

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

February 3, 2016 – 3:00 P.M.

Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Nicholas H. Holmes, III, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
Members Present: Robert Allen, David Barr, Nick Holmes, III, Craig Roberts, Steve Stone, and Jim Wagoner
Members Absent: Robert Brown, Catarina Echols, Kim Harden, Carolyn Hasser, Bradford Ladd, and Harris Oswalt
Staff Members Present: Cartledge W. Blackwell and Melissa Mutert.
2. Mr. Stone moved to approve the minutes for the December 3, 2014 meeting. The motion received a second and was unanimously approval.
3. Mr. Stone 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: Kay Cruthirds**
 - a. Property Address: 306 Charles Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/11/16
 - c. Project: Install two cast iron handrails on the front steps.
2. **Applicant: Richard Brown with Building & Maintenance Company**
 - a. Property Address: 1210 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/11/16
 - c. Project: Repair/replace deteriorated woodwork (siding and details) to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material on the main residence. Touch up the new boards per the existing color scheme. Repair/replace siding to match on an ancillary building. Touch up the paint on impacted areas as per the same.
3. **Applicant: Doug Tierce with Tierce Construction**
 - a. Property Address: 205 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/13/16
 - c. Project: Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material and material. Repaint per the same.
4. **Applicant: Darrel J. Williams Associates**
 - a. Property Address: 1657 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/14/16
 - c. Project: Construct a 7' 5" x 9' 4" rear addition which is not visible from the street (per submitted plans). The board and batten addition will square out a rear corner of the house.
5. **Applicant: Moore Law Firm**
 - a. Property Address: 8 North Dearborn Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/13/15
 - c. Project: Replace rotten as necessary, repaint, body Storm Cloud, white trim. Repair foundation bricks, reroof with metal as per existing.
6. **Applicant: Jarrod White**

- a. Property Address: 1461 Eslava Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/20/16
 - c. Project: Erect six foot wood privacy fence that will not extend beyond the front plane of the house. Said interior lot fence will enclose the rear lot. A three foot picket fence will enclose the front lawn.
- 7. Applicant: Belfor Restoration**
- a. Property Address: 1318 Chamberlain
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/15/16
 - c. Project: Repair rotten wood, repaint existing colors.
- 8. Applicant: Wayne Askew**
- a. Property Address: 214 South Dearborn Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/20/16
 - c. Project: Repair/replace rotten wood as necessary, repaint in existing color scheme.
- 9. Applicant: Moore Law Firm**
- a. Property Address: 8 North Dearborn Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/20/16
 - c. Project: Install a hanging blade sign. Said sign will be affixed to the building's northernmost column. Said metal sign (double-faced) will measure ten square feet.
- 10. Applicant: Tony van Aken**
- a. Property Address: 302 South Georgia Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/21/16
 - c. Project: Install cast iron railings on the front porch.
- 11. Applicant: Inge & Associates**
- a. Property Address: 169 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/21/16
 - c. Project: Re-open an infilled window and transom on the building's west (side) elevation.
- 12. Applicant: Marc Jackson**
- a. Property Address: 558 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/22/16
 - c. Project: Reinstall a white canvas awning on the existing metal awning armature. Paint the stucco and lower-story portions of the building Thunder Gray (Sherwin Williams). Retain replacement windows (wooden matching existing and matching storefront replacement).
- 13. Applicant: Andre Baskin**
- a. Property Address: 264 Stocking Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/22/16
 - c. Project: Reroof with 5 V crimp metal; replace non-historic door and sidelights with historically appropriate cypress with window and sidelights as documented.
- 14. Applicant: Roy and Rebecca Burns**
- a. Property Address: 1160 Church Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/22/16
 - c. Project: Remove a plate glass panel from the upper portion of a wooden door. Install a handcrafted stained-glass panel within the same location. Said treatment is appropriate to the period and style of the building.
- 15. Applicant: Devereaux Bemis**
- a. Property Address: 165-167 State Street

- b. Date of Approval: 1/22/16
- c. Project: Remove a later door not original to the building from the side of a rear wing. Install a period appropriate door at that ground level entrance (per submitted design). Repair another door (renewal of a previous approval.).

16. Applicant: Nathan Emmorey

- a. Property Address: 1116 Old Shell Road
- b. Date of Approval: 1/22/16
- c. Project: Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Touch up the paint per the existing color scheme. Install a window in the rear gable.

17. Applicant: Dharam Pannu

- a. Property Address: 505 Eslava Street
- b. Date of Approval: 1/22/16
- c. Project: Construct a tool shed per submitted plans.

18. Applicant: Royal Scam

- a. Property Address: 72 South Royal Street
- b. Date of Approval: 1/22/16
- c. Project: Reroof the building to match.

19. Applicant: St. Mary's

- a. Property Address: 72 South Royal Street
- b. Date of Approval: 1/22/16
- c. Project: Renew an approval for a circular drive.

20. Applicant: Bernard Wood, IV, with B & W Construction

- a. Property Address: 105 Ryan Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 1/22/16
- c. Project: Construct a rear porch (one not visible from the public view) per submitted plans.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2016-02-CA: 1169 Elmira Street

- a. Applicant: Keri Coumanis with the City of Mobile's Legal Department
- b. Project: Partial Demolition – Demolish the later rear additions to a contributing dwelling.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2016-03-CA:

- a. Applicant: Rishan Figures and Henry Sanpelices with Window World for the Archdiocese of Mobile
- b. Project: Window Replacement on Chancery Building – Remove wooden windows and replace said windows with aluminum clad wooden windows.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

- 1. Guidelines
- 2. Discussion

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2016-02-CA: 1169 Elmira Street
Applicant: Keri Coumanis on behalf of the City of Mobile
Received: 1/22/16
Meeting: 2/3/16

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Partial Demolition – Demolish the later rear portion of a 19th Century residential building.

BUILDING HISTORY

This dwelling is a testament to the importance of studying a building’s construction and evolution as well as its formal and typological characteristics. What appears to be a typical Mobile shotgun with wing began its existence as a circa 1860/70 two room dwelling. Possibly five other building stages informed the evolution of that workman’s cottage. The second phase notably included the constructed of a front room and porch. The public view - the shotgun with wing appearance - is the result of that first change in the building’s morphology. An additional section phase or quite possibly a third phase was the building a detached kitchen. The infill of the space between the main house and connection, a typical spatial expansion, marked the next phase. Two shed additions followed.

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. According to the contents of this property’s MHDC property file, City of Mobile representatives from the Legal, Historic Development, and Property Maintenance departments have been involved with efforts to spur the stabilization and restoration efforts of the subject property since 2005. The application up for review calls for the demolition of later rear portions of the building. A transaction has been arranged whereby the older more historically and architecturally significant portions of the building will be sold to a contractor. The aforementioned contractor will restore the older and more visible portions of the building and thereby save a vital component of a block of eroding historic buildings.

B. With regards to demolition, the Guidelines read as follows: “Proposed demolition of a building must be brought before the Board for consideration. The Board may deny a demolition request if the building’s loss will impair the historic integrity of the district.” However, our ordinance mirrors the Mobile City Code, see §44-79, which sets forth the following standard of review and required findings for the demolition of historic structures:

1. *Required findings; demolition/relocation.* The Board shall not grant certificates of appropriateness for the demolition or relocation of any property within a historic district unless the Board finds that the removal or relocation of such building will not be detrimental to the historical or architectural character of the district. In making this determination, the Board shall consider:

- i. The historic or architectural significance of the structure;
 1. This house exemplifies the evolutionary nature typifying many older buildings. The house began its existence as a two-room workman cottage dating circa 1860/1870. The addition of a street-facing room with gallery resulting in the formal similarity to a shotgun with wing ensued shortly thereafter. The construction and/or connection of a kitchen followed circa 1900. Shed rooms to the east were added in the 20th Century.
- ii. The importance of the structures to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
 1. The subject dwelling contributes to the built density, rhythmic spacing, and historical character of the surrounding Oakleigh Garden District. The two most visible and architecturally significant portions of the building will be retained and sold to a new owner who will restore them. The kitchen wing, infill, and shed additions are not visible from the head-on public view.
- iii. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
 1. The historic building materials are capable of being reproduced.
- iv. Whether the structure is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood, the county, or the region or is a good example of its type, or is part of an ensemble of historic buildings creating a neighborhood;
 1. All buildings are singular, but this dwelling is one of almost two dozen Mobile dwellings that started as workman’s cottages and evolved into larger dwellings featuring a narrow block fronting their initial two-room cores.
- v. Whether there are definite plans for reuse of the property if the proposed demolition is carried out, and what effect such plans will have on the architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological, social, aesthetic, or environmental character of the surrounding area.
 1. If the kitchen wing, infill, and shed additions are granted demolition approval, the building will be sold to a contractor who will restore the historic workman and front room & porch portions of the building. The aforementioned elements are the most visible and substantive portions of the structure.
- vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 1. The City of Mobile acquired the property on 5 February 2015 for a purchase price of \$100.00.
- vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 1. The property has stood vacant for many years. The acquisition by the City of Mobile and action up for review are notable efforts to save the building.
- viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;

1. The property has been listed for sale. The property has an offer. Said offer is dependent upon the demolition of the later rear additions.
 - ix. Description of the options currently held for the purchase of such property, including the price received for such option, the conditions placed upon such option and the date of expiration of such option;
 1. If granted demolition approval for the kitchen wing, infill, and shed additions, the property will sold for a \$2,500.
 - x. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
 1. N.A.
 - xi. Financial proof of the ability to complete the replacement project, which may include but not be limited to a performance bond, a letter of credit, a trust for completion of improvements, or a letter of commitment from a financial institution.
 1. Application submitted.
 - xii. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the Board.
 1. See submitted materials.
2. *Post demolition or relocation plans required.* In no event shall the Board entertain any application for the demolition or relocation of any historic property unless the applicant also presents at the same time the post-demolition or post-relocation plans for the site.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted materials and communications):

1. Demolish the rear portions of a 19th Century dwelling.
2. The subject areas – a kitchen, infill connecting kitchen to main part of the house, and additional shed constructions - constitute later additions.
3. Remove debris from the impacted area property.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application concerns the demolition of the rear portions of a contributing residential building. When reviewing demolition applications, the Board takes into the account the following considerations: the architectural significance of the building and/or portion of building; the condition of the building; the impact the demolition will have on the streetscape; and the nature of any proposed redevelopment.

With regard to the architectural significance of the building, the phases of this dwelling’s construction are illustrative of the societal conditions, construction systems, and cultural expectations informing late 19th Century/early 20th Century Mobile. While those rear portions of the building proposed for demolition (kitchen, infill, and sheds) attest to the house’s growth and its culture’s development, they are not immediately visible from the public view. The original core and most architecturally significant portions of the building will be restored.

The condition of the subject building is an extreme instance of demolition by neglect. The proposal up for review follows up on earlier efforts to protect the building. According to correspondence in the subject property’s vertical file, then MHDC director Devereaux Bemis, made efforts to safeguard the building in 2005. Former MHDC Assistant Director and City Legal member Keri R. Coumanis has continued those efforts. The intervening years from the initial identification through continued action have been accompanied by lack of maintenance and advanced decay. From foundation to roof structural and cosmetic maladies are readily apparent.

If granted demolition approval for those later rear portions of the dwelling, the public view would remain essentially the same. Only the oblique views from the Northeast and to lesser degree Northwest would be

impacted. The former is more pronounced on account of the loss of the adjoining building to the east, while the latter is difficult to experience for reason of the location of the house to the West. The demolitions of those most deteriorated, less visible, and least architecturally significant portions of the building would ensure the restoration of those more prominently situated and conceived portions of the structure.

The redevelopment plan calls for demolition of only the later rear portions of the building and the sale of the two earliest, most visible, architecturally, significant, and visibly prominent portions of the building to contractor who would restore the building. The Board approved a similar application for 957 Selma Street within the past nine months. On July 15, 2015, the demolition of the later rear additions for the aforementioned dwelling was approved. If granted demolition approval, later rear additions would be demolished. The debris would be carefully removed. Ultimately, later asbestos siding (original siding survives beneath) would be removed. Historical features would be retained, repaired, restored, and/or replicated. These latter scopes of work are not a part of the application up for review. They are mentioned so as to attest to the more positive future awaiting the property.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff believes that the removal of the latter additions would impair the architectural and the historical character of the property, but recommends approval of the demolition on account extremely advanced state of the disrepair of those later additions and their minimal impact on the public view. The demolition of those rear portions of the building would enable the restoration of the more architecturally and historically significant main part of the building.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Keri Coumanis with the City of Mobile's Legal Department was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Holmes welcomed the representative for the application. He asked Ms. Coumanis if she had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Ms. Coumanis further clarified the scope of work up for review. So to provide the Board with a broader awareness of how later phases of the project which would be appearing before them, she explained that the new owner was considering buying the adjacent lot and moving the subject building to a more central location atop a re-subdivided lot prior to restoring it. Ms. Coumanis reiterated that the aforementioned purchase and location would take time. She stated that the latter would be subject to the Board's review.

Mr. Wagoner said that while not subject to the Board's review at the present juncture, he was all the same curious of the building's condition. Ms. Coumanis explained that the frame of the building remains in great shape. She added that until recently the roof was even holding tight and the doors and mantels remained in situ.

Mr. Holmes encouraged Ms. Coumanis to provide a plan, if only a diagramed print out of the City Map, for future projects of this nature. He said that one was not deal killer for the present application, but would have proved helpful.

Mrs. Coumanis further explained the portions of the building. She added that if salvageable, the new owner might consider saving a portion of the old kitchen portion of the building. Ms. Coumanis elaborated by saying that the building's dissection would afford a better opportunity realize if it could be saved in part.

Mr. Allen asked for further reassurance that the move would appear before the Board for their review. Ms. Coumanis answered yes.

No further discussion ensued among the assembled Board members.

Mr. Holmes 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 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.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 2/3/17

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2016-03-CA: 400 Government Street
Applicant: Rishan Figures and Henry Sanpelices with Window World for the Archdiocese of Mobile
Received: 1/5/16
Meeting: 2/3/16

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: T5-2 (DDD)
Project: Window Replacement on the Chancery Building – Remove wooden windows and replace said windows with aluminum clad wooden windows.

BUILDING HISTORY

The main building of 400 Government Street dates from 1860.

The house was built for William H. Ketchum and his wife Sarah Nellie Ketchum (nee Creagh of Wilcox Co.) as a town residence. Located on what was then the heart of Mobile’s most prominent residential thoroughfare, the house was one of the last great residences to be completed in Mobile on the advent of the Civil War. The house combines two veins of the fashionable Italianate style. The symmetry, solidity, and monumentality of the dwelling show an assurance in the mastery of the Palazzo variant of the Italianate, while the tower, galleries, and eaves exhibit an equal adeptness in the handling of the style’s villa mode. The high style character of the house has caused for numerous attributions to its designer. C. T. Lernier and Samuel Sloan, both Philadelphia architects who worked on projects in Alabama, have been postulated. Regardless of the architect, the house ranks among the finest of Mobile’s Italianate dwellings. The house has served as the seat of the Roman Catholic bishops and more archbishops of the Mobile since 1906.

The Chancery Building to the west of the main dwelling represents a later addition to the Archbishop’s Residence. The building dates from 1950s. it was designed by John Carey, a longtime architect of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Alabama. Carey was responsible for several dozen buildings for then statewide Diocese of Alabama. Some of his notable Mobile buildings include the McGill Building of McGill-Toolen Catholic High School, St. Mary’s School (eastern portion), and numerous houses in Midtown.

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. According to materials located within this property's vertical, the Ketchum House and Chancery Building have never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. As attested to by three decades of paperwork, all work conducted on the building has been authorized on a midmonth basis. The application up for review calls for the removal and replacement of windows on the Chancery Building. The windows are on the main part of the Archbishop's Residence are in an excellent state or repair and are not part of the application up for review.
- 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 the building. Original window openings should be retained as well as original sashes and glazing."
 2. "Where windows cannot be repaired, new windows must be compatible to the existing."
- C. **Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):**
 1. Remove forty-three deteriorated wooden windows and casings from the Chancery Building of the Archbishop's Residence.
 2. Replace the aforementioned wooden windows and casings with aluminum clad wooden windows of the same light configuration and framing.
 3. The windows will be double-paned in construction and feature impact resistant glass.
 4. The west-facing windows will not feature the frosted glass as is now employed.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The application began as a site visit with the contract firm in October of 2015. The original intention of the contractor was to remove the wooden windows from the Chancery Building and replace them with vinyl windows. The contract firm was informed that vinyl windows are not allowed for installation in Mobile's Historic Districts.

On January 4th 2016, Staff received a call from representatives of the contract firm during which the continued interest in the replacement of the windows was expressed. An application was submitted on January 5th. That application, the one up for review, calls for the removal and replacement of wooden windows with aluminum clad wooden windows.

Staff contacted the Office of the Archdiocese on January 6th. During that call, representatives of the Archdiocese were informed of alternatives to replacing the windows. A combined approach of window repair and storm window installation was mentioned.

Staff first visited the site with the application up for review in full consideration on January 8th. Staff inspected the windows from the exterior.

On January 11th, Staff met with a representative of Archdiocese's Properties staff and a representative of the contracting firm. The windows were examined from both exterior and interior vantage points. It was added that the intention to not replace frosted glass panes found on the west elevation. If granted approval, the replacement panes would be clear unfrosted glass.

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 the building and that original window openings should be retained as well as original sashes and glazing (See B-1.). The

Design Guidelines go on to state that where windows cannot be repaired, new windows must be compatible to the existing (See B-2.).

As with any application, particulars of physical condition, later changes, and multiple other concerns come into play. What more advanced deterioration which has as occurred is internal in nature. The windows are for the most part inoperable.

During the on-site meeting with representatives of the contracted firm and Archdiocese, Staff was informed of the rationale behind the replacement – the want of impact resistant glass and operability. The current windows could not support impact resistant glass. Repair of those windows would further jeopardize their structural integrity and possibly remove functional ability. Wholesale pane replacement calls for the installation of fully code compliant window windows and glazing.

The proposed replacement windows would match the originals in all respects other than construction (double paned and aluminum clad). The windows are then fully compatible as per design. Aluminum clad wooden windows are approved for additions and new construction. They have been approved for the replacement of later non-historic windows and in some cases extremely deteriorated historic windows. The replacement of windows on the Van Antwerp Building represents the most recent instance. That project was approved on May 1, 2013.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (2), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the property or the surrounding historic district. Staff recommends approval on this application for reason inevitable destruction of the windows for purposes of the installation of the glazing and the compatibility of the design to the original windows (casings, profiles, light configuration to match).

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Keith Bradfor Rishan Figures with Window World for the Archdiocese of Mobile and Robin Rockstall and Lisa Hanson with Archdiocese of Mobile were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Holmes welcomed the Archdiocese's representatives. He asked the representatives if they had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Ms. Hansen stated that the Archdiocese of Mobile would like to see the application approved as submitted and recommended.

Mr. Roberts and Mr. Holmes asked for clarification as to the use of the muntins and filler. Mr. Bradford and Mr. Blackwell addressed their queries by confirming that interior and exterior muntins would be employed. They added that said muntins would be white in color and be divided by a white filler.

Mr. Stone asked for clarification as to the window surround. Mr. Blackwell addressed Mr. Stone's concern.

Mr. Allen asked if all light configurations would be replicated. Mr. Bradford answered yes.

Mr. Allen asked for clarification as to the use of frosted glass on the West Elevation. Ms. Hanson provided the institutional background of why frosted glass had been used and why it was not requested.

No further Board discussion ensued.

Mr. Holmes asked if there was anyone who wished to speak either in favor or in opposition to the application. Upon hearing no response, he 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 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.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 2/3/17