Mr. Penney explained that for structural and aesthetic reasons the balconies would be four to five feet in depth.

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

No further Board discussion ensued.

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 project would reflect the revised elevation drawings provided by the applicant's representative.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 1/19/15